

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of
Oxford.

ANDREW OF ST. VICTOR, A TWELFTH CENTURY HEBRAIST.

AN INVESTIGATION OF HIS WORKS AND SOURCES.

by

GERRY A. C. HADFIELD.

A B S T R A C T

Michaelmas Term 1971 [ie 1972]^{HT}

St. Hugh's College

The aim of this study is to examine the biblical commentaries of Andrew of St. Victor, abbot of Wigmore (d.1175), and to pay particular attention to his Jewish sources.

Andrew wrote commentaries on most of the books of the Old Testament. His work can be divided into three groups: commentaries on the historical books, written before 1147; interpretations of the prophetic books, written shortly after c.1154; and his exposition of the Song of Songs, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, written before 1161 or 1163. Ever since Miss Smalley's articles in the Rech.Théol.anc.méd. of 1938 and 1939 and her book, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, the importance of Andrew as a commentator has been recognized, but the fact that his work exist in manuscript form only, apart from his commentaries on Ecclesiastes and Jonah, has prevented his writings from becoming more widely known. For this reason I originally intended to prepare an edition of a commentary on one of the Pentateuchal books. However, as it became clear that an edition would lose much of its value without an examination of the sources Andrew used, I decided to concentrate on the latter. The large number of his commentaries made it necessary, all the same, to select one or two for special study. The interpretations of Exodus and Isaiah were chosen, first because they were written during different periods of Andrew's life, thus making it possible to follow any changes in his exegetical method; and secondly because the different contents of these books present their commentators with different problems.

Andrew, probably an Englishman by birth, began his studies at St. Victor under Hugh (d.1141). At the time St. Victor was very much a part of what is so conveniently called 'the twelfth century Renaissance', of which the theological aspects have been so well described in Père Chenu's La Théologie au douzième siècle. The

Victorines, being both claustrales and scholares, played an important part in transmitting the lectio divina from the secluded atmosphere of the cloister to the school, the new urban centre of intellectual activity. The library of St. Victor was well stocked with the pagan classics; Hugh lectured on the literal sense of the historical books of the Old Testament and wrote his De Sacramentis along historical rather than theological lines, and also provided his pupils with maps and a guide to reading. As far as the study of Scripture was concerned, he took Gregory's advice seriously, once again, to lay first the fundamenta historiae before passing to allegorical and tropological exposition. This new evaluation of the literal sense was, of course, inspired by Jerome, 'patron de l'exégèse littérale', rather than by Gregory. It is not surprising, therefore, that Andrew, when he decided to make the literal interpretation of the Bible his special field of study, regarded Jerome as his great master and precursor.

It may be noted here that, among modern historians of medieval thought and doctrine, there are some differences of opinion on the importance of the rediscovery of historia and of the literal sense at the expense of allegoria; on the influence of Jerome and Hugh in bringing about this change in biblical studies; and on the role of this rediscovery in the general emergence of a scientific theology in the twelfth century. In particular Père de Lubac, at the beginning of the second part of his invaluable Exégèse médiévale differs from Miss Smalley, as well as from the Pères Mandonnet, Spicq, de Ghellinck and, to a lesser extent, Chenu, on this point. However, it seems undeniable that there was a renewed interest in the explanation of the literal sense during that period, as is illustrated by the works of men like Hugh, Andrew, 'the anonymous commentator on Leviticus' (cf. Smalley), and Herbert of Bosham's commentary on Jerome's Hebrew Psalter, as well as by the increasing popularity of Andrew's

In this study Andrew's method of interpretation is examined, his knowledge of Hebrew is discussed, and his Jewish sources are analysed as far as possible. An attempt is made to discover Andrew's own attitude towards Jewish exposition - how far was he prepared to go in accepting their interpretations, and how did he try to avoid the risk of being accused of judaizing by his contemporaries. As his work had much in common with the twelfth century French Jewish schools of biblical exegesis, a chapter is devoted to these schools and to their most prominent representatives. Some attention is also paid to the controversy between Jews and Christians from early times onwards over the interpretation of Is.vii.14, since Andrew's explanation of this particular verse, an important part of his commentary on Isaiah, is a good illustration of his evaluation of Jewish exposition; and also because it was to attack Andrew's comments on this verse in particular that Richard of St. Victor wrote his De Emmanuele. Lastly, the Jewish interpretation of the servant passages in Isaiah are discussed in some detail, again as a background against which to see Andrew's explanation of the prophecies concerned. In studying the commentaries I have adopted the method of examining selected passages, while some longer extracts are printed in an Appendix.

One of the main problems in the examination of Andrew's commentaries is his vagueness, and his refusal, in good medieval tradition, to commit himself firmly to one or the other interpretation. This did not prove much of a hindrance as regards his commentary on Exodus, as in the interpretation of a book of this kind it is often quite informative to have several possible explanations put forward. In his comments on Isaiah, however, it means that it is often difficult to decide whether he understands certain prophecies as referring to the actual historical situation of the people of Israel, or to an eagerly

Servant that this new attitude made its first noticeable appearance.

awaited messianic future. It seemed to me that this ambiguousness reflected partly the Jewish approach to Scripture, which often likes to insert a note of messianic hope into its interpretations, partly Andrew's fear of committing himself too firmly to Jewish (messianic) explanations, and partly the sometimes enigmatic character of the words of the prophet himself. Another problem is the anonymity of his sources, another medieval vice, and the fact that all Jewish explanation came to him at second hand. Also, his own ambiguous concept of the 'literal sense' and the fact that he tended to regard all Jewish interpretation, whatever its content, as 'literal', makes his comments at times somewhat confusing, and leads him to state occasionally that some prophecies of Isaiah can be understood as referring to 'our' Messiah as well as to the Jewish one.

The comparison of the two commentaries shows that one of the differences between them is that in Exodus much stress is laid on the linguistic information Andrew received from the Jews, while in Isaiah it is the Jewish exposition he was most concerned with. Another striking difference in Andrew's interpretational method in Exodus and Isaiah is that in Exodus he showed himself a keen collector of information on the literal sense, both from Jewish and non-Jewish sources, which he used rather indiscriminately. In Isaiah, on the other hand, he is more selective in the choice of his material and he shows a much greater measure of independence towards his sources, especially Jerome, while his comments are of a more thoughtful and substantial character. Most important, however, is the change which was beginning to emerge in his recording of Jewish information. While in Exodus he took the teaching of the Jews as it came, in Isaiah he began to sense that it was sometimes necessary to distinguish between Jewish spiritual and Jewish literal explanation. It was in the chapter on the Suffering Servant that this new attitude made its first noticeable appearance.

Andrew's commentaries, therefore, constitute a significant stage in the development of medieval biblical studies. Not only did their author look back to Jerome, and followed him in going to the Jews for the literal explanation of Scripture, he also prepared the way for Hebrew scholarship in the following centuries, and contributed to a new evaluation of the literal sense and Jewish interpretation.

ANDREW OF ST. VICTOR, A THIRTEENTH CENTURY HEBREW SCHOLAR,
 AN INVESTIGATION OF HIS WORKS AND SOURCES.

JERRY A.O. RABINOVITZ,



London: Duckworth, 1974. [i.e. 1972]

St. Hugh's College.

PREFACE

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the
University of Oxford.

The works of Andrew of St. Victor take a unique place among medieval biblical commentaries, partly because they give a partly literal explanation of Scripture, and partly because they demonstrate that references to the Hebrew text and contemporary Jewish exposition had already found a place in Christian commentaries more than a century before the Festivals of Nicholas of Lyre.

ANDREW OF ST. VICTOR, A TWELFTH CENTURY HEBRAIST.

Since Miss Scalley first called attention to Andrew's work, now

AN INVESTIGATION OF HIS WORKS AND SOURCES.

more than 30 years ago, in a series of articles in Recherches de

Théologie ancienne et médiévale and later on in The Study of the
by

Bible in the Middle Ages, the importance of Andrew as an exegete has

been generally acknowledged; but the absence of a detailed study of

GERRY A.C. HADFIELD.

his writings and above all of a critical edition of some of his more

influential commentaries has prevented full recognition. Apart from

an edition of his commentaries on Ecclesiastes and Jonah, his works are

accessible in numerous editions. This circumstance has led me to

elaborate on Miss Scalley's 'introductory studies', as she likes to

call them. Although I intended to prepare an edition of

Andrew's commentaries on the Pentateuch books, it became clear

that an edition would be of little value without a thorough

examination of the contents of his work and of the sources used. An

investigation of these, therefore, seemed of primary importance, leaving

an edition to come later time perhaps. This approach has the advantage

that by not being limited to the study of one commentary in particular,

it is possible to follow Andrew's exposition over a longer period of

Michaelmas Term 1971. [ie 1972] ^{HT}

St. Hugh's College.

All the same, the number of his commentaries made some selection

necessary. I have paid particular attention to the interpretation of

Exodus and Isaiah, because these date from different periods of his

writing and are particularly

PREFACE .

The works of Andrew of St. Victor take a unique place among medieval biblical commentaries, partly because they give a purely literal explanation of Scripture^{and} partly because they demonstrate that references to the Hebrew text and contemporary Jewish exposition had already found a place in Christian commentaries more than a century before the Postillae of Nicholas of Lyre.

Since Miss Smalley first called attention to Andrew's work, now more than 30 years ago, in a series of articles in Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale and later on in The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, the importance of Andrew as an exegete has been generally acknowledged; but the absence of a detailed study of his writings and above all of a critical edition of some of his more influential commentaries has prevented full recognition. Apart from an edition of his commentaries on Ecclesiastes and Jonah, his works are accessible in manuscript form only. This circumstance has led me to elaborate on Miss Smalley's 'impressionistic studies', as she likes to call them. Although I initially intended to prepare an edition of Andrew's commentary on one of the Pentateuchal books, it became clear that an edition would lose much of its value without a thorough examination of the contents of his work and of the sources used. An investigation of these, therefore, seemed of primary importance, leaving an edition to some later time perhaps. This approach has the advantage that, by not being limited to the study of one commentary in particular, it is possible to follow Andrew's exposition over a longer period of time.

All the same, the number of his commentaries made some selection necessary. I have paid particular attention to the interpretation of Exodus and Isaiah, because these date from different periods of his

life, thus making it possible to detect any changes in his method of interpretation. Furthermore, the different contents of these books make different demands on a commentator of the literal sense. I have used MS.B.Nat.Lat. 356, Paris (microfilm), collated with MS.Laud.Lat. 105 (Bodleian Library), for Andrew on the Pentateuch, and MS.Pem.45, Cambridge (partly the actual MS, partly microfilm), collated with MS.Maz.175, Paris (microfilm) for Andrew on Isaiah.

In this study I have attempted to elucidate Andrew's method of interpretation and to investigate his sources. I have concentrated especially on his references to Jewish exposition, since the latter form the most striking, but at the same time the most neglected aspect of his work. In the examination of his Jewish sources I had to rely much on translations and the help of other scholars, as my knowledge of Hebrew did not allow for reading the medieval commentaries independently. I have discussed Andrew's knowledge of Hebrew, and the type of information he derived from the Jews. This information was found to be influenced to a large extent by contemporary Jewish schools of biblical interpretation, although Andrew himself may not have been aware of this. Another point of interest was that not all of Andrew's references to Jewish exegesis could be accounted for. Although someone more experienced than I in the field of medieval Jewish biblical interpretation would most certainly be able to allocate most of these, some may point to Jewish oral tradition and deserve further investigation. Also Andrew's own unsystematic approach to his work came to light, and his lack of distinction between Jewish literal and spiritual interpretation, which led him to incorporate all Jewish exposition rather indiscriminately as belonging to the literal sense. I found one notable exception to this rule.

My basic method has been to analyze Andrew's most relevant comments on a particular chapter or group of chapters, selected for their special interest, and to follow this examination with a discussion of the results of the investigation. Exodus, however, required a somewhat different

approach because of Andrew's own treatment of the text, which involved the use of a greater variety of sources than ^{were consulted} for his commentary on Isaiah. Moreover, I thought it necessary to pay more attention to the general characteristics of his manner of interpretation in the discussion of Exodus, being the first commentary dealt with, than in the chapters on his exposition of Isaiah. In order to form some idea of the kind of Jewish interpretation Andrew was likely to come across, a chapter on the contemporary Jewish biblical schools and one on the Jewish treatment of the servant passages of Isaiah have been added. Some longer extracts of his commentaries on Exodus and Isaiah can be found in the Appendix.

I would like to express here my gratitude to my supervisor, Miss Beryl Smalley, for the encouragement she gave me throughout the preparation of this thesis, and for the way she made her wide knowledge of the subject available to me. Without her help and suggestions and, above all, her initial studies of Andrew this thesis would have been inconceivable. I also like to mention here Professor C.W. Moënich of Amsterdam, who awakened my interest in the Middle Ages by his enthusiastic and thoughtful appreciation of the period. Much of his own love for the subject has been reflected in his students. I am grateful to Mr. Hayim Soloveitchik who has helped me with the tracing of some of the Hebrew material, and to Dr. Paul Hyams for his critical reading of much of the manuscript.

For generous financial assistance I have to thank the Johanna van Tussenbroek Fund, the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.) and St. Hugh's College, Oxford, which awarded me the Yates Senior Scholarship.

Finally, I want to acknowledge my debt to my parents and my husband, David, for the opportunity they gave me to embark on and finish this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Abstract.	Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research.	pp.1-7
Preface.	The Bible, 'authorized version'.	pp.i-iii
Table of Contents.	The Babylonian Talmud, ed. L. Epstein (London, 1935-43), 2 vols.	p.iv
List of Abbreviations.	res christiana latinae : Les rabbins	pp.v-vi
Editorial Procedure.	Études Juives, iv, 1963).	pp.vii-viii
Chapter I	Andrew of St. Victor, abbot of Wigmore. His life and work.	pp.1-20
Chapter II	The Jewish biblical schools of France... in the Twelfth Century.	pp.21-38
Chapter III	The Commentary on Exodus. Andrew on Exodus.	pp.39-103.
Chapter IV	The Commentary on Isaiah. Prologue and interpretation of chapter i.	pp.104-141
Chapter V	Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium (Is.vii.14).	pp.142-162
Chapter VI	Isaiah xi, a twofold explanation.	pp.163-187
Chapter VII	Isaiah xl to lxvi, different ways of approach.	pp.188-209
Chapter VIII	Some notes on Andrew's interpretation of Isaiah xl to lii.12.	pp.210-242
Chapter IX	The servant-chapter, Is.lii.13-liii.12.	pp.243-263
Chapter X	Conclusions.	pp.264-269
Appendix I	Some longer extracts from Andrew's commentaries (Ex.i-iii.11; xiv.3-31; xx.1-17; Is.vii.1-13; lii.1-10).	pp.270-284
Appendix II	Table I (acknowledged borrowings on Exodus). Table II (acknowledged Jewish borrowings on Exodus).	pp.285-286 pp.287-288
Select Bibliography.	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, la	pp.289-298

LIST of ABBREVIATIONS.

- Am.Ac.Jew.Res. : Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research.
- A.V. : The Bible, 'authorized version'.
- Bab.Talmud : The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I.Epstein (London, 1935-48),
34 vols.
- B.Blumenkranz, Les auteurs chrétiens latins : Les auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme
(Etudes Juives, iv, 1963).
- C. : MS.Pem. 45 (cf. below).
- Cah.Civ.Méd. : Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale.
- C.C.S.L. : Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (1954-...), vol.I-...
- Encl.Rel.Eth. : Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J.Hastings
(Edinburgh, 1908-21), 12 vols.
- Etymologiae : Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX, ed. W.M.Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), 2 vols.
- L.Ginzberg, Legends : The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia, 1909-59),
7 vols.
- Hebr.Un.Coll. Ann. : Hebrew Union College Annual.
- Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is. : Commentary on Isaiah, ed. M.Friedländer (Ibn Ezra Literature, i, 1873).
- Italia Med. e Uman. : Italia Medioevale e Umanistica.
- J.E. : The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. I.Singer (New York-London, 1901-06),
12 vols.
- Jerome, Comm.inEs. : Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XVIII (C.C.S.L. 73 and 73A).
- Jerome, Hebrew Questions : Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libros Regum et Paralipomenon (P.L.23).
- J.J.S. : The Journal of Jewish Studies.
- Kimchi, Comm.on Is. : Rab.Davidis Kimchii commentarii in Jesaiam prophetam, transl. C.Malanimeus (Florence, 1774).
- H.de Lubac, Exégèse méd. : Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Écriture (Paris, 1959-64), 4 vols.
- M. : MS.Maz.175 (cf. below).
- Med. and Renais.Stud. : Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- G.F.Moore, Judaism : Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era, the age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, Mass., 1940-44),
3 vols.
- MS.B.Nat.Lat.356 : MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Latin 356.

- MS. C.C.C. 30: MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 30.
- MS.Laud.Lat. 105 : MS.Bodleian Library, Oxford, Laud.Lat. 105.
- MS.Maz.175 : MS.Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, 175.
- MS.Pem.45 : MS, Pembroke College, Cambridge, 45.
- A.Neubauer, Isaiah 53: The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish interpreters (Oxford, 1876-77), I-Texts; II-Transl. by S.R.Driver and A.Neubauer.
- Notulae : Hugh of St. Victor, Adnotationes Elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon (P.L.175).
- O. : MS.Laud. Lat.105.
- P. : MS. B.Nat.Lat. 356.
- P.L. and P.G. : J.P. Migne, Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina (Paris, 1844-63); Series Graeca (Paris, 1857-66).
- Quaestiones Ex. : Augustine, Quaestionum in Heptateuchum Libri VII, L.II: Quaestiones Exodi (C.C.S.L.33).
- Rashi, Comm.on Is. : R. Salomonis Jarchi, Commentarius Hebraicus in Prophetas Maiores et Minores, ed. J.F. Breithaupt (Göttingen, 1713), vol. i.
- R.E.J. : Revue des Etudes Juives.
- Rech.Théol. anc. méd. : Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale.
- Rev.Sc.Phil Théol. : Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques.
- Strack-Billerbeck : H.L.Strack and P.Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud and Midrasch (Munich, 1922-1928), 4 vols.
- Strom.Patr. et Med. : Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia.
- Study : B. Smalley, The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (2nd edn., Oxford, 1952).
- Trans.Jew.Hist.Soc.Eng. : The Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England.
- Theol.Zeitschr. : Theologische Zeitschrift.
- ThW : Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G.Kittel (Stuttgart, 1933-...), vol.I-...
- V. : Biblia sacra vulgatae editionis cura monachorum Abbatiae pontificiae sancti Hieronymi in urbe Ordinis sancti Benedicti ([Rome], 1959).
- Z.A.W. : Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

Editorial Procedure.

1) For Andrew on the Pentateuch MS.B.Nat.Lat. 356 (referred to as P.) has been used, collated with MS.Laud.Lat.105 (referred to as O.); for Andrew on Isaiah MS.Pem.45 (referred to as C.), collated with MS.Maz.175 (referred to as M.). Manuscript folio numbers are given in the footnotes, except in the longer extracts in Appendix I, where they are placed in the right hand margin; those of O. and M. are shown between brackets in the footnotes. In chapters dealing exclusively with either Exodus or Isaiah the symbol referring to the manuscript is omitted. Each manuscript folio is divided into columns a, b, c and d, and the end of each column is shown as /.

2) The text is substantially that of the manuscripts, except for conjectural readings made necessary by damage and defective writing, or for editorial additions, which are all placed within < > . Passages which should be omitted from the text are placed within []. Occasional explanatory notes, for example sc., are placed within (). The most important other departures from the manuscript reading are marked with a superior letter, a, b, c etc. and recorded in the footnotes. As no attempt has been made to edit the transcribed texts, only the significant variant readings are noted. These are likewise marked with a superior letter a, b, c etc. in the text and given in the footnotes. For the same reason, expanded abbreviations and interlinear or marginal writings are not indicated, nor is evidence of erasure or deletion. Obvious mistakes are not mentioned either, following Professor Southern's advice in these matters, that there is no point in repeating the errors of the past.

3) Capitalisation and punctuation are regularized in accordance with modern usage. The division into chapters and verses is made

according to the Vulgate, for which the Benedictine edition ([Rome], 1959) was used.¹ Following a somewhat arbitrary principle, in references to the Psalms the numbers of the A.V. are given, and the Vulgate numbers shown between brackets where necessary.

4) All scriptural quotations are italicized throughout. Where the manuscript reading was substantially different from the Vulgate, this is noted in the footnotes. In a few cases, where this made better sense, the Vulgate text was preferred to the manuscript version. References to biblical texts other than those under consideration are given in the footnotes.

5) For the spelling of Scriptural names the manuscripts are followed as closely as possible, with occasional modifications in accordance with the Vulgate reading.

6) The spelling of Latin is standardized and 'modernized' throughout. For example: c before i > t (iusticia > iustitia); y > i (ymago > imago); h before vowel is left out (honus > onus); p between m and n is left out (dampnatio > damnatio); h after c is left out (sepulchrum > sepulcrum), except in nichil. The medieval practice of writing e for ae and oe is observed. Numerals are given in full writing.

7) In both Latin and English quotations the spelling of the sources is followed, including the use of capitals and brackets (). Explanatory notes in quotations if more important than (sc....) are placed within [], except in quotations from the Babylonian Talmud (ed. Epstein) where square brackets are used by the editor.

1. The Isaiah volume of the great Benedictine edition appeared too late to be consulted for this thesis. For the sake of convenience, therefore, the Exodus volume was not used either.

CHAPTER I

Andrew of St. Victor, abbot of Wigmore. His life and work.

I

Andrew, in all probability an Englishman by birth, began his studies at St. Victor under Master Hugh (d. 1141), though we do not know when he first entered the order.¹ There is evidence that he held the office of prior for a short period at some time around the year 1148, since it is in this capacity that the Augustinian canons of a daughter house of St. Victor in Herefordshire asked him to become their abbot.

This small foundation, which had only recently been founded, had already known many troubles in its short existence. Several brothers from the mother house had been sent to England to help the young community organize itself, but most of them quickly returned to Paris, homesick and regarding life at the Welsh border too uncivilized to bear for long. The early thirteenth century History of the Foundation of Wigmore Abbey,² which describes the foundation of the house under King Stephen (1135-1154) and its history until about 1251, mentions as one of the problems the difficulty of finding a suitable site; this was mainly due to the unreliability of their patron Hugh de Mortimer, who kept them moving from place to place. Thus, when Andrew arrived he found awaiting him an almost inaccessible church and a rough uncomfortable house with an insufficient water supply, inhabited by canons who were difficult to rule and harassed by a continuous threat of robbery and war. It is therefore hardly surprising that fairly soon, about 1154, a 'coolness', as the

1. The biographical material has been taken from B. Smalley, 'Andrew of St. Victor, Abbot of Wigmore: a twelfth century Hebraist', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., x (1938), 358-73 and from the chapter on Andrew in The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (2nd edn., Oxford, 1952), p. 112 ff. Here after this work will be referred to as Study.

2. Printed in T. Wright, The History of Ludlow (Ludlow, 1852), p. 102 ff., and recently edited from the manuscript by J.C. Dickinson and P.T. Ricketts, 'The Anglo-Norman Chronicle of Wigmore Abbey', Trans. Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club, xxxix (1969), part iii.

chronicle calls it, arose between the brethren and Andrew, who after all was more of a scholar than an administrator, which made him decide to go back to St. Victor and take up his studies again.

In the mean time the canons succeeded in finding a permanent site near Wigmore; consequently there was a considerable improvement in their position. Thus, following the death of Andrew's successor, Abbot Roger, they agreed to recall Andrew. The bishop of Hereford, Gilbert Foliot, wrote a pleading letter on their behalf to the abbot of St. Victor, which three of their wisest brothers personally took to Paris in an attempt to persuade Andrew to come back.¹ The History states that they managed to do so with much difficulty, and that the canons received their former abbot with great joy. This happened between 1161 and 1163. Andrew stayed in Wigmore until his death in October 1175 and was buried there 'with great honour.'

It seems that in Wigmore most of his time was occupied with ruling the house and caring for the brethren. This demand on his time probably explains why all his work was written in Paris. Such an impression is emphasized by Richard of St. Victor, who in his De Emmanuele refers to Andrew as to someone who is already dead, or at least lost from view.² As Richard died in 1173 the De Emmanuele must have been written before that date, probably during Andrew's second period in England. This means that he must have lost contact with the academic world, busying himself elsewhere. The surroundings of St. Victor, on the other hand, with its mixture of mysticism and learning, provided him with the right kind of background for his biblical studies. The regular monastic discipline, with its set times for prayer and study and its stress on

1. The letter has been printed in The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot, ed. A. Morey and C.N.L. Brooke (Cambridge, 1967), p. 181. The letter, nr. 138, is dated 1161-63.

2. De Emmanuele (P.L. 196, 601-666).

lectio divina, offered plenty of opportunity for peaceful scholarship, much more so than the hustle and bustle of administration. Here Andrew could devote himself undisturbed to the work he really loved. Here also he had at his disposal the famous library of St. Victor and another, to him invaluable source of information, namely the Jews.

II

Andrew's work, consisting of commentaries on the Old Testament, falls roughly into three sections. First of all the commentaries on the historical books, written before 1147.¹ Secondly his exposition of the prophetic books. From the prologue to this collection of interpretations it appears that Andrew felt that he was coming back to this type of work after a considerable interval: 'Proposui sicut olim super Pentateuchum et Iosue et Iudicum et Malachim ita et nunc...aliquam explanatiunculam super obscura prophetarum scripta cudere'.² The difference in time can be explained best as referring to his first stay in England; when he returned to Paris he took up his old tools again, though not than with 'great reluctance, fearing to start a work of such difficulty'.³ Lastly he wrote commentaries on the Song of Songs, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. By that time he had already made his name as a commentator, for in the prologue to the Proverbs he says that he was 'compelled to write them at the many urgent requests of his friends'.⁴

As far as the form of his work is concerned, he chose the well

1. Cf. Study, p. 112.

2. MS. Maz. 175, fo. 93b (The prologue is printed and translated in Study, pp. 375 ff. and 121 ff. respectively).

3. Ibid.

4. MS. C.C.C. 30, fo. 87d: '...multis amicorum precibus compulsus...'. As Andrew does not use this cliché elsewhere, we may accept it as true in this case.

established practice, going back to the patristic scholia, of commenting on selected passages only. Sometimes he concentrates on a single word, sometimes on a complete verse, depending on what caused a particular problem of interpretation. As regards his intentions and principles, for these we have to search his commentaries and in particular the various prologues, since he does not indicate them in any systematic way himself. For instance, in the above mentioned prologue to the Proverbs he says that he was asked 'ad opuscula Salomonis iuxta littere superficiem explananda...'; to explain the surface of the letter. This expression we find over and over again in his writings. At the beginning of his interpretation of Genesis, for example, we read that he does not intend to discuss questions about the construction of the firmament, whether it moves and such like problems, 'since we are concentrating only on an exposition of the letter'.¹ This means that he is not interested in theological questions and dialectics, or in a division of the text into a literal, an allegorical and a mystical sense. All this he leaves, as he says in the prologue to the Prophets, to the more competent, regarding it better 'to stay safely on one's own level than to rise vainly above it'.² This level, which Andrew has made specifically his own is, as we have already seen, the exposition of the literal sense of the Old Testament books.

III

The interpretation of the literal or historical sense had always played a minor part in the writings of patristic and medieval theologians.

1. MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356, fo. 5a (92a): 'An purus ignis sit firmamentum, an stet, an moveatur, cuiusque figurae sit et ceteris huiusmodi quaestionibus supersedentes, solam littere expositionem exequi temptabimus'.

2. MS. Maz. 175, fo. 93a.

4. quoted by H. de Lubac, *op. cit.* II, 1, 476.

Every one accepted as a matter of fact the division of the text into three or four different senses, among which the literal sense invariably took the lowest place.¹ Even Jerome, in spite of his concern for the letter of the text, took this pattern for granted; while after him commentators moved further and further away from the study of the literal meaning of Scripture. Augustine, though not neglecting the letter, had a deep spiritual understanding of the sacra pagina; Gregory's Moralia were used almost exclusively as an example of allegorical interpretation,² and not much real attention was paid to his advice first to lay the fundamenta historiae.³ In fact, according to the abbé Wasselynck, this warning had become a mere 'slogan' for many generations of interpreters.⁴ Moreover, not many new, in the sense of original, works were being completed between the fifth and the eleventh centuries. Exegesis was characterised by a great respect for tradition and an almost servile faithfulness to patristic interpretation. Subsequently the great majority of material which was handed down concentrated on spiritual exposition.

This changes from the end of the eleventh century onwards. We see how the mind frees ~~it~~^{it}self from the past and begins to recover new possibilities. Natural science flowers; the pagan classics are read

1. For a comprehensive study of the multiple senses of Scripture, cf. H. de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale. Les quatre sens de L'Ecriture (Paris, 1959-1964) in particular vol. I, 1, ch. 2. On the absence of literal interpretation, see C. Spicq, 'Pourquoi le moyen âge n'a-t-il pas davantage pratiqué l'exégèse littérale?', Rev. Sc. phil. théol. xxx (1941-42), 169-79.

2. Cf. R. Wasselynck, 'L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux', Rech. Théol. anc. méd. xxxii (1965), passim, pp. 157-204.

3. Epistola Missoria, c. iii (P.L. 75, 513C): 'Nam primum quidem fundamenta historiae ponimus; deinde per significationem typicam in arcem fidei fabricam mentis erigimus; ad extremum quoque per moralitatis gratiam, quasi superducto aedificium colore vestimus'.

4. Quoted by H. de Lubac, op. cit., II, 1, 210.

more widely and with more pleasure than ever before. Attempts are made at more accurate translations of the Bible and the Koran; a renewed interest is taken in history; nature and its beauty are studied and admired. Itinerant missionaries cross the country, preaching the gospel in the vernacular and urging the people to go back to a life of apostolic poverty and simplicity; students travel far from home to hear the famous masters, who are teaching now in the cities, rather than in the often isolated monasteries.

In the field of exegesis this new outlook is represented by Hugh of St. Victor. It has been the merit of Hugh that he was able to change the formula of Gregory into a workable hypothesis. Gregory, as it were, advised his readers to construct a building by piling up different types of stones in a certain order, but exegetes did not quite understand how this should be done and consequently the stones marked 'littera' were left out. Hugh, however, indicated exactly which stone should be fitted where, and thus built a compact structure in which every stone found its natural place. The Père Chenu has clearly explained this unity of the different types of interpretations and their proper function in the construction of a systematic theology as conceived by Hugh. 'Contre une allégorisation prématurée, he writes, il réagit catégoriquement en faveur de l'historia et de son irremplaçable valeur; hors de la lettre, pris comme fondement, on bâtirait à vide'.¹ Not only the words (voces) have a deeper meaning, according to Hugh, but also the historical realities (res) acquire a higher value if seen as the expression God's handling of the events, that is to say when historia becomes historia salutis, and it is by means of allegory that this transfer can be understood: 'L'édifice de la pensée chrétienne, ainsi

1. M.-D. Chenu, La Théologie au Douzième Siècle (Paris, 1957), p. 200.

bâti en textes scripturaires, s'élève, se "fabrique" par la méthode allégorique....L'histoire biblique, dont la signification est un élément essentiel, nourrit, par ce symbolisme, la théologie, dans la mesure même ou la théologie est une élaboration du donné scripturaire'.¹ Thus allegory became on the one hand a rule for the spiritual understanding of Scripture, on the other an instrument for a theological construction, while in both qualities it is firmly based on the historical foundation provided by the letter of the text.² 'L'Esprit est dans l'Histoire', the Père Chenu observes, 'et tous les réveils bibliques ont fait de cette conjonction la loi de leur mystique comme de leur méthode'.³

There are many passages in Hugh's writings which deal with this revaluation of the historical sense. 'Do not despise the lesser things', he warns in the Didascalion, '....If you scorn to learn the alphabet, you will never make your name as a grammarian'.⁴ In the De Scripturis et scriptoribus sacris praenotiuunculae he shows himself contemptuous of those who pass the letter by and start straight away with allegory:

'The mystical sense is in the first place gathered from what the letter suggests. I wonder, therefore, how some dare to pretend to be learned in allegorisation, while they do not know the primary meaning of the letter. "We," they say, "read Scripture, but we do not read the letter. We do not care for the letter, we teach allegory." But how can you read Scripture and not the letter? For if you take away the letter, what remains of Scripture? "The letter," they say, "means one thing according to the literal, another according to the allegorical sense. Lion for example is according to the historical sense a beast, but allegorically it means Christ....". But I ask you, who approves of this why lion means Christ? Perhaps you answer, as one should in such a case when the meaning has been

1. Ibid., p. 203.

2. For an appreciation of the Père de Lubac's views on this revaluation of the historical sense, see below p.7a.

3. Op. cit., p. 209.

4. Didascalion, vi, 3 (ed. Buttimer, p. 114).

At the beginning of the first volume of the second part of his Exégèse médiévale, pp. 9-14, the Père de Lubac refers to the fact that it is now commonly accepted among historians of medieval theology that from the eleventh century onwards the symbolic theology of the preceding centuries begins to be replaced by a theological science, at last worthy of that name. Recognizing the value of this concept as a whole, he has all the same the impression that there is a danger of oversimplifying the outlined process of development. According to him, many historians stress too much the rediscovery of the role of historia, as a reaction against a too grotesque and outgrown allegoria, and the influence of the exegesis of Jerome, 'patron de l'exégèse littérale', in bringing about this change. Therefore he devotes a large part of his book to examining 'dans leur ensemble, l'une après l'autre, les deux thèses conjointes relatives à la lignée hiéronymienne et aux innovations de l'école de Saint-Victor' (p.13). He disagrees in particular with the Père Spicq, who sees an increasing influence of Jerome from Paschasius onwards (Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge, Paris, 1944, pp. 59 and 100-101). In his work, the Père de Lubac points out that these influences often have been exaggerated, and that the authors under consideration (Bernon, Paschasius, Christian of Stavelot, Bruno of Segni and Rupert of Deutz) are all firmly embedded in the general patristic tradition. It seems to me, however, that in his examination the Père is at times somewhat too severe in judging the literal interests of these commentators, almost to the point of denying their concern about the letter if this is being accompanied by allegorical interpretations; although he is, of course, right in pointing out that literal interpretation never replaces allegory in their commentaries and that they did not in any way intend to favour Jerome more than Augustine and Gregory. Also his thesis that Hugh is a pupil of Gregory rather than of Jerome is indisputably correct; but this does not exclude the fact that Hugh interpreted Gregory in a new light and as such marked a definite change in the history of medieval exegesis, as the Père Chenu and many others have pointed out; and that this change 'enormously increased the dignity of the historical sense' (Study, p.89).

derived from a likeness:" because a lion sleeps with open eyes," or something like that. Thus a lion signifies Christ because he sleeps with open eyes!'.¹

Here Hugh reacts against an allegorisation based entirely on the words of Scripture, which had become common practice among the biblical commentators. Numerous lapidaries, bestiaries and the well-known Physiologus were used for this purpose of applying certain qualities to the words of the text, whatever their context. Hugh, on the contrary, argued that allegory is a valid way of expanding Scripture as long as it is based on the facts as they can be understood from reading the texts simply in their historical setting.² First concentrate on the letter, then decide what should be explained spiritually:

'It is one thing to consider the writer's intention and his argument as a whole, another to think that certain of his sayings, which have a mystical sense and must be understood spiritually, should not be passed over.'³

Hugh put his ideas concerning the literal sense into practice in various ways. He compiled two chronicles and a map of the world in order to facilitate the understanding of historical and geographical references in the text. He gave a literal interpretation of parts of the Old Testament in his Notulae. He made an attempt at studying Scripture in the original, following the advice of Jerome and Augustine; and he questioned Jews on exegetical difficulties. Admittedly, Hugh's knowledge of Hebrew was rudimentary and the allusions to Jewish expositions not numerous; yet his attempts were important enough to

1. De Scripturis...c.5 (P.L. 175, 13A-C).

2. Cf. M.-D. Chenu, 'Les deux âges de l'allégorisme scripturaire au moyen âge', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xviii (1951), 22 ff.

3. Prologue to Ecclesiastes (P.L. 175, 115B): 'Sed aliud est, quo tota scribentis intentio totaque narrationis series ducitur attendere; atque aliud quaedam ex accidenti mystice dicta et spiritualiter intelligenda non negligenter praetereunda putare'.

open up new ways for biblical scholarship in general, and to fascinate one of his pupils in particular. To him we shall now turn.

IV

Andrew was deeply impressed and influenced by his master's teaching on the literal sense of Scripture, so much so that he devoted his own commentaries entirely to the exposition of the letter. It has already been noted that we have to rely on the prologues and scattered remarks in his works in order to discover his intentions and method of interpretation. The first result a search for these yields is that if Hugh was the teacher who had drawn his attention to literal exposition, Andrew certainly realized that Jerome had to be his other master. In the prologue to the commentary on Isaiah, for example, he emphasizes that he is 'following Jerome, though with unequal step';¹ while for his exposition of Ezekiel he 'added Jerome's historical interpretation to his own'.² In Jerome's writings there was much that was of interest to Andrew in his quest for literal explanation. Works like the Hebraicæ Quaestiones in Libro Geneseos, or the Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum proved useful sources of information, as well as the many literal sections in his commentaries on the prophets. Andrew's commentaries on the Minor Prophets are 'practically an abridgement of Jerome's' according to Miss Smalley, though I would not go as far as to call his commentaries generally 'supplementary' to him;³ in any case this statement would not hold for his interpretation of Isaiah, as we shall see later on.

1. MS. Pem. 45, fo. 1c (40b): 'Venerabilem itaque Ieronimum, licet impari pede, sequentes....'. The prologue is printed in Study, pp. 377-80, and will be discussed in chapter IV, below pp. 105-113.

2. Prologue to Ezekiel, MS. B. Nat. Lat. 14432, fo. 37c; likewise printed in Study, p. 380.

3. Study, pp. 127-28.

What mainly attracted Andrew in Jerome was his concern about the primary meaning of the text, which included, besides a scholarly linguistic approach, an interest in the intention of the author and his personality; also his remarks about local customs and his historical annotations. To this, of course, should be added Jerome's references to the Hebrew text and to rabbinic expositions.

Jerome, though important, was not Andrew's only source. In the prologue to the Prophets he says that he collected the passages on the historical sense from commentaries and glossed books, and that he consulted Jews and certain others,¹ ~~by~~ whom he most likely meant Hugh. A study of his commentaries shows that he used Augustine's Hebrew Questions on the Pentateuch, Isidore's Etymologies, Bede's Hexaemeron and De Tabernaculo, Josephus' Antiquities, the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Regum et Paralipomenon, falsely ascribed to Jerome, Raban Maur's commentary on Kings, the Gloss and Hugh's Notulae.² The extent of Andrew's dependence on his sources for Exodus and Isaiah will be discussed in detail in the appropriate chapters.

Andrew, in agreement with the spirit of his day, used his sources in a critical manner. The servile following of the Fathers of the preceding centuries was slowly giving way to a greater liberty towards authoritative teaching. Discrepancies in their works were discovered, which were debated freely by the dialecticians and solved by such men as the Lombard. The classic example of this new attitude is, of course, Peter Abelard, who, at a time when he had studied nothing but philosophy, boldly stated that he did not need to rely on the Patres in order to produce an adequate explanation of a most obscure passage in Ezekiel:

1. MS. Maz. 175, fo. 93b.

2. Andrew used the Notulae for Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Judges and Kings.

'Theology', he claims, 'may be beneficial to the soul; for a sufficient understanding of Scripture, however, it should be enough to read the texts and use one's intellect'.¹ But also more moderate people, like Richard of St. Victor, and a traditionalist, like Rupert of Deutz, argued that, with all respect for their teaching, it was possible to go beyond the Patres and to find new ways of expressing the 'fugitive truth'.²

This is basically Andrew's point of view too. In his prologue to Isaiah he remarks that however much he admired the work of Jerome, the latter all the same did not exhaust the subject: 'Even if some aspect of the truth has been found, there is always something still to find'.³ He also did not refrain from occasionally severely criticizing his great precursor. Expressions^{such} as 'I wonder how Jerome can say....' are not infrequent. Needless to say, the same applies to the other sources he quotes. 'Here we follow Josephus and the Jews rather than Bede' he states frankly somewhere in his exposition of the section on the Tabernacle in Exodus. His independence, which was more or less forced on him, is in fact quite startling, even for the twelfth century. Andrew knew in this respect his capacities quite well. He realized that his own insight and understanding were often more reliable than what others had said before him. Especially since he was exploring a very much neglected branch of biblical studies, he soon discovered that there was not a great deal in the traditional sources which was of use to him, and that he was often thrown back on his own resources. His casual remark that he

1. Historia Calamitatum, c.3 (ed. Cousin, i, 175). Cf. C.W. Monnich, De Weg en de Wegen (Amsterdam, 1959), p. 126 ff. for a discussion of this incident.

2. Cf. R. Wasselynck, 'L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire....', Rech. Théol. anc. méd. xxxii (1965), 177-81 and 195-97. For an evaluation of Rupert's independence of the Fathers, see H. de Lubac, Exégèse méd., II, i.227 ff.

3. MS. Pem. 45, fo. 1b,c (40b): 'Sic semper invenitur, ut semper supersit quod inveniatur'.

inserted in his commentaries among other things what 'his own study had shown him' should certainly not be overlooked.¹

V

Andrew calls his expositions expositiuncula, historica expositio, littere expositio or literalis sensus explanatio. His aim in writing them is, according to the lengthy prologue to the Prophets, to investigate the truth. He has devoted himself completely to this purpose: 'We have given ourselves over wholly to this, the toilsome search for wisdom, toilsome but pleasant, wholesome, fructifying'.² Knowing his own poverty, he does not attempt to set himself up as a teacher or author, he only writes because writing gives more satisfaction than reading and learning, entirely for his own pleasure, for 'no one is obliged to take my gift'.³

It is significant that he wrote this long prologue, which should justify his unusual way of expanding Scripture, at the beginning of his interpretation of the Prophets. He was apparently well aware of the circumstance that a literal exposition of the Prophets was more likely to evoke criticism than an interpretation of the historical books according to their literal sense. And indeed, his forebodings did not deceive him. The only attack openly launched against him during his lifetime was Richard of St. Victor's De Emmanuele, condemning his comments on Isaiah vii. 14, Behold a virgin shall conceive.⁴

According to Andrew an interpretation of the literal sense should

1. Prologue to the Prophets, MS. Maz. 175, fo. 93b.

2. Ibid. fo. 93a. The translation is Miss Smalley's, Study, p. 122.

3. Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto, iii, 6, 58.

4. Cf. chapter V below, p. 142 ff.

not exclusively concentrate on the historical facts as implied by the text, or on the understanding of the words of the text as such; it should also deal with translations, with the construction of sentences, the order of words and the meaning of the text in relation to the context.¹ For example in his explanation of Gen. ii. 5, And every plant of the field before it was in the earth...., he quotes Boethius' warning:

'Substract something from the text and you get a contrary: take away the parts and you take away the whole'.² On the same occasion he warns against the use of unreliable translations, which could easily be misleading. On the other hand, he knew that it can sometimes be illuminating to compare different translations, and he himself consulted at times an 'antiqua translatio', or the Septuagint, while he frequently referred to the Hebrew text.³ Elsewhere we see how he tries to harmonize two seemingly conflicting texts. In Gen. ii. 17 the Lord had forbidden Adam to eat of the tree of knowledge, lest he should die, while in iii.3 Eve said to the serpent that they were not only forbidden to eat of the tree, they also were not allowed to touch it. Andrew solves this discrepancy by remarking that 'what Scripture left out previously for briefness sake, has now been added here'.⁴ Likewise he argues that a recapitulation of certain facts or statements should never be explained as contradicting what has been said before; should this

1. Andrew had learnt this from Hugh, who wrote in the beginning of his Notulae on Genesis: 'In hoc autem libro duo praecipue attendenda sunt, scilicet veritas rerum gestarum, et forma verborum'. Notulae, c.2 (PL. 175, 32D-33A). Cf. also Didascalion, vi.3 (ed. Buttner, pp. 115-16).

2. MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356, fo. 11a (93d-94a). The quotation is from Boethius, De Differentiis Topicis, iii (P.L. 64, 1197A); the translation is Miss Smalley's Study, 135, where a translation of the full interpretation of the verse can be found (the Latin text is printed at pp. 383-84).

3. Andrew's references to the Hebrew will be discussed later on.

4. MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356, fo. 15b (95b).

happen to be so, then something is wrong with the interpretation, since 'in a recapitulation something is often added, but not as to destroy what goes before'.¹ We shall notice further on that he never fails to point out what has been said by way of recapitulation and is often able to reconstruct the historical order of events by this device, when at first sight there seems to be a contradiction. He is always concerned to keep as closely to the text as possible; always anxious to get back, should he occasionally have departed from a straightforward exposition.²

These are the main rules according to which Andrew deals with his text. It is noteworthy that his preoccupation with the letter also implies an interest in the human authors of Scripture, as was the case with Jerome. He often states that descriptions of God's being or acting are portrayed humano or nostro more; while in his zeal to explain the difficulty caused by the plural in Gen.i.26, And God said, Let us make man....., he even goes as far as to say that perhaps the Lord had not used these words at all and that they are only an expression of the author.³ Also, in the prologue to the Pentateuch he ascribes an important role to its author, in casu Moses: It is thanks to Moses' psychological insight in the nature of man, according to Andrew, that Scripture begins with an account of the creation and not with legal precepts. For the Israelites, lax from the soft living and many pleasures in Egypt, would never have been able to keep the commandments,

1. This remark occurs in the same passage as referred to in note 2, p. 13.

2. After a long digression from the text in which he had discussed the Jewish interpretation of Is.vii.14, Andrew remarks: '....ceptam literalis sensus explanationem exequamur'. MS. Pem. 45, fo. 15d (49c). Cf. ch. V, below pp. 144-45.

3. MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356, fo. 8b,c (93b): 'Sed intelligendum est aut Deum his verbis omnino usum non fuisse, sed a scriptore.../posita fuisse'. That Andrew never intended to go against the teaching of the Church with his interpretations can be seen from the remainder of this explanation: 'aut si forte usus est, personarum pluritatem et deitatis unitatem his verbis insinuare voluisse'.

had not they heard first of God's promises and manifold graces to them as revealed in the story of the creation on the one hand, and of his punishment of the disobedient on the other.¹ It is interesting to point here to a similarity in atmosphere with Bekor Shor, when he seeks for rational grounds to explain the commandments to bring sacrifices to the Lord. I quote here from Mr. Walter, who states that Bekor Shor found these grounds in the fact that Israel

'weil sie sich vom Götzendienste lossagen sollte, dies aber schwerlich hätte thun können, wenn dem geistig noch nicht so hoch stehenden Volke eine von aller Sinnlichkeit losgelöste Verehrung des Übersinnlichen zur Aufgabe gemacht worden wäre'.²

What other characteristics can we look for? Of course, the most striking one is an exclusively literal exposition of a highly original character. Andrew's deep interest in the text and his desire to bring out every possible nuance it may contain are in fact responsible for all other features of his interpretation. Because of this limited scope he has been accused of superficiality; but a closer study of his commentaries will reveal that he brought many new aspects to the interpretation of the literal sense, and that he furnished it with a wealth of scholarly and interesting material. Besides, when judging Andrew, one should not forget that his 'superficiality' was self-inflicted. It is quite deliberately that he leaves out all theological speculation and spiritual interpretation, which should, therefore, not be explained as a sign of mental poverty. What one could, in fact, rightly reproach him for is for failing to put his work against a broader background, for never

1. MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356 fo. 1a, b (91a). The prologue is printed and translated in Study, pp. 382-83 and 131-32 respectively. Interesting also is Andrew's remark that Moses had obtained his knowledge of the creation by carefully studying the oral and written accounts of this event as handed down by Adam and his descendants. Ibid., fo. 1b, c (91d).

2. G. Walter, Joseph Bekor Shor, der letzte nordfranzösische Bibelexeget (Breslau, 1890) p. 23.

referring to a fabrica theologia, which could be built on the fundamentals he was so busy laying.

In Andrew's commentaries we find furthermore definitions of the exact meaning of words and their derivations, geographical descriptions, historical annotations, an interest in people and what things looked like, comments on Old Testament customs and references to precepts still kept by the Jews, explanations in terms of every day life, which was still a rare thing among his contemporaries, an occasional use of the vernacular and a conscious effort to do away with all supernatural interpretation.¹ This, as we shall see in the next chapter, 'is precisely the atmosphere of the contemporary Rashi school of French Jewry'.² However, before dealing with the French Jewish commentators, we have to discuss one more aspect of Andrew's work, namely his consultations with the Jews.

VI

Lack of space prevents us from tracing the history of knowledge of Hebrew among the Christian commentators.³ According to some historians, for example Dr. Hailperin and the père de Lubac, there had been a steady tradition of Hebrew knowledge and Jewish interpretation ever since Jerome. Dr. Hailperin is of the opinion that 'through St. Jerome they (id est the Christian commentators) were kept constantly in sight of the problems of the Old Testament and its original meanings for theology,

1. In chapter III these characteristics of Andrew's interpretation will be discussed more extensively. Cf. below p. 57 ff.

2. R. Loewe, 'The mediaeval Christian Hebraists of England', Trans. Jew. Hist. Soc. Eng., xvii (1953), 238.

3. For this, see the works of B. Altaner, S. Berger, S.A. Hirsch, G.A. Kohut, H. Steinschneider (cf. bibliography). Also R. Loewe, op.cit. and H. de Lubac, Exégèse med., II, i, ch. 3, pt. iv. 238 ff.; 'L'hébreu, le grec et saint Jérôme'.

inspiration, law, prophecy and Hebrew institutions'.¹ This should certainly be considered rather too optimistic a statement. The père de Lubac is, as was to be expected, more careful in his evaluation and rightly points out that a reference to the veritas hebraica in medieval commentaries usually meant nothing more than a mechanically copying from Jerome, without giving the matter any further original thought.² All the same, he would not restrict knowledge of Hebrew to 'quelques rares individus privilégiés qui s'opposeraient par miracle à leur temps'.³ The more common view, however, is that an interest in Hebrew was a rare exception among medieval commentators. Actual knowledge of the language was practically non-existent, and those exegetes who were at all concerned about the original text of the Old Testament usually consulted Jerome and the Jews in order to solve their problems, as did for example Bede, Alcuin and Paschasius, with the possible exception of Rabanus, who probably knew some Hebrew himself.⁴

This picture gradually changes from the end of the eleventh century onwards: Stephen Harding corrected the text of the Vulgate with the help of Jews; Abelard advised Heloise to study the Bible in the original; and Hugh's concern for the literal sense sent him to the Jews and made him learn some Hebrew.

1. H. Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian Scholars (Pittsburgh, 1963), p. 9. This book should be read with great circumspection, as indeed Mr. Loewe has pointed out in his review in R.E.J. - Historica Judaica, 4th Ser., T. iii, cxxiii (1964), 537-40.

2. Exégèse méd., II, i. 244.

3. Ibid., 238.

4. It is outside the scope of this chapter to discuss the influence of the actual presence of Jews, living among Christians, on the interpretation of certain aspects of Scripture, and on popular belief and prejudice. Generally it was assumed that 'the Jews had a living tradition which kept them close to their fore-fathers' (B. Smalley, 'Herbert of Bosham on the "Hebraica"', Rech. Théol. anc. méd. xviii (1951), 51.)

Jerome knew that the literal sense of the Old Testament was to be found with the Jews; it was generally accepted among the Christian commentators that the Jews expounded literally, they spiritually. Indeed, it was exactly this circumstance which had often deterred them from explaining the literal sense, lest they should make the same mistakes as those 'perfidi'.¹ If they occasionally sought advice from the Jews, it was, as we saw, usually on textual problems. Hugh, however, went further. He remembered Jerome's teaching and learnt, so Andrew tells us, the literal sense of the Pentateuch from the Jews.² Andrew was to follow Hugh. He made this notion one of the guiding lines of his interpretation and consistently used the Jews, both for text and exposition.

Paris in the middle of the twelfth century was an ideal centre for such an enterprise. There was a fairly large Jewish population and Jews and Christians were still on good terms. Thus we can imagine that Andrew set out to discuss his problems with Jewish contemporaries as often he had a chance to do so. He learnt from them some Hebrew, perhaps just enough to somehow follow the text when his teachers translated it word for word; in chapter III we shall discuss exactly how much Hebrew he knew. Then he questioned them on exegetical difficulties, he possibly scribbled down some notes and worked out what he had heard as soon as he was alone. We shall notice that he did not always remember exactly what the Jews had told him and therefore made occasional mistakes. What is important, however, is that Andrew turned 'to the Jews for information as the quest of a scholar for the best equipment for his purpose rather than that of an antiquarian for the unusual'.³

1. Cf. H. de Lubac, Exégèse méd., II, i, ch.2, pt. iv. 153, entitled 'Perfidi'.

2. MS. C.C.C. 30, fo. 37a: '....secundem alios qui ab Hebreis sicut et nos literalem sensum Pentateuchi edocti sunt....'.

3. R. Loewe, op.cit., p.239

Andrew introduces his Jewish source material with expressions like, secundum Hebreos, Hebrei dicunt, Hebrei tradunt, Hebreus meus dicit, in Hebreo habet, secundum Hebraicum veritatem, consuetudo Hebreorum, and so on. As he did not consult the Jews systematically on each text, it is often difficult to guess why he gives a Jewish interpretation of some texts and leaves out others. Frequently he seems to have consulted the Jews on texts of which several interpretations were possible, but this is by no means a rule. Likewise he usually first summarizes the traditional Christian exposition of a text or gives his own explanation, then he adds the Jewish interpretation, but again, this is no fixed principle. At times he refers to the Jews only, while we shall see that in his commentary on Isaiah he adopts once the unusual procedure of first giving an interpretation of a longish biblical passage in his normal manner, referring to the Jews only occasionally, and of then afterwards explaining the same section all over again 'according to the Jews', although he does not explicitly say so.¹

In his commentaries on the historical books he puts his own or the traditional exposition next to the Jewish one, without any attempt at harmonizing them. In the prophetic books this proved more complicated. Therefore he feels sometimes compelled to introduce the Jewish interpretations with words like 'the Jews fable' or 'the Jews, those enemies of the truth, say', or, when it regards a messianic promise according to the Jewish faith, 'this the Jews in their simplicity or lack of definition of the precise contents of the literal sense and the folly promise themselves'. However, such outbursts are very rare indeed. Quite often one feels that Andrew agrees with the Jewish rather than with the Christian explanation, but especially in the prophetic books he is careful not to commit himself too obviously. What becomes abundantly clear when reading his commentaries is that he was absolutely fascinated by the Jewish way of expounding the text. He found their interpretations straightforward and rational on the one hand, illuminating and interesting on the other.

1. Cf. below p. 168 ff.

This admiration did not imply an uncritical acceptance of everything they said,¹ although at least in his commentaries on Exodus and Isaiah he is less critical of the Jews than of his other sources. It should also be noted that Andrew does not normally distinguish between Jewish literal and spiritual exposition, nor between oral and written tradition, or between the traditional interpretations of Talmud and Midrash and the more radical exegesis of the French-Jewish schools. All Jewish interpretation he classifies as literal, whatever its content.² Possibly this assumption was confirmed by the fact that the Jewish commentators do not contrast their spiritual and literal interpretations in the same way as the Christians, nor exclude one in favour of the other, but rather blend the two in a natural manner; and by the circumstance that much of the information Andrew received from the Jews he talked to was coloured by the strictly literal interpretations of the contemporary Jewish schools.

In the next chapter the exegesis of these schools will be discussed; while later on we shall have opportunity for studying in detail Andrew's references to Jewish exposition.

1. Cf. Study, p.157 ff.

2. In his commentary on Isaiah Andrew likens occasionally Jewish messianic interpretations to those of the Christians, thus realizing that the Jewish interpretation could have a deeper meaning as well. But his lack of definition of the precise contents of the literal sense and the idea that any exposition which was not christological (in casu the Jewish exposition) could not be spiritual, still led him to regard Jewish non-literal interpretations to be more 'literal' than Christian non-literal exposition. The commentary on the Psalms of Andrew's 'pupil' Herbert of Bosham marks a step forward in that Herbert is at least conscious of the problems involved and tries to distinguish between the different types of interpretation. Cf. B. Smalley, 'Herbert of Bosham on the "Hebraica"', Rech.Theol.anc.méd., xviii (1951), 63: 'Herbert makes a real attempt....to distinguish between passages which might be taken as prophecies of Christ in their literal sense and those which might be left in their Old Testament background.'

CHAPTER II

The Jewish Biblical Schools of France in the Twelfth Century.

In order to discuss the Jewish biblical schools of France in the twelfth century, we must distinguish between the schools of Northern and Southern France, as they are the products of such different conditions.

I

First we shall direct our attention to the school of Southern France. As is well known, the South of France was a centre of medieval culture. The towns were prosperous, commerce flourished, and the influence of the Roman civilisation had not yet disappeared altogether. The region was divided into a number of semi-independent principalities, more or less beyond the sphere of influence of the royal court. Orthodox catholic teaching was almost non-existent, and a greater measure of tolerance, freedom and freethinking was found here than in the North. This was where heresy became most widespread in the 12th century;¹ here we find the strongest opposition to the decadence and abuses within the Church; while also this explosive, unorthodox climate could foster the Kabbala, which likewise reacted against accepted teaching and strove for perfection of body and soul.²

In this atmosphere of tolerance the Jews could live quietly and undisturbed, and although the upheaval of the First Crusade did not pass

1. On heresis and the crusades against heretics see Chr. Thouzellier, Catharisme et Valdeisme en Languedoc à la fin du XII^e et au début du XIII^e siècle (2nd edn., Paris, 1969) and A. Borst, Die Katharer (Stuttgart, 1953).

2. Cf. G. Scholem, Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala (Studia Judaica iii, 1962), p. 15.

completely unnoticed in the Midi,¹ the anti-Jewish outbursts seem to have been of a transitory character. In fact, judaizing sympathies had become quite common since the end of the eleventh century, in particular among members of noble families. The main Jewish centres were Narbonne, Montpellier, Arles, Toulouse and Marseille, where there were communities of about 500-1500 Jews.² The great amount of freedom and prosperity they enjoyed encouraged learning, in which they were stimulated by the vicinity of the Arabic culture in Spain and the contacts with Spanish scholars and philosophers.³

Three factors concerning biblical studies had been at work in Spain. First came the impetus given to the literal interpretation of the Holy Text by the great Babylonian exegete Saadya in the beginning of the 10th century. He stressed the importance of grammar and philology for the understanding of the literal sense of the Bible, which for him always came first. And when he brought the traditional rabbinic interpretation to bear on the text, he applied the findings of reason to it as well.⁴ Thus he gave a completely new meaning and value to the method of peshat (i.e. the 'plain' meaning of Scripture⁵). He translated the Bible into

1. N. Golb, 'New light on the persecution of French Jews at the time of the First Crusade', Am.Ac.Jew.Res., xxxiv (1966), 26 ff., argues that there was widespread suffering among the Jews in France during the First Crusade, for which a considerable number of people was recruited from the Midi. The current opinion, however, is that 'French Jewry seems to have suffered relatively little from the great upheaval' (S.W. Baron, Social and Religious History of the Jews (2nd edn., New York, 1957), iv. 289).

2. The numbers given for the Jewish population in the larger centres of France vary. E.g. L. Rabinowitz, The Social Life of the Jews of Northern France in the xii-xiv Centuries (London, 1938), pp. 29-34, estimated that there were about a 100 Jewish households in Paris and about 50-100 in other large cities. The Jewish Encyclopedia, ix.169, numbers the Jews in Narbonne in the beginning of the twelfth century as 2000, H. Gross, Gallia Judaica (Paris, 1897), p. 405, gives the same number for Narbonne and estimates the Jewish inhabitants of Montpellier as 'très nombreux' (ibid. p.324). A. Lévy (cf. n. 3 below) states that there were about 300 Jewish families in Narbonne (p. 75).

3. A. Levy, Die Exegese bei den französischen Israeliten vom 10ten bis zum 14ten Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1873), pp. 74-77.

4. Cf. E.I.J. Rosenthal, 'The study of the Bible in medieval Judaism', The Cambridge History of the Bible (Cambridge, 1969), ii. 256-57.

5. Cf. R. Loewe, 'The "plain" meaning of Scripture in early Jewish exegesis', Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies, i (1964).

Arabic and also wrote his commentaries in that language. This made them more readily available for the Spanish commentators, upon whom he was to exercise a profound influence when the centre of Jewish learning moved from Babylon to Spain.

The second factor was the Karaitic movement, which had alienated itself from the traditional teaching of Talmud and Mishnah and recognized as only source of revelation the Bible itself. As the Karaites openly rejected the authoritative rabbinic teaching, they formed a great threat to traditional Judaism, which was made even more dangerous by their mastery of biblical interpretation. As it was found that the best way to oppose them was to meet them on their own ground, the biblical text itself, they stimulated exegesis in this way. One of their main opponents was in fact Saadya.

The third factor was Aristotalian philosophy, which deeply influenced the Jewish philosophy of religion and stressed the validity of a realistic, rationalistic interpretation.

All these factors stimulated the Arabic speaking Jews to a renewed and intensive study of the literal meaning of the Bible. The affinity of the Arabic and Hebrew languages facilitated the understanding of the rules and roots of the latter, and various grammars and lexicons were published. Most well known was the Machbereth (lexicon) of Menachem ibn Saruk. Since Menachem wrote in Hebrew, his work 'remained for a long time the chief source of philological instruction for Jews who were unacquainted with Arabic, especially for those in the Christian countries of Europe'.¹ Menachem's views, based on the two letter root theory, were opposed by Dunash ibn Labrat, likewise a tenth century philologist. Hayyuj (born c.950), a disciple of Menachem, gave more or less the final

1. W. Bacher, J.E., viii.470.

shape to Hebrew grammar by scientifically establishing the triliteral root theory for all Hebrew words. The latter wrote in Arabic.

When under the regime of the Almohades all non-Moslems in Spain were being persecuted, many Jews sought refuge in the Midi, bringing with them the Arabic-Jewish civilisation. Among them was Joseph Kimchi (c.1105-c.1170), who settled in Narbonne. He wrote several grammatical works, among others the Sepher ha-Galuj, and some Bible commentaries, for example a commentary on the Prophets, the Sepher ha-Miknah. He also translated many Arabic works into Hebrew. Kimchi was not a great scholar, but often he followed his own ideas rather than copying what had been said before. One of the characteristics of his biblical interpretations was the use of the vernacular, a phenomenon which became more and more common from then onwards.

Kimchi is also known as one of the most ardent controversialists of his time.¹ His apologetic work, the Sepher ha-Berith, which has come down to us in mutilated form, gives a lively picture of the social and moral life of the Provençal Jews in his day. In this work Kimchi shows an acquaintance with Christian doctrines and with the Vulgate, from which he frequently quotes.²

Abraham Ibn Ezra (c.1092-1168), the wandering Spanish scholar, who by his influence and travels did much to bridge the gulf between the Spanish-Provençal and the ^{Narbonne} North French schools, was a contemporary of Kimchi. He was one of those rare geniuses who possessed all the learning of his time. On his journeys he went to Palestine, Italy, France and England, which he visited in 1158,³ and perhaps as far as

1. Cf. L.I. Newman, 'Joseph ben Isaac Kimchi as a religious controversialist' in Jewish Studies in Memory of I. Abrahams (New York, 1927), p. 365 ff.

2. Ibid., sparsim.

3. M. Friedländer, 'Ibn Ezra in England', Trans.Jew.Hist.Soc.Eng., ii (1894-95), 48.

India.¹ His exegetical works are marked by a marked critical attitude towards the traditional interpretations of those whom he often terms 'the ancients'; he does not hesitate to reject quite openly the generally accepted exposition in favour of his own interpretation. He is concerned with grammatical constructions, with the exact meaning and etymology of words, and with a natural and direct understanding of the text based on common sense. Occasionally he criticizes the Christian typological interpretation.² He is also interested in philosophical problems, such as the nature and attributes of God, the creation and the calculation of time. As well as other works, he wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch (completed in its original form in Italy, shortly before 1145), Isaiah (written in 1145 at Lucca, the home of a large Italian rabbinic school) and the Psalms (completed in Dreux in 1156).³

Friedländer says in his essays on Ibn Ezra that the commentary on Isaiah does not seem to have attracted at the time the attention of the learned in the same way as that on the Pentateuch did. The description he gives of the character of the commentary shows so many points of correspondence with Andrew's commentary on Isaiah that I shall quote it in full:

'This comparative neglect is attributable to the absence of lengthy discussions of historical, philosophical, or theological questions, such as occur in the Commentaries on the Pentateuch, Psalms, Daniel, and Ecclesiastes. In interpreting the prophecies of Isaiah, Ibn Ezra appears to have avoided all digressions, and confined himself to simply explaining every word which requires to be elucidated in regard to grammatical construction, etymology, or signification. Here and there he gives a brief outline of the prophecy, and states the historical event to which it refers. Such remarks appear like short introductions

1. Essays on the Writings of Ibn Ezra, p. 142.

2. See below p. 245, n. 1.

3. Id., The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah (London, 1873), i. xvii.

2. E.g. on Is. l. iii. 13 ff; see below p. 245.

3. M. Friedländer, Essays on the Writings of Ibn Ezra (London, 1877), pp. 142-95, where a description of his commentaries is given.

periods. to a chapter or a section of the book. Although he lays down a new theory on the composition of the prophetic book of Isaiah,¹ he does not make his Commentary to rest on that theory. He follows the received opinion throughout, contenting himself with an occasional allusion to his own particular views....²

Another important representative of the Provençal Jewry is David Kimchi (1160-1235), a son of Joseph. He wrote a grammar entitled Miklol, and a dictionary of the Bible, the Sefer ha-Shorashim, which originally formed one work. His commentary on the Psalms gave rise to much controversy, since he disputed the Christian messianic interpretation of many passages. He also wrote a commentary on Isaiah, where we find an example of his polemical interpretation in the 'servant-chapter'.³ His editor, Finkelstein, remarks that David Kimchi shows a modern scholarly approach to the many manuscripts he had access to when he was writing the last mentioned commentary in that he carefully noted their origin and reliability.⁴ His works, like those of Ibn Ezra, are characterised by the primary importance they give to the peshat, the literal meaning of the text. In dealing with the traditional material, he distinguished sharply between the purely exegetical passages which could be found there and homiletic rabbinic interpretation.

Kimchi's works were among the first to be translated into Latin; but they became in particular well known to Christian commentators because of the use made of them by the fifteenth and sixteenth century humanists and Bible translators, and by the protestant Hebraists of these and later

1. Ibn Ezra ascribes the book to two different authors, living respectively before and during the Babylonian exile. Cf. below p. 191 ff.

2. Essays on the Writings of Ibn Ezra, p. 163.

3. See below p. 245, n. 1.

4. The Commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah, ed. L. Finkelstein (New York, 1926), i. xxvii.

periods.¹ For the Jewish commentators Kimchi's commentaries on the prophetic books together with those of Ibn Ezra became the scientific standard works.

The last commentator of the Spanish school to be mentioned is Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite, who about 1170 wrote a treatise Milhamoth Adonai (the wars of the Lord). In the introduction to this work Jacob says that he used to have discussions with a learned ^{MONK} priest about religion; this may partly explain his wide knowledge of Christian writings and doctrines, which he apparently supplemented by his own reading. According to Mr. Rosenthal, the treatise is 'the sharpest anti-Christian polemical work written by a Jew in the Middle Ages'.² It is also the most systematic Jewish polemic written until then.

Rosenthal continues: 'The result is a book which is not only more and more 'The fairness in tone and freedom in debate which are felt through the book may be ascribed to the general religious freedom which prevailed at that time in Provence and especially in Gascogne, a freedom which found its expression in heretical movements.'³

It is a simplified extract of part of this work which, according to Dr. Blumenkranz, Nicholas of Lyre combats in his Contra Iudeum impugnatores Evangelium secundum Mattheum.⁴ Lyre refers to the work as 'tractatus a Iudeo quodam confectus in quo ex verbis evangelicis autorem Dominum Iesum Christum ~~n~~ittitur impugnare'.⁵

1. Cf. L.I. Newman, Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements (New York, 1925), pp. 99-101 and 436-609 passim.

2. J.M. Rosenthal, 'Prolegomena to a critical edition of Milhamot Adonai of Jacob ben Reuben', Am.Ac.Jew.Res., xxvi (1957), p. 133 (The edition appeared in 1963: Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite, Milhamoth ha-Shem, Jerusalem, 1963.)

3. Ibid., p. 134.

4. B. Blumenkranz, 'Nicolas de Lyre et Jacob ben Ruben', J.J.S., xvi (1965), 47-51.

5. Ibid., p. 47.

II

We shall now turn to the exegetical school of Northern France. The social circumstances under which the Jews of Northern France lived differed greatly from those in the South. During the reign of Charlemagne and his successors the Jews had known a great deal of freedom and prosperity: they were the literate class,¹ the natural interpreters of the Old Testament; while their affinity with the people of the East made them the merchants par excellence. All these things went to gain them a highly esteemed reputation at the imperial court.² In fact, their influence on court circles was such that prudent churchmen, like Agobard, bishop of Lyons (d. 840), warned against an all too great familiarity with the Jews.³ These favourable circumstances, however, began to deteriorate in the eleventh century, and in particular after the First Crusade. The result was that the Jews were thrown back more and more to their own resources. They still did some trade, but mainly to provide for their own table.⁴

As far as biblical studies were concerned, here also the Jews withdrew more and more within themselves and concentrated on the exposition of

The exegesis of the Northern French school is characterized by an

-
1. Dr. Liebeschütz goes as far as to say: 'In this respect the Jew, and he alone, was the natural heir to late antiquity and its civilisation'. 'Relations between Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages', J.J.S., xvi (1965), 44. There is some exaggeration here.
 2. On the Jews in the Carolingian period, see A. Lévy, op.cit., pp. 43-47; J. Parkes, The Jew in the Medieval Community (London, 1938), pp. 49-58; S.W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews iv. 43-53; B. Blumenkranz, Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidental (Etudes Juives ii, 1960), sparsim and id. Les auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme (Etudes Juives iv, 1963), sparsim (Hereafter this work will be referred to as Les auteurs chrétiens latins).
 3. Cf. H. de Lubac, Ex.Med., II, i. 148-49; B. Blumenkranz, Les auteurs, pp. 152-68; Th. Reinach, 'Agobard et les Juifs', R.E.J., i (1905), lxxx-cxi.
 4. Cf. J. Katz, Exclusiveness and Tolerance (Oxford, 1961). In this book the (legal) problems arising from this kind of contact between Jews and gentiles are extensively dealt with.

1. J. Geiger, Die nordfranzösische Exegese (Leipzig, 1895), p. 10.

2. Talmud, Yebmoth 24a (ed. Epstein, p. 144).

Scripture in the light of the traditional teaching of Talmud and Midrash. As they did not have the philological aids of their contemporaries in Spain and the Midi and were not in touch with Latin learning around them, their studies were necessarily of a somewhat 'introvert' character. Slowly they mastered the intricacies of the Hebrew language which they could not compare with Arabic, as was done in the South. The vernacular therefore played an important part in their elucidation, as we see, for example, in the works of Rashi. Also, they were more directly involved in the biblical text itself, which they approached in a matter of fact manner with a kind of natural objectivity. In the words of Geiger, 'Sie versenkt sich ganz selbstlos in die Schrift, die sie zu erklären unternimmt. Und indem sie sich mit ihr verschwistert, denkt sie wirklich mit ihr und gibt vollkommen ihren Anschauungen wieder.'¹ Hence the exegetical problems the commentators came across were essentially textual problems, there was no danger, as sometimes was the case in the South, of reading Scripture exclusively with the intention of solving problems of a non-scriptural nature.

The exegesis of the Northern French school is characterized by an imaginative approach to the text, which linked biblical events to problems and experiences of every day life and ^{to} still prevailing customs and precepts; these exegetes also took an interest in chronology and geography; they harmonized contradictions and rationalized miracles, doing away with the often too fantastic homiletic explanations and replacing them with interpretations based on sound common sense. Their aim was to explain Scripture according to the most simple rules of interpretation, to penetrate into the roots of the matter, and thus to reveal the real depth of the text. With all their strength they put forward again the old principle that 'the text can never lose its plain meaning.'²

1. A. Geiger, Die nordfranzösische Exegetenschule (Leipzig, 1855), p. 10.

2. ^{cf.} Bab. Talmud, Yebamoth 24a (ed. Epstein, p. 144).

Another feature of this intensified study of the Bible was the instruction of the faithful in defending themselves against attacks of Christian controversialists and in seeing the loopholes in the sermons preached by the Christian clergy with ^{the} purpose of converting them. As far as contacts in disputations are concerned, although many did take place, one should not forget that both on Christian and Jewish sides theologically unskilled people were warned against engaging in them, since the results had too often proved fatal.¹ An illustration of this is a letter from Peter of Blois (d. after 1204) to John, bishop of Worcester, in the preface of his Invectiva contra perfidiam Iudaeorum, where he remarks:

'As for what you say that you desire to dispute with Jews so as to convince them and convert them to the faith, I commend you the less for that, for you beat the air, exhausting yourself with foolish vain and zeal'.²

As one can hardly classify a bishop among the theologically unskilled, the letter proves that a specialized training was an absolute necessity for the prospective debater.

It has already been pointed out in Chapter I that also among the Christian theologians of the twelfth century a renewed interest in the Bible and its interpretation can be observed, in particular in Victorine circles and in those of the so called réveil évangélique.³ An exchange of ideas between Christian biblical scholars and Jews was certainly not

1. Cf. S.W. Baron, Social and Religious History of the Jews, v.136: 'Some polemicists like Bartholemew, bishop of Exeter 1180-84, warned his readers not to engage in a debate over religion with them (the Jews) in the presence of unbelieving or inexperienced listeners'; cf. also L.I. Newman, Jewish Influence, pp. 331-32. On disputations in general cf. S.W. Baron, op. cit., v.108-37, H. de Lubac, Ex.méd., II, i.148-81 and the works of B. Blumenkranz, G. Kisch, J. Mann and A.L. Williams.

2. Peter of Blois, Invectiva contra perfidiam Iudaeorum (ed. Giles, iii.62 ff).

3. See above p. 6 ; for the latter cf. M.-D. Chemu, La Théologie au douzième siècle, pp. 225-73, in particular chapter xi, 'Le réveil évangélique'.

uncommon, and the men thus engaged must have drawn considerably from each other's experience.¹ But although the new awareness of man and his universe, characteristic for the end of the eleventh and for the twelfth century, did stimulate the rationalistic approach to Bible exegesis which we find among Jews and Christians alike, this does not mean, as has been suggested, that there is a direct relationship between the Jewish and Christian exegetical movements; partly because they originate from different circumstances, partly because their objectives, at least in some respects, are different.²

We shall now deal briefly with some of the most prominent Bible commentators of the Northern French school. The greatest and most influential of all is, of course, Rashi (1040-1105). This great scholar had mastered all of the rabbinic literature, and he combined his knowledge with a rare gift for clear exposition.³ He first wrote a commentary on the Talmud, followed by a commentary on the whole of Scripture, which he was not able to finish however. He aims at a natural and simple understanding of the meaning of the text, and although his interpretation strikes us occasionally as naive and still many references to the sayings of 'our ancient rabbis' can be found, he carefully selects the traditional material he uses and makes it subservient to his main purpose, the

1. An interesting example is 'An early twelfth-century commentator on the literal sense of Leviticus'. This anonymous exegete frequently consulted the Jews. (I am referring here to a not yet published article by Miss B. Smalley). *Now published, cf. below p. 54.*

2. A. Lévy, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-71. Many of the statements of the author concerning the motives behind the new approach to Bible exegesis in certain Christian circles cannot be held anymore (pp. 67-71).

3. On Rashi see e.g. N. Kronberg, Rashi als Exeget (Halle, 1882); A. Berliner, 'Zur Charakteristik Rashi's' Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann (Breslau, 1900), pp. 260-78; 'Rashi Anniversary Volume', Am. Ac. Jew. Res., Texts and Studies, i (1941); H. Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian scholars; etc.

explanation of Scripture according to its peshat. An interesting feature of Rashi's commentaries are the many French glosses he uses to explain difficult Hebrew words or expression. Over 3,000 of them have been counted.¹ On linguistic points he usually follows the views of Menachem.

An anti-Christian attitude is revealed in some passages in the works of his later years, when the position of the Jews was slowly getting worse; for example in his exposition of the Psalms, where he sometimes preferred to interpret texts of David instead of referring them to the Messiah, in order to refute Christian interpretations. This could also have been a motive for his explanation of the servant of the Lord in the Isaiah prophecies as Israel, and not the Messiah, as in the traditional interpretations. Baer is of the opinion that whole chapters in his commentaries on Isaiah, Daniel, Zachariah and the Psalms have to be understood in this light, and that his motives for writing these were not only to elucidate Scripture, but also to instruct and inspire his contemporaries in the disastrous times in which they lived.²

Rashi's work was not only of great influence on Jewish biblical commentators, for whom he 'has always had a special appeal and fascination',³ but also on Christian Bible scholars like Andrew, Peter Comestor and, through them and directly, Nicholas of Lyre, whose influence again on Luther has been firmly established. Since Rashi was the first

1. E.I.J. Rosenthal, 'Study of the Bible in medieval Judaism', p. 263.

2. I. Baer, 'Rashi and the historical reality of his time', Tarbiz, xx (1949), 320-32. Cf. also R. Loewe, 'The Jewish midrashim and patristic and scholastic exegesis of the Bible', Studia Patristica, i (1957), 501 and E.I.J. Rosenthal, art.cit., p. 264, who seems to regard Rashi's refutation of Christian interpretation as one of the main aspects of his work.

3. E.I.J. Rosenthal, art.cit., p. 261, '....his biblical commentaries, especially that on the Pentateuch, have always had a special appeal and fascination for countless generations of Jews.'

commentator in Northern France to attempt to free the understanding of Scripture somewhat from the burden of midrashic interpretation it had accumulated throughout the centuries, it was only natural that his followers tended to be more radical in their approach to the text.

Rashi was 'succeeded' by his grandsons Samuel ben Meir and Jacob ben Meir Tam. Samuel ben Meir (c.1085-c.1174), also called Rashbam, aimed at the most simple exposition of Scripture possible, while he often saw the midrashic explanation as more of a hindrance than a help in discovering the actual meaning of the text. The defence of Judaism against Christian attacks and the instruction of his people were some of the motives which made his work all the more actual and necessary; but his foremost desire was to interpret Scripture in the spirit of his grandfather and to develop his ideas and principles. Rashbam's best known work is a commentary on the Pentateuch.¹ His brother, Jacob ben Meir Tam (1100-1171), usually referred to as Rabbenu Tam, showed more appreciation for the Talmud and enriched the talmudic literature with clever discussions in his attempts to harmonize contradictions. This made him the most prominent of the French Tossafists.

Joseph Kara (c.1070-c.1140) lived in Troyes, like Rashi and his family. He left, as his name Kara, the interpreter of Scripture, indicates, exclusively biblical works, among others glosses on Rashi's Pentateuch commentary and an exposition of the prophets.² Kara's aim was, according to Littmann, to notice the inner correspondence between the verses and to point out the simple meaning of the words. This brought him into

1. Cf. D. Rosin, R. Samuel ben Meir als Schriffterklärer (Breslau, 1880), a somewhat uncritical study. The author also edited the commentary (Breslau, 1881).

2. M. Littmann, Joseph Kara als Schriffterklärer (Breslau, 1887), p. 13.

For Joseph Kara on Isaiah, see Jubilee Volume for S. Kraus (Jerusalem, 1937), pp. 110-16.

conflict with the traditions of midrashic interpretation, a challenge he readily accepted. He referred the old fashioned reader, who still preferred the traditional interpretation to the many existing books in that field, since his own interpretation was going to be different.

In the words of Littmann:

'So werden wir wirklich in Kara den ersten Exegeten sehen, der endgültig mit dem Midrash bricht, nicht mehr wie Raschi mit Zaudern und Bedenken, sondern kühn und selbstbewusst und in seinem Selbstbewusstsein bis zur Schroffheit vortschreitend.'¹

Joseph Bekor Shor of Orleans (c.1140-c.1210), a disciple of Rabbenu Tam and Rashbam, has been described as a 'most sober and careful commentator'.² In him the exegesis of the school of Northern France reached its climax. During his lifetime some of the works of the commentators of the South had penetrated to the North; Bekor Shor stressed the importance of these grammars and lexicons for the interpretation of Scripture. Like Rashbam and Joseph Kara he looked for connections between the verses and logical unities in the text. His explanations strike us as extremely reasonable and down to earth; he denies every supernatural element in Scripture and reminds us of Andrew in his directness of approach and in the finality with which he poses his solutions. When for example in Ex.xxx.1 ff, And thou shalt make an altar to burn incense upon, opportunity is given to the sinner to repent by means of offerings. this is done, according to Bekor Shor, to make sure that the sinner after having sinned will realize that there is a possibility of a fresh start, which would prevent him from going from bad to worse. His commentaries are full of such

1. M. Littman, op. cit., p. 14.

2. Commentaries on the later Prophets by R. Eleazar of Beaugenci, ed. J.W. Nutt (London, 1879), i.xxvii.

explanations.¹ He knew Latin and was acquainted with Christian exegesis, which he normally refutes. Likewise he criticizes the translations of the Christians, in particularly Jerome's translation of the Psalms; for instance Ps.ii.12, which Jerome translated as 'adorate filium', while קִדְּוָה in this context should be taken, according to Bekor Shor as 'purity', and thus the meaning of the text should be 'be equipped with purity'.²

Eliezer (or Eleazar) of Beaugency, a pupil of Rashbam, is perhaps also worth mentioning. Except the fact that he was a pupil of Rashbam, nothing is known about his life according to Nutt.³ He lived in all probability in the late twelfth century. Eliezar wrote commentaries on Genesis, Leviticus, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Maleachi and the minor prophets. His chief aim was to find the connection between successive verses and the sequence of thought. His works are entirely free from midrashic interpretation. He shows no signs of being acquainted with Christian interpretation. With him the school of Northern French commentators came to an end.

III

These then are the commentators who determined the climate of Jewish biblical interpretation Andrew came in contact with. It will be helpful if we put them into their historical context by adding a few more general remarks on Jewish-Christian relations at the time they were writing. In assessing these relations we must distinguish between informal scholarly

1. This and other examples are quoted by G. Walter, Joseph Bekor Shor, der letzte nord-französische Bibelexeget, p. 22 ff. Cf. also Study, pp. 152-53.

2. The example is mentioned by Z. Kahn 'Le Livre de Joseph le Zélateur' R.E.J., iii (1881), 6. Jerome's translation and explanation can be found in his Commentarioli in Psalmos (C.C.S.L. 72, p. 182, 1.37). The Hebrew קִדְּוָה can mean 'to kiss' and 'to be equipped'.

3. J.W. Nutt, op. cit., p. xxix.

and every day contacts, and the more formal polemic ones. As regards the first category, there is some difference of opinion among historians on the time when these contacts began to deteriorate. As previously noted, some scholars take the first crusade as the starting point; while according to, for example, Dr. Rabinowitz the reign of Philip August (1180-1223) marked the turning point for the worse.¹ It seems most likely, however, that in France during the twelfth century the situation varied from place to place, the effects of the first crusade, for instance, were felt more acutely in the North than in the South of France, and that anti-Jewish feeling tended to suddenly erupt and then die out again.² Scholarly contacts were, of course, less directly affected by anti-semitism and they certainly continued until well in the last decades of the century, as can be gathered from Jacob ben Reuben's conversations with the learned priest (c.1170) and Herbert of Bosham's commentary on Jerome's Hebrew Psalter, on which he was working in 1190.³

As far as the more formal polemic contacts are concerned, these took the form of disputations which were often forced on the Jews; of written treatises and of conversionalist sermons, 'originally animated by the sincere belief that if a Jewish audience were shown that the Messiahship of Jesus was indicated not only by a correct interpretation of the Old Testament, but also by the Talmudic studies themselves, it would speedily recognize its error and accept the Christian religion.'⁴

new co-religionists to refute their old beliefs. A good example is

1. L. Rabinowitz, op. cit., p. 18.

2. J. Parkes, The Jew in the Medieval Community, pp. 82 and 88. Cf. also S.W. Baron, op. cit., v.111-112 for the rise and decline of anti-semitism throughout the centuries.

3. R. Loewe, 'The Christian medieval Hebraists of England', Trans.Jew. Hist.Soc.Eng., xvii (1952), 242.

4. S.W. Baron, 'The Jewish factor in medieval civilisation', Am.Ac.Jew. Res., xii (1942), 31.

The père de Lubac explains the theological background of this expectation by pointing out that it was thought that the perfidia of the Jews obstructed the capacities of their mind and prevented them from accepting the true faith.¹ It only needs taking away the bandage from Synagogia's eyes and she will see like her sister Ecclesia.

From the end of the eleventh century the genre of disputations (i.e. reports of real or fictitious dialogues) had become popular again.² Baron is of the opinion that, with the exception of Gilbert Crispin's dialogue, no authentic records of disputations exist for the eleventh and the twelfth century, although he does not deny that debates did take place during that period.³ According to Baer, many debates were held as early as the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, but then became less frequent because the Christian scholars and clergy became too preoccupied with the reform movements of the eleventh century and the investiture struggle. With the first Crusade the aggressive power of the Christians became again apparent and the literary polemics revived, reaching their climax in the middle of the twelfth century.⁴ The generally received view, however, is that anti-semitism was at its height in the thirteenth century when there were a great number of Jewish converts, and the Dominican friars were especially charged by pope Gregory ix (1227-41) to convert the Jews. Jewish converts have always played an important role in the polemics between Jews and Christians, since they were often keener and, of course, better equipped than their new co-religionists to refute their old belief. A good example is

1. H. de Lubac, Ex. méd. II, i.167-69. Cf. also C. Roth, 'The medieval conception of the Jew; a new interpretation' in Essays and studies in memory of Linda R. Miller (New York, 1938), p. 172.

2. R. Loewe, art.cit., p. 230.

3. S.W. Baron, op.cit., v.114-15.

4. I. Baer, 'Rashi and the historical reality of his time', Tarbiz xx (1949), p. 320 ff.

Peter Alfonsi (d.1110), baptised with the encouragement of Alfonso I of Aragon, and later physician to Henry I of England. His Dialogues of Peter and Moses¹ provided some of the arguments for Peter the Venerable's anti-Jewish treatise.²

To this category also belong the anti-Christian interpretations of certain Old Testament passages of the Jewish commentators, both in Northern and Southern France. These interpretations, together with more specific polemic works as Joseph Kimchi's Sepher ha-Berith and Jacob ben Reuben's Milhamoth Adonai, have as their main objective to strengthen the faith of the Jews and to protect them from the various forms of Christian attacks, as a result of which they were losing many people, rather than to counter-attack or even defend.³

In order to facilitate the comparison of Andrew's work with the Jewish commentators of his day a chronological list of the exegetes mentioned in this chapter has been included:

Southern France:

Ibn Ezra (c.1092-1168); Joseph Kimchi (c.1105-c.1170)

Jacob b. Reuben (active c.1170)

David Kimchi, son of Joseph, (1160-1235)

Northern France:

Rashi (1040-1105)

Rashbam (c.1085-c.1174), R. Tam (1100-71), grandchildren of Rashi; J. Kara (c.1070-1140)

Eliezer of Beaujeu, pupil of Rashbam (late 12th C.)

Bekor Shor, pupil of Rashbam and R. Tam, (c.1140-c.1210).

1. Dialogues Petri cognomento Alphonsi, ex Judaeo Christiani, et Moysi Judaei (P.L. 157, 537-672).

2. Petrus Venerabilis, Tractatus adversus Iudaeos inveteratam duritiam (P.L. 189, 507 ff).

3. Cf. S.W. Baron, op.cit., iv. 135.

of the Colophon, CHAPTER III

said before, he finished his

his Christ Andrew on Exodus.

A) Background and sources.

I

It need hardly be mentioned here that Exodus had always been popular among Christian commentators. They found in it much that most adequately foreshadowed the life of the Church as a whole and that of each Christian individually. The slavery in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the giving of the Law and the taking possession of the Promised Land all had a deep spiritual meaning. Also, it was in Exodus that one could find the description of the Tabernacle, this 'très suggestive figure de l'Église'.¹ Allegorical interpretations leapt to the eye wherever one looked. In view of this, an exclusively literal commentary like Andrew's becomes even more remarkable.

In our discussion of the commentary we shall deal first with its background and sources. Next we shall pay attention to Andrew's manner of interpretation, giving some characteristic examples, while several longer extracts can be found in Appendix I. Since a selection of examples necessarily rests on a subjective choice and tends to concentrate on the most striking ones, these longer extracts will enable the reader to form a more objective view of Andrew's mode of exposition. Subsequently we shall discuss the chapters concerning the Tabernacle, and finally the references to Jewish interpretation.

— Andrew's commentary on Exodus forms an integral part of his exposition

1. M.-D. Chenu, 'Les deux âges de l'allégorisme scripturaire au moyen âge', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xviii (1951), 20, quoting John of Kelso.

1. 'Tunc vero sensensus proprie peccatus voluntaria; hoc est culpa etiam que damnationem meretur, sed apud Deum res statuitur'. Opera et Sermo Dictus: Scripta Insuper, n.3 (ed. Cousin, ii, 596).

of the Octateuch, which commonly circulated as one work.¹ As has been said before, he finished this group of commentaries around 1147, shortly before his first departure to England. In this group as a whole references to generally debated theological quaestiones are extremely rare and usually appear to have as their common source the Gloss. A few examples may suffice. In Exodus Andrew devotes twice a long exposition to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart by the Lord. On Ex. iv. 21, Indurabo cor eius, he remarks:

'Hic Dominus se induraturum cor pharaonis promittit et in sequentibus factum fuisse narratur. Excusari posse videtur pharao quia populum non dimittit, induraverat enim Dominus cor eius ne dimitteret. Sed cor hominum Dominus indurat, non impertiendo malitiam, sed non impertiendo misericordiam; his, quibus non esse impertiendam, equitate occulta et ab humanis sensibus remota iudicat. Est etiam iudicium Dei cum ipse malitiae vitium malo desiderio, et facto malo, malum desiderium punit. Et hoc ultimum sit, cum mala voluntas potestatem accipit implere quod intendit. Operatur Dominus in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates quocumque voluerit, sive ad bona pro sua misericordia, sive ad mala pro meritis eorum iudicio utique suo, aliquando aperto, aliquando occulto, semper autem iusto. Vel indurat corda hominum Dominus, quia cum possit non emollit, vel indurat, id est indurari permittit'.²

Of course, Andrew relies on the standard teaching and literature when he ventures out from the safe field of literal interpretation into theology. What he says here, for example, that it is God who moves the will of man, reminds one of Augustine. It is in agreement with Abelard's doctrine that the bad desire as the essence of wickedness should be punished. For the latter points out that wickedness is the consent to do evil, rather than the evil deed itself, and that it is this frame of mind that makes man guilty before God.³

1. In some manuscripts the commentary on the Libri Regum has been omitted, cf. Study, pp. 175-78.

2. fo. 42d-43a (103b).

3. 'Hunc vero consensum proprie peccatum nominamus; hoc est culpa animae, qua damnationem meretur, vel apud Deum rea statuitur'. Ethica seu Liber Dictus: Scito Teipsum, c.3 (ed. Cousin, ii, 596).

The second text which mentions the hardening of pharao's heart is Ex.vii.3, Ego indurabo cor eius. On this occasion he quotes Augustine's Question 18 on Exodus,¹ which was also incorporated in the Gloss, then he suggests another possibility: 'Potest ac sic accipi: Indurabo, id est quam durum sit demonstrabo'.² Of both texts Andrew gave several possible interpretations, some being rather complicated, others being extremely short and to the point. In neither case he commits himself.

On Ex.xvi.4, Ut temptem eum utrum ambulet, he comments:

'Temptat Deus aliquando per prospera, aliquando per adversa. Per prospera temptat cum omnium bonorum affluentiam alicui confert, tamquam scire volens utrum pro collatis beneficiis/datori gratiam sit relaturus, an in insolentiam et superbiam sese sit elevaturus, et accepti beneficii immemor futurus; facile enim in eorum animis, quibus omnia pro voto suppetunt, divini cultus irrepit oblivio. Unde alias legitur, Cum pulcras domus edificaveris et comederis et biberis et satiatus fueris, cave ne obliviscaris Domini Dei tui.'³

Temptat et per adversa Deus hominem, tum in carnis sue, tum in rerum suarum substantia, tamquam patientiam et fortitudinem eius experiri volens, utrum adversa viriliter sustineat, an victus asperitatibus muliebriter succumbat. Nec iccirco temptat Deus qui non ad seductionem, sed ad probationem temptat, ut noverit quod nesciat, sed ut hominem sibi ipsi ostendat quo propria fragilitate cognita, humilior fiat ad petendum adiutorium et ad agnoscendum gratiam Dei'.⁴

Again in this moral-theological exposition Andrew covers common ground. From nec iccirco onwards he quotes Augustine's Quaestio 58,⁵ which could be found in the Gloss as well.

It is only once that we come across an allegorical explanation, and

1. fo. 44d-45a (103d). Cf. Augustine, Quaestionum in Heptateuchum Libri vii, L.ii; Quaestiones Exodi, Q.18 (C.C.S.L. 33, p. 76, 1.224). (Here after we shall refer to this work as Quaestiones Ex.)

2. fo. 45a (105a).

3. Andrew's quotation seems to be a free rendering of Deut. viii.11-14.

4. fo. 53a,b (106d-107a).

5. Quaestiones Ex. 58 (C.C.S.L. 33, p.96, 1.912).

this seems more or less accidental. The example occurs in Ex.xxvi.9, ...ut sextum sagum in fronte tecti duplices. In his explanation of this text Andrew quotes at length from Bede's De Tabernaculo. Sometimes he cites Bede literally, sometimes he prefers the slightly shorter version of the Gloss, as in the passage under consideration:

'Hec (sc.saga) ab omni iniuria tempestatum, pluviarum et caumatum foris defendebant, quia prepositi ita vitam subditorum sollerti cura circumspiciunt, ut nec subsidia carnis, nec vite spiritualis auxilia desint, et dogmata hereticorum et pravorum exempla catholicorum absint; adsit doctrina salutaris qua confortati male docentes repellant, et mala illata patienter sustineant; adsit vita ipsorum qua semper quasi viva lectione utantur. Sed quia inter predicatores illi maximo honore digni sunt, qui excepto quod officio predicationis et populorum regimini deserviunt et pro Christo sanguinem fundunt, recte subditur: Facies operimentum aliud etc.'¹

As this allegorical exposition, both in Bede and in the Gloss, followed after a long literal section on the building of the Tabernacle, it seems most likely that he was copying mechanically and inserted this passage by mistake. In particular since the quotation occurs in a long passage which Andrew ascribed explicitly to Bede on the historical sense concerning the Tabernacle, it is possible that he did not bother to check his quotation.

All the preceding examples turned out to go back at least partially to traditional sources. Therefore they do not throw much light on Andrew's attitude towards the theological questioning of his day. All we can say is that he considered some of the theological material relevant to his work. His choice can be regarded as revealing in that he only takes material which was of importance for problems arising directly from the biblical text, as for instance the hardening of the pharao's heart. As he is not interested in the quaestiones as such, he avoids unnecessary details and does not get involved in all the pros

1. fo. 62d (109c,d). Cf. Bede, De Tabernaculo, ii.3 (P.L.91, 434C-435A).

and contrasts put forward by the various authorities. If he adds something to a quotation from the Gloss or other sources it is always a straightforward remark, often coloured by an Augustinian way of thinking, which is hardly surprising if we remember how well Augustine was taught at St. Victor by Hugh, the Victorinians' 'second Augustine'.

As far as his biblical studies are concerned, he was taught to read first the historical books of the Old Testament with the aid of

II

It was common practice among biblical commentators - adhering to Augustine's teaching that the letter of a text could truthfully be explained in various ways as long as it led to charity - to put together several possible interpretations without making a final choice between them. Andrew was no exception as we have already seen; it is not unusual for him to list as many as three, sometimes four different possibilities. In particular in an exposition of the literal sense this proved a useful practice, since at this level no vital dogmatic decisions had to be taken, while it provided an opportunity for giving various scraps of interesting information.

Another striking feature of Andrew's commentary on Exodus, compared for example with his commentaries on the prophetic books, is the number of quotations from other works, sometimes acknowledged, sometimes anonymous. In this respect he was trained in the good medieval tradition of borrowing whenever one could.

In discussing Andrew's sources we have to take into account first of all his own theological training. Since he began his studies under Hugh of St. Victor he most probably followed the latter's educational programme as set out in the Didascalion. This encouraged students to acquire as wide a learning as possible.¹ The richly stocked library

3. For the problems posed by the manuscript tradition of the Didascalion, see J. P. Pollit, 'Some new readings in the Didascalion', *Journal of Theological Studies*, xliii (1966), 3-9 and the literature therein cited.

1. Didascalion, vi. 3 (ed. Buttner, p. 115).

of St. Victor was available to him, and we can imagine that he became particularly well read in the works of Augustine and Gregory, as they had been of such a profound influence on his master's teaching.¹ He naturally studied the pagan classics too and refers to them in his commentaries, though very rarely in his exposition of Exodus.²

As far as his biblical studies are concerned, he was taught to read first the historical books of the Old Testament with the aid of Augustine's Quaestiones and Josephus, concentrating on the literal sense. Then he could begin to explore the allegorical sense and to study doctrine with the help of Hugh's De Sacramentis Christianae Fidei, after which he could pass eventually to the tropological sense by reading certain parts of the Bible and Gregory, which occupation would lead him finally to the contemplation of God and his works, the ultimate purpose of the study of Scripture.

As Andrew followed up his master's teaching in particular where he stressed the importance of the interpretation of the literal sense, it is not surprising that Hugh's Notulae, which were intended as a set of glosses on the literal sense of the Octateuch, influenced his work most noticeably.³ Miss Smalley has pointed out that on Leviticus Andrew

1. Ibid. iv. 14 (ed. Buttimer, p. 88): 'Horum tamen omnium studia Augustinus ingenio vel scientia sui vicit...'. For Gregory's influence on Hugh cf. H. de Lubac, Exégèse méd., II, i, ch. 4, pt. iv, 328-39, 'Hugues et saint Grégoire'. Also R. Wasselynck, 'La présence des Moralia de Saint Grégoire le Grand dans les ouvrages de morale du xii^e siècle', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxv (1968), 233, and his 'L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxii (1965), 192-95. Hugh himself remarked: 'Inter quae beatissimi Gregorii singulariter scripta amplexanda aestimo, quae, quia mihi prae caeteris dulcia et aeternae vitae amore plena visa sunt, silentio nolui praeterire'. Didascalion, v.7 (ed. Buttimer, p. 105).

2. Cf. below p. 94 for an example.

3. For the problems posed by the manuscript tradition of the Notulae, cf. Study, p. 98 and H.J. Pollit, 'Some considerations on the structure and sources of Hugh of St. Victor's Notes on the Octateuch', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxiii (1966), 5-9 and the literature mentioned there.

acknowledged his debt explicitly, claiming only to explain what Hugh had left untouched.¹ In a recent article Dr. Pollit has discussed the sources behind Hugh's notes and paid special attention to the question as to how far Hugh used his patristic and later sources at first hand, or how far he took the material from intermediary authorities. Dr. Pollit claims that often we cannot be sure which is the case, as so many sources were verbally copied throughout the ages. As an example he mentions 22 references to Jerome's Hebrew Questions in Hugh's notes on Genesis: 'It ranks as a major ultimate source of the Notulae', but all the same, 'we can at no point be sure that Hugh resorted to it at first hand: all the relevant material was available in writers after Jerome whom he can be shown to have consulted directly'.² As direct sources consulted by Hugh are listed Bede, Augustine, Raban Maurus, Angelom of Luxeuil and the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Regum et Paralipomenon.³

In his carefully documented analysis of Hugh's sources Dr. Pollit provides us, all the same, with much useful material, and brings home once more the proneness of medieval commentators to copy mechanically what had been said before. Much of what he says about the way in which Hugh used his sources can be applied to Andrew as well, even though it is outside the scope of this thesis to investigate in such great detail where Andrew borrowed directly, where indirectly.

1. '...nunc littere quam illi indiscussam reliquerunt insistamus'. MS. C.C.C. 30, fo. 37a. The passage is printed in Study, p. 127, n.1.

2. art. cit., p. 11.

3. Ibid., p. 33, where the exact sources are mentioned. It seems to me that perhaps Dr. Pollit bases his arguments somewhat too exclusively on the inner evidence provided by the Notulae and does not enough take into account important circumstances as, for example, what original works were available to Hugh in the library of St. Victor, or his professed aversion to the practice of hastily reading with glosses. On the other hand, it may be that, since the Notulae were compiled as lecture notes, Hugh prepared them rather hurriedly with the help of existing textbooks, but this consideration is of no influence on Dr. Pollit's conclusions.

Andrew rejects the view on the III grounds.

Of the 56 acknowledged borrowings in the commentary, that is not including references to Jewish exposition, 14 can be traced back to the Notulae, which is a significant number (cf. Table I).¹

As we have already seen, Andrew was by no means uncritical of his predecessors and thus we find that he does not agree with Hugh on 4 occasions out of the

14.² The first occasion occurs in Ex. iv. 25, ...circumcidit praeputium filii sui. Andrew comments:

'...De uno (sc. filio) tantummodo / facit mentionem, quia alterum forsitan circumciderat Moyses, illum vero quem mater gentilis sibi retinuit non circumcidit. Quod alterum cum avo relictum quidam^a asserunt stare non potest, quia supra dictum est quod filios suos tulit et asinis imposuit.'^{3,4}

Hugh had explained:

'Circumcidit praeputium filii sui. Quare non dicit filiorum? Quia forsitan mater unum sibi, videlicet majorem natu, proprium et incircumcisum retinuerat. Alterum vero Moyses, qui circumcisus erat, quasi suum circumciderat.... Vel forsitan solum majorem filium secum ducebant, et minorem apud avum reliquerant'⁵

That one of Moses' children was circumcised and one not is a Jewish tradition, which can be found for example in the Mekilta.⁶ As regards the other possibility mentioned by Hugh, it is interesting to note that

a. P. om. quidam.

1. Below p. 205 f.

2. Although these figures do not in any way claim to be of statistical value, since we have not checked them against Andrew's unacknowledged borrowings, they are meant as some indication of Andrew's dependence on and of his attitude towards his sources in general.

3. Ex. iv. 20.

4. Fo. 300, d (1032, e).

4. Fo. 43c, d (1030).

5. Notulae, c. 8 (P.L. 175, 63A).

6. Mekilta, tract. Jithro, 64b.

Andrew rejects the view on textual grounds.

The second time he criticizes Hugh is on Ex.xxii.15, Maxime si conductum venerat. Andrew explains:

'Id est tunc precipue quod presente domino mortuum est non restituetur, si illud ad eum apud quem mortuum est venit conductum pro mercede operis sui. Quod est dicere iumentum quod aliquis pro mercede operis conduxit, si presente domino qui locavit illud mortuum fuerit, ita tamen quod non ex culpa conductoris, non restituetur. / Quidam grammaticae artis ignarus in hoc loco venerat pro venditum erat exponit. Sed venio, venis preteritum suum plusquamperfectum non venerat, sed venierat vel veniverat facit. Formatur enim a preterito perfecto sic: venii vel venivi, i [vel vi] mutata in e et addita ram fit venieram vel veniveram.'¹

The poor ignoramus turns out to be Hugh, for he had explained:

'Maxime si conductum venerat pro mercede operis sui: quasi dicat: Tunc non reddet quis mutuo acceptum, quando praesente domino illud amittit; sed et illud praesertim non reddet, quod conduxerat praesente domino, similiter amittit; et hoc dicit littera, quod venerat, id est venditum erat; non quidem finaliter, sed et pro mercede sui operis, id est quam mercedem expetebat suum opus, id est usus; ut referatur suum ad rem conductam.'²

The next occasion where Andrew is critical of Hugh occurs in a rather technical remark about the order of historical events which do not exactly correspond with the order of the texts, in the end of Ex.xxiii and Ex.xxiv.1-9. Andrew does not agree here with the changes proposed by Hugh.³

Finally on Ex.xxv.27, Subter coronam erunt circuli, he disagrees with Hugh. Andrew remarks:

'Ostendit in quibus locis ponendi sunt circuli, quibus

1. Fo. 58b,c (108b,c).

2. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 68D).

3. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 69A-D); Andrew: fo. 60a,b (108d).

4. I have used The Latin Josephus, (Introduction and text Antiquities 1-2)

immittantur vectes ad portandam (mensam),^a in summo scilicet iuxta labium quam hic coronam appellat et non versus terram in immo. Quidam dicunt quod quas supra dixit duas coronas (vss. 24,25), hic unam vocet, subter quam dicit circulos esse ponendos. Secundum quam sententiam extrinsecus in latere due supradicte corone labio adiungentur, nec quare adiungantur facile patet. In superficie autem versus superiora necessario adiungenda videntur, ut ea que super mensam posita sunt contineant, et ne aliquo casu de mensa corruant, obstaculo sint.¹

Hugh had said about this text:

'Modo duas coronas quasi unam coronam dixit, et ostendit annulos, qui erant in pedibus arcae^b ad eam portandam,² statim iuxta mensam et non versus terram in imo erant.'²

Here Andrew partly copies Hugh, partly rejects him and, as before, puts forward a logical, to the point argumentation.

Thusfar his references to Hugh. It has already been said that he more often agrees with Hugh than that he criticizes him. Examples of the last category, however, were thought to be of more interest in that they illustrate the manner in which Andrew uses his sources. In the section on Jewish explanations we shall notice that he occasionally copies Hugh where he is not correct: apparently he was less capable of criticism in this particular field.³

Andrew's second most referred to, explicitly mentioned source is Josephus' Antiquities;⁴ there are 10 acknowledged borrowings from him (cf. Table I). It is interesting to note that once he contrasts

a,b. Both P. and O. have arcam which does not make sense in the context. The fault, apparently, is caused by Hugh's in pedibus arcae, which should be in pedibus mensae. Adam the Scot amended the mistake when he was copying Andrew in his De Tripartito Tabernaculo, pt. i. 17 (P.L. 198, 658C).

1. Fo. 61a (109a,b).

2. Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175,70B).

3. Cf. below p. 71.

4. I have used The Latin Josephus, ed. F. Blatt (Copenhagen, 1958), i (introduction and text Antiquities i-v).

Josephus with the Jews, on Ex.xiv.27, while twice he refers to the Jews and Josephus jointly, namely on Ex.xxvi.9 and xxxviii.7, which suggests that he checked the latter's opinions with those of contemporary Jews. We shall discuss some of the borrowings from Josephus in the section on Jewish interpretation.

Andrew's direct dependence on Augustine, from whom there are 6 acknowledged borrowings (cf. Table I), is difficult to assess. The reference to Augustine on Ex.xxvi.1, which Andrew took over from Hugh's Notulae is, according to Dr. Pollit, probably the result of scribal interpolation, as the interpretation is not Augustine's.¹ From the remaining 5 quotations 3 can be found in the Gloss as well and are as such no proof of any direct use he could have made of the Questions on Exodus, which is their source. These three references occur in Andrew's interpretation of Ex.xx.14 (Q.71), Ex.xxiii.11 (Q.89) and Ex.xxvi.7 (Q.108). The remaining 2 both occur in the section on the Tabernacle; neither of them could be found in intermediary authorities and Andrew does not agree with Augustine in either case. The first example is Ex.xxvi.19, Ut binae bases singulis tabulis per duos angulos subiciantur.

Andrew explains:

'Bini cardines singulis tabulis in inferioribus suis versus terram inerant, et singulis cardinibus singule bases supposite erant. Augustinus tamen dicit quod non ex una parte singulis tabulis binae bases supponebantur, sed una basis tabule supponebatur, alia superponebatur, basim pro capitello accipiens. Sed littera contrarie videtur que dicit: ut binae bases singulis tabulis per duos angulos subiciebantur.'²

Andrew refers here to Quaestio 110.³ We should note that Andrew disagrees with Augustine on grounds of the letter of the text.

1. H.J. Pollit, op. cit., p. 10, n.41. Cf. below p.61 where the passage will be discussed.

2. Fo. 64c (110a).

3. Quaestiones Ex.110 (C.C.S.L.33, p. 123, l.1845).

The second point is on Ex. xxxviii.7, In circulos qui in altaris lateribus eminebant. Andrew remarks:

'Ecce et altare holocausti suos habet circulos per quos portetur. Credibile est igitur utrumque altare separatim et craticulas eorum separatim portatas fuisse. Secundum Hebreos et Iosephum et omnes fere expositores inter candelabrum et mensam propositionis, extra velum contra arcam testimonii positum fuit altare thimiamatis. Augustinus tamen multis in locis dicit quod intra velum fuit.'¹

With this comment Andrew ends his exposition of Exodus. His remark about the placing of the altar of incense according to Augustine seems almost to come as an afterthought, for the text he is commenting on deals with the altar of burnt offerings only. The reason for this may be the circumstance that Augustine's opinion occurred in Quaestio 177, which is a lengthy Expositio Tabernaculi, closing the questions on Exodus. We can suppose that Andrew read through this last question when he had come to the end of his own exposition to see whether there might be anything in it he would wish to add to his own work. When he came across the controversial point about the placing of the altar of incense, he thought it necessary to comment upon it.

This explanation suggests rather that Andrew had worked with Augustine's Questions on his desk throughout his interpretation of Exodus. Is there, however, any other evidence in his commentary, apart from the two above mentioned interpretations, which would confirm this hypothesis? There are certainly many unacknowledged references to the Quaestiones; Andrew used it lavishly and freely, sometimes quoting it in full, sometimes paraphrasing its contents, according to his needs.

A comparison with the Gloss, however, shows that practically all the derivations can be found there as well. On two occasions only I found that Andrew was reminiscent of Augustine, where the Gloss does not refer

1. Fo. 68d (111b).

5. Quaestiones Ex. 99 (C.C.S.I. 33, p. 118, l. 405).

to him, although a more systematic search might bring to light some more. The first point is Ex.xxiii.2, Non sequeris turbam. Andrew comments:

'Non ideo putes malum aliquid esse faciendum, quia vides multos illud committere, vel ideo peccatum non esse, quia a multis committitur.'¹

Augustine's Quaestio 87 reads:

'Non eris cum pluribus in malitia. Ne se inde quisquam defendat, quia cum pluribus fecit, aut ideo putet non esse peccatum'.²

Although the first part of the interpretation could be suggested by the biblical text itself, the second part shows a verbal correspondence with Augustine.³

The other reference occurs in Ex.xxiv.7, Adsumensque volumen foederis.

Andrew writes:

'Librum scilicet in quo iustificationes scripte erant, qui quasi fedus quoddam et testamentum inter Deum et populum erat. Nam decalogum in tabulis lapideis postea fuisse scriptum patet.'⁴

Augustine's Quaestio 99 has:

'....Et advertendum librum testamenti cum sanguine hostiae recitari, in quo libro illas iustificationes conscriptas debemus accipere. Nam decalogum legis in tabulis lapideis fuisse conscriptum postea manifestatum est'.⁵

Again a verbal correspondence with a part of Augustine's explanation.

These two borrowings which do not seem to have been used by intervening authors, although they form only a small percentage of the incorporated in the Gloss, point to a direct use of Andrew's Gloss.

The second reference is on Ex.xxvi.9, Et accipet eum in fronte dextera a. O. om. vel ideo etc.

1. Fo. 58c (108c).

2. Quaestiones Ex. 87 (C.C.S.L. 33, p. 113, 1.1502).

3. As P. is the older and most reliable manuscript of the two, there is no reason to change our conclusion because of the omission in O.

4. Fo. 60b (109a). 11. 1-3 (P.L. 91, 420.435A). Andrew, fo. 61b-63a (109b-d).

5. Quaestiones Ex. 99 (C.C.S.L. 33, p. 118, 1.1684).

total augustinian material in Andrew's commentary, suggest first hand dependence on Augustine. This, together with the two acknowledged quotations which we found to go back directly to the Quaestiones, gives one some reason to suppose that Andrew consulted Augustine independently for his comments on Exodus. Also, if we think of his remark that he used glossed books and commentaries for his interpretations in relation to the importance of the Questions as a textbook, and of the fact that he had learned from Hugh to use it as a source of information on the historical books, we have even more reason to do so.

Next on the list of acknowledged derivations comes Bede, who is mentioned three times in the section on the Tabernacle (cf. Table I). We have already mentioned that Andrew, though recognizing Bede's authority on the subject, treats him in his usual unprejudiced manner.¹ The first reference to him is on Ex.xxvi.1, Tabernaculum vero ita fiet. After a few introductory remarks he says:

'Et quoniam Bede liber extat de tabernaculo, qualiter ipse de factura/tabernaculi iuxta historiam sentiat, videamus....'.²

Andrew refers here to Bede's De Tabernaculo et Vasis Ejus, from which he proceeds to give a long quotation.³ We have seen above that Andrew sometimes prefers a shorter version of Bede, as can be found in the Gloss, to Bede's own lengthy expositions. The phrasing of his remark, however, and the fact that large parts of the quotation are not incorporated in the Gloss, point to a direct use of Bede's treatise. The second reference is on Ex.xxvi.9, Ut sextum sagum in fronte tecti duplices. On this technical point Andrew claims to be 'following the

1. See above p. 11.

2. Fo. 61c,d (109b).

3. De Tabernaculo, ii. 1-3 (P.L. 91, 424C-435A). Andrew, fo. 61d-63a (109b-d).

Jews and Josephus rather than Bede'.¹ The last one is on Ex.xxviii.14, Facies in rationali catenas sibi invicem coherentes. Andrew comments:

'Ordo operis secundum Bedam hic fuit....'.²

Here again follows a rather technical exposition.

Finally Isidore is once mentioned explicitly, as well as Jerome and Cassiodorus. The last two are referred to in Ex.xv.20, in an explanation of musical instruments, tympanum and chorus, of which they gave different interpretations.³ However, Andrew borrowed here from the Gloss. The reference to Isidore occurs in Ex.xii.25, in his explanation of the word ceremonie. The Etymologies mention two different explanations of the word, which are both copied by Andrew.⁴ Apart from this one acknowledged borrowing there are many other references to the Etymologies throughout the commentary. It is not surprising that Andrew found there much information of the kind he was interested in himself, for instance on Ex.iv.24, Cum esset in itinere in diversorio. One of the interpretations of diversorium put forward by him, 'Diversorium est quo ex diversis viis convenitur', was taken from Isidore.⁵ Another example is Ex.vii.12, where Andrew gave a definition of dracones as 'maxima omnium animantium super terram', which came from the same source.⁶

Thus far Andrew's named authorities. In our survey of the latter we have often referred to 'the Gloss', assuming that it was one of the

1. Fo. 63d (110a): 'Insexi sagi in fronte tecti duplicatione magis Iudeorum et Iosephi sententiam quam Bede sequimur'.

2. Fo. 66a (110c).

3. Fo. 52c (106d).

4. Fo. 47d-48a (105c); Etymologiae, vi.19 (ed. Lindsay, vi.19, 36-37) cf. below p.96 where the passage is quoted fully.

5. Fo. 43a,b (103b); ibid., xv.3 (ed. Lindsay, xv.3, 10).

6. Fo. 45b (105a); ibid., xii.iv (ed. Lindsay, xii.4, 4).

textbooks available to him. Although the Glossa Ordinaria for all the biblical books did not obtain its standard form until the middle of the twelfth century, after its adoption by Peter Lombard, we know that various copies of individual biblical books together with their Gloss were in circulation long before that time.¹ The Gloss on the Pentateuch and the Prophets, and, most probably, on Kings also,² was compiled by Anselm of Laon's pupil Gilbert the Universal, this 'veteris et novi testamenti glossator eximius',³ at some time before he was appointed bishop of London, late in 1127. As it seems likely that these glosses were copied at Paris before 1137,⁴ we have reason to suppose that Andrew was able to make use of them.

As we have already seen, the Gloss was responsible for some of his quotations from Augustine and Bede; also his allusions to explanations of Origen are almost certainly taken from that source.⁵ In fact, it seems that together with Augustine's Quaestiones and Hugh's Notulae the Gloss was Andrew's principal standby for his exposition of Exodus.⁶ Therefore the Gloss must be the best place to search for Andrew's 20 remaining acknowledged quotations, of which the author is not mentioned and which do not derive from Hugh, whom Andrew usually referred to as quidam.

1. Cf. Study, pp. 46-66, which deals with the origin of the Gloss. On these early collections of glosses, cf. id. 'Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées', Cah. Civ. méd., iv (1961), 16-18.

2. R. Wasselynck, 'L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxii (1965), 186-191. According to Miss Smalley 'the argument for Gilbert's authorship of the Gloss on Kings might well be extended to cover Josue, Judges and Ruth'. Cf. 'An early twelfth-century commentator on the literal sense of Leviticus', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxvi (1969), 80, n.10.

3. B. Smalley, 'Gilbertus Universalis, bishop of London (1128-34) and the problem of the "Glossa Ordinaria"', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., vii (1935), 247.

4. Study, p. 64.

5. Cf. pp. 55, 86-87, 92-93.

6. Hugh's Notulae were too early to use the Gloss.

However, if we look at Table I only 3 out of the 20 borrowings can be found there. The remark in Ex.iv.10 will be discussed on pages 86-87.

The second reference occurs in Ex.xvii.9,elige viros et egressus pugna contra Amalech. Andrew comments:

'Amalech, dicunt quidam, filium Ismaelis fuisse a quo Amalechite, qui et Ismaelite sunt, qui nunc Saraceni vocantur'.¹

The first part of this explanation is ascribed to Strabo, while the addition that they are now called Saracens was, according to Professor Southern 'a commonplace of Western scholarship' ever since Bede.²

The third reference is on Ex.xx.4,neque omnem similitudinem.

Andrew comments:

'Hoc volunt quidam inter idolum et similitudinem differe, quod idolum ex nullius rei existentis similitudine, ut si quis humanis membris caput canis aut arietis formet sumptum, sed otiose confictum sit. Similitudo vero sit que ex imagine rei existentis sit, sicut quando imago hominis aut avis aut serpentis in aliqua materia formatur'.³

This distinction goes back to Origen's Homilia 8 in Exodum; it was slightly changed by Andrew.

As can be seen from Table I, some of the remaining acknowledged borrowings are derived from the Etymologies, for instance Ex.xii.25 (p. 96) and xiii.18. The nostri citation in Ex.iv.25 goes back to Augustine's Question 12 on Exodus. The apocrypha scriptura in Ex.xvi.31 is a quotation from Wisdom. Some others may reflect Jewish opinions,

1. Fo. 55b (107c).

2. R.W. Southern, Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), p. 17. The identification of the children of Ishmael with the Saracens was made by Eusebius and even earlier by Josephus. Bede, whose intermediate source was Isidore, introduced it into the medieval tradition (cf. ibid. pp. 16-18). Cf. also J. Praver, Histoire du Royaume Latine de Jérusalem (transl. from the Hebrew, Paris, 1969), p. 102, n.8, who ascribes the tradition to Jerome. Miss Smalley was so kind to draw my attention to these works.

3. Fo. 56c (107d).

4. Fo. 56d-57a (107e).

for example Ex.xvi.5, which could be derived from Rashi; also some remarks about Jewish festivals in Ex.xxiii.15, and lastly part of his comment on Ex.xxiii.19, which is reminiscent of Joseph Bekor Shor later on (cf. pp. 98-99). The quidam quotations in Ex.xxvi.4 and xxxvi.31 are again rather technical; they could possibly go back to Bede. The quidam in Ex.iii.12 were 'borrowed' by Andrew from Hugh (cf. p. 85), which leaves Ex.iv.24, Ex.iv.25, Ex.iv.27, Ex.xii.42 and Ex.xx.5 still to be discussed. None of these could be traced. Ex.iv.25 and Ex.xii.42 will be referred to later on.¹

On Ex.iv.24, Cum esset in itinere in diversorio Andrew remarks:

'Diversorium est quo ex diversis viis con/venitur, vel sicut alii: domus inter duos muros duas ianuas habens'.²

Only the first explanation can be found in Isidore (cf. above p.53).

The second reference, of which no source could be found, occurs in the

same chapter, verse 27, Dixit autem Dominus ad Aaron, Vade in occursum

Moysi in deserto. Qui perrexit obviam in montem Dei. Andrew comments:

'Desertum quod est in Egypto, ut quidam dicunt, sed potius videtur de deserto Sinai agere, quia sequitur quod perrexit Aaron obviam in montem Dei, quo nomine specialiter mons Sinai appellabatur'.³

The last one occurs in Ex.xx.5, Visitans iniquitatem patrum in

filios in tertiam et quartam generationem. Andrew comments:

'.....quidam totum ad misericordiam referunt, dicentes quod peccantibus, etiam his qui Deum oderunt, non statim in ipsos vel filios ipsorum ulciscitur, sed usque in tertiam vel quartam generationem vindictam differt/sicut de Achab et Iehu legimus....'.^{4,5}

Thus far Andrew's sources.

1. Cf. below pp. 76-77 and 88-89 respectively.

2. Fo. 43a,b (103b). (The description is not to be found in Papias' Lexicon).

3. Fo. 43d (103c).

4. iii Reg.xxi.29.

5. Fo. 56d-57a (108a).

B) Some comments on Andrew's manner of interpretation.

A comparison with Chapter II will illustrate the general correspondence between Andrew's mode of interpreting and that of the French Jewish biblical schools. It was therefore not thought necessary to draw attention to each individual instance¹.

That Andrew is very much concerned about the historical order of events in the biblical narrative can easily be gathered from reading his explanation of the first chapter of Exodus. In fact, we find this characteristic throughout the commentary. He often explains why the author recapitulates certain points, or how an apparently illogical sequence of events should be understood. For instance Ex.xii.1, Dixit Dominus ad Moysen et Aaron. Andrew comments:

'Ab hoc loco usque vocavit autem Moyses² omnia per recapitulationem dicuntur. Plague quibus percussa est Egyptus non per intervalla temporum fiebant, sed finita una statim succedebat alia. Finita nona plaga, post comminationem regis cum subiunxisset in persona Domini loquens: media nocte, scilicet illa que instabat, ingrediar Egyptum etc.,³ cum series historie exigeret ut de contione vocata et de pascha, quod eadem nocte celebraturus erat populus ageret, mandatum Domini de ritu celebrandi, quod iam ante illis dixerat, ne per oblivionem in aliquo errarent, per recapitulationem interponit'.^{4,5}

Andrew realized how difficult it must have been for the Israelites to remember the complicated instructions for the celebration of the Passover festival and therefore suggests that Moses told them everything

1. Cf. also above p. 15 .

2. Ex.xii.21.

3. Ex.xi.4. c.8 (P.L. 175, 640).

4. Fo. 47a (105b)

5. Hugh takes this passage to be a recapitulation on the grounds that the Israelites must have known of the precepts beforehand in order to be able to have everything ready on the actual night preceding their departure. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 64A,B).

at least twice. That these verses are a recapitulation indeed is confirmed, according to Andrew, by verse 3:

'Decima die. Cum ea nocte que instabat, quando Moyses pharaoni loquebatur, occisa sunt Egyptiorum primogenita et hic dicat quod decima die mensis primi sumatur agnus ab unaquaque familia et domo unus, patet quod que iam dixerat, et si ubi dicta sint Scriptura non loquitur, recapitulat'.¹

Andrew follows Hugh here. The latter explained:

'Quod autem addit: Nocte illa, non ista, signum est per recapitulationem esse dictum, quidquid hic praecessit de agno paschali, et caeteris cohaerentibus'.²

Andrew always tries to discover why certain things have been expressed in a certain way, for example in Ex.iv.18, where Moses asks Jethro permission to go to Egypt:

'Ut videam si adhuc vivant. Hanc causam quare in Egyptum eat pretendit, pro qua et si non principaliter forsitan ibat, sed veram causam vel humilitatis causa, vel quia indignus erat Iethro, utpote gentilis cui revelaretur, silentio suppressit'.³

Another interesting explanation concerning Moses can be found in

Ex.xvii.4, Adhuc paucillum et lapidabunt me. Andrew comments:

'Quasi dicat angustia sitis compulsi, me qui in hec inaquosa loca ex tuo precepto populum adduxi, nisi succurreris potum prebendo in brevi lapidabunt. Ex magna familiaritate et dilectione hec Domino locutus est, sicut et in sequentibus dicturus est: aut dimitte eis hanc noxam, aut dele me de libro vite.⁴ Periculum quod a populo incurrere poterat pretendit, quia certissime sciebat quod prius populo Dominus potum tribueret, quam ipsum amicum suum periculum incurrere sineret'.⁵

Frequently we come across the expression more Scripture, solet Scriptura etc. In this manner Andrew allows for some peculiarities of

1. Fo. 47b (105b).

2. Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 64C).

3. Fo. 42c (103b).

4. Ex.xxxii.32.

5. Fo. 55a (107b,c).

4. Fo. 57d (108d).

Scripture, which would otherwise be difficult to explain. It shows that he takes his stand at a certain distance from the actual wording of the text in a rudimentary form of text criticism.

He is always busy explaining and illuminating, as in Ex.xii.8, where he comments on the herbs, lactucae agrestes according to the Vulgate, to be eaten by the Israelites during the Passover festival. In the Gloss he could read that these were supposed to be extremely bitter; but this is not enough for him, and he points out why this is the case: '...lactucis agrestibus, que sunt amariores his que in horto crescunt'.¹

He loves to insert descriptions of places, plants and institutions, and his commentaries are characterised by a fondness for definitions, many of which were taken from Isidore, as we have seen already.

Occasionally he refers to the customs of the 'ancient people'. For example in his definition of cratera (Ex.xxiv.6):

'Cratera a conexione dicitur, quia Antiqui conexione virgarum sibi calices faciebant. Cratin enim Grece conecti dicitur. Crateres enim sunt calices ansas habentes.'²

In this case he mentions the Antiqui presumably under influence of Isidore, whom he follows here.³ They are also referred to in Ex.xx.26, where the priests are forbidden to go up the altar by means of stone steps to prevent their garments from being disturbed and their limbs from being exposed. From this we can conclude, according to Andrew, 'quod Antiqui usum feminalium non habebant'.⁴

1. Fo. 47c (105b).

2. Fo. 60b (109a).

3. Isidore, Etymologiae xx.5 (ed. Lindsay, xx.5,3): 'Cratera calix est duas habens ansas, et est Graecum nomen... Fiebant autem primum a conexionibus virgularum; unde et dictae craterae ἀπο τοῦ κρατῆρι, id est quod se invicem teneant'.

4. Fo. 57d (108b).

5. Cf. below p. 74.

We find that Andrew also illustrates certain passages with examples from every day life, or that he explains words by referring to the vernacular; one of the first Christian interpreters to do so. For instance on Ex.ix.16, Iccirco autem posui te ut ostendam in te fortitudinem meam, he refers to weight-throwing matches:

'A simili loquitur sicut magni ponderis lapis, vel massa aliqua a iuvenibus in platea ponitur, ut robur suum experiantur et vires suas ostendant, ita et Dominus pharaonem posuisse videtur, ut in eo debellando fortitudinem suam ostenderet et nomen suum celebraret'.¹

Another reference to a contemporary custom occurs in Ex.xxvii.4,5, where Andrew in his description of the craticula according to the Jews remarks:

'Craticulam vero utriusque altaris, sive auream, sive eneam, dicunt esse opus quoddam, undique foraminibus plenum, quod ad similitudinem earum que in ecclesiis sunt, rias appellant'.²

What Andrew means with this comparison is not quite clear; the description is obscure. It could be that rias refers to the French rideaux-curtains.³ Rashi states that 'רָזַרְזָה is an expression connected with רָזַרְזָה - a sieve, which is called in French "criblé"'.⁴ Possibly Andrew has in mind some type of curtain-like screen with which he compares the craticula.

A reference to the vernacular can be found in Ex.iv.26 in a comparison between Hebrew, the Romana lingua and Latin, which will be discussed in the section on Jewish exposition.⁵ Also in Ex.x.26, where

1. Fo. 45d (105a,b).

2. Fo. 65c (110c).

3. F. Godefroy in his Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Francaise et de tous ses Dialectes (Paris, 1881-1902), vii.188 interprets the old French 'ridé' as 'plissé à petits plis'.

4. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.148a). I have used Rashi in the edition of M. Rosenbaum and A.M. Silbermann: Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos etc. and Rashi's Commentary (London, 1946).

5. Cf. below p.77f.

Moses tells the pharao that he must release not only the Israelites, but their cattle as well: Non remanebit ungula. Andrew comments:

'Ordo verborum ex eis que neces/saria sunt in cultum Domini; nec ungula remanebit, id est nec minimum, nec ultimum quid. Romane loquentes dicere solemus: pes non remanebit'.¹

Also to a quotation on Ex.xxvi.1, wrongly ascribed to Augustine,² Andrew adds something in the vernacular. The Vulgate has:varietas opere plumario faceres. Andrew comments:

'Pluma, ut dicit Augustinus, lingua Punica dicitur acus. Opus plumarium est, cum iam facto panno fila aurea aut argentea acu inseruntur, ut fiat aurifrisum aut diverse in ipso panno figure. Huiusmodi opus vulgo brustatum appellari solet'.³

Godefroy's dictionary explains 'brusti' as 'brodé' and mentions as an example: 'd'or brusti'.⁴ The quotation from Augustine can also be found in Hugh's Notulae.⁵

Andrew, like Hugh, says remarkably little about the various plagues which afflicted pharao and the Egyptians. Following Hugh, he remarks that they were the result of a divine, not a human interference. On the hail in Ex.ix.22, for example, he comments as factually as possible:

'Dicitur quod in Egypto semper sit serenitas aeris, sed forsitan pro aliqua parte et non pro tota terra dictum est. Grando enim sine nube fieri non solet. An forsitan nec/grando in Egypto naturaliter fiebat, ut et grando prodigium sit, quamvis mensuram naturalis grandinis non excederet. Sed nisi naturaliter in Egypto grando fieri soleret, Scriptura non diceret, qualis non fuit in Egypto a die qua fundata est usque in tempus presens'.^{6,7}

-
1. Fo. 46c,d (104). Fo. 104 is not a complete page and not divided into columns.
 2. Cf. above p.49.
 3. Fo. 63b (109d).
 4. Godefroy, op. cit. i, 741.
 5. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 70 B,C).
 6. Ex.ix.24.
 7. Fo. 45d-46a (104). Jewish interpretation in Antiquitates, ii.15,3 (ed. Velleius).

then, On the plague of the darkness in Ex.x.21 ff. Andrew follows partly the Gloss,¹ but finding this explanation not literal enough, he suggests a way to interpret the palpability of the darkness which keeps closer to the text. The Vulgate has:et sint tenebrae super terram Aegypti tam densae ut palpari queant... (23) nemo vidit fratrem suum.

Andrew remarks:

'Ut palpari queant. Hyperbolice magnitudinem tenebrarum significat. Tenebras hic vocat nebulam densissimam et tenebrosissimam. Et forsitan ita densatus est aer et usque aquarum naturam spissatus accessit, ut etiam tactui subiacere posset....Fratrum suum (vs.23)...Iosephus dicit tam densas fuisse tenebras, quod nec oculos aperire poterant. Unde nec mirum est si se invicem presentes videre non valebant'.^{2,3}

It is interesting to see how Andrew deals with the 'miracle' of the crossing of the Red Sea.⁴ He took the geographical description of the place and the explanation of its name from Isidore,⁵ but added that where we read 'Red Sea', the Jews read 'Sea of Reeds', because reeds grow abundantly on its shores; an interpretation derived from Rashi.⁶ He then followed Josephus, who had explained that when the Israelites were enclosed by the sea on one side and an insurpassable mountain on the other, they noticed the Egyptian chariots.⁷ The Lord, however reassured them, and the pillar of cloud came between the Egyptians and

1. The Gloss notes: 'Hyperbolice vocat tenebras palpabiles: non quod palpari possint, sed quod hoc magnitudinem tenebrarum significat'.

2. Antiquitates, ii.14,5 (ed. Blatt, p. 211): '....pro quibus et visus eorum aeris crassitudine clausi sunt, eosque mori miserabiliter compulerunt'. explanation: '....Sibi post eos, ut dicitur, tenebrae erant, aliis tenebras per eorum visum dicitur'.

3. Fo. 46c (104).

4. Cf. Appendix I, where Andrew's interpretation of Ex.xiv.3-31. is printed.

5. Etymologiae, xiii.17 (ed. Lindsay, xiii.17, 2-4).

6. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.67). The remaining references to Jewish interpretation in this passage will be discussed below.

7. Antiquitates, ii.15,3 (ed. Blatt, p. 213).

them, 'providing darkness to the former and light to the latter'.¹

About the division of the water, erat enim aqua quasi murus (Ex.xiv.22), all he says is:

'Quasi murus. Alta et non magis ad eos accedere valens, quam si murus esset; vel instar muri muniens eos a lateribus ab incursu hostium'.²

He comes back to this point in his interpretation of the next chapter, which deals with the song sung by Moses and the children of Israel, namely in verse 8, Stetit unda fluens on which he comments:

'Unda naturaliter fluida contra naturam suam immobiliter stetit',³ which is a fairly non-committal statement, and again in verse 10:

'Flavit spiritus tuus. Secundum quosdam divine potentie notat facilitatem. Quasi diceret quam facile aliquis flando proicit pulverem, tam facile tu eos interfecisti. Vel simpliciter possumus dicere quod spiritum ventum vocat, quo flante et undas super eos impellente, obruti sunt. Quem ideo spiritum Dei vocat, quia ab eo immissus erat et eius voluntatem explebat'.⁴

In the Gloss it was explained that the spirit, mentioned here, was in fact the Spiritus Sanctus, an opinion which did not concern Andrew. But even Hugh's interpretation of spiritus as a description of the divine power could not satisfy him, although he at least mentions it as a possible interpretation.⁵ He prefers to explain spiritus simply as an ordinary wind. Admittedly he had read in chapter xiv.21 that the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind, but this did

1. Fo. 50a(106a). H.J. Pollit, art.cit., p. 27 has explained that this interpretation goes back to Rabanus Maurus. Hugh probably referred to it in his explanation: '....Abiit post eos, ut defenderet eos per nubem: suis lumen, aliis tenebras per eadem simul faciens'. (Notulae, c.8, P.L.175, 65B).

2. Fo. 50a (106a).

3. Fo. 51a (106b).

4. Fo. 51b (106b).

5. Hugh, Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 65D).

not necessarily cause one to explain the divine spirit simpliciter as wind, even though it was a God-sent one. What Andrew wants to stress with his interpretation is that the Lord does not work through some form of supernatural interference, as for example Hugh had indicated, but uses means which seem quite natural, only they are not caused by natural causes, but are expressions of the divine will. His explanation of Ex.ix.23, Tonitrua Dei et grando, may illustrate this:

^{Dei}
'Tonitrua_h et grando, id est Dei virtute et potentia,
non aeris qualitate facta. Sic et sopor Domini
dicitur non naturaliter obveniēns, sed a Domino
immissus....'¹

The remarkable thing about Andrew's interpretation of Ex.xv.10 is that he explained in such a 'simple' way the very words spiritus Dei, which every medieval reader would naturally associate with the third person of the Holy Trinity.

Andrew admits that the effect made by the division of the sea on those who saw it was that of a miracle; he uses the word three times in the course of his explanation, which is interesting enough to be followed up somewhat further. In his interpretation of priorem locum (vs.27)² he says that the Egyptians, fleeing away because of the thunderstorm which was raging over them, were drowned by the returning waters. Then he wonders how the Egyptians in the darkness which surrounded them knew that the Israelites had disappeared; or, if they had seen them going into the sea, why they were not prevented from pursuing them any further because of this unusual sight. The same questions which had been asked by Hugh. The first one Andrew answers in roughly the same way: the Egyptians had sensed that the Israelites had departed because of the

1. Fo. 46a (104).

2. Fo. 50b,c (106b); cf. Appendix I.

3. Fo. 59a (108a).

noise they had made.¹ The second problem, however, is solved quite differently by Andrew. How can one expect, he says, that a people who had not been moved by so many preceding miracles, would suddenly have been struck by this one, so that they would stop their pursuit, especially as they saw some of their own men safely entering the sea. Or perhaps, he suggests in a delightful anachronism, they had heard from the histories of the Ancients that Alexander the Great and his soldiers had found the Pamphylian Sea divided when they were pursuing Darius, and that therefore they were not so shocked when they saw a similar thing happen again.! Andrew completely misunderstands Josephus here, it seems, for the latter had only referred to Alexander the Great in this context in order to point out that a similar thing had indeed happened not so long ago.² On the other hand, the fact that Andrew so frequently consulted Josephus, the major source of historical information on the Old Testament available to him, shows his great concern about historical accuracy.

The giving of the Decalogue and other legal precepts (Ex.xx-xxiv) are dealt with in the usual straightforward manner. For example on Ex.xxiii.13,per nomen externorum deorum, Andrew comments:

'Non vult ut iurent per nomen externorum deorum, ne frequenti iuramento inducantur ad cultum eorum. Per nomen suum iurare permittit, non quod bonum sit iurare, sed sciebat homines pronos ad iurandum esse. Sic et hostias non approbat Deus, mavult tamen sacrificare sibi quam idolis. Non audietur ex ore vestro. Non vult ut frequenti nominatione deorum alienorum recordentur eorum'.³

1. Cf. Hugh: 'Quaeritur si non videbant eos praecedentes propter nubem interpositam, quomodo sequi potuerunt? Aut si videbant miraculum maris, quomodo ausi sunt eos persequi? Ad quod respondetur, quod non poterant eos videre perfecte, et tamen quia abire eos sentiebant, per aliam viam pedetentim eos sequebantur nescientes se vel illos mare ingredi'. Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 65B,C).

2. Antiquitates, ii.16,5 (ed. Blatt, p. 216).

3. Fo. 59a (108c).

He derived the first part of this interpretation from the Gloss; the second part is typical of Andrew. The same attitude is reflected in his explanation of the beginning of the Decalogue, Ego sum Dominus qui eduxi te:

'Hoc non est unum aliquod de preceptis, sed dicit cuius precepta sunt. Maximum enim Dei beneficium commemorat, ut eius legem et mandata libentius amplectentur'.¹

Andrew does not comment much on how the Law affected the lives of the Israelites in Moses' day, although he is interested in the religious practices and festivals of the Jews, and occasionally takes trouble to find out which precepts they still keep.² His main sources for the interpretation of this section, however, were Augustine's Quaestiones and Hugh's Notulae, as can be seen from Table I.

The above examples may suffice to form some idea of Andrew's manner of interpretation.

C) Andrew on the Tabernacle.³

The section on the Tabernacle covers the chapters xxv to xl of the book of Exodus.⁴ In chapter xxv the Lord makes a request for an offering and orders the people of Israel to build him a sanctuary. The description of the Tabernacle itself begins in chapter xxvi, followed by instructions concerning the two different altars, garments for the priests, and so on. In chapter xxv, which deals with the ark and the

1. Fo. 56b (107d). Cf. Andrew's prologue to the Octateuch, where we find the same theme (above p. 14). Also in the prologue to Isaiah Andrew sees this alternation of pleasant and less pleasant or difficult things.

2. Cf. the section on Jewish interpretation.

3. Some of Andrew's references to Jewish interpretations have been included here in order not to interrupt the continuity of his comments.

4. Fo. 60c-68d (109a-111b).

5. Etymologiae, xx.5 (ed. Lindsay, xx.5,1).

6. Fo. 61a (109A); cf. Notulae, c.5 (1.1.173, 70a). interruptionem, sic est intelligendum, quod artificiosus est...

table of shewbread, we find that Andrew mainly elucidates certain words and expressions, or comments on items which could easily cause confusion. For instance on Ex.xxv.6, Oleum ad luminaria concinnanda, he remarks:

'Concinnanda: componenda. Nam cinrus genus est potionis ex diversis mixturis. Hinceconcinno, id est compono dicitur'.¹

On the height of the table (Ex.xxv.23) he observes:

'Et in altitudine cubitum ac semis. Non tanta fuit spissitudo mense; truncus enim non mensa esset, sed ab imo pedis ubi terre iungebatur in hanc altitudinem se extollebat'.²

Andrew may have heard this interpretation from a Jew, since Rashi had explained in the same way.³ On the various dishes of the table of shewbread he consulted both Isidore and the Jews: Ex.xxv.29, Parabis ...ac phialas, he notes:

'Vasa quedam vitrea. Phiala enim quasi/hyala dicitur. Hyalum vero vitrum est. Hec vasa capacia sunt, ut aiunt, in imo stricta, in superioribus lata. Hebrei hec vasa scutellas appellant'.⁴

The first part of his explanation is derived from Isidore,⁵ the latter apparently from the Jews, though I have not been able to trace Andrew's description. He also borrowed from the Notulae, for instance on Ex.xxv.25, et ipsi labio coronam interrasilem...:

'Interrasilem dicit coronam quia artificiose sculpta erat'.⁶

On most points, however, he gave his own view.

For the description of the actual Tabernacle in Ex.xxvi Andrew consulted the traditional sources, among whom Bede, of course, took a

1. Fo. 60d (109a).

2. Fo. 60d (109a).

3. Rashi ad loc (ed. Silbermann, i.136).

4. Fo. 61a,b (109d). Cf. above, p.52.

5. Etymologiae, xx.5 (ed. Lindsay, xx.5,1).

6. Fo. 61a (109A); cf. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 70A) 'Quod dicitur interrasilem, sic est intelligendum, quod artificiose erat sculpta...'

first place. In fact, as we have seen already, he begins his interpretation by copying Bede on the general structure of the Tabernacle, the saga and the cortinae,¹ and only then proceeds with his own comments. He supplemented his sources with some more information from Josephus than Bede had already offered, and with an occasional reference to the Hebrew text or interpretations of contemporary Jews. In spite of these borrowings from others, one of the most remarkable features of Andrew's explanation of this chapter is his independence and originality. This is emphasized by the critical use he makes of the existing sources. Since many of his comments are necessarily of a highly technical character and therefore not relevant to us, for instance about the exact way of placing the different layers of curtains over the wooden structure of the Tabernacle or the joining of the boards, we shall not discuss them here.

In the remaining chapters, for no apparent reason, he draws heavily on Hugh. In Ex.xxvii he follows the Notulae in the description of the various implements to go with the altar of burnt offerings (vs.3) and of the craticula, the grating network of brass (vss. 4 and 5).² Hugh had compared these verses with the Hebrew and had pointed out the discrepancies between the Hebrew and the Vulgate rendering of the text. He had also quoted the opinion of others on the subject: someone (quidam) who claimed that the altar did not have a covering on top nor a base, but consisted of walls only, which used to be filled with earth, according to Ex.xx.24, An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me; offerings were burnt on top of this altar. Since Rashi had commented in roughly the same way on Ex.xxvii.8, Hollow with boards shalt thou make it, Hugh may have had this explanation in mind.³ The other opinion he quotes coincides more or

1. De Tabernaculo, ii.1-3 (P.L. 91, 424C-435A). Cf. above, p.52.

2. Hugh, Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 70D-71D).

3. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i. 148b-149).

less with Bede.¹ According to those who explain in this way, the craticula is placed in the middle of the altar on top of which (sc. the craticula) offerings are placed to be burnt, that is to say, they are burnt inside the altar itself. If asked how the wooden walls of the altar did not catch fire, being so near the flames which consumed the sacrifices, they answered that the walls of the altar were made of an unflammable wood; an opinion of which Hugh is highly suspicious.

All this is dutifully quoted by Andrew; since it, apparently, did not satisfy him he discussed the passage again with the Jews, making the following comment as a result:

'Iudei ubicumque nos aram dicimus, dicunt aream. Quod nos ereum vel aureum altare propter laminas asseribus affixas dicimus, illi parietes aree appellant; hos parietes in quadrum dispositos terra usque ad summum repleri solere dicunt. In summo glebarum parietibus supradictis inclusarum ligna poni, quibus sacrificia superponebantur. Craticulam vero utriusque altaris sive auream sive eneam dicunt esse opus quoddam undique foraminibus plenum, quod ad similitudinem earum que in ecclesiis sunt, rias appellant. Hec ab imo altaris ubi terre iungebatur usque ad medium eius pertingebant. Habebant iste rie per quatuor angulos in superiore sui parte circulos quatuor. Anuli isti positi erant subter arulam altaris. Quod nos dicimus arulam, Iudei dicunt aratiunculam vel sulcum quendam fuisse in medio parietum altaris, usque ad quem locum rie altaris attingebant. Huic sulco anuli craticule supponebantur, quia usque illuc attingebant. His anulis inductis vectibus craticula et altaris parietes simul portabantur'.²

To begin with, the remark that where the Vulgate has aram, the Hebrew text reads aream, where the Vulgate has ereum or aureum altare, the Hebrew text has parietes aree. Area, of course, means open space, open field, but in medieval Latin it can also mean fire place. If we look up the Hebrew, however, we find that in all the cases where the Vulgate renders either aram (e.g. Ex.xxxiv.13, Deut. vii.5, xii.3) or altare, whether made of copper or of gold (e.g. Ex.xxxviii.30, xxxix.39, xl.5),

1. De Tabernaculo, ii.12 (P.L. 91, 454B,C).

2. Fo. 65c (110c). (ed. Silberman, i. 148c,b).

the Hebrew uses one word only, namely חֲזֵק which is the normal word for altar. This means that there is no textual evidence for Andrew's comment. We know, on the other hand, that Rashi in his description of the altar refers to Ex.xx.24. In fact he identifies the altar mentioned there with the one in this chapter:

'For the altar of earth there spoken of is identical with the altar of copper described here and it was called an altar of earth, because they used to fill the hollow space within it (within its coppered walls) with earth at every place where they camped in the wilderness'.¹

It seems very likely that Andrew was told of this interpretation which described the altar as having four walls filled up with earth, and concluded that the Hebrew must use an altogether different expression from the Latin, namely parietes aere. This would correspond exactly with Rashi's description.² Here we have clearly a case where Andrew mistakes an explanation of a Jewish commentator for the actual wording of the Hebrew text. He frequently makes this mistake as we shall see in the next section.

The remark about the craticula has already been discussed.³ His next observation concerning the arula is more interesting and seems again to be influenced by Rashi, who explains the word פְּרָקִי of the Hebrew text as:

'A surround; anything which encompasses an object all the way round is called פְּרָקִי This is similar to the practice of making rounded grooves in the boards that form the sides of chests and wooden chairs. For the altar too he made a hollowing round about.... It also served to mark the middle of its height....'⁴

1. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.148b).

2. The wording of Andrew's comments suggests that he is referring to a Jewish source, rather than to Hugh's explanation (cf. p. 68 above).

3. Above, p.60 .

4. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.148a,b).

*not claim it was a Jew
opinion.*

It is indeed possible, on grounds of this interpretation, to refer to the arula as a furrow, breaking up the altar in two halves, as Andrew does. But here again, he takes an explanation of a Hebrew word for the word used in the text itself.

In chapter xxviii he quotes first Bede on the garments of the high priest¹ and then Hugh.² In fact Andrew on Ex.xxviii.14 to Ex.xxxiii.20 is a literal quotation from the Notulae (which end here), without any addition of his own. Hugh repeatedly referred to the Hebrew text or Jewish expositions in these passages; Andrew copied them, apparently without checking, as can be gathered from the following example:

Ex.xxviii.36, Facies et laminam de auro purissimo in qua sculpes 'sanctum Domino'. Hugh had commented and Andrew borrowed:

'Has duas scilicet dictiones pro eo quod nos habemus sanctum Domino in Hebreo habetur anoth^a adonay. Hoc autem nomen adonay scilicet quatuor litteris scribitur: he, ioth, heth, vau, quod interpretatur "iste principium passionis vite" et ineffabile dicitur'.³

The Hebrew, however, reads ה' ה' ה' ה' ש' ה' ה' of which the Vulgate text gave a correct translation with its 'sanctum Domino'.⁴

From Ex.xxxiii.20 onwards Andrew gives a short interpretation of some selected passages. As much of the Bible text is a repetition of the preceding chapters he could afford to be short, and we do not find anything very new in his comments.

a. O.. avoth.

1. De Tabernaculo, iii. 5 (P.L. 91, 472 B - 473 A).

2. Hugh, Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 71D-72A).

3. Fo. 66d (110b); cf. Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 72B).

4. The origin of Hugh's remark is not known. A somewhat longer version can be found in the Gloss ad loc.

D) Andrew's consultation with the Jews.

In the course of his exposition of Exodus Andrew refers about 80 times to the Hebrew language or to a Jewish interpretation.¹ These remarks can be classified in the following categories (cf. Table II):

- I Notes on the Hebrew or Jewish explanations borrowed from other Christian commentators.
- II Linguistic remarks.
- III Exegetical comments.
- IV References to Jewish customs.

Sixteen observations were found to belong to the first group, of which 11 were taken from Hugh's Notulae. The linguistic annotations had to be divided into purely linguistic ones, which numbered 24 and half linguistic, half exegetical comments of which there were 9. Nineteen further notes were found on exegetical matter and 8 references to Jewish customs. We shall now discuss Andrew's comments in this order.

I

Because of their secondary character only a few examples of the first category will be examined. The first one is Ex.i.11,

Aedificaverunt urbes tabernaculorum:

Hugh:

'In Hebraeo, ubi nos habemus tabernaculorum, est quidam sermo, qui transpositione puncti modo ad dextram modo ad sinistram, vel sonat in voce miscenoth, et significat pauperum; vel sonat

Andrew:

'Secundum Hebreos vel pauperum, scilicet ut que prius debiles et pauperum mansiones erant, operatione Hebreorum facte sunt fortiores, vel positionum, id est ita fortes ut thesauri regis ibi reponerentur in

1. Apart from the acknowledged sources I have used for the investigation of Andrew's Jewish material in this chapter The Soncino Chumash, ed. A. Cohen (London, 1947) and many helpful comments of Mr. H. Soloveitchik.

5. Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, 11.7 (P.L. 103, 290).

miscenoth et significat positionum: et secundum hoc, quod prior vox subinnuit, urbes pauperum aedificatas intelligitur: urbes prius debiles, et pauperum mansiones operatione Hebraeorum fortiores effectas. Secundum hoc autem, quod miscenoth significat positionum, intelligitur ita fortes urbes compositas quod thesauri regis reponerentur ibi in custodia pro firmitudine loci, sive ante fuerint ibi urbes, sive non'.¹

custodia pro firmitate loci, sive ante fuerint ibi urbes, sive non. Vel urbes tabernaculorum, id est castrorum, ita scilicet firme et manite sunt ut castra'.²

It is interesting to note that Andrew does not mention in his interpretation Hugh's assumption that the verse could be explained in different ways depending on the writing of the word miscenoth.³ Whether he omitted it because he realized his master's mistake is uncertain.

Andrew's explanation of Ex.iii.1 was well known among Christian commentators:

'De medio rubi. In rubo ideo Dominum aiunt Hebrei apparuisse Moysi, ne possent inde sibi idolum sculpere Iudei; semper enim Deus idolatrie occasionem recidit'.⁴

We find it for instance in Isidore's Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum,⁵

1. Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 61C).
 2. L. Ginsberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenslavern, II: 4. Haggada' (in Memoire du Dr. S. Poznanski, Varsovie, 1907), p. 202.
 3. Hugh seems to assume that miscenoth is written מִשְׁכְּנוֹת, in which case the ו could indeed be read as ו or ו. However, the Hebrew word is written מִשְׁכְּנוֹת and all the traditional and later Jewish sources interpret it as 'store cities', for example the Targum, Rashi, Rashbam, Ibn Ezra and Bekor Shor. On the other hand, the Hebrew has a word מִשְׁכְּנוֹת meaning 'poor', 'miserable'. Thus if Hugh had asked his Jewish teachers the meaning of the word miscenoth without referring to its context, it is possible that they gave him both meanings; hence his explanation. In a medieval Jewish commentary, printed at Livorno in 1783 under the name מִשְׁכְּנוֹת בְּרֵיכָה, is interpreted as derived from מִשְׁכְּנוֹת -poor, which points to a poor understanding of the Hebrew.
 4. Mekilta, tract. Pisha, vii.50 (ed. Lauterbach, l. 55).
 5. Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, ii.7 (P.L. 183, 290A).

in Rabanus Maurus Commentaria in Exodum¹ and in the Gloss. Ginzberg in his 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern' has pointed out that Theodoretus and Ephraem Syrus already knew of this interpretation.²

On Ex.iii.22 Andrew quotes Hugh where the latter refers to an interpretation similar to Rashbam's explanation of the text:³

'Postulabit mulier. Dicunt Hebrei quod tantam gratiam dederit eis in conspectu Egyptiorum, ut dono postularent eorum vasa et ipsi donarent. Sed credibilius est mutuo accepta asportasse, sed excusantur quia imperio Domini^a hoc fecerunt'.⁴

Andrew includes Hugh's criticism of the Jewish interpretation. However, by adding that the Jews were absolved from giving back what they had borrowed because they acted by order of the Lord, he defends them against the charge of deceitful borrowing. Exactly the same had been the object of Rashbam who remarked that this, namely that the Jews received silver from the Egyptians as an unconditional gift, was 'its real meaning and a refutation of the Christians'.⁵

On Ex.xii.12 he follows the Gloss in an explanation which goes back to the Mekilta⁶ and was used again by Rashi and Ibn Ezra:

a. P.om.Domini.

1. Commentaria in Exodum, i.5 (P.L.108, 20A).

2. L. Ginzberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern, iii: Exodus' (in Livre d'Hommage à la Mémoire du Dr. S. Poznanski, Warsaw, 1927), p. 202.

3. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 62 B,C): 'Tradunt Hebraei quod tantam gratiam habuerint a Domino filii Israel coram Aegyptiis, ut dono postularent eorum vasa, et ipsi darent. Nostri vero expositores dicunt verisimilius, mutuo accepisse'. Although the Notulae are now dated before 1125 and Rashbam's dates are c.1085-c.1174, acquaintance of Hugh's Hebrei with Rashbam's commentary on the Pentateuch is still feasible. Another possibility is that Hugh's rabbis drew on oral teaching of Rashbam and his circle.

4. Fo. 42a (103a).

5. Cf. Study, p. 105.

6. Mekilta, tract. Pischa, vii.50 (ed. Lauterbach, i. 55).

(Jerusalem, 1955-1960).

3. This last remark applies equally to the use made by Andrew.

4. Fo. 42a (103a).

and 7010 'Et in cunctis diis Egypti faciam iudicia. Ultionem faciam in deos Egypti. Ferunt Hebrei quod omnia/idola Egypti confracta sunt in nocte illa et templa, vel motu terre, vel fluminis Nili inundatione'.¹

Since Andrew and the Gloss both give the same abbreviated version of the Jewish tradition, we can assume that Andrew took his information from the Gloss, rather than from a Jewish source. An interesting point is that Bekor Shor explains this verse of the mighty ones of Egypt who were destroyed that night, not the idols, thus rationalizing the incident.²

II

The main point of consideration as far as the linguistic remarks are concerned is whether or not they lead to any conclusions about the extent of Andrew's knowledge of Hebrew. We shall therefore study the examples of this group with this question in mind. At the same time we shall again be able to notice the remarkable degree of coincidence between Andrew's interests and those of the French Jewish biblical schools.³

Our first linguistic comment occurs on Ex.iv.3, Dixitque Dominus proiice illam (sc. virgam) in terram. Proiecit et versa est in colubrum.

Andrew comments:

'Versa est. Vel ad virgam respicitur, vel ad serpentem. In Hebreo relatio sit ad colubrum'.⁴

The Hebrew renders וְהָיָה הַמֶּלֶךְ וְהָיָה הַמֶּלֶךְ -and it became a serpent. Since the form of the verb is the one used for the third person masculine, וְהָיָה does indeed refer only to הַמֶּלֶךְ the serpent, this word being masculine

1. Fo. 47c,d (105c).

2. The latest edition of Bekor Shor's commentary on the Pentateuch is: Sepher Rabbenu Joseph Bekor Shor: perush 'al ha-Torah, ed. J.I. God, 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1956-1960).

3. This last remark applies equally to the two remaining categories.

4. Fo. 42a (103a).

and הַבַּיִת -rod being feminine. This means that Andrew is right here. However, because he does not explain why this is the case in the Hebrew, he leaves open the possibility that he is simply recording information without fully understanding all its implications.

Ex.iv.25, Tulit illico Sephora acutissimam petram. Andrew explains:

'Tulit illico Sephora cultrum vel ferrum acutissimam. Verbum Hebraicum pro quo nos in hoc loco et in Iosue petram habemus, aciem proprie significat et prout verba resonant hic sensus est: Tulit Sephora acutissimam aciem etc. Unde et ipsi non petrinis cultris, ut quidam putant, sed acutissimis novaculis suos circumcidunt'.²

The explanation is somewhat inaccurate. First of all, the Latin text of Joshua does not use the word petra, but cultri lapidei: Eo tempore Dominus ait ad Iosue, fac tibi cultros lapideos et circumcide secundo filios Israel. Secondly, the Hebrew he refers to renders both in Exodus and Joshua, כַּיָּד, which means flint or flint knife, while it does not use the adjective acutissimam in the Exodus text. However, Rashbam ad loc. had interpreted כַּיָּד as a sharp instrument, which may explain the remark of Andrew, who mistakes here again an interpretation for a translation of a Hebrew word.³ Finally his reference to the instrument of circumcision, which can be best discussed here. There is no specific Jewish source stating that circumcision is valid only if performed with a knife. In fact Maimonides (d.1204) remarked in his

Mishneh Torah:

'The circumcision may be performed with any instrument made of flint, glass or other material which cuts.... The best method of fulfilling the precept is to use an iron instrument, such as a knife or shears. The universal custom in Israel is to use a knife'.⁴

1. Josh. v.2.

2. Fo. 43b (103b,c).

3. Bekor Shor also explained in this way.

4. Mishneh Torah: The Book of Adoration, transl. M. Hyamson (Jerusalem, 1962), p. 163b.

From this we may assume that knives were most generally used for circumcision. That there was some discussion on the subject, which, of course, intrigued many Christians, laymen and theologians alike, can also be gathered, for example, from Peter Comestor's explanation of the same text,¹ apart from the reference to the unidentified quidam.

Ex. iv. 26, Et dimisit eum postquam dixerat: sponsus sanguinum, ob circumcisionem. Andrew comments:

'Angelus Moysen. In Hebreo relaxavit eum, id est cessavit ab eo, Moyse scilicet, angelus qui prius tamquam occidere volens artabat eum. Nostri dicunt quod Sephora dimisit Moysen, commota propter circumcisionem et cum filiis ad patrem reddit, unde postea cum eisdem et patre in deserto ei occurrunt.² Sed verbum Hebraicum non potest nisi masculino convenire. Distingunt enim apud eos verba genera eorum de quibus dicuntur, sicut apud nos in Romana per articulos, non in Latina lingua. Pro eo quod nos habemus postquam dixerat sponsus etc. in Hebreo habet: Et dixit Sephora, scilicet 'et' est principium versus'.³

Andrew is right here in that he says that the Hebrew has relaxavit eum, rather than dimisit eum, for the verb הִרַחֵם means indeed: 'to relax', 'to sink down', 'to drop from', rather than 'to send away'. Of more importance is his remark that the form of the verb, הִרַחֵם , can be used for a masculine subject only and that he explained why this is so. This, I think, hints at a basic knowledge of Hebrew, for even if he is

1. Tulit illico Sephora etc. '....Et hinc volunt quidam, morem circumcidendi petrinis cultellis habuisse principium, vel a Josue in Galgalis. Tamen ubi nos habemus "petram", Hebraeus habet "aciem", et dicit "acutissimam aciem novaculam". Unde et Judaei novaculis circumcidunt. Fabulantur quidam Hebraei, usque ad David circumcisionem factam per petram. Sed quia in dejiciendo Goliath ferrum loricae et galeae cessit lapidi jacto, quasi dans ei locum, deinceps cessit lapis ferro in circumcisione'. Historia Scholastica, Liber Exodi, c.10 (P.L. 198, 1147C,D).

2. Cf. Augustinus, Quaestiones Ex.12 (C.C.S.L. 33, p.74, 1.163) and R. Maurus, Commentaria in Exodum, i.8 (P.L.108, 27B).

3. Fo. 43c (103c). הִרַחֵם read tracentos.

reporting here what he heard from his Jewish instructors, the explanation would not have made much sense had he known no Hebrew at all. The comparison with the French language made it easier for his readers to understand his comment. Also his note on the different division of the sentences in the Latin and the Hebrew text is correct; it should be remembered that a concern about the correct division and construction of the biblical text was typical of the Jewish French schools of exegesis.

Ex.vi.12,....praesertim cum sim incircumciscus labiis. Andrew explains:

'....vel regius eius fastus non permittat me proprius accedere, ut obstruisis, quod in Hebreo est, labiis loquentem audire possit'.¹

In this case his reference to the Hebrew is in fact an interpretation of Rashi, who had explained: 'I have an obstruction as regards my lips'.²

The Hebrew has פ'ת פ'ת פ'ת ללל -of uncircumcised lips. That Pharaoh's pride would not allow Moses and Aaron to come near him was already suggested by Augustine.³

Ex.xii.51,....eduxit Dominus filios Israel de terra Egypti per turmas suas. Andrew comments:

'Id est per exercitus suos. Ubi cumque nos habemus in veteri testamento turmam, qui sunt triginta milites, illi habent exercitum'.⁴

The Hebrew has ח'ג ח'ג , 'an organised gathering', id est: warfare, host, fighting men, which could correctly be translated into Latin by exercitus.

Ex.xiv.7. The Vulgate renders, Tulitque sexcentos currus electos, quicquid in Aegypto curruum fuit.⁵ Andrew has:

1. Fo. 44c (103d).

2. Rashi ad loc (ed. Silbermann, i.26).

3. Quaestiones Ex.16 (C.C.S.L.33, p.75, l.204).

4. Fo.48d-49a (105d).

5. According to the Benedictine edition of the Vulgate (Rome 1929, p.149) some MSS (Ω^m and Ω^{m2}) read trecentos.

'Trecentos. In Hebreo sexcentos. Forsitan trecenti currus electi erant et preter illos alii trecenti qui comprehenduntur in eo quod dicitur quicquid in Egypto curruum fuit'.¹

The Hebrew has indeed שש-ח'ו'ן -600. The same number of chariots is mentioned by Josephus, but from the way Andrew puts it: 600 in the Hebrew, it seems more likely that he got his information directly from a Jew, all the more so since Josephus does not explicitly refer to the biblical text.²

Ex.xiv.13,quos nunc videtis:

'In Hebreo planius: ut nunc videtis, vivos scilicet et persequentes. Possumus et nostram litteram ad eundem sensum exponere: quos, id est quales nunc videtis, vivos scilicet et persecutores'.³

The Hebrew has כִּי זַיֶּשֶׁר הָיוּ תַּחֲתַי. It is certainly possible to take כִּי זַיֶּשֶׁר as כִּי זַיֶּשֶׁר - for as, for like; Andrew's quales. This, in fact, is the simplest way of interpreting the verse, though the construction is unusual. Andrew noticed correctly that the Hebrew does not use a relative pronoun; that he was able to change the Latin text in accordance with the Hebrew version shows a good understanding of the difficulty.

Ex.xv.13, Dux fuisti in misericordia tua populo quem redemisti.

Andrew:

'Quem redemisti. De manu eorum qui/eos tanquam empticios servos possidebant. In Hebreo, ut aiunt, habet emisti, id est caros habuisti. Non enim emimus nisi quod desideramus habere et carum reputamus'.⁴

Andrew's remark that the Hebrew uses here a verb meaning 'to buy' is wrong, since the word קָנָה is employed in the Hebrew text, which

1. Fo. 49d (106a).

2. Antiquitates, II, 15.3 (ed. Blatt, p.213).

3. Fo. 50a (106a).

4. Fo. 51d-52a (106c).

4. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, 1.78).

has exactly the same meaning as the Latin redimo. However, a comparison with his interpretation of verse 16 makes his mistake understandable:

Ex.xv.16, donec pertranseat populus tuus quem possedisti.

Andrew comments:

'Quem possedisti.....In Hebreo comparasti vel emisti. In quo notatur quod caros et pretiosos eos habebat. Ideo aliquid emimus, quia illud amamus et ha/bere volumus.'¹

In this verse the Hebrew uses the verb קנה - to buy, of which

Rashi says:

'The verb קנה denotes here 'to hold dear' (חנן), like an article purchased at a high price and which is² therefore held in affection by the man who bought it.'²

This time Andrew's reference to the Hebrew is correct, while from Rashi's interpretation he learned that for the Jews the verb 'to buy' can have the connotation of 'to hold dear'. The most likely explanation of his wrong interpretation of verse 13, therefore, is that the Latin verb redimo reminded him of emo and that, since in both cases the text could be explained very well of the people of Israel held dear by the Lord, he assumed that the Hebrew used the same verb in both texts. This also means that he apparently did not check the Hebrew text himself.

Ex.xv.13, Et portasti in fortitudine tua. Andrew:

'Et portasti. Sicut nutrix parvulum ad pectus suum astringens portare solet. In Hebreo habet eduxisti.'³

We find indeed that the Hebrew has here נהיך from the verb להניח - to lead with care. It may besides be noted that Rashi explicitly rejects the translation of Targum Onkelos, where the word was interpreted in the sense of 'bearing', 'carrying'.⁴

1. Fo. 52 a,b (106c).

2. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.78).

3. Fo. 51d (106c).

4. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.78).

Ex.xv.14, Dolores obtinuerunt habitatores.... Andrew remarks:

in French 'Dolores, sive ut in Hebreo habet timores'.¹

He is wrong here. The Hebrew has ח'ן labour pains, which is much better translated by dolores, being sometimes used for the pangs of childbirth, than by timores.

Ex.xx.3 Non habebis deos alienos coram me. Andrew comments:

'In Hebreo in multis locis ubi nos habemus coram, habet contra. Sensus est: Non habeas idola et imagines deorum qui sunt alieni a me....Idioma est Hebreo lingue futurum indicativi pro presenti imperativi ponere'.²

As regards his first remark, the Hebrew has פ'נא-literally: before my face, which is translated much better by coram than by contra. His second annotation is slightly more complicated. Although it is true that the Hebrew imperfect, which has the meaning of a future tense, can be used as an imperative, especially to express a prohibition, in this particular case the wording of the Hebrew text differs from the Latin and reads, translated literally, 'there shall not be for you other gods before me'. That is to say Andrew's remark does not apply to the text under consideration, though it would apply to many other texts of the Decalogue.³

Ex.xxiii.19 Non coques hedum in lacte matris sue. Andrew:

'Verbum Hebraicum pro quo nos hedum sive agnum habemus, magis separatum significat'.⁴

1. Fo. 51d (106c).

2. Fo. 56b (107a).

3. Andrew makes the same remark in his interpretation of Is.i.12, quoting as an example Ex.xx.13, non occides, which is correct. See below pp. 132-34.

4. Fo. 59a (108c).

5. Fo. 61b (109b).

Under influence of Menachem's two letter root theory, predominant in France in the twelfth century,¹ it is quite feasible that some interpreters would explain 'קָדָשׁ' -kid of a goat as derived from קָדָשׁ -to cut, and interpret the word generally as 'youngling', 'offspring'.

On Ex.xxv.4 Andrew remarks:

'Coccumque bis tinctum. Lanam bis coccineo colore tinctam, ut multum rubea sit. In Hebreo tamen non habet bis tinctum'.²

He is right here, for the Hebrew has 'קָדָשׁ' -a crimson cloth dyed with scarlet.

Rashbam explained the words as 'wool (קָדָשׁ) coloured red with the dye ('קָדָשׁ)'. It is striking that Andrew hardly ever tries to explain why the Latin version is different from the Hebrew, which would have been easy in this case since the Latin text seems to be a description of the Hebrew pleonasm, a crimson cloth dyed with scarlet. This again suggests that he reported what he discussed with his Jewish teachers, rather than that he compared the text systematically and fully understood the discrepancies.

Ex.xxv.34, In ipso autem candelabro erunt quattuor scyphi in nucis modum. Andrew:

'.... et quedam in modo nucis formata, quos scyphos Scriptura appellat. Sed Hebreum non sonat scyphos istos in modum nucis esse factos, sed potius, ut ita dicam, nigellatos. Opera que ex argento fiunt nigellari solent, aurum vero opus nigellatum me vidisse non recolo'.³

Andrew follows here Rashi's interpretation. The Hebrew has 'כַּדָּיִם' -shaped like flowers of almonds.

Rashi, however, comments:

1. Cf. above p. 23 .
2. Fo. 60c (109a).
3. Fo. 61b (109b).

'Understand this as the Targum has it: $\text{כִּי־נִיִּלְלוּ־בְּכֶסֶף}$
 -chased. They were modelled in the way that
 is done on gold and silver vessels, a kind of
 work called in French "nieller".¹

This is exactly what Andrew meant with his nigellatos. Again he took an interpretation for a translation, but this time he may have realized that he was describing rather than translating, hence his careful way of expression: 'ut ita dicam'. His criticism of the Jewish explanation is interesting in that he compares it with what he has seen himself in every day life.

The last example of this category to be discussed is Ex. xxxv.35, Ambos erudivit sapientia, ut faciant opera abietarii... Andrew comments:

'Abietarii. Hebraicum verbum quod in hoc loco est
 significat magisterii vel artificii'.²

This remark is correct. The Hebrew uses the word אֲבִי־עָרִי which means craftsman or artisan.

Evaluating Andrew's references to the Hebrew language one comes to the conclusion that most of his annotations can be explained best as portraying 'second hand' knowledge. We have noticed that he frequently took interpretations to be literal translations of the Hebrew and that he occasionally made mistakes, for example on Ex. xv.13 (p.79f.), Ex. xv.14 (p. 81) and Ex. xx.3 (p. 81). On the other hand he knew some of the general rules of the Hebrew grammar, as appears from his comments on Ex. iv.26, et dimisit eum (p. 77) and also from his remark about the use of the imperative in Ex. xx.3, although not applicable in that particular case.

Therefore we are of the opinion that Andrew made himself familiar with the basic rules of the Hebrew grammar and syntax and that he, most

1. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.137).

2. Fo. 68c (111b).

3. Translations of Jewish commentaries either into Latin or into the vernacular did not yet exist.

likely, was able to follow his Jewish teachers when they referred to the Hebrew text, as long as they looked at it together. Without assuming this basic understanding of the language some of his comments would be difficult to account for; but it should again be stressed that his commentaries do not suggest anything more than that he was able to follow a word for word translation of a Hebrew text. In particular the fact that transliterations of Hebrew words are extremely rare in his works makes one wonder exactly how skilled he was at reading Hebrew.¹ This impression is confirmed by his other commentaries, where we have not found evidence that his command of the language had increased in any spectacular way. Most of his remarks on the Hebrew have essentially the character of reports of conversations. He wrote down what he remembered from his consultations, in the process of which he was not always able to distinguish between explanation and translation, or to make sense of the notes he had taken. It also happened at times that he associated his knowledge with the wrong word, as we shall see later on in this chapter.² His annotations are still haphazard; all the same, we are acutely aware of Andrew's desire to reach a more authentic and accurate understanding of the biblical text, and of the importance he ascribed to turning to the Hebrew original for the achievement of his purpose.

Lastly, it should be mentioned that his defective knowledge of Hebrew prevented him likewise from independently consulting Jewish commentaries.³ Therefore we must assume that he also gathered his

1. The only two transliterations of Hebrew words in the commentary of Exodus, namely on Ex.xxviii.30 and 36 (fo.66b,c (110d)) occur in quotations from Hugh (cf. above p. 71).

2. Cf. below p. 92, 92-94 and 96-97.

3. Translations of Jewish commentaries either into Latin or into the vernacular did not yet exist.

exegetical material from oral conversations with the Jews, conducted in the French vernacular.

III

In the discussion of the third category-Jewish influence on the actual interpretation of the text-we shall also include some remarks which are partly linguistic, partly exegetical in character (cf. above p.72). As so many comments belong to this group, we have to be selective in the choice of examples to be examined.

On Ex.iii.12, Et hoc habebis signum quod miserim te cum eduxeris,
locutus es ad servum tuum.
Andrew remarks:

'Quidam sic exponunt: hoc habebis signum quod ego miserim te, scilicet quod cum eduxeris populum de Egypto, immolabis Deo super montem istum. Sed quomodo posset quod longe post futurum erat esse signum rei quam nuper facturus erat, vel quam certitudinem poterat ei conferre quod longe post futurum erat, ut presens negotium fiducialius et securius susciperet? Alii dicunt sic: habebis signum, hoc scilicet quod miserim te, id est quod mitto te sit/tibi signum quod educes filios Israelis de Egypto. Et hoc habebis signum quod miserim te. Hic finit versus iste in Hebreo et est sensus: hoc scilicet quod de rubo vidisti, scilicet quod ardebat et non comburebatur et quod ego de medio rubi locutus sum tecum, habebis signum quod ego miserim te ad educendum populum meum de Egypto.'

The first part of the explanation is influenced by the Notulae.

The quidam are most likely the same persons whose interpretation did not satisfy Hugh, while the alii refer to Hugh's own explanation.²

Andrew's reference to the Hebrew version coincides more or less with one opinion that Moses during his stay in Egypt was schooled in all the wisdom of that country and was regarded as a son of the land.

1. Fo. 41d-42a (103a).

2. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 62A,B): 'Quomodo posset esse signum, quod futurum remotum erat, rei quam nuper facturus fuit? Dicimus itaque habebis signum, hoc scilicet, quod miserim, id est quod mitto te sit tibi signum quod educes filios Israel de Egypti: ut hoc scilicet cum eduxeris, sit principium alterius narrationis'.

'And this, id est the sight which thou hast witnessed in the bush, shall be a sign unto thee because I have sent thee and I am competent to save: just as thou hast seen the bush carrying out its mission I had laid upon it and it was not consumed, so go thou too on the mission I entrust to thee and thou shalt suffer no harm'.¹

Although Andrew does not give all the details of Rashi's interpretation, in both cases the phenomenon of the burning bush is understood as a sign of the divine authority behind Moses's task.

Ex. iv. 10, Non sum eloquens ab heri et nudius tertius et ex quo locutus es ad servum tuum. Andrew comments:

'Quidam dicunt Moysen propterea non esse eloquentem, quia diu moratus fuerat in terra Madian, unde oblitus erat aliquantulum Egyptie lingue; Aaron autem continue in Egypto morabatur, quare datur ipse interpres ad pharaonem. Alii sic exponunt non sum eloquens etc. Qui videbar prius et sapiens et disertus, ab heri et nudius tertius non sum eloquens et ex quo cepisti loqui servo tuo impeditioris et tardioris lingue sum. Sed que excusatio est ut tamquam ineloquens ad pharaonem non mittatur, quia comparatione Dei ineloquentem se iudicat, aut que audivit a Domino in quibus usque adeo eius apparuit facundia. Hebreus sic exponit non sum eloquens etc. Id est nec antequam locutus fuisti mecum fui eloquens nec etiam post, cum ex tui communicatione colloqui, si prius etiam ineloquens fuisset, eloquentior esse deberem,^a quia homo sum impeditioris et tardioris, id est impeditior et tarde lingue. Solemne est in Scripturis comparativa/pro positivis poni'.²

Andrew combines in his explanation material from several sources. The first interpretation is taken from the Notulae and goes in fact back to Rashbam.³ The second one comes from Origen, who was of the opinion that Moses during his stay in Egypt was educated in all the wisdom of that country and was regarded as a man gifted with an

1. Num. 3 in Ex.
a. O. om. cum....deberem.

2. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, 1.16), slightly changed.
1. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, 1.12).

3. Fo. 43b (103b).
2. Fo. 42b,c (103a).

4. Bab. Talmud, Nedarin 31b-32a (ed. Epstein, p. 24), cf. Mekilta, tract. 3. Notulae, c. 8 (P.L. 175, 62C).
5. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, 1.18, 19).

incomparable eloquence. It was not then after he had heard the voice of the Lord that he realized his own shortcomings.¹ Andrew could have read this interpretation in the Gloss. The Jewish explanation, which suggests that Moses was not a fluent speaker by nature, goes back to either Rashi or Ibn Ezra. The latter had argued that Moses not only claimed that he was slow of speech, but also slow of tongue, which points to a general disability to speak fluently and clearly. Rashi had commented on the verse: 'I speak heavily (id est with difficulty) in French "balbus" (a stammerer).²

Ex. iv. 24, Cumque esset in itinere in diversorio occurrit ei Dominus.

Andrew:

'....Ubi cum Moyses reficeretur, ut aiunt, occurrit ei angelus, volens eum occidere. In Hebreo sic: cum esset in itinere, Moyses scilicet, in mansione ubi forsitan per noctem hospes manserat, occurrit ei angelus Domini, volens, ut videbatur, occidere eum, Moysen scilicet'.³

It was a well known Jewish tradition, ascribed to R. Jose, that the angel sought to kill Moses not because he had neglected the circumcision of his son - for how could some one like Moses be capable of such a transgression? - but because when he came at the inn he immediately concerned himself with eating and drinking, when he should have circumcised his son first.⁴ It seems likely that this tradition lies behind Andrew's 'when he had eaten, as they say, the angel met him'. His reference to the Hebrew text is rather obscure as it hardly differs from the Vulgate rendering. The best way of explaining it is to compare

1. Hom. 3 in Ex.

2. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.16), slightly changed.

3. Fo. 43b (103b).

4. Bab. Talmud, Nedarim 31b-32a (ed. Epstein, p. 94), cf. Mekilta, tract. Amalek, iii.117 (ed. Lauterbach, ii.170), and Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.18, 19).

Andrew's remark with Rashi's interpretation. Rashi did not want to read the Hebrew $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים בַּלַּיְלָהַּ הַהוּא}$ as: And it came to pass by the way in the lodging place, as was commonly done; he proposed to take וַיֵּלֶךְ as referring to Moses and to interpret: 'And he, scilicet Moses, was during the journey in the lodging place and the angel sought to kill him....'¹ The Vulgate had already translated in this sense. It looks as if Andrew did not quite understand the point Rashi wanted to make, and that he did not realize that the latter's interpretation was in agreement with the Latin version. All he gathered was that in the Hebrew Moses was mentioned as the subject of the sentence; hence his comment.

Ex.xii.42, Nox est ita observabilis Domini, quando eduxit eos de terra Aegypti. Andrew comments:

'Quando eduxit. Non quod noctu egrederentur de Egypto, prima/enim die azymorum egressi sunt, sed quia ea nocte factum est unde egredi potuerunt, primogenitorum scilicet interfectio. Paulo quoque superius dictum est: Nullus vestrum egrediatur ostium domus sue usque in mane, transibit enim Dominus percutiens Egyptios;² causa est quare egredi debent. Mirum est ergo quomodo quidam asseverant hoc preceptum non tunc observatum fuisse, sed tunc dictum ut postea observaretur, cum potius iacirco iussum est postea observari, quia tunc observatum est. Quod autem Moyses et Aaron nocte illa acciti ad regem introierunt, iussio regis urgebat. Vel ideo forsitan dictum est quod ea nocte eduxit illos Dominus, quia urgentibus eos Egyptiis ut egrederentur, ad summo mane egrediendum ipsa nocte se preparaverunt'.³

Andrew wants to harmonize this text, which states that the Lord brought the Israelites out of Egypt, by night, with the text mentioned earlier on, which forbade the Jews to leave their houses during that very night. This apparent contradiction had led some interpreters to explain

1. Ibid., p. 18 and p. 233, n.4.

2. Ex.xii.22,23.

3. Fo. 48b,c (105d).

that the prohibition to leave the house did not apply to the night of the first Passover. He rightly disagrees with this view. Later on he apparently discussed the problem with the Jews, and remarked in his explanation of Ex.xiii.3 Mementote diei huius in qua egressi estis:

'Ecce hic dicit quod die egressi sunt de Egypto. Noluit Dominus latenter et tanquam furtim de Egypto noctu egredierentur, sed potius clara luce, videntibus cunctis Egyptiis et mortuos suos sepelientibus, ut sic potentia eius magis innotesceret. Unde et illud quod supra positum est: nullus egrediatur limen domus sue (vs.22) secundum Hebreos sic accipere possumus, ut non sit prohibitio ad quolibet modo exeundum, sed de Egypto proficiscendum. Unde nec postea ab Hebreis tanquam preceptum est observatum'.¹

On his enquiries whether the Jews went out by day or by night Andrew found that the Jewish interpreters stress the fact that they went out by day: 'in broad day light' according to Rashi.² On the same occasion he may have heard from his Jewish teachers about the distinction between

פסח חג'ים (Passover of Egypt) and פסח דורות

(Passover of posterity), that is to say the distinction between those precepts unique to the Passover night in Egypt and those permanently binding upon the Jews. Since the prohibition to leave the house obviously applied only to that particular night on which the Lord set about killing the Egyptians, no Jewish commentator needed comment on it explicitly. This means that there is no particular source for Andrew's

1. Fo. 49a (105d).

2. Rashi notes in his exposition of Deut.xxxii.48, And the Lord spoke unto Moses that selfsame day, that in three places in Scripture this expression is used in the sense of 'in the glare of full daylight', namely in Gen.vii.13, Ex.xii.51 and Deut.xxxii.48. Concerning the Exodus text he remarks that the Egyptians intended not to let the Israelites go if they should notice them about to do so. 'There upon said the Holy One...."See I will bring them forth in the middle of the day, and anyone who has power to prevent it, let him come and prevent it"'. (ed. Silbermann, ii.168). Cf. also Mekilta, tract. Pisha vii.100 (ed. Lauterbach, i.58).

3. Gen.ii.19.

4. Ex.ix.27.

5. Fo. 51a (106a).

comment, but we can assume that it was mentioned to him during the discussion that this was one of the rules which was no longer kept.

He continues, referring to Ex.xii.42:

Quod autem supra dictum est, nox est ista observabilis Domini, vel observationis Domini sicut in Hebreo est, secundum eosdem Hebreos sic accipere possumus: Nox ista immolationis agni paschalis est nox observationis Domini, qua filios Israel ab angelo exterminatore observavit, tunc scilicet quando eduxit filios Israel de terra Egypti. Ideo hanc observare debent/omnes filii Israel etc.¹

The reference to the Hebrew is correct here: לַיְלֵי שְׂמֵרָה

Ex.xv.1 הַיְלֵי הַלְּלָהּ הַלְּלָהּ הַלְּלָהּ הַלְּלָהּ or הַיְלֵי הַלְּלָהּ הַלְּלָהּ הַלְּלָהּ הַלְּלָהּ

can be translated best as: a night of watching of (or unto) the Lord.

Rashi had interpreted the verse:

'A night of watching unto the Lord, id est a night which the Holy One....was watching for and looking forward to that he might fulfil his promise to bring them out from the land of Egypt'.

The second time the word occurs he remarks:

'It is a night of protection for all the children of Israel....This night is protected and he will not suffer the destroyer to enter their houses'.²

Andrew's explanation reflects this last observation.

Ex.xv.12,devoravit eos terra. Andrew remarks:

'Devoravit hostes terra. Ita absorpti disparuerunt, quasi devorasset eos terra. Vel terra tanquam vicinum elementum et quo aqua ubique sustentatur pro aqua posuit, sicut et ibi: formatis cunctis animantibus de humo.³ Secundum Hebreos beneficium est quod dicitur devoravit eos terra. Quia enim pharao dixerat Dominus iustus est, ego autem et populus meus impii.⁴ Hanc veritatis confessionem renumerare volens Dominus, cum naufraga eorum

1. Quaestiones ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, 1.62).

2. Commentaria in Exodum, 11.4 (P.L. 103, 71D), cf. H.J. Pollit, art.civ.

1. Fo. 49a,b (fo. 105D).

2. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, 1.62).

3. Gen.ii.19.

4. Ex.ix.27.

5. Fo. 51c (106c).

Andrew's suggestion that 'earth' here is used inclusively of water was a well known concept among Christian commentators. It was put forward by Augustine,¹ and quoted by Rabanus Maurus² and Hugh,³ from whom Andrew most likely got his information. The Jewish tradition which he quotes can be found in the Mekilta⁴ and in Rashi, who had explained:⁵

'The earth swallowed them. From this it may be gathered that they received the privilege of burial as a reward for having said: the Lord is righteous'.⁵

Ex.xv.14, Ascenderunt populi et irati sunt. Andrew comments:

'In Hebreo ita: Audierunt populi. Cladem scilicet pharaonis et suorum audierunt populi Egypto vicini et timuerunt ne et ipsis propter Hebreos simile quid inferret. Dolores.....obtinuerunt habitatores Philistiim. Id est Philistei audito quod Egyptiis acciderat valde perterriti sunt. Pro eadem quoque causa et principes Edom et ro/busti Moab trepidaverunt'.⁶

Andrew rightly remarks that the Hebrew has audierunt, אָדְּוּ, instead of ascenderunt. He did not realize, however, that the next verb was likewise not correctly translated in the Vulgate, since the Hebrew uses a form of יָדַעַ, meaning 'to be frightened', 'to tremble', rather than 'to be angry'. On the other hand, he does include the notion of fear in his interpretation: et timuerunt; this means that we have

here a case where Andrew fails to notice that his interpretation is in fact a translation of a Hebrew word. Rashi refers in his explanation of this verse to a rabbinic tradition, based on 1 Chron.vii.21, which

1. Quaestiones Ex.54 (C.C.S.L. 33, p. 94, 1.854).

2. Commentaria in Exodum, ii.4 (P.L. 108, 71D), cf. H.J. Pollit, art.cit., p. 28.

3. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 65D).

4. Mekilta, tract. Beshallah, i.12 (ed. Lauterbach, i.169).

5. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silberman, i.78).

6. Fo. 51d-52a (106c).

has it that the Philistines had a special reason to be afraid of the Israelites, as the former had killed the Ephraimites when they left Egypt before the time of departure appointed by the Lord.¹ Although Andrew does not mention this tradition, it may be reflected in his 'propter Hebreos'.

Ex.xv.16, Irruat super eos formido et pavor. Andrew notes:

'Non orat ut super quos iam venisse dixit timorem et formido super eos irruat, sed ut qui in eos iam cepit tam diu perseveret, donec populus pertransierit. Formido et pavor diversa significare non videntur apud nos, sed Hebraica verba pro quibus nos hec habemus hanc habet distantiam, quod alterum significat metum pro instanti periculo, alterum pro longe posito'.²

The Hebrew has indeed two different words: פחד and או'חיה.

We read for example in the Mekilta, '....fear upon those far away and dread upon those nearby'.³ Rashi also makes this distinction, referring to Joshua ii.9,10. או'חיה according to him is the fear of the nations for whom what they are afraid of is still far away, and פחד the fear of the nations for whom the danger is immediate.⁴ If Andrew intended to indicate by alterum, alterum 'the former' and 'the latter', he did not put his information in the right order. Apparently he did not quite remember which explanation belonged to which word when it came to writing it down.

Ex.xv.18, Dominus regnabit in eternum et ultra. Andrew:

'Hanc litteram quidam sic exponunt quod per eternum hoc seculum presens accipiunt, per ultra seculum futurum. Vel per eternum spatium quod cum mundo incepit et cum mundo perseverabit; quod postea additur ultra non aliquod spatium quod preter illud sit refertur, sed perseverantie divine dignitas demonstratur. In Hebreo habet in seculum et seculum, id est in omne

1. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.78). Cf. Mekilta, tract. Shilarata ix.63 (ed. Lauterbach, ii.71-72).

2. Fo. 52b (106d).

3. Mekilta, tract. Shilarata, ix.97 (ed. Lauterbach, ii.74).

4. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.78, cf. also p. 241, n.2).

7. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.100b).

seculum. Seculum appellant spatium quinquaginta annorum. De servo Hebreo dicitur: erit servus in secula,¹ id est usque ad quinquagesimum annum iubilium scilicet'.²

The first opinion referred to by Andrew is taken from Hugh's Notulae.³ His explanation was influenced by Raban Maurus, who in turn followed Origen.⁴ The Hebrew reads לְעֹלָם וָעֶד , which can be interpreted in various ways. Rashi for example takes it as 'in all eternity', 'for ever'. He arrives at this explanation by taking לְעֹלָם as a noun meaning 'eternity' and interpreting the whole sentence as $\text{וְעַד לְעֹלָם וָעֶד}$ which could have influenced Andrew's 'in omne seculum'.⁵ Targum Onkelos has likewise 'in eternity of eternity'. Ibn Ezra, however, takes לְעֹלָם as לְעֹלָם 'and through', 'and more', which interpretation corresponds with the 'et ultra' of the Vulgate. Coming back to Andrew's explanation, it seems that he after mentioning the Hebrew version of the expression remembered that the Hebrew also uses the word seculum (לְעֹלָם) for a period of 50 years, among others in connection with the laws of slavery. Thus he quotes the appropriate text, and he shall serve him forever, and explains accordingly. In his exposition of chapter xxi he repeats this interpretation: 'In secula. Usque ad annum iubilium'.⁶

We find this interpretation in many Jewish commentaries. Rashi for example explains Ex.xxi.6 as:

'Until the Jubilee. Or perhaps לְעֹלָם וָעֶד means for ever. However, a comparison of this text with Lev.xxv.10 tells us that a period of 50 years is termed לְעֹלָם '.⁷

1. Ex.xxi.6.

2. Fo. 52b (106d).

3. Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 65D-66A). (ed. Weiss, 35b).

4. Cf. H.J. Pollit, art.cit., p. 28. (The reference is to Origen's Hom.6 in Ex., n.13 (P.G.12, 340 B,C)).

5. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.79).

6. Fo. 57d (108b).

7. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.108b).

Dr. Loewe, in his article 'Jerome's rendering of 'OLAM', mentions that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan actually renders אֵלֶּיךָ here as לְךָ 'לְךָ'?. He further states that Ibn Ezra accepts this as the correct interpretation, while there is some discussion as to its meaning in the Mekilta,¹ where again it is proved with Lev.xxv.10 that אֵלֶּיךָ means 50.²

As far as Andrew's reference in Ex.xv.18 to this meaning of אֵלֶּיךָ is concerned, we have here clearly a case where he associates his knowledge with the wrong expression.

Ex.xv.25, At ille clamavit ad Dominum, qui ostendit ei lignum.

Andrew comments:

'Non ita intelligendum est quod lignum aliquod ei ostenderit quod ipse prius non viderit, sed ostendit ei quid faceret ut sanarentur aque, ut lignum, scilicet quoddam amarum secundum Hebreos, acciperet et in aquas proiceret. Quod cum factum fuisset sanate sunt aque. Poterat Deus sine omni/ligno aquas potabiles facere, sed ut virtus divina manifestius innotesceret et mirabilior appareret, addita ligni amaritudine amaris aquis, dulces eas et potabiles reddidit. Josephus sentire videtur aquas illas amaritudinis vitium ex eo contraxisse quod immobiles uno in loco perseverabant iuxta illud: "et vitium capiunt ni moveantur aque."³ Dicit enim Moysen summitatem virge quam manu gestebat precipuisse et in puteum iactasse, exhaustasque primum aquas super terram fundere precepisse et ex frequenti contusione que in imo putei remanserant aquas in dulcedinem versas fuisse'.⁴

The Jewish tradition of the bitterness of the wood can be found in Ginzberg's Legends:

'The ways of the Holy One....differ from the ways of man: Man turns bitter to sweet by the agency of some sweet stuff, but God transformed the bitter water through the bitter laurel tree'.⁵

1. Mekilta, tract. Mishpatim, ii (ed. Weiss, 83b).

2. R. Loewe, 'Jerome's rendering of 'OLAM', Hebr.Un.Coll.Ann., xxii (1949), 278.

3. Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto, i.5,6.

4. Fo. 52c,d (106d).

5. L. Ginzberg, Legends, iii.39.

Andrew apparently accepted this tradition, for he points out that the use of the bitter wood made God's power even more manifest.

Josephus' interpretation, on the other hand, must have attracted him because of its rational explanation of the sweetening of the waters.¹

Ex. xxi. 32, Si servum ancillamque invaserit, triginta siclos argenti dabit domino. Andrew remarks:

'Triginta siclos. Ideo dicunt triginta siclos pro servo dari, quia triginta generationes, ut arbitrantur Hebrei, de Chanaan quem Noe servituti addixit, exierunt.'²

Obviously the Jewish tradition Andrew refers to is based on Gen. ix. 25, And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. I have not been able to trace it, however.

With this example we have come to an end of our survey of the influence of Jewish exegesis on Andrew. We shall now look at some of his references to Jewish customs and discuss the results of these last two categories jointly.

Ex. iii. 5, locus enim in quo stas terra sancta est. Andrew:

'Terra sancta. Non propter aliud quam propter divinam presentiam. Calciamentum iubet remove, quia locus in quo stat sanctus est. Non est consuetudo Iudeis ut sancta loca calciati ingrediantur'.³

The first part of the interpretation, that the ground was made holy by the divine presence, goes most probably back to Hugh.⁴ As for the reference to the Jewish practice not to wear shoes in holy places, this

1. L. Ginsberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kircheng Vätern', p. 202. However see, J. J. G. (ed. Blatt, p. 219).

1. Josephus, Antiquitates, iii. 1, 2 (ed. Blatt, p. 219).

2. Fo. 58b (108b).

3. Deut. xxi, 11 (par. Lev. xxi, 18).

3. Fo. 41c (102d).

3. Fo. 47a-48a (105a).

4. Notulae, c. 8 (P.L. 175, 62A, B).

4. Notulae, vi. 19 (ed. Lindberg, vi. 19, 36-37). See above p. 53.

prohibition can be found, according to Ginzberg, in Exodus Rabba, ii:

'An dem Orte, wo die "Schechina" sich zeigt, darf man nicht Schuhe tragen....Ebenso verrichten die Priester nur barfuss den Tempeldienst'.¹

Ex.xii.25,....observabitis ceremonias istas. Andrew comments:

'Ceremonie, ut dicit Ysidorus, apud Latinos dicuntur sacra omnia, que apud Grecos orgia vocantur. Proprie autem visum doctoribus est a carendo appellari ceremonias, quasi caremonias, eo quod eis que in sacris/divinis offeruntur, in suo usu carent homines. Alii ceremonias proprie in observationibus Iudeorum credunt, abstinentiam scilicet quarundam escarum secundum veterem legem, eo quod observantes careant his rebus quibus se abstinerunt. Hebrei dicunt Hebraicum verbum in cuius loco ceremonias habemus, illa precepta significare de quibus quare precepta sunt ratio reddi non potest, ut est illud: non induaris veste ex lana linoque contexta'.^{2,3}

As we have seen already, Andrew took the first two explanations of the word ceremonia from Isidore.⁴ His interpretation of the word

according to the Jews is interesting. The Hebrew text reads:

וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם

- and you shall keep this בְּרָחָה. The word בְּרָחָה means: labour, service in general, but also service of God, cultic usage, various acts of worship. The explanation which Andrew gives, as that of a precept given without any obvious reason, is nowhere to be found in connection with בְּרָחָה; however, it can be found in relation to חֻקָּה. It is true, חֻקָּה does not always mean a precept given without an obvious reason, as can be gathered for example from Ex.xiii.10,thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance, but the text quoted by Andrew to illustrate

1. L. Ginzberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', ii, p. 202. Cf. however Bab. Talmud, Berakoth 63a (ed. Epstein, p. 395), where it is stated that one is allowed to enter a synagogue with shoes, but not the Temple.

2. Deut. xxii.11 (par. Lev. xix.19).

3. Fo. 47d-48a (105c).

4. Etymologiae, vi.19 (ed. Lindsay, vi.19, 36-37). See above p.53.

the meaning of such an inscrutable precept is indeed one of the stock examples of **הקפ"ה** in this sense. Rashi, for instance, interprets **הקפ"ה** in this way in Gen xxvi.5, Lev.xviii.4 and Lev.xix.19. A similar interpretation can be found in the Talmud, tractate Yoma 67b.¹ We shall only quote Rashi's explanation of Gen.xxvi.5 as an example:

הקפ"ה - my ordinances; matters which our evil inclination and the heathen nations argue against the necessity of prohibiting, such as the eating of swine's flesh and the wearing of garments made of a mixture of wool and linen. Things for which there are no apparent reasons, but which are the King's decrees and enactments imposed on his subjects'.²

When a Jew wanted to give an example of a precept for which there was no apparent reason he almost automatically quoted the text Lev.xix.19, the so called 'kilajim' (**שני'ן** - of two kinds): Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed: neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee. It is, therefore, possible to imagine that a Jew mentioned this particular meaning of **הקפ"ה** to Andrew when they discussed Ex.xiii.10 and that the latter, when he came to explain Ex.xii.25, the form of the commandment being the same as that of Ex.xiii.10, associated the interpretation with the wrong word.

Ex.xxiii.19, Non coques hedum sive agnum in lacte matris sue. We have already referred to this text in the section on linguistics,³ but Andrew's interpretation goes further than that:

'Verbum Hebraicum pro quo nos hedum sive agnum habemus magis separatum significat. Et est sensus: nichil quod separatum est a carne, id est quod per generationem carnalem conceptum et editum est, quod preter aves determinatum Iudei putant, nichil, inquam, tale in lacte

1. Bab. Talmud, Yoma 67b (ed. Epstein, p. 316).

2. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.118).

3. See above p. 81, 82.

coques. Observant usque hodie Iudei ut nullius/
 gressibilis animalis carnes in lacte vel cum aliquo
 eorum que de lacte fiunt, ut caseo vel butyro et
 huiusmodi, coctas comedant. Non ideo putant in
 lacte matris sue, agni scilicet vel hedi vel
 separati, dictum fuisse, quod si alterius peccoris
 lacte coquatur transgressio non sit, sed quia hoc
 lac paratius et magis presto quam alium forsitan
 invenire posset. Nec ideo de agno vel hedo hoc
 prohibitum, quod de aliis animantibus hoc fieri
 liceat, sed quod de hoc animali precipitur de
 omnibus potius vult, exceptis avibus que non de
 carne sed de ovis separantur, debere intelligi.
 Sunt tamen qui non de quolibet agno vel hedo hic
 dictum putant, sed de his tantum que Domino
 offerentur, de quibus Dominus in lege precipit:
Bos, ovis et capra cum generata fuerint, septem
 diebus erunt sub ubere matris sue. Die autem
 octavo et deinceps offerri poterunt Domino.¹
 Hii hoc modo litteram exponunt: non coques et
 non offeres ad occidendum et coquendum dum est
 in lacte matris sue, id est dum recenter natus
 non herba pascitur, sed sole lacte matris sue
 alitur'.²

Andrew refers here to a religious practice which was still kept by
 the Jews in his day, as it is today. He first reports that the Jews are
 not allowed to eat any meat cooked with milk or with any kind of milk
 product, which is the traditional halachic interpretation of the text.
 He then explains in detail that the prohibition of the law to eat a kid
 cooked in its mother's milk does not mean that one could cook it with
 the milk of another animal, but that only this case was mentioned
 because the mother's milk was most readily available; and he stresses
 again that the law does not apply only to the cooking of a lamb or a
 young goat, but to any kind of animal.³ The exception to this rule
 referred to by Andrew, namely that it does not apply to birds, can be

1. Lev.xxii.27.

2. Fo. 59 (108c,d).

3. Cf. Mekilta, tract. Kaspa, ii. 15 (ed. Lauterbach, iii.158): 'Similarly:
 Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk. I thus know only about
 the kid. How about any other animal? Scripture simply speaks of the
 usual case'.

found in the Talmud, tractate Hullin.¹ The explanation introduced by 'sunt tamen qui.....putant' may be a faint echo of Theodoretus, who mentioned that according to some this rule applied only to recently born offspring.² He, however, did not limit the application of the law to the animals to be offered to the Lord, which is what Andrew's commentators have in mind: 'sed de his tantum que Domino offerentur'. *More so,* Andrew's explanation is reminiscent of the opinion of Bekor Shor who referred to Lev.xxii.27 in his explanation of the text and interpreted: '....thou shalt not let the kid grow in its mother's milk, but after seven days offer it to God'.³ With this explanation Bekor Shor aimed at explaining away the grounds for the dietary laws, which he regarded as irrational. As far as Andrew's annotations are concerned, one notes that he was obviously puzzled by this peculiar Jewish practice and that he takes great pains to explain it to his Christian readers, using all the information he had so carefully gathered. Thus far his references to Jewish customs.

V

In a discussion of the material belonging to the two last groups we have to consider the following points:

- 1) Did Andrew consult the Jews regularly and methodically, or at infrequent intervals and on particular problems only?
- 2) Is there any evidence on Andrew's part for a preference for one or more particular commentators?

1. Bab. Talmud, Hullin 113a (ed. Epstein, p. 621).

3. Andrew wrote in all probability too early to have used Bekor Shor's commentary. Possibly various explanations which did not take the text literally were being put forward by Jewish commentators.

2. Cf. Gloss ad loc.

1. Cf. above pp. 20-22.

- 3) Does he show any particular interest in the more radical exegesis of the French biblical schools, or is it likely that he was not aware of the recent developments in contemporary Jewish circles?
- 4) Is he mainly interested in the Jews as 'tools' which could help him to reach a better understanding of the actual biblical text, or is he more concerned about the Jewish interpretation of the text?

As regards the first point, from Table II it can be seen that there is no pattern of a constant flow of Jewish information throughout the commentary; on the contrary, more or less heavy concentrations of Jewish influence at infrequent intervals can be noticed. Much information, for example, is inserted in chapters iii and iv, then again in the end of xii and the beginning of xiii, some in xiv, for which chapter Andrew borrowed much from Josephus, as can be seen from Table I; chapter xv shows a rare abundance of derivations from Jewish commentators and references to the Hebrew text; then there is some Jewish influence again in chapter xxiii, xxv and xxvii. Some of the more isolated remarks can be traced back to earlier conversations or larger units of borrowings, for instance vi.12 to iv.10; or xiii.18 to the references in chapter xiv; xviii.8 is a repetition of iii.1; his remark in chapter xx.3 is of a general character and Andrew could easily have heard it at another occasion, while the same was concluded for xii.25. All this makes it seem most likely that he only occasionally discussed the text with his Jewish contemporaries. This fact can be illustrated from his interpretation of chapter xii and xiii. Having finished his own explanation of chapter xii he went to the Jews to ask them about certain points which still bothered him, and thus we see that he inserts the Jewish interpretations of Ex. xii.22, 42 and 51 in the beginning of his comments on chapter xiii.¹ The large amount of information in chapter xv

1. Cf. above pp. 88-90.

also shows that for some reason he must have discussed this chapter very intensively with the Jews.

Another feature of Andrew's references to Jewish interpretation is that he often mentions the latter as one of several possibilities, for example in iii.12 (p. 85), iv.10 (p. 86), xv.12 (p. 90), xv.18 (p. 92-94) and xii.25 (p. 96); this may indicate that he asked the opinion of the Jews on points which he considered to be particular difficult or uncertain. The fact that he did not consult them more consistently could perhaps be explained from the circumstance that he simply did not always have the opportunity to go and seek their advice.

With reference to point two, Table II indicates that Andrew's borrowings most often, though not exclusively, coincide with Rashi's interpretation. This can in fact be best explained from the popularity of Rashi and his influence on medieval Jewish commentators. That the paramount importance of Rashi's influence on Andrew's commentary must be due to this circumstance is made all the more likely by the previous observation that Andrew himself was not able to consult Jewish commentaries, and thus was completely dependent on what his informants told him.¹ Moreover, as he never mentions a Jewish source by name, except of course Josephus, we may take it that he himself was ignorant of the precise origin of his information. This means that all ideas of deliberate choice on Andrew's part must be discarded; likewise, it prevents one from drawing any conclusions as to his sources from the actual wording of the Jewish derivations.

As regards the third point, there is no need to recall the similarities between Andrew's interests and mode of interpreting and those of the contemporary French Jewish exegetical schools. All that should be stressed here is that much of the new approach to exegesis interpretation and by supplementing and covering the Christian exposition

1. Cf. above pp. 84-85.

current among the Jewish scholars was reflected in the information that was given to Andrew, and that it was exactly because of these correspondences that he recorded so eagerly what he heard. On the other hand, there is no evidence in his work which would suggest that he himself was aware with any precision of what was going on within the Jewish schools of biblical interpretation. There is no marked preference for the newer explanations in favour of the older ones; in fact, it has been observed that Andrew quite often inserts interpretations derived from a traditional source in his work. Since in these cases Rashi usually refers to the traditional explanation as well, it is impossible to assess the origin of Andrew's source. However, the fact that they are included in Rashi's commentary indicates that these particular traditions do not belong to the fanciful aggadic type. But here again, we may assume that the origin of his source did not much matter to Andrew. For him the Jews were the people who had handed down and expounded the Old Testament throughout the ages and were as such its most reliable interpreters. It most likely did not even occur to him that certain developments had taken place among them also, and that their interpretation of Scripture could differ considerably at different periods of time.

Lastly we have to consider what kind of help Andrew did seek to obtain from the Jews. It has been sufficiently explained in the section on linguistics that Andrew undoubtedly used the Jews as 'tools' with the help of which he would be able to understand more fully and completely the actual text of the Old Testament. However, it should be pointed out that he did not systematically distinguish between textual and exegetical problems. This implies that his quest for knowledge goes much deeper than a concern for the text only. By questioning the Jews on their interpretation and by supplementing and comparing the Christian exposition

with their view, he gives a much wider scope to his work.

In his commentary on Exodus he usually puts the Jewish and Christian exposition together without making a choice between them. It is quite remarkable in fact that at times he explains a text first according to the Christian view and then according to the Jews, even if the two are not easily compatible: in other words, he does not allow his interpretation to be influenced one way or the other. This can be partly explained from the medieval habit, referred to earlier on in this chapter, not to choose definitely any one particular exposition,¹ partly from Andrew's own ill-defined concept of his work. He has not completely made up his mind yet how far he wants to go in adopting the Jewish interpretations, and for the time being he is quite content to solve the problem in this way. In his commentary on Isaiah we shall notice that he is more outspoken in his approach and frequently favours the Jewish exposition.

[Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

1. See above p. 43.

2. E.A. Jussé, *Le commentaire de Jérôme sur l'Exode*, Paris, 1885, p. 100.

3. A. Molinier, *Commentaire de Jérôme sur l'Exode*, Paris, 1885, p. 100-01.

1. See above p. 43.

ANDREW on ISAIAHCHAPTER IVPrologue and interpretation of Chapter I.

I

Andrew wrote his exposition of the prophets after his first stay in England and before his second departure, that is between 1154 and 1161 or 1163.¹ For his commentary on Isaiah we have used MS. Pembroke College 45 (Cambridge), which was collated with MS. Mazarine 175 (Paris). Although the Paris manuscript, written towards the end of the twelfth century, is older and somewhat more accurate than MS. Pem. 45 which according to M.R. James dates from the thirteenth century,² the last manuscript was preferred for being complete. MS. Maz. 175 breaks off abruptly in the interpretation of Is. xlv.4 at the bottom of fo. 92d: 'Propter servum meum Iacob. Hec supradicta'. Then follows Andrew's general prologue to the Prophets, written in a different hand (fo. 93a, b). This is followed by Jerome's commentary on Isaiah, written in the same hand again which finished Andrew's commentary on the prophet. The former's exposition ends in the middle of his comment on Is. lxvi.24: (Fo. 160a). '....ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium.' The fact that Andrew's commentary is not complete and that it is followed by his general prologue and by Jerome's exposition has not been noted in the description of the manuscript.³

1. Cf. above p. 3.

2. M.R. James, A descriptive catalogue of the MSS. in the library of Pembroke College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1905), p. 44f.

3. A. Molinier, Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Mazarine (Paris, 1885), 1.60-61: "Andreas super Ysaïam - In explicando Ysaïam omnium quorum apud nos existit commendata...". Fin: "Ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium". Cet ouvrage est d'André de Saint-Victor, qui vivait dans la seconde moitié du xiie siècle.

4. Cf. below p. 125.

In his prologue to the Prophets Andrew tells us that he had considered for some time writing an exposition of the prophetic books, but 'their abysmal depth, perplexing intricacy, the startling diversity of people and things, have turned me in some measure from my purpose, fearing to begin the work'.¹ At last having overcome his hesitations, he begins with an exposition of Isaiah, still realizing that his task would not be an easy one. To contribute something original to the interpretation of Isaiah, he remarks in his lengthy prologue which requires to be studied in some detail, means a great deal of work and many late nights.² For the echo of Jerome's impressive commentary still resounded in the ears of every medieval commentator who was about to attempt a new interpretation of the prophet.³ Thus Andrew too wondered whether it would not be presumptuous or ill-considered to try to write yet another commentary. Would not he seem to give the impression of disagreeing with Jerome's interpretation and to be lacking in respect for so great a commentator?

Although these considerations should perhaps not be taken too literally, they do indicate how highly Andrew valued Jerome's work. That this, however, need not prevent him from writing his own commentary can be argued from the following ^{he thinks.} In the first place he points out that Jerome too had his predecessors, for example the Greek commentators whom he greatly admired, Origen in particular, but they had not exhausted the subject. And Jerome, that wise man who knew the proverb 'be sparing of time',⁴ would never have written a new commentary if he had not regarded it a worth while contribution to the writings of earlier

1. The translation is Miss Smalley's, Study, p. 123.

2. A large part of the prologue is printed in Study, p. 377 ff; translations of passages can be found on pp. 124 and 136.

3. Jerome, Commentariorum in Esaiam; the commentary has been used in the edition of Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 73 and 73A (Turnholt, 1963).

4. Cf. below p. 125.

Fathers. Secondly he argues from the very nature of truth, which is so inexhaustible that something new always remains to be discovered for him who takes the trouble to sort her out.¹ Therefore, Andrew has no intention whatsoever to make Jerome's interpretation redundant by writing his own commentary. On the contrary, all he desires to do is to bring to light a few different aspects of this hidden and fugitive truth. Finally he claims that he leaves it to his readers to decide whether, after exerting his full strength, he has achieved something or not.

What did Andrew intend with these remarks? His reflections are conventional, but they sound more sincere than many of the same kind. The style of writing is unusually elaborate, which would indicate that he thought about it a great deal. One possibility is that Andrew realized that his commentary might well meet with some criticism; therefore he defends himself here by pointing out that all he is concerned with is the quest for truth, exactly in the same way as Jerome was long before him. Also in this light can be seen the fact that he says explicitly that he has no wish to impose his judgment on anybody: no one should accuse him of unorthodox intentions.² On the other hand, one could observe in these reflections the scholar justifying his case in an objective, deliberate manner before embarking on his task, leaving the final evaluation of his efforts to his readers in the certain knowledge that he has worked as well as he could. Both motives may have inspired Andrew.

Now that he has made clear what his position is, he turns to the subject-matter itself. Considering it important for a correct understanding of Isaiah's prophecies to know something about the prophet

1. Cf. above p. 11.

2. See the Prologue to the Prophets where he states that 'no one is obliged to take his gift'; cf. above p. 12.

himself he gives - still in the prologue - a brief description of Isaiah's character, his personal background and the political circumstances in which he lived. Once in this curriculum vitae of the prophet Andrew refers explicitly to a Jewish tradition:

'Quod nobilis et de regia stirpe oriundus fuerit, filia eius, si vera est Iudeorum traditio, regi Manasse filio Ezechie, regis Iude, connubio iuncta, evidens est argumentum'.¹

In the Jewish sources it is said that the daughter of the prophet was married to Hezekiah, the father of Manasseh. The tradition that she was married to Mansse goes back, according to Ginzberg, to a wrong interpretation of Jerome.² Other details concerning Isaiah's life which can be found both in Jewish and Christian sources are that he was the son of a prophet and that he was sawn asunder by Manasseh with a wooden sword. The first tradition will be dealt with below.³ On the second one Andrew notes:

1. MS. Pen. 45, fo. 1c (MS. Maz. 175, fo. 40b).

2. L. Ginzberg, Legends, vi. 370. 'Jerome on Isaiah quotes the Jewish tradition, according to which Isaiah was the father-in-law of Manasseh. This is very likely a slip for the father-in-law of Hezekiah and grandfather of Manasseh, for not only Babli, but also Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 10,28c declares that Manasseh was the grandson of the prophet.... Jerome was possibly inaccurate in reporting the tradition; he may have meant to say a grandson instead of a son.' The passage in Jerome referred to by Ginzberg is Jerome's comment on Is.xx.2, In tempore illo locutus est Dominus in manu Isaiae filii Amos dicens: Vade et solve saccum de lumbis tuis et calcamenta tua tolle de pedibus tuis; et fecit sic, vadens nudus et disculcatus. Jerome remarks: 'Simulque discimus oboedientiam prophetarum, quod vir nobilis, --tradunt enim Hebraei Esaiam socerum fuisse Manasse filii Ezechiae regis Iuda--, non erubuerit nudum incedere....'. (Comm. in Es., v, C.C.S.L. 73, p. 201, l.44). Cf. also Ginzberg's note on Jerome's interpretation in his 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern, vi: Der Kommentar des Hieronymus zu Jesaja' (in Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, New York, 1935), pp. 298-99. The correct version of the Jewish tradition is mentioned in the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Librum II Paralipomenon, c. 33: 'Tradunt Hebraei eundem Manassen filium fuisse filiae Isaiae.' (P.L. 23, 1399 C).

3. Pp. 115 ff.

'Traditur enim ab impio Manasse, qui Ierusalem a porta usque ad portam sanguine implevit prophetarum, serra sectus lignea, eo quod mala que Iudee superventura Domino relevante didicerat, confidenter emuntiaverat'.¹

This tradition concerning the death of the prophet is mentioned in various sources. In ii Kings xxi.16 it is said that Moreover Manasseh shed very much innocent blood, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to the other. Josephus states that Manasseh slaughtered prophets daily, so that Jerusalem ran with blood.² In the Babylonian Talmud, tractate Sanhedrin 103b the text from ii Kings xxi. 'is interpreted as meaning that he slew Isaiah'.³ That Manasseh killed the prophet by sawing him asunder is transmitted in tractate Yebamoth 49b:

'Raban said: He (sc. Manasseh) brought him to trial and slew him. He said to him: Your teacher Moses said, For men shall not see Me and live,⁴ and you said, I saw the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lifted up⁵.... "I know", thought Isaiah "that whatever I may tell him, he will not accept; and should I reply at all, I would only cause him to be a wilful [homicide]". He thereupon pronounced the [Divine] Name and was swallowed up by a cedar. The cedar, however, was brought and sawn asunder. When the saw reached his mouth he died. [And this was his penalty] for having said, And I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips'.^{6,7}

An extensive account of the trial and martyrdom of the prophet is given in the Ascension of Isaiah, chapters 3 and 5. Some scholars are of the opinion that the section of the Ascension which deals with Isaiah's

1. Fo. 1d (40c).

2. Antiquitates, x.3,1. (ed. Loeb, vi. 179).

3. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 103b (ed. Epstein, p. 702).

4. Ex. xxxiii.20.

5. Is. vi.1.

6. Is. vi.5.

7. Bab. Talmud, Yebamoth 49b (ed. Epstein, p. 324); cf. also Pesikta Rabbati 4.14 and L. Ginzberg, Legends, iv. 278-79 and vi. 373-74 where he lists the different charges brought against Isaiah. On Manasseh's wicked deeds see Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 103b and II Baruch 64; cf. also Legends, vi. 372.

death is of Jewish origin,¹ while others attribute the whole book to a Christian source.² The Ascension is a possible source for the many early Christian authors who refer to the above mentioned tradition of the death of the prophet.³ Jerome inserts it in his interpretation of Is.lvii.2, Veniat pax, requiescat in cubili suo qui ambulavit in directione sua:

'Iudaei et haec et cetera quae sequuntur, vel generaliter de omnibus iustis arbitrantur intelligi, quorum Manasses fudit sanguinem et implevit Hierusalem a porta usque ad portam; vel certe Esaiam de sua prophetare morte, quod serrandus sit a Manasse serra lignea, quae apud eos certissima traditio est. Unde et nostrorum plurimi illud, quod de passione sanctorum in epistola ad Hebraeos ponitur: Serrati sunt,⁴ ad Esaiam referunt passionem'.⁵

It is difficult to say which was Andrew's source of information, since the tradition was well-known among both Jewish and Christian interpreters. We know that Rashi commented on the passage in tractate Yebamoth of the Babylonian Talmud,⁶ but he does not mention the tradition in his commentary on Isaiah. Ibn Ezra mentions only that Manasseh is said to have slain Isaiah, and he adds 'if this statement is true it may be accepted'.⁷ The author of the Hebrew Questions also refers only to

1. E.g. L. Ginzberg, Legends, vi.375 and R.H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (London, 1900), introduction; passim.

2. E.g. D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (London, 1964), p. 59.

3. According to Ginzberg, op. cit.,^{vi.375,} it is uncertain whether the Fathers made use of the Ascension, or drew upon the oral traditions of the Jews, 'as this legend was current among the Jews for centuries'. It is mentioned e.g. in Justin's Dialogue, 120, Tertullian's De patientia, 14, and Visio Pauli 49.

4. Hebr.xi.37.

5. Jerome, Comm. in Es.xv (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p. 640, l.49).

6. Cf. Bab. Talmud, Yebamoth 49b (ed. Epstein, p. 324, n. 12).

7. Ibn Ezra, Commentary on Isaiah (ed. Friedländer, p. 3). Henceforth this work will be referred to as Comm.on Is., p....

in J.C. Fraser, Adonis, Attis, Osiris (3rd edn, London, 1936), 124f.

the death of the prophet at the hands of Manasseh;¹ but in Haimo of Auxerre we find the tradition that Isaiah was sawn asunder by the king.²

In giving this information about the prophet in his prologue Andrew shows his historical interest and orientation. Not only the biblical text as such is of importance to him, also the person who wrote the text. He regards Isaiah as a man of noble character, who had a great sense of duty, and who eventually paid with his life for his divine calling.³ This interest in the people with whom the biblical text deals is typical of Andrew. It is not surprising, therefore, to find in his commentary on Isaiah a lively description of what was going on in Jerusalem and in the country during Isaiah's lifetime, of the people's ungodly behaviour, of the bad example they were set by their king, and of their motives for being disobedient to the Lord.

These observations concerning the background of the prophet are followed by remarks on the title of the book, Ysaïas propheta, and on the intentions of the author. Referring to the title Andrew remarks that by the name Isaiah both the author and the book are indicated.⁴ The intention of the prophet is, he continues, to urge Judah and Benjamin to stop their sinful way of life, and to behave again as God's chosen people. He does this by announcing to them the fall of the ten tribes as a result of their leaving the way of the Lord, and by predicting the

1. Quaestiones Hebraeicae in Librum II Paralipomenon, c. 33 (P.L. 23, 1399C).

2. Haimo of Auxerre, not of Halberstadt, Commentariorum in Isaiam, Prol. (P.L. 116, 715D). On Haimo cf. R. Quadri, 'Aimone di Auxerre alla luce dei "Collectanea" di Heiric di Auxerre', Italia med. e uman., vi (1963), 148.

3. Cf. the prologue, fo. 1c,d (40b,c).

4. Fo. 1d (40c): 'Quando quis librum demonstrans ait: hoc est Ysaïas propheta, nomine auctoris opus ipsius appellatur'. Andrew's remark is reminiscent of Plutarch: 'And just as we say that a purchaser of Plato's books purchases Plato, or that an actor who plays the comedies of Menander plays Menander....', Plutarch, Isis and Osiris, 69-71. Transl. in J.G. Frazer, Adonis, Attis, Osiris (3rd edn., London, 1936), ii.41.

destruction of the gentile nations who had never adhered to the Lord, but rather tortured his people. In this context he also shows what rewards await the faithful, what punishments the bad.

As there is only one book, Andrew observes, there is no problem here about number or order, and one can concentrate on the actual wording of the text.¹ He then briefly analyses Isaiah's division of the book. First the prophet makes himself known and makes clear for whom and when he is writing.² Then he expounds the word of God. Andrew is of the opinion that in his prophecies the prophet alternates predictions of prosperity with threats, lest the rejoicing about good tidings should foster laxity. As regards the historical events in the book, these are not mentioned, according to Andrew, for their own sake, but only to demonstrate God's immense favours towards his people in order to convert them.³ Lastly, at the end of his work, the prophet speaks of the return of the exiles to Israel, the glorious restoration of the Temple, and the unheard of good fortune of his people.

From reading the prologue we may conclude that Andrew was convinced that Isaiah was the author of the whole book. He explicitly states that we are dealing here with one book only, a circumstance which makes the interpretation less complicated than if there had been a number. That the work could be a collection of Isaiah's prophecies by later contemporaries, or that the last half of the book could date from an even later period simply does not occur to him. Another noteworthy point is Andrew's

1. Fo. 2a (40c): 'De numero et ordine librorum nulla hic questio est cum unus sit liber.... Explanatio vero est que sit in singulis versibus'.

2. Cf. Jerome, Comm. in Es, i (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 7, l.1) where a similar remark is made.

3. Fo. 2 b,c (40d): 'Historias etiam quasdam o/pero suo interserit, non quia res gestas describere intendat, sed ut ingentia dei beneficia ingratis collata ad ipsorum ~~conversionem~~ demonstraret'. (Both C. and M. read confusionem demonstraret).

attitude towards the historical events mentioned in Isaiah. Although he himself in his explanation concentrates very much on the historical side of the prophecies, he makes it clear all the same that these events are mentioned only because they are an expression of the divine purpose. That is to say, even when he is interpreting the historical sense of the book he is not dealing with ordinary history, but with a history of a completely different nature, namely the history of God's dealing with mankind, which is the history of salvation. It is important to keep this attitude in mind when we are evaluating his work. It gives a deeper meaning to Andrew's understanding of what was regarded in his day as 'the surface of the letter'. His historical interests enabled him in this way to acquire a more comprehensive view of what we are now used to call the 'theology of the Old Testament' than most of his contemporaries had. He had a definite idea of the part played by Israel and the nations in the drama of Israel's apostasy and return to the Lord; a drama enacted under His overall guidance.

A comparison of Andrew's position as it appears from his prologue with, for example, the prologue of Jerome, or Rupert of Deutz' introductory remarks to his interpretation of the prophet, makes us realize once more that even when the latter refer to historical events, they mainly look to the promises concealed in these events. Rupert e.g. says, 'Et cum interdum ad praesentem respiciat historiam, et post Babyloniae captivitatem reditum populi significet in Judaeam, tamen cum hoc omnis ei cura de vocatione gentium et de adventu Christi est'.¹ Jerome's, 'Unde post historiae veritatem, spiritualiter accipienda sunt omnia....'² speaks for itself. It was interesting to find in the second part of

-
1. Rupert of Deutz, In Esaiam Prophetam, 1 (P.L. 167, 1271 B,C).
 2. Jerome, Comm.inEs, Prol. (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 3, l. 73).

the prologue of Peter Lombard's commentary on Isaiah several points of correspondence with Andrew's. It reflects to a certain extent the same straightforward approach to the material, has the same analysis of the prophet's modus agendi, and stresses the righteousness of God's punishment of Israel. On the other hand, the prophecies of the advent of Christ and the calling of the gentiles are referred to in terms almost identical with Rupert's: 'Et cum interdum ad presentem respiciat historiam, et post Babilonicam captivitatem reditum populi significet, in Iudeam advocationem [in] gentium et Emanuelis adventum omnem intendat curam....'¹ Besides, the Lombard did not come to this section until after a lengthy argument, which has hardly anything to do with the subject, very much according to the current school method. Andrew's prologue on the contrary is factual and deals with relevant matters only: his conception of the task he is about to begin, and the person and working method of the author concerned. The comparison also shows that it was a most unusual undertaking to give an explanation of the historical sense of Isaiah to the exclusion of everything else; the consistency with which Andrew completes his task, calls for admiration. Thus far the prologue.

That Andrew indeed goes his own way openly and independently becomes obvious as soon as we read the first words of the commentary:

1. 'Visio Ysaie filii Amos. Hebraicorum consuetudo scriptorum est in titulis, quos suis prescribunt operibus, verbum substantivum cum pronomine demonstrativo subintelligendum relinquere.... Idem locutionis genus^a apud Salomonem invenis: Parabole Salomonis, filii David regis Israel.²et apud Iohannem: Apocalypsis Dei etc.'^{3,4}

a. C. ordo, M. genus.

1. B. Smalley and G. Lacombe, 'The Lombard's Commentary on Isaias and other fragments', The New Scholasticism, v (1931), 158.

2. Prov. i.1.

3. Apoc. i.1, (V.: Apocalypsis Iesu Christi).

4. Fo. 2b (40d).

These words leave little doubt as to the kind of sources he intends to use for his exposition. Notable also is the use of grammatical terms which illustrate his familiarity with classical grammar as taught in the schools, and the circumstance that he did not hesitate to apply his knowledge to the language of the Bible.¹

Another feature of the commentary is its amazing straightforwardness. The most direct explanation is the one Andrew usually goes for, as can be seen from the following examples. On verse 1, The vision of Isaiah the son of Amos, he claims that Isaiah calls himself the son of a prophet, and remarks that it often happens that prophets are the sons of prophets. That indeed Isaiah's father Amos was a prophet we know from a Hebrew tradition, he continues, which says that when a prophet mentions one of his near forefathers by name in the opening verses of his work, he must have been a prophet as well. There is nothing particularly striking in this remark; characteristic, however, is the manner in which he warns one not to confuse this Amos with the shepherd-prophet of Tekoa.² They must be two different persons, he argues, as it would have been extremely unbecoming for someone who was related to the royal family -- for was not the granddaughter of Isaiah's father married to the king of Judah? -- to look after a herd of sheep and to feed himself with mulberries, which we know Amos the shepherd-prophet did.³ Only after these critical considerations the usual arguments are put forward by Andrew: 'But also the name of the one and the other, although they sound the same to us, are not written in the same way in the Hebrew language, nor do they have the same meaning.'⁴

1. Cf. above p. 44 and below p. 125 ff. (p. 57): 'R. Levi further

2. Amos i. 1. *amotab were another*. Rashi begins his interpretation of Isaiah by referring to this tradition. Rashi's commentary has been

3. Amos vii. 14. translation of J.F. Breithaupt, *R. Salomon's Arvot*

4. Fo. 2c(41a). Cf. Jerome, Comm. in Es., i (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 5, l.25) and the Gloss where a similar explanation can be found.

5. *Sh. Talmud, Megillah 15a* (ed. Epstein, p. 88).

The tradition that Isaiah's father was a prophet can be found in many Christian and Jewish sources. The Gloss refers to it as an apparently well-known Jewish legend. There is a remarkable correspondence with Andrew here.

The Gloss: Andrew:

'Sed iste scilicet pater Amos propheta fuit, si Hebraeis consentimus, qui patres, avos, atavosque prophetarum, quorum nomina in principio prophetiae eorum ponuntur, prophetas fuisse contendunt.' 'Amos vero patrem Ysaie prophetam fuisse Hebreorum habet traditio qua tradunt^a patres, avos et proavos prophetarum quorum in titulis librorum suorum nomina ponuntur, prophetas fuisse, si tamen vera est, comprobat.'¹

Ginzberg in his Legends dwells on it at length. He refers to the statement, found in many Christian writers who were ignorant of Hebrew, that Isaiah was the son of the shepherd-prophet Amos,² and continues:

'It is, however, an old Jewish tradition that Isaiah's father was also a prophet, living in the reign of Amaziah (795-767), whose brother he was.³ It was at his advice that the king dismissed the army he had gathered from among the Ephraimites (ii Chron. xxv.7-10).'⁴

The tradition can be found for example in the Babylonian Talmud, tractate Megillah 15a:

'We admit that [some of] those [eight] mentioned above are expressly described [as prophets], but how do we know that their fathers were [prophets]? From the dictum of 'Ulla; for 'Ulla said: Wherever a man's name is given along with that of his father as the author of a prophecy, we know that he was a prophet, son of a prophet.'⁵

a. M. que tradit.

1. Fo. 2c(40d). Haimo of Auxerre in the prologue to his commentary on Isaiah mentions both the Jewish tradition and the different ways of writing of the two names. Comm. in Is., Prol. (P.L. 116, 715C,D).

2. E.g. Clement, Stromata, i.20.

3. Bab. Talmud, Megillah 10b (ed. Epstein, p. 57): 'R. Levi further said: The following is a tradition that we have from our ancestors, that Amoz and Amaziah were brothers'. Rashi begins his interpretation of Isaiah by referring to this tradition. Rashi's commentary has been used in the Latin translation of J.F. Breithaupt, R. Salomonis Jarchi, Commentarius Hebraicus in Prophetas Maiores et Minores etc., i, (Göttingen, 1713); henceforth referred to as Rashi, Comm. on Is., p...

4. L. Ginzberg, Legends, vi. 357.

5. Bab. Talmud, Megillah 15a (ed. Epstein, p. 86).

Ibn Ezra is rather critical of these old traditions. He remarks:

'Isaiah the son of Amoz. There exist an opinion, though a solitary one, ¹ that when the father of a prophet is mentioned by name, he also was a prophet; another opinion is that Isaiah was a member of the royal family, that his father Amoz and Amaziah were brothers....Irrespectively of all traditional explanations, we may say that the father of a prophet, if mentioned by name, was a man of some distinction....; sometimes he was himself a prophet, at others not, e.g. David, the son of Jesse (ii Sam.xxiii.1). David was the man of God (ii Chron. viii.14), Jesse was not.' ²

Although Andrew states explicitly that there is a Jewish tradition which, if reliable, proves that Isaiah was the son of a prophet, he probably knew of this tradition through the Gloss rather than directly through a Jewish informant. This is all the more likely since Andrew refers to the royal relationship of Amos, the father of Isaiah, through his granddaughter,³ while the Jewish sources refer to the fact that Amos was the brother of Amaziah, the king of Judah. Had Andrew known this particular tradition he would surely have mentioned it, being the kind of detail that interests him. Besides, it would have made his argument even more to the point: that the brother of a king should have been a shepherd is even more unlikely than the grandfather of the queen!⁴

two texts. 2. 'Audite celum et auribus percipe terra. Quidam putant quod per figuram quam metonymiam vocant angelicas, vel^a secundum mysticum sensum spirituales et animales, propheta virtutes^b ad audiendum invitat. Nobis vero non ut quibusdam deliramenti simile

a. M. angelicas virtutes, quidam quod.

b. M. om. virtutes.

1. Namely the opinion of 'Ulla, as quoted above, and of R. Johanan, as quoted in Midrash Rabba, Leviticus, vi.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 2.

3. Fo. 2c(41a): '....vir nobiliscum cuius nepti rex potens matrimonium contrahere non erubesceret....'

4. Cf. above p. 114.

7. St. Basil, de 3, editor's note: 'quidam deliramenti'.

then he videtur inanimata ad audiendum invitare, sed
 consuetudinem fuisse Hebreis in pangendis inter
 occasions Dominum et populum federibus et Domini
 contestationibus et comminationibus populo
 of agre pronuntiandis, maxima hec elementa et firmioris
 interpre materie quedam inanimata vel ad audiendum vel
 Jerome, ad testificandum invitare. Unde in Pentateucho,¹
 can be Item: Testor hodie contra te celum et terram.
 says that Item: Audite celi que loquor, audiat terra verba
 that text oris mei. ² Et Iosue: Testis est lapis iste quod
audierit omnia.³ Ac si diceret, vos proni ad
 faciendas excusationes, in peccatis negare
 temptabitis verba Domini vobis esse recitata,
 sed celum et terra vos erunt in testimonium,
 que invitavi ad audiendum quod mihi de vobis
 Dominus locutus est'.⁴

Andrew could have read in Jerome that 'heaven' is sometimes used
 in a metonymy for the angelical powers. The latter also says that it
 is possible that the text refers to the fact that the Lord, when he gave
 his law to Israel, called upon heaven and earth to be his witnesses,
 according to Deut, xxxii.i.⁵ Others, according to him, consider heaven
 and earth as animate beings, which can be spoken to;⁶ this being an
 interpretation put forward by the followers of Origen.⁷ Andrew
 apparently did not care for those interpretations, which tried in some
 way or another to explain heaven and earth as being animate. According
 to him it is not at all absurd to summon inanimate elements to listen,
 as it is a well-known Jewish custom to do so. He illustrates this with
 two texts, in which heaven and earth are appealed to as witnesses; but

1. This 'text', given in both C. and M., could be a corruption of
 Deut.iv.26 (= Deut.xxx.19): Testes invoco hodie coelum et terram.

2. Deut.xxxii.1.

3. Jos.xxiv.27; the Vulgate renders: En lapis iste erit vobis in
testimonium, quod audierit omnia verba Domini.

4. Fo. 3a (41a,b).

5. Jerome, Comm. in Es., i (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 7, l. 5): 'In caelo supernas
 significans angelicasque virtutes.... Sive quia per Moysen testes
 vocaverat Dominus caelum et terram, dans populo Israel legem suam et
 dixerat: Attende, caelum, et loquar; audiat terra verba oris mei.
 (Dt.xxxii.1).

6. Ibid., p. 8, l. 31, 'quidam caelum et terram quasi animantia ad
 audiendum provocari putant....'

7. Cf. ibid., p. 8, editor's note: 'quidam-Origenistae'.

the words contaminis, which are missing in the Vulgate, but not in the then he shows that other elements also can serve for this purpose, as Hebrew text (וְעָבְדוּ אֶת הַבְּרִית Deut. iv.26), indicates Jewish influence occasionally an appeal has been made to stones to witness a certain act in his explanation.

of agreement. It is typical of Andrew that he prefers to base his

interpretation directly on a Jewish custom, rather than to refer to

Jerome, who at least mentions the possibility that the text in Isaiah

can be read in the light of some other Old Testament text. Ibn Ezra

says that 'Isaiah begins his prophecy by addressing those witnesses,

that have been pointed out to Israel by Moses when he said, I call

heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that you shall soon

utterly perish;¹ the time, foretold by Moses, had then come.'² Thus

Ibn Ezra regards on the one hand heaven and earth called upon by

Isaiah as the appropriate witnesses of the Jewish people; on the

other hand the text is seen as the fulfilment of a prophecy. Rashi

cites in his treatment of one of the texts quoted by Andrew, Deuteronomy

xxxii.1, the Siphre, explaining why heaven and earth are called upon as

witnesses:

'Moses [having written the words of the law] thought:
"I am a being of flesh and blood; tomorrow I shall
be dead. If the Israelites will once say, We have
never accepted the covenant, who can come and refute
them?" Therefore he called heaven
and earth as witnesses against them - witnesses that
endure forever'.³

From these examples we may gather that the Jewish custom referred to by

Andrew was indeed well-known. From the assured way he argues and the

number of examples he gives, it seems likely that a Jewish informant

had drawn his attention towards it, either when they discussed the

Isaiah-text with its quotation from Deuteronomy, or at an earlier

occasion. Also the fact that he incorporates in his first example

1. Deut. iv.26. Interesting is the second interpretation in which he

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 4.

3. Rashi, Commentary on the Pentateuch (ed. Silbermann, ii.158).

his freedom of movement.

refers to a common way of speaking.

4. 'Ve genti peccatrici. Predicitur impiis superventura illis miseria, tribulatio et angustia, ne forte in excusationem sui causentur se iccirco illa precavere non potuisse, quia predicta et prescita non erant. Subponitur etiam breviter tantorum causa malorum ibi: dereliquerunt Dominum, ne se iniuste flagellatos conquerantur'.¹

Andrew explains that Israel was warned beforehand by Isaiah of the coming misery and informed of the reason why she was going to suffer. This warning was intended to deprive her of the possibility to excuse herself by appealing to ignorance of what was coming. In his comments on this and the following verses Andrew makes clear that according to him the prophet follows a fixed scheme. First he deals at length with Israel's apostasy (verses 2,3,4), this being the reason for her severe punishment (verses 5,6). Having thus mentioned her personal sufferings, the prophet then describes the destruction of her possessions (verses 7,8).² This alleged pattern shows Andrew's conviction that a biblical text can lend itself to proper analysis and a matter of fact treatment.

id. 'Populo gravi. Non maturo et auctoritatis pleno, iuxta illud: in populo gravi laudabo te,³ sed gravi iniquitate, id est quem multitudo iniquitatis, tamquam farcina gravis et importabile pondus portantem ad succubitionem premens aggravavit. Grande onus gravem et vix sese movere potentem eum qui subvehit reddit. Hac similitudine quem multa replevit iniquitas, iniquitate gravis appellatur'.⁴

What is meant with a people laden with iniquity, says Andrew, is easy to understand if we think of a person loaded with a heavy burden, which makes, as it were, the person who carries it heavy and prevents

1. Fo. 3c (41c).

2. E.g. Fo. 4b (42a): 'Terra vestra deserta (vs 7). Hactenus que in semet ipsis, nunc que in possessionibus suis passuri erant latius exequantur?

3. Ps. xxxv.18. (V. xxxiv.18).

4. Fo. 3c (41c).

1. Fo. 3c (41c).

2. Fo. 3d-4a (41d).

3. Fo. 4b,c (42a).

his freedom of movement. Again a simple illustration, which was undoubtedly even more appropriate in Andrew's day than in our technological age.

id. 'Blasphemaverunt sanctum Israel. Indigna de Deo qui est sanctus Israel, id est quem sanctum Israel et mundum credit, dixerunt.^a Vel derelinquentes Dominum idolatre indigna dixerunt de Israel sancto, qui scilicet noluit sicut ipsi inter gentes coinquinari; frequens enim consuetudo est perversorum dissimiliter viventes blasphemare. Vel sanctum Israel, Dominum scilicet qui sanctificat Israel, blasphemaverunt, male¹ de illo loquentes et suis impotentem adesse dicentes'.

Here we see how Andrew carefully weighs the words of the text and tries out different possibilities; in casu the meaning of sanctus Israel, for which he gives three interpretations. Interesting also is his remark about those who have gone astray and now criticize those who have not.

On vs 5, Super quo percutiam vos ultra addentes praevaricationem, he remarks:

'Ultra. Quammodo per/cutiam? In hac vice iterum percutiam quod parum vel nichil restabit in quo ulterius percutiam? Vel in quo percutiam vos, addentes et accumulantes prevaricationem, id est transgressionem, ultra quam hactenus addidistis et accumulastis? Ultra enim secundum diversas lectiones tam ad precedens verbum quam ad participium subsequens referri potest....'²

It is possible, he notes, to read the text in different ways. From the manner in which he continues the interpretation of this text, it seems that he prefers to connect ultra with percutere.

9. 'Nisi Dominus exercituum. Tanta erit vastitas et perditio tam hominum quam terre ut....in nichilum/redigeremur, nisi^b virtus et potentia Domini, quam ex eo dat intelligere quod eum Dominum exercituum vocat, in^c agricole more, qui ex multo annone acervo parvam portiunculam in semen reservat, paucos nobis Iudeis, unde alii³ seminari possent, misericorditer reliquisset.'

a. C. om. dixerunt.

b. C. ubi.

c. C. vel.

1. Fo. 3d (41c).

2. Fo. 3d-4a (41d).

3. Fo. 4b,c (42a).

Andrew compares the Lord with a farmer, who saves a small amount of his crop as next year's seed, this seed being, as it were, the remnant of Israel, who escaped the total destruction.

10. 'Audite verbum Domini, principes Sodomorum....
 Ne cui forte videtur Dominus qui nil eorum que fecit odit, crudelis penaque eorum, licet iusta, delectari, a facie impendentis ire qualiter salvari possint aperit, monens verbum Domini et legem audire et facere...., perversione cogitationis scilicet et operis cessare, misericordie et pietatis operibus invigilare'.¹

Andrew seems at times to identify himself with the prophet, trying to imagine the effects of his message. However, the idea that the Lord, who does not hate anything he does, must, therefore, have pleasure in punishing his people, is typically a product of theological questioning and reflection, unknown in the time of Isaiah. That this idea is obviously wrong is made clear by Andrew by explaining that the Israelites were given a chance to escape the divine anger, which implies that the act of her punishment was more or less the duty of the Lord. Here we have one of those rare occasions where it is possible to catch a glimpse of Andrew's theological notions, which seem to conform to generally accepted ideas. He does not elaborate on them at all, but keeps strictly within the limits of his text.

14. 'Anima mea. Ad insinuandam desiderii, vel odii, vel alicuius alterius affectionis vehementiam solet hoc nomen frequenter in sacra scriptura poni.
 Moyses: Si esus carnum quas desiderat anima tua.²
 Item: Sicut desiderat anima tua.³ Ysaïas: Anima mea desideravit te.⁴ Psalmographus: Sitivit anima mea ad Deum.⁵ Item: concupivit anima mea.⁶

1. Fo. 4c (42a).

2. Andrew's text seems a combination of Deut. xii.15, Sin autem comedere volueris et te esus carnum delectaverit...., and Deut. xii.20,et volueris vesci carnibus quas desiderat anima tua....

3. Andrew could have had in mind Deut. xii.20 (cf. n.2) or Deut. xiv.26, et omne quod desiderat anima tua.

4. Is. xxvi.9.

5. Ps. xlii.2 (V. xli.3).

6. Ps. cxix.20 (V. cxviii.20).

Salomon: Num quem desiderat anima mea vidistis?¹
 Item: Sex sunt que odit Dominus et septimum quod detestatur anima eius.^{2,3}

Andrew tries to define the exact value of certain expressions, which frequently occur in Scripture. See also:

15. 'Avertam oculos meos. Aversio oculorum displicentie est signum. Quos enim diligimus libenter aspicimus, ab his ergo quos odimus oculos avertimus'.⁴

On verse 17, Discite benefacere: quaerite iudicium, subvenite oppresso, iudicate pupillo, defendite viduam, he notes:

'Discite etc. Si per vos nescitis, ab aliis benefacere discite. Vel quia usus reddit magistrum, multo usu et assidua^a exercitatione benefacere discite. Ac si diceretur avaro, frequenter dando liberalitatem addisce'.⁵

In explaining this verse Andrew refers to a commonly known proverb,⁶ and illustrates it with a simple example. Apart from learning something by practising, he suggests that one could learn from the example set by others.

id. 'Iudicate pupillo. Ad utilitatem pupilli, si causa eius permittit, iudicium facite. Alioquin mementote scriptum esse: Non misereberis pauperis in iudicio.⁷ Pupillus est, qui altero patre scilicet, orphanus qui utroque parente destitutus est'.⁸

A short and practical explanation of the meaning of the text and an exact definition of an apparently little used word.

a. C. om. assidua.

1. Cant.iii.3.

2. Prov. vi.16.

3. Fo. 5a (42c).

4. Fo. 5b (42c).

5. Fo. 5b (42d).

6. Cf. H. Walther, Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters (Munich, 1963-69), v.503.

7. Ex. xxiii.3.

8. Fo. 5c (42d).

18. 'Et venite et arguite me etc. Que predicta sunt facientes venite ad templum meum, vel in causam contra me, et accusate me, quasi reum et iniustum, si non benefecero vobis. Vel locutio est quod dicit venite'.¹

Andrew explains this verse in his scheme of warning, punishment and remuneration. If the people of Israel do justice they can be absolutely sure of fair treatment by the Lord, even to the point of accusing him of injustice if he should fail to reward them. Having first taken venite literally, he then suggests that it can also be understood as a manner of speaking.

21. 'Quomodo facta est meretrix etc. Quoniam contra/hoc quod illos in superioribus monuerat egisse studiose intelligit, predicat quod tantam de illis vindictam sumpturus est, que consolationi de contemptu suo sufficere possit, stupens et admirans quomodo tam boni prius in tam perversos postea sint commutati'.²

Again according to his scheme: the Lord, having warned the Israelites in vain to change their way of life, proceeds now to predict to what extent he intends to punish them.

24. 'Heu. Quam invitus percutiat qui percussurus in vocem plangentis erumpit declarat'.³

Andrew points out repeatedly that the Lord has no pleasure in punishing Israel.

id. 'Consolabar super hostibus meis. Nostris utitur verbis, quibus facta ultio de nostris hostibus non minima est consolatio'.⁴

He never fails to indicate an anthropomorphism, a characteristic he shares with Ibn Ezra, who explains here: 'I will find comfort for their having provoked me. An anthropomorphism'.⁵

Thus far the examples of Group I.

1. Fo. 5c (42d). *Quomodo facta est meretrix* (ed. Hartman, 1.1, 1. 6).

2. Fo. 5d-6a (43a).

3. Fo. 6b (43b). *Latinitas Sprichwörter*, v. 255.

4. Fo. 6b (43b).

5. Ibn Ezra, Comm. in Is., p. 12. *Quomodo facta est meretrix*, VIII, 51 (ed. Hartman 1.416, 1. 10).

6. Fo. 3a (41b).

III

Examples belong to group II (knowledge of the pagan classics etc.).

Before turning to Andrew's comments on the first chapter of Isaiah, we shall briefly point out some allusions to the classical authors in his prologue. In the beginning of the prologue he uses an expression 'acta ne agas',¹ which is an adaptation of Terence's 'actum ne agas'.² Secondly, in a rhetorical question, 'aut forte perspicacius et acutius, utpote iuniores....?'³ he refers to Priscian's '....cuius auctores, quanto sunt iuniores, tanto perspicaciores'.⁴ Lastly he uses the proverb 'tempore parce',⁵ which was apparently a widely used saying, originally taken over from the Greeks.⁶

The first reference in the actual commentary to classical grammar occurs in verse 1, Visio Ysaiae filii Amos:

'Hebraicorum consuetudo scriptorum est in titulis quos suis prescribunt operibus, verbum substantivum cum pronomine demonstrativo subintelligendum relinquere'.⁷

The term 'verbum substantivum' is derived from Priscian's

Institutiones Grammaticae:

'Praesens tempus proprie dicitur, cuius pars praeterit, pars futura est...., excepto "sum" verbo, quod ὑπαρκτικόν Graeci vocant, quod nos possumus "substantivum" nominare'.⁸

In verse 2, Audite caeli et auribus percipe terra, he uses the term metonymia:

'Quidam putant quod per figuram quam metonymiam vocant, angelicas....virtutes ad audiendum invitat....'.⁹

1. Fo. 1a (40a).

2. Terence, Phormio, 1.419: "'actum" aiunt "ne agas"'.²

3. Fo. 1a (40a).

4. Priscian, Ad Iulianum Epistula (ed. Hertzius, i.1, l. 6).

5. Fo. 1b (40a).

6. Cf. H. Walther, Lateinische Sprichwörter, v. 295.

7. Fo. 2b (40d).

8. Priscian, Institutiones Grammaticae, viii. 51 (ed. Hertzius i.414, l. 10).

9. Fo. 3a (41b).

Other grammatical terms employed by Andrew are, for example, adverbium in verse 9,quasi Sodoma fuissemus, et quasi Gomorra similes essemus, on which he notes: '...cum quasi similitudinis adverbium premissum sit...'¹; and nominativus and vocativus in verse 10,percipite auribus legem Dei nostri populus Gomorrae, where he remarks: 'Populus. Nominativus est pro vocativo'.²

3. 'Cognovit bos.... Novit, cum litterate habeat preteriti sensum, habet presentis, sicut odi et memini. Cognovi in sensu presentis, nisi forte in hoc loco, me legisse non recordor. Non olim bovem et asinum presepe domini sui cognovisse, sed in presenti noscere vel cognoscere solere dicere intendit. Nec in eo putandus est bos dominum suum cognoscere, quod ex qualitate faciei, vel vocis, vel alio quolibet eiusdem generis modo ab aliis hominibus eum dis/cernere sciat, sed in eo quod de asino subditur, scilicet quod per se ad presepe domini sui redire cognovit'.³

We see here first Andrew's concern with the tenses of verbs. Although he cannot remember having come across an analogous example, he concludes on grounds of the context that cognovit (or novit) has the meaning of a present tense here. Secondly he makes sure that his readers understand the verb in the right way. They should not understand it as if the animal recognizes his master's face or voice, and from that knows where to go; no: it knows instinctively where to go. Precisely this instinctively knowing where to go is a quality Israel is lacking completely.

In verse 7a,regionem vestram coram vobis alieni devorant, he is likewise concerned with the use of a particular tense in its context:

'Regionem vestram.... Quod dicit regionem illorum alienos hostes scilicet devoraturus; verbum enim presentis pro verbo futuri temporis ex nimia certitudine posuit....'⁴

1. Fo. 4c (42a).

2. Fo. 4d (42b).

3. Fo. 3b,c (41b,c).

4. Fo. 4b (42a).

5. Omne caput languidum etc....Languor est diutius et frequentissime usque ad ultimam diem perseverans morbus, qui non minus quam ex se gravis est, ex convalescendi desperatione. Desperatio autem, si Stoicis credimus, est egritudo sine ulla expectatione meliorum, languente capite que spes sanitatis esse potest....Merens. Meror est, ut Stoicis visum est, egritudo flebilis....(6) Sanitas. Sanitas duplex est; est sanitas mentis, est et corporis. Sanitas corporis est temperantia partium, cum ea congruunt ex quibus constat. Sanitas vero animi est cum eius iudicia et opiniones concordant.¹

Andrew draws heavily on Cicero's Tusculanae Disputationes in this passage. His definitions of desperatio,² meror³ and sanitas⁴ can be found there. In verse 16, Lavamini, mundi estote, auferte malum cogitationum vestrarum ab oculis meis, quiescite agere perverse, he shows the same fondness of definitions:

'....Non quelibet mala dicuntur perversiones, sed que contra ius equitatis officii et nature fiunt. Veluti si quis liberatorem de manu hostili hostibus suis tradat. Vel si benivolos et indulgentes sibi filius parentes oderit, vel si quis fideli amico fidem non servaverit et cetera huiusmodi'.⁵

I have not been able to trace the source of Andrew's definition of perversiones. Again he illustrates his statement with examples taken from every day life.

In verse 7b we find a quotation from Virgil:

'Terra vestra deserta....Deserta. Occisis vel in captivitate ductis cultoribus. Solent frequenter nominati^a participiorum preteriti temporis et substantivorum quibus adiciuntur sine verbis substantivis, que tamen subaudiri deberent, poni. Nec solum apud nos, sed etiam apud secularium litterarum autores: Vergilius in i

a- C. nomina; M. nominati.

1. Fo. 4a (41d).

2. Cicero, Tusculanae Disputationes, iv. 8, 18.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., iv. 13,30.

5. Fo. 5b (42d).

Eneidos: "olim volventibus annis hinc fore ductores, revocato sanguine Teucris, qui mare, qui terras omni ditione tenerent, pollicitus",¹ ubi subaudiendum est "es". Sic et hic subaudiri debet "erit".²

Andrew does not feel obliged to justify himself for illuminating peculiarities of the biblical text with quotations from the pagan classics, as was so often the case with his contemporaries in monastic circles.³ The reference to Virgil is most probably taken from Priscian's grammar, where these lines are quoted twice to illustrate the omission of verba substantiva.⁴ In fact, the quotation occurs five times altogether in the Institutiones Grammaticae and was therefore well-known to every student of this work.

In verse 8, Et derelinquetur filia Sion ut umbraculum in vinea et sicut tugurium in cucumerario.... we find an interesting reference to the Numidians:

'Umbraculum. Cuius beneficio custodes vinearum a nimis fervoribus solis proteguntur. Tugurium. Vilis et agrestis pastorum casula, qualibet Numide palantes utuntur'.⁵

1. Virgil, Aeneid, i.234 ff. The complete passage reads:

'Certe hinc Romanos olim, volventibus annis,
Hinc fore ductores, revocato a sanguine Teucris,
Qui mare, qui terras omni ditione tenerent,
Pollicitus: quae te, genitor, sententia vertis?'

The verb in the last line has to be completed as pollicitus es: you (sc. Jupiter) have promised.

2. Fo. 4b (42a).

3. Cf. B. Smalley, 'Ralph of Flaix on Leviticus', Rech. Théol. anc. méd. xxxv (1968), 43, where is mentioned that some of Ralph's friends were shocked by his insertions of testimonia of pagan books into a commentary on Scripture.

4. Priscian, Institutiones Grammaticae, xviii.201 (ed. Hertzius, ii. 305, l. 6): 'Hoc Romani faciunt in omnium passivorum et deponentium et communium praeteritis, per quae participiis utuntur pro verbo adiungentes verbum substantivum; frequenter tamen et per ellipsin eius per se participia loco verborum funguntur, ut Virgilius in I Aeneidos: Certe hinc...., deest "es"'. Cf. ibid. xvii.80 (ed. Hertzius, ii, 153, l.18).

5. Fo. 4b (42a).

Andrew's source is most likely a passage in Isidore's Etymologies devoted to aedificia rustica. Here a tugurium is mentioned as a booth for the watchmen of the vineyard, while the oblong huts in which the Numidians live are called magalia.¹

16. 'Auferte malum cogitationum vestrarum. Quia lavari eos preceperat, ne quis hoc de lavacro in aquis et variis baptismatibus, que tam apud Hebreos quam gentiles erant -- quod Pelas, loquens Acasto, declarat, dicens: "Solve nefas dixit, solvit et ille nefas"² --, errore deceptus acciperet, lavandi modum subiungit, dicens, Auferte malum etc'.³

Another example which shows to what extent Andrew identifies himself with the prophet and ascribes to him his own associations. As the prophet, according to Andrew, was afraid that the moral cleansing intended by him might be confused with ritual purifications as prescribed by the Jewish law, or with the rites of purgation as known in antiquity, he explicitly stated what kind of cleansing he had in mind. That Isaiah was not very likely to have heard of the last form of cleansing from sin does apparently not occur to him. It reminds one again of the fact that for the middle ages antiquity was very much a

a. C. Solum.

1. Isidore, Etymologiae, xv.12 (ed. Lindsay, sv.12, 2-4): 'Tugurium casula est quam faciunt sibi custodes vinearum ad tegimen sui, sive propter ardorem solis et radios declinandos....Magalia aedificia Numidarum agrestium oblonga, in curvis lateribus tecta, quasi navium carinae sunt, sive rotunda in modum furnorum'. Miss Smalley drew my attention to a passage in Sallust's Bellum Iugurthinum, where he describes the habits of the various people living in Africa from early times onwards. It would seem that Isidore derived his information from this source. Sallust, Bellum Iugurthinum, xviii and xix.

2. Ovid, Fasti, ii. 39-40, 43-46 (ed. Frazer, i.55). Andrew has abbreviated the passage somewhat. The complete section reads:

39. 'Actoriden Peleus, ipsum quoque Pelea Phoci caede per Haemonias solvit Acastus aquas:....

43. Amphiareiades Naupactoo Acheloo
"solve nefas" dixit, solvit et ille nefas
a! nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina caedis
fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua!'

3. Fo. 5b (42c).

unity, in which only a vague distinction was made between biblical events and the history of Greeks and Romans.

The examples of this group have shown that Andrew was able to draw on the pagan authors if this suited his purpose. He knew their grammar and applied its rules to the biblical text. His grammatical studies had introduced him to the practice of reading a text carefully, and had helped him to develop a keen feeling for the importance of the littera as such. Whether he read the ancient writers in the original, or in the much used set books of the schools could only be decided after a more detailed study of his quotations throughout his commentaries, and of the sources available to him, in particular the library of Saint Victor. He certainly borrowed from Priscian for some of his quotations. In any case, his references to the pagan classics illustrate that Andrew was well versed in the secular learning of his day.

IV

Examples belonging to group III (references to the Hebrew and Jewish interpretation).

References to Jewish traditions in the prologue¹ and the verses 1² and 2³ have previously been noted.

4. Ve genti peccatrici....Miseria velociter super-veniet et repentina vastatio genti Israeli scilicet, qui quondam populus meus, nunc propter peccata sua inter gentes, id est in genitura sua manentes, sine iure videlicet et lege reputatus est'.⁴

Andrew's interpretation is vaguely reminiscent of Rashi, who says that it seems right to lament Israel, which has changed so much that she

1. Cf. above p. 107 ff.

2. Cf. above p. 113; 114 ff.

3. Cf. above p. 11b ff.

4. Fo. 3c (41c).

has become a sinful nation, and the people of which it was said, thou art an holy people¹ have changed into a people laden with iniquity.²

They both stress the drastic change of Israel from God's chosen people into a sinful nation.

On verse 8, Et derelinquetur filia Sion, he remarks:

8. 'Derelinquetur. Abductis civibus suis, tanquam derelicta et destituta sola sedebit filia Syon. Quodam genere locutionis apud Hebreos filius et filia in constructionibus ponitur, ubi^a ad sensum nihil operatur. Nil aliud hic intelligi debet filia Syon quam Syon,^b sicut nec alibi filia Babylonis quam Babylon: Filia Babylonis misera, beatus qui retribuet tibi'.^{3,4}

It is easy to imagine that this manner of speaking was pointed out to him by one of his Jewish advisers. It would be the sort of thing Andrew remembered and was interested in. His actual interpretation is very much like Rashi's, but both are relying heavily on the context, which makes it impossible to draw any conclusions as to Rashi's influence on Andrew here. Rashi interprets: 'Deprived of her inhabitants, who moved away from her, like a cottage in the vineyard is left'.⁵

On verse 9, Nisi Dominus exercituum reliquisset nobis semen, quasi Sodoma fuisset, et quasi Gomorra similes essemus, Andrew remarks:

'Quod post Gomorram 'similes' apponitur, cum quasi similitudinis adverbium premissum sit superflue^c videtur. Frequenter tamen tam apud nos quam apud Hebreos huiusmodi superfluitates reperiri solent.

a. C. nisi.

b. C. om. quam Syon.

c. M. superfluere.

1. Deut. vii. 6.

2. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 4.

3. Ps. c xxxvii. 8. (V. cxxxvi.8).

4. Fo.^{4b}₁ (42a).

5. Rashi, op. cit., p. 6.

Ut: Aaron quem elegit ipsum.¹ Cuius participatio eius.² Et: Cuius non sum dignus solvere corrigiam calceamentorum eius.³ Et: haut mora continuo. Et: quod nesciebam melius magis^a q(uam) h(ec)^b.⁴

The last two examples are obviously Andrew's own and belong to the apud nos ones. Unfortunately the last one has a different reading in the two manuscripts and is partly abbreviated, as indicated. As far as his examples from the Hebrew are concerned, it seems that Andrew relies here more on the Latin version than on the Hebrew itself, as he does not seem to appreciate that in the Hebrew certain verbs, like כה - to be like, to be similar, or בחר - to choose, are always used with special prepositions, in casu ל and ב. These constructions have been translated into Latin as quasi....similes and quem....ipsum, and may seem superfluous to someone not familiar with their Hebrew origin.⁵ The fact that an example from the New Testament is inserted along with those from the Old Testament, makes it all the more likely that Andrew bases his comment on the Vulgate, rather than on the Hebrew text.

12. 'Ante conspectum meum. Cum^c venistis ad introitum atrii sacerdotum, quo ab offerentibus immolande ducebantur et afferebantur victimae, unde a me de monte cherubin et de propitiatorio, ubi apparere soleo, conspici poteratis. Nostris condescendit verbis, qui conspiciere non possumus, nisi quod ante conspectum habemus. Quis quesivit hec de manibus vestris. Hec etsi queram et accipere

a. C. mage; M. magis.

b. C. and M.: q.h.

c. C. convenistis.

1. Ps. cv. 26. (V. civ.26).

2. Ps. cxxii. 3. (V.cxxi.3).

3. Lk. iii. 16.

4. Fo. 4c (42a).

5. The Hebrew reads וְאֵיךְ הָיָה לָךְ לִישׁוֹר בְּחַרְבְּנוֹ (Is. i. 9) and וְאֵיךְ הָיָה לָךְ לִישׁוֹר בְּחַרְבְּנוֹ (Ps. cv. 26).

1. Ps. cxli. 5 (V. cxli. 5).

2. Ex. xx. 13.

3. Fo. 4c (42b).

velim, de manibus vestris iniquorum et a quibus aliquid accipiam indignorum, nec quero nec volo. Huic simile quid in Psalmis legimus: Oleum peccatoris non impinguabit caput meum:¹ etsi oleum ad impinguandum caput meum velim, nolo peccatoris oleum. Ut ambularetis in atriis. Quis quesivit predicta de manibus vestris, ut hac occasione quia victimas afferetis, vos indigni ambularetis in atriis meis. Vel superioribus coniungendum est sic: Cum veniretis ante conspectum meum ut ambularetis in atriis meis, quis quesivit etc. In Hebreo planius: calcare atrium meum non apponetis. Vos indigni et iniquitate pleni non presumatis in atrium meum, quod sanctum est, intrare et ipsum mihi dicatum immundis pedibus vestris calcare. More Hebraico futurum indicativi pro presenti imperativi et coniunctivi posuit. Sic et in lege frequenter invenimus: Non occides.^{2,3}

Andrew's interpretation of ante conspectum meum as an anthropomorphism is quite ingenious; his main concern, however, is the interpretation of ut ambularetis in atriis meis. Should one explain: who has asked for an offering of you, unworthy people, which would give you unworthy ones an opportunity to walk in my courtyard—something I desire even less to happen? In this case ambularetis is closely connected with quesivit, and the stress is laid on the desecrating of the sanctuary. Or should it be joined to venistis: when you come to appear before me and walk in my courtyard, who would have asked for your offerings?; in which case the stress is laid on the asking of offerings from unworthy people. Andrew says he prefers the Hebrew, where the difficulty does not occur. For there we read according to him: 'You shall not continue to trample my court', which he interprets as: 'You wicked people shall not take it for granted any longer to come into my sanctuary, trampling it and desecrating it with your unworthy presence.' However, what Andrew gives as the Hebrew version of the text looks very much like a quotation from Jerome, who translates the last part of the text: 'Calcere atrium meum

1. Ps. cxli. 5 (V. cxl. 5).

2. Ex. xx. 13.

3. Fo. 4d (42b).

non apponetis'.¹ The Vulgate renders: Cum veneritis ante conspectum meum, quis quaesivit haec de manibus vestris ut ambularetis in atriis meis? (12.). Ne adferatis ultra sacrificium frustra....(13), while the Hebrew has: '.... who has asked this from your hands, to trample my court? (12). You shall not continue to bring worthless offerings.... (13).² As the word for the bringing of offerings in verse 13 is a hif'il form of the verb ה'לל - to come, it is possible that Jerome misread it. It seems likely that Andrew, who found the text difficult to explain, looked up what Jerome said about it. When he saw that his translation differed from the Vulgate he assumed that the latter had based it on the Hebrew text. Considering this version more intelligible too, he inserted it in his own explanation without checking, however, with the Hebrew original. Presently we shall notice that he does this several times in the course of the first chapter. As far as his grammatical remark is concerned, it can indeed happen that the Hebrew imperfect, which has the meaning of a future tense, can be used as an imperative. This is in particular the case to express a prohibition, since the imperative, which has a separate form, cannot be connected with a negative particle. The conjunctive ^{mood} is not known in Hebrew at all and has therefore to be expressed in different ways, for example by the imperfect (iussivus), referred to by Andrew as futurum indicativi.³

13,14 'Neomeniam. Neo Grece, novum Latine, mene luna. Neomenia est festum quod fit ab Hebreis nova apparente, vel accensa a sole luna. Festivitates alias. Pascha, Pentecosten et Scenophegiam, annum septem et quinquaginta...Kalendas etc. Vel uno vel duobus diebus in singulorum initiis mensum festa celebrant Hebrei. Unde in Samuele legitur, Cras erunt kalende et requiretur sessio tua usque in diem tertium.⁴

1. Jerome, Comm. in Es., 1. (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 17, 1.11).

2. ה' - נִקְשׁוּ זֵוֹת הַיָּדָיִם לַחֵם חֲזַרְזָו (וּ), לֵאמֹר תִּזְכְּרוּ אֵת יְמֵי חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם וְלֹא תִשְׁכְּחוּן

3. Cf. above p. 81, where Andrew makes a similar remark.

4. 1 Regum xx. 18.

Item, Non comedit Ionathas panem in die secunda kalendarum.¹ Sollemnitates. Non quelibet festa dies, sed ab omnibus communiter celebrata sollemnitas nominatur'.²

We notice again Andrew's fondness of definitions in his discussion of these Jewish festivals. As has already been pointed out in Chapter III, he often relies on Isidore's Etymologies for descriptions of this kind;³ there is no reason to assume Jewish influence here. The so-called 'blessing of the New Moon', which was accompanied by the blowing of the sophar, was still celebrated in Andrew's time.⁴

On verse 14b, facta sunt mihi molesta, laboravi sustinens, he notes:

14. Facta sunt mihi molesta. Hec, que dum a piis et bonis bene, pure riteque fierent grata mihi esse solebant, nunc etiam tantum me molestant, quod laboro dum fiunt, ac si grave quoddam pondus portarem. Quod est dicere displicent sicut fesso labor et grave pondus sustinenti. In Hebreo: facti estis mihi in satietatem, nequaquam dimittam peccata vestra, huius littera expositione non indiget'.⁵

Again a case where it looks as if Andrew took Jerome's rendering of the text for a literal translation of the Hebrew original. Jerome has:

'Facti mihi estis in satietatem; nequaquam dimittam peccata vestra. Pro quo interpretatus est Aquila: laboravi sustinens; Symmachus: ἰκονωμεν ἑαυτοκομις, quod est: defeci miserans; ut ostendat se nequaquam ultra misereri, quia aliud sit servos ad se missos occidere, aliud Filium'.⁶

The Hebrew has: קִיָּוִי לְיָיִן לְיָיִן בְּשֵׁן

- they are a burden unto me, I am tired of bearing. The last part of the text, however, can equally well be translated as 'I am tired of forgiving', since the verb, בְּשֵׁן has both meanings. Symmachus and

1. i. Regum xx. 34.

2. Fo. 5a (42b,c).

3. Cf. Etymologiae, vi. 18 (ed. Lindsay, vi. 18). On kalendae see ibid., v. 33 (ed. Lindsay, v. 33, 13). Cf. above p. 53.

4. J.E., ix, 243-44 (cf. Nu. x. 10).

5. Fo. 5a (42c).

6. Jerome, Comm. in Es., i (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 18, l. 13).

Jerome both refer to the last meaning of the verb, while Andrew apparently regarded this interpretative translation as a straightforward version of the Hebrew text. Ibn Ezra interprets; 'They are a trouble unto me. These words imply the threat: I shall therefore banish you, and they -- the festivals -- will then cease. I am weary. A figurative expression.¹ Andrew's reference to a Jewish tradition in his exposition of verse 18 has been quoted extensively in Miss Smalley's Study of the Bible.² In his comment on verse 22 he again identifies a translation of Jerome with the original Hebrew without going back to the text itself:

22. 'Vinum tuum mixtum est. Que olim bonus et suavis sapor eras in ore omnium de te loquentium, nunc fatuus es et insipidus. Vel doli fallacie et fraudis arguit eos quod argento et vino que pura et absque omni commixtione vendere deberent, nil precio detrahentes, sordes et aquam immiscebant. Huic sententie consonat alia translatio, que congruit Hebraice veritati: Caupones tui miscent vinum aqua.³

The Vulgate has the same text as Andrew, Vinum tuum mixtum aqua, but Jerome writes,

'Caupones tui miscent vinum aqua. Pro quo Symmachus transtulit: Vinum tuum mixtum est aqua. Et est sensus: Lex Dei pura atque sincera, et, ut ita dicam, mera veritate subnixa, violata est traditionibus pharisaeorum.⁴

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 9.

2. Study, pp. 389-90 (transl. p. 148).

3. Fo. 6a (43a).

4. Jerome, op. cit., p. 21, l. 12. L. Ginzberg in his 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', vi, p. 280 remarks about Jerome's explanation:

'Et est sensus.... Pharisaeorum. Targum jer:....Die Thora die reinem Weine gleich ist, deren Gesetze hast du nun verunstaltet, so dass sie gewässertem Weine gleicht'

In a note he says that Jerome's interpretation could go back to Eusebius.

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 9.

2. Study, pp. 389-90.

3. Fo. 6a (43a).

4. Jerome, op. cit., p. 21, l. 12.

L. Ginzberg in his 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', vi, p. 280 remarks about Jerome's explanation:

'Et est sensus.... Pharisaeorum. Targum jer:....Die Thora die reinem Weine gleich ist, deren Gesetze hast du nun verunstaltet, so dass sie gewässertem Weine gleicht'

In a note he says that Jerome's interpretation could go back to Eusebius.

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 9.

2. Study, pp. 389-90 (transl. p. 148).

3. Fo. 6a (43a).

4. Jerome, op. cit., p. 21, l. 12. L. Ginzberg in his 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', vi, p. 280 remarks about Jerome's explanation:

Symmachus is here much closer than Jerome to the Hebrew: וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, which means indeed: your wine is mixed with water. Both
 Rashi and Ibn Ezra understand וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה as 'mixed', and remark that the
 expression occurs nowhere else in Scripture.¹ Rashi, however,
 interprets the verse; 'Your winetraders mix the wine with water, as
 is said in the Pesikta'.² Again Andrew's reference to the Hebrew is
 an interpretation rather than a translation and goes in all probability
 back to Jerome. It is possible that Rashi's interpretation strengthened
 his view that what he gave was the correct Hebrew version.

On the verses 30 and 31, Cum fueritis velut quercus defluentibus
 foliis et velut hortus absque aqua (31) et erit fortitudo vestra ut
 favilla stuppae et opus vestrum quasi scintilla et succendetur utrumque
 simul et non erit qui extinguat, Andrew comments:

30,31. 'Cum fueritis etc. Tunc erubescetis super
 hortis cum fueritis omni pulchritudine destituti, velut
 quercus cum foliis destituta et velut hortus qui
 arescet pro penuria aque, et cum destituti fueritis
 omni fortitudine et opere in quibus ante confidebatis.
 Vel fortitudinem et opus eorum [que] comparat purgamento
 stuppe, ut habetur in Hebreo et Symmachus transtulit,
 et scintille; opera fortitudinis eorum municipia
 scilicet et artes appellat, que non diutius^a castrensibus
 flammis resistere poterunt, quam supradicta, que
 facillime pertranseunt, durare possunt'.³

This time Andrew refers to the Hebrew text and Symmachus as in one
 breath, thus possibly giving one a clue where his knowledge of the
 Hebrew text might come from. He found Symmachus' translation in Jerome⁴
 and silently assuming that Symmachus went back to the Hebrew original he
 puts: In Hebreo et Symmachus. Perhaps the fact that Jerome did not
 follow Symmachus' translation of the text made him slightly uneasy about

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 11; Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 12.

2. Ibid., p. 12.

3. Fo. 6c,d (43b,c). See above p. 136.

4. Jerome, Comm. in Es., i (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 26, l.1): 'Et erit fortitudo
 vestra ut favilla stupae. Pro favilla ἀποτιωμῆ interpretatus est Symmachus,
 quando stupa pectitur, et quidquid sordium habet, proicitur. Omnis igitur
 fortitudo et superbia peccatorum et sceleratorum Israel....redigentur in
 purgamenta stupae, quae levi vorantur incendio'.

a. C. divinis.

it and he thought it necessary to mention Symmachus as a supporter of what he gives as the Hebrew version, which indeed it is: $\eta' \eta?$

$\eta' \eta?$ $\eta' \eta?$.¹

Another reason why it is doubtful whether Andrew consulted either the Hebrew text itself, or a Jewish scholar is the fact that he does not mention that the Hebrew has not opus vestrum as the Vulgate, but $\eta' \eta?$ -his maker, the artifex of idols, or the workmen, as Ibn Ezra explains;² while Rashi explicitly disagrees with Jonathan, who translated the word as 'work'.³

The discussion of Andrew's remarks on the Hebrew text or Jewish interpretation has brought to light several interesting points. First of all, there are very few references which cannot be traced back to sources other than Jewish ones, for example in verse 2:

'....sed consuetudinem fuisse Hebreis in pangendis inter Dominum et populum federibus....maxima hec elementa et firmioris materie quedam inanimata vel ad audiendum, vel ad testificandum invitare'.⁴

and in verse 18:

'....Peccata omnium, si vera est Iudeorum traditio, in candidissima scripta servantur materia, ut facile iudicis appareant oculis'.⁵

Many explanations, we concluded, were likely to be derived from Christian sources, for example in the prologue:

'Quod nobilis et de regia stirpe oriundus fuerit, filia eius, si vera est Iudeorum traditio, regi Manasse....conubio iuncta....'.⁶

1. Ibn Ezra remarks here: $\eta' \eta?$ Tow. That which is shaken off from the flax'. Comm. on Is., p. 13.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm. in Is., p. 13.

3. Rashi, Comm. in Is., p. 16.

4. Cf. above pp. 117 ff.

5. Cf. Study, p. 389. See above p. 136.

6. Cf. above p. 107.

7. Cf. above p. 131.

8. Cf. above p. 131.

9. Cf. above p. 131.

in verse 1:

'....Amos vero patrem Ysaie prophetam
fuisse Hebreorum habet traditio....'.¹

and in verses 13 and 14:

'....Neomenia est festum quod fit ab Hebreis
nova apparente, vel accensa a sole luna....
Kalendas etc. Vel uno vel duobus diebus in
singulorum initiis mensum festa celebrant
Hebrei....'.²

We noticed that some interpretations corresponded more or less
with those of Rashi, for example in verse 4: 'Ve genti peccatrici....',³
and in verse 22: 'Vinum tuum mixtum est....',⁴ but there was no reason
to assume any direct influence of Rashi on Andrew.

Secondly, as in his commentary on Exodus, many allusions to the
Hebrei turned out to be notes on the peculiarities of the Hebrew language,
rather than exegetical comments. For example in verse 1:

'Hebraicorum consuetudo est in tutilis, quos suis
prescribunt operibus verbum substantivum cum
pronomine demonstrativo subintelligendum relinquere....'.⁵

in verse 8:

'....Quodam genere locutionis apud Hebreos filius
et filia in constructionibus ponitur, ubi ad sensum
nihil operatur'.⁶

in verse 9:

'....quasi Gomorra similes....'Frequenter tam apud
nos quam apud Hebreos huiusmodi superfluitates
reperiri solent'.⁷

and in verse 12:

'....More Hebraico futurum indicativi pro presenti
imperativi et coniunctivi posuit'.⁸

1. Cf. above, p. 115 Cf.

2. Cf. above p. 134 f.

3. Cf. above p. 130 f.

4. Cf. above p. 136.

5. Cf. above p. 113 f.

6. Cf. above p. 131.

7. Cf. above p. 131 f.

8. Cf. above p. 133 f.

These observations are of the same character as those in his commentary on Exodus and do not throw any new light on Andrew's knowledge of the Hebrew language.

Thirdly, as far as the references to the Hebrew text are concerned, these were often found to be ^{at} second hand and they gave the impression that Andrew did not check them with the Hebrew original. For example in verse 12:

'....In Hebreo planius: calcare atrium meum non apponetis....'¹, (from Jerome).

in verse 14:

'....In Hebreo: facti estis mihi in satietatem, nequaquam dimittam peccata vestra, huius littera expositione non indiget'² (from Jerome).

in verse 22:

'Vinum tuum mixtum est....Huic sententiae consonat alia translatio, que congruit Hebraice veritati'³ (from Jerome).

and in verse 31:

'....Vel fortitudinem et opus eorum[que] comparat purgamento stuppe, ut habetur in Hebreo et Symmachus transtulit....'⁴ (from Jerome).

At times he seems to indicate that he finds the Hebrew version more readily understandable than the Latin, for example in verse 12 and verse

14. There is no immediate influence of Jewish exposition in these cases either.

V

Summarizing we can say that Andrew in the first chapter of his commentary on Isaiah approaches his task full of enthusiasm. He makes a rather frequent use of the pagan authors, his style is to the point

1. Cf. above p. 133f.

2. Cf. above p. 135.

3. Cf. above p. 136f.

4. Cf. above p. 137f.

CHAPTER V

and businesslike. He explains only what needs explaining, and he takes great care to make things as clear as possible, if necessary by referring to examples taken from everyday life. He furthermore illustrates his work with references to Jewish interpretation or the Hebrew text; but these were not always thought to come directly from a Jewish source. His work bears the mark of great independence; his attitude towards it is scholarly and, to a certain extent, disengaged. We shall notice that this changes in the course of his commentary. The references to Jewish exegesis become more frequent and those to the pagan classics rather less. Andrew himself gets more and more involved in the work as he goes on and the commentary acquires a more personal character. He relies less and less on Jerome for his references to the Hebrew text and often disagrees with the latter's interpretations. This gradual change in attitude becomes particularly obvious in his comments from chapter xl onwards, but it can already be noticed in his sign Achan is required to ask (vs. 11) should be seen entirely in the interpretation of the chapters vii to xi. We shall now turn to some of these last mentioned chapters, paying special attention in our investigation to Andrew's allusions to Jewish exposition.

son of Benaliah, the king of Israel. He then explains verse 14 as follows:

'Propter hoc. In Hebreo certe, quod^a planius. Certissime sciatis quia Dominus ipse, non idola, dabit vocis signum. Ecce virgo concipiat et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen eius Emmanuel. Hanc de conceptione et nativitate vestri salvatoris et integritate et virginitate matris eius semper virginis apertissimas prophetias prout iustas est cuius de factis scripturis. Insurgentes in eis dicitur veritatis insidiis, cavillationis ariete firmissime fidei vestrae vocis labefactare conantur. Primum dicitur

a. C. quia.

1. Richard of St. Victor, *De Emmanuele* (P.L. 196), pp. 100-101.
 2. Cf. below Appendix I, pp. 279-87, where the text of 12.11 is discussed.
 3. P. 140 (45d). Andrew quotes here from Cicero, *De Officiis* 1.12.
 4. Pp. 15a-d (49a-c).

CHAPTER V

Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium (Is.vii.14).

I

We shall attempt a somewhat different treatment of Andrew's exposition of Isaiah vii, concentrating on his explanation of verse 14. The explanation of this particular verse was apparently considered his most daring judaizing interpretation, since it led Richard of St. Victor to attack Andrew in his De Emmanuele.¹

The first part of the chapter is dealt with by Andrew in his usual manner.² He expands the historical sense with an occasional reference to the Hebrew or a Jewish tradition; sometimes he quotes Jerome, sometimes the pagan classics, as for example in verse 4 on the distinctions between different kinds of fear.³ He points out that the sign Achaz is required to ask (vs. 11) should be seen entirely in its historical context, namely as an assurance that Judah has nothing to fear from the alliance between Rezin, the king of Syria and Pekah the son of Remaliah, the king of Israel. He then explains verse 14 as follows:⁴

'Propter hoc. In Hebreo certe, quod^a planius. Certissime sciatis quia Dominus ipse, non idola, dabit vobis signum. Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen eius Emmanuel. Hanc de conceptione et nativitate nostri salvatoris et integritate et virginitate matris eius semper virginis apertissimam prophetiam prout iustum est cum de ipsis exponimus. Insurgentes in nos Iudei, veritatis inimici, cavillationis ariete firmissimum fidei nostre murum labefactare conantur. Primo dicunt

a. C. quia.

1. Richard of St. Victor, De Emmanuele (P.L. 196). Cf. below p. 145.

2. Cf. below Appendix I, pp. 279-82, where the text of Is.vii.1-13 is printed.

3. Fo. 14c (48d). Andrew quotes here from Cicero, Tusculanae Disputationes, iv. 8, 19.

4. Fo. 15a-d (49a-c).

quod in Hebreo non habetur betula, que vox^a virginem, sed alma, que nunc iuvenulam, nunc absconditam significat. A quibus cum opponentis querimus quomodo future liberationis signum esse possit quod iunioris etatis femina vel abscondita et secreta concipiat et pariat, cum hoc frequentissime fieri videamus, respondent dicentes in hoc signum erat, quod ea que nondum conceperat in prima ad eam viri accessione conceptura erat et masculum paritura, qui ab ipso populo vel matre Emmanuel nominaretur. ^{qu}Ac si a propheta diceretur:^b O domus David, si videris hanc iuvenulam que nondum concepit in proximo concipere et filium parere, scias hoc tibi signum future liberationis de manu supradictorum regum a Domino datum. Vos autem, inquiunt, qui hoc de virginis vestri Iesu matris conceptione et partu exponitis, respondete quomodo quod post sescentos vel eo amplius factum est annos domui David et Achaz, quod de manu Rasin, tunc regis Syrie et Phacee filius Romelie liberandi essent, signum esse potuit. Quomodo illis signum esse potuit quod nunquam viderunt vel visuri erant? Vos per abruptam, nos per planam incedimus viam, quibuscum tota capituli continentia consonat. Vos tota littere circumstantia reclamante univ^{er}siculo adheretis. Quod, ut melius pateat, ab exordio usque ad finem totum prosequamur capitulum. Mandavit Dominus per prophetam Achaz quod signum peteret, per quod certus esse posset quod non oporteret eum timere a duabus caudis titutionum fumigantium. Quo signum petere nolente, convertit se propheta ad populum, qui dicit ipsum Dominum signum esse daturum, ipsumque signum^c statim supponit, dicens: Ecce virgo concipiet etc. Subiungit et cibum ipsius pueri ex virgine concepti et nati et causam quare tali cibo utatur. Post hec interponitur de adventu Assyriorum in terra Iuda et quid in ea facturi sint. Ad extremum post enumerationem eorum que vaetitatem sequuntur, imperat Dominus prophete ut in grandi libro plane et legibiliter scribat nascituri de iuvenula vel abscondita pueri nomina duo hec 'velociter spolia detrahe', 'cito predari'. Et ne qua fraus vel dolus subesse putaretur, vel ne alio quam ad prophetissam, Ysaie videlicet uxorem et filium ex ea natum, quod de virgine, vel potius iuvenula paritura dicitur inverteretur,^e adhibuit et duos cui bene deberet credi testes et sub his testibus ad prophetissam maritali officio accessit et concepit et peperit, cuius nomen Domino precipiente sicut subiungitur appellat, causamque quare sic debeat appellari supponit. Ecce, inquiunt, omnia rationabiliter

a. C. nos.

b. C. om. Ac...diceretur.

c. C. om. Quomodo...potuit.

d. C. om. signum. tus : C. alter naturalem vite fines sortitus.

e. C. diverteretur.

f. 1. Is. viii. 1-4.

g. C. vobis.

1. iv Reg. xvi. 9.

2. iv Reg. xv. 30.

*sciat patrem suum et matrem vocare,
Damascus et Samaria ab Assyriis destruenda

procedunt, omnia que promittuntur fiunt. Promittitur iuvenula que nondum conceperat in signum paritura filium. Adhibentur testes duo fideles, qui visu et auditu prophetissam ad quam Ysaïas accessit adolescentulam esse dinoscere et ex ea viri ad illam accessione concepisse, cum tempus pariendi advenerit certissime scire valerent. Si dubitatis de iuvenula, fideles fidem facient testes. Predicitur conceptura concepit, paritura filium peperit et masculum; cibos comedit quos commesturus fuit predictus. Ecce datum est signum quod se daturum promisit Dominus. Numquid non res signum secuta est? In diebus infantie filii virginis vel iuvenule duo reges a quorum facie Iuda trepidabat, alter ab Assyriis interfectus,¹ alter ab Osee filii Ela trucidatus^{a,2} occubuerunt. Ecce signum precessit, secuta est res. Liberatus est Iuda a metu propter quem tollendum datum est signum. Vestre autem virginis partus nec signum fuit quibus tollendus erat metus, sed nec esse potuit. Nec res propter quam signum datum est secuta est, sed quingentis et eo amplius annis signum quod vos ponitis precessit. Explicate, si potestis, quomodo Ysaïas propheta sub notis et nominatis testibus ad prophetissam accesserit, ex qua accessione ipsa concepit et filium peperit, quem Dominus iccirco vocare iusserit 'accelera spolia detrahe', 'festina predari', quod in diebus infantie eius a regibus Assyriorum tollenda esset fortitudo Damasci, ubi^b regnabat Rasin et spolia Samarie, ubi sceptrum gerebat Phacee filius Romelie. Apertissime loquitur sacra Scriptura Dominum qui mentire non potest dicere, quod antequam puer quem prophetissa peperit Ysaïe^c sint. Si virginem vestram^c huius pueri matrem dixeritis, consequenter et Ysaïam eius patrem esse dicere vos oportebit. Si statim post natum Ysaïe de prophetissa filium, mortuis duobus regibus, Iuda a metu quem illi incutiebant liberatus est, cuius rei gratia signum dabatur, luce clarius elucet quia eiusdem pueri matris et conceptus et partus predictæ liberationis signum fuerit.

Hec sunt que in nos tela iaciunt Iudei, sacrarum nos litterarum depravatores et violentos distortores appellantes. Quibus ut respondeamus nec opus est, cum alii hoc ante nos fecerint, sed an sufficienter responsum sit, ipsi qui responderunt viderint, nec utile ne, si forte anceps certamen imparibus ineuntes viribus succumbamus, non nobis^d solis, sed et illis quorum acutissimi vivacitate ingenii, si cum eis congressi fuissent facile superarentur, victores insultent. Nos itaque nostris viribus emensis fortiora fortioribus liquentes, ceptam literalis sensus

a. alter....trucidatus : C. alter naturalem vite finem sortitus.

b. C. ut.

c. C. nostram.

d. C. vobis.

1. iv Reg. xvi.9.

2. iv Reg. xv.30.

*sciat patrem suum et matrem vocare,
Damascus et Samaria ab Assyriis destruende

explanationem exequeamur. Dabit. Gratuita voluntate sua, non vestris^a perversorum et incredulorum meritis. Signum. Facturus est Dominus quiddam vobisque in signum daturus, quod cum videritis significabit vobis quod a metu predictorum regum liberabimini. Ecce^b virgo concipiet etc. Iuencule vel abscondite partus et conceptus, quando eum videritis, significabit vobis quod a predicto metu liberabimini. Et vocabis. Vel^c tu domus Iuda, vel que concepisti. Emmanuel. Ideo tali nomine vel domo Iuda vel matre vocante puer nominabitur, quia Deum propitium et adiutorem sibi futurum intelligent, cum puerum quem sibi in signum se daturum promisit, iam natum perspexerint. Vel quia in diebus nativitatis eius iam illis Dominus benefacere ceperat.'

'I have found much in Andrew's commentary on Isaiah', wrote Richard of St. Victor,

'which is not only rather carelessly expressed, but also unorthodox. In many places he puts forward the Jewish point of view, not only as a matter of interest though, but as if it was correct and true. In Isaiah vii.14, for example, he mentions the Jewish objections and questions and seems to suggest that they are right, as he leaves them as insoluble. And even nowadays some of his pupils do not explain the verse of the Blessed Virgin, but of the wife of the prophet. Therefore, in order to prevent this happening again, I wrote the following treatise in which the above mentioned objections have been refuted.'¹

Certainly Richard was not the first theologian to reach for his pen with the intention of writing an apologetic or polemic exposition of this passage. In fact the exegesis of Is. vii.14 has been one of the main points of controversy between Jewish and Christian commentators since the beginning of the Christian era. The vital word in this controversy is the Hebrew תולדה, translated by the Septuagint as παρθένος, by the Latin translators as adolescentula,² and by Jerome as virgo.³ The latter became the generally accepted Latin version.

a. C. nostris.

b. C. om. partus.

c. C. om. vel.

1. De Emmanuele, Prologus (P.L.196,602).

2. Jerome, Comm.in Es., iii (C.C.S.L.73, p. 103, 1.22): '...omnes adolescentulam transtulerunt'.

3. Ibid., pp. 102,103 passim.

It should be noted that the Hebrew $\eta \eta \zeta \zeta$ has several nuances: it can mean a young girl (puella), or a young woman (adolescentula), either with or without the connotation of a virgin.¹

The importance the Christian exegetes attached to the 'right' interpretation of this text, one of the main messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, is only too obvious. However, we need not recall its long exegetical history here. What we are concerned with is the part it played in the disputes between Jews and Christians throughout the centuries and particularly in the Middle Ages. Again, it is beyond our capacity and purpose to investigate this in great detail, but Andrew's interpretation of the verse makes it necessary for us to make some examination of the matter in order to see his explanation in its correct historical light. The works of Dr. Blumenkranz are a useful guide to the sources dealing with our problem, although we do not always agree with the author's interpretation.²

The earliest work which deals exclusively with 'the problem of the Jews', is Tertullian's tractate Adversus Judaeos. In chapter ix he quotes the Isaiah-text and comments on it along the following lines: the Jews take the prophecy of Isaiah and see if what has been said there can be applied to Christ. And thus they point out that Christ

¹ Cf. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, ed. L. Koehler (Leiden, 1958), p. 709, which gives for $\eta \eta \zeta \zeta$ -marriageable young girl, young woman (until the birth of her first child). Also the New English Bible translates Is.vii.14 as: Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: A young woman is with child, and she will bear a son, and will call him Immanuel.

² B. Blumenkranz, Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme; 'Die jüdischen Beweisgründe im Religionsgespräch mit den Christen in den christlich-lateinischen Sonderschriften des 5. bis 11. Jahrhunderts', Theol. Zeitschr., iv(1948), 119 ff; Die Judenpredigt Augustins. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen in den ersten Jahrhunderten (Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft, xxv, 1946). Cf. also A.L. Williams, Adversus Judaeos (Cambridge, 1935).

was neither called Immanuel, nor performed any warlike deeds. Against this Tertulian argues that Isaiah does not only mention the name Immanuel, but also gives its interpretation 'Nobiscum Deus', which certainly can be said of Christ.¹ Furthermore it is here that we find for the first time the argument that if it is God who gives a sign, it should be something new and unusual, and that therefore the text does not speak of an ordinary girl (iuencula), but of a virgin who is to give birth to a son.²

Jerome's interpretation of the verse in his Commentary on Isaiah and other writings, notably in the De perpetua virginitate beatae Mariae, Adversus Helvidium,³ in Adversus Jovinianum⁴ and in the Hebrew Questions on Genesis,⁵ were of lasting influence on medieval commentators. In his Commentary on Isaiah he begins his interpretation with Tertullian's argument from the novelty of the sign, an argument which was to be repeated over and over again, until eventually it found a place in the Gloss. Then he argues that the most preferable translation of $\eta\theta\upsilon\gamma\gamma$ is virgo:

'....Et revera, ut cum Iudaeis conferamus pedem, et nequaquam contentioso fune praebeamus eis risum nostrae imperitiae, virgo Hebraice bethula appellatur, quae in praesenti loco non scribitur; sed pro hoc verbo positum est alma, quod praeter LXX omnes adolescentulam transtulerunt.⁶ Porro alma apud eos verbum ambiguum est;

-
1. Tertulian, Adversus Iudaeos, ix (C.C.S.L. 2, p. 1364, 1.1).
 2. 'Signum autem a deo, nisi novitas aliqua monstruosa fuisset, signum non videretur. Denique, si quando ad deiciendos aliquos--ad hanc divinam praedicationem vel convertere singulos simplices quosque gestitis--mentire audetis, quasi non virginem, sed iuenculam concepturam et parituram scriptura contineat, hinc quoque revincimini, quod nihil signi videri possit res cottidiana, iuenculae scilicet praegnatus et partus. In signum ergo nobis posita virgo mater merito creditur, infans vero bellator non aequae'. (C.C.S.L.2, p. 1366, 1.53).
 3. De perpetua virginitate beatae Mariae (P.L.23, 183 A ff.).
 4. Adversus Jovinianum (P.L.23, 211 A ff.; cf. in particular Liber i, 254 C,D).
 5. Hebraicae Quaestiones in Libro Geneseos on Gen. xxiv.43 (C.C.S.L. 72, p. 29, l. 7).
 6. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion render here $\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\iota\varsigma$; $\text{LXX}\ \pi\alpha\rho\theta\upsilon\varsigma$.

dicitur enim et adolescentula et abscondita, id est ἀποκρυφος.
 Unde et in titulo psalmi noni, ubi in Hebraeo positum
 est alamoth, ceteri interpretes transtulerunt: pro
 adolescentia, quod LXX interpretati sunt: pro absconditis.¹
 Et in Genesi legimus, ubi Rebecca dicitur alma, Aquilam non
 adolescentulam, nec puellam sed absconditam transtulisse.²
 Sunamitis quoque mulier, amisso filio, cum Elisaei fuisset
 pedibus provoluta et prohiberet eam Giezi, audit a propheta:
Dimitte eam, quia in dolore est, et Dominus abscondit a me.³
 Pro eo quod in latino dicitur: abscondit a me, in Hebraeo
 scriptum est: eelim memmeni. Ergo alma, non solum
 puella vel virgo, sed cum ἐπιτασι virgo abscondita dicitur et
 secreta, quae numquam virorum patuerit aspectibus, sed
 magna parentum diligentia custodita sit. Lingua quoque
 Punica, quae de Hebraeorum fontibus manare dicitur,
 proprie virgo alma appellatur. Et ut risum praebeamus
 Iudaeis, nostro quoque sermone alma sancta dicitur.
 Omniumque paene linguarum verbis utuntur Hebraei....⁴

Jerome's interpretation of אלהים as virgo abscondita became,
 as we shall see, generally accepted among the Christian theologians.
 Like Tertullian's remark on the novelty of the sign, it was finally
 included in the Gloss.

The argument from the novelty of the token occurs again in Isidore's
De fide catholica⁵, an influential work throughout the Middle Ages,
 which was translated into German as early as the eighth century. A
 pupil of Isidore, Ildefons of Toledo, although writing in the seventh
 century directed his tractate De virginitate beatae Mariae⁶ not only
 against the Jews, but also against the fourth century heretics Jovinian

1. Ps.ix.1. Aquila translates νικητοίω; LXX εἰς τὸ τρυφῶν, ὅτι τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑδάτων τῆς ἁγίας.

2. Gen.xxiv.16. V. renders virgo illa; LXX ἡ παρθεῖνος; Aquila ἡ ἀποκρυφος

3. iv Reg.iv.27.

4. Jerome, Comm.in Es., iii (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 103, l.18).

5. Isidore De fide catholica ex veteri et novo testamento contra Judaeos, i.10 (P.L.83, 468 B,C). That Isidore was much concerned with the problem of the Jews and other non-Christians can also be gathered from his Liber de variis quaestionibus adversus Iudaeos seu ceteros infideles, for a long time wrongly attributed to Raban Maur. The work has been edited by P.A.C. Vega and A.E. Anspach, S. Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Liber de Variis Quaestionibus etc. (Scriptores ecclesiastici Hispano-Latini veteris et medii aevi, vi-ix, 1940).

6. San Ildefonso, De virginitate beatae Mariae, ed. V. Blanco (Textos Latinos de la edad media española, seccion 3a, 1937).

and Helvidius, thus following Jerome who previously had attacked their heterodox views concerning the Blessed Virgin.¹ As far as his arguments with the Jews are concerned, Ildefons dealt mainly with two points which were in particular questioned by them, namely whether Christ was indeed the expected Messiah and the factual impossibility of a virgin birth. However, it soon becomes obvious that Ildefons did not attempt an objective discussion of these problems. What strikes one immediately when reading the treatise is the almost naive tone of his writing, which in many respects reminds one of medieval hymns in honour of the Virgin Mary.² The whole work makes the impression of being a confession of his belief, rather than of a systematically planned defense of it. It is full of parallelisms and repetitions, as if the author thought that he could more easily convince by saying the same over and over again. Also, he appears to have kept as closely as possible to the traditional teaching of the Church and to have presented his arguments in a familiar language, in the hope that his readers would more easily remember them, should they have to defend their own faith. For we have to keep in mind that more often than not polemical writings, in particular those of the first millennium, were also intended to be an affirmation of the belief of the Christian reader himself.³

1. Cf. above, p. 147.

2. For example '....Quae neque ante natum neque post natum hunc filium, alterius accessum vel transitum novit, quia solus ipse Dominus per eam nascendo transivit. Unde et semper est clausa, quia semper est virgo'. Op. cit., iii (ed. Blanco, p. 79).

3. Some authors are of the opinion that this type of instruction was the main purpose of Ildefons, e.g. A. Braegelmann, The life and writings of Saint Ildefonsus of Toledo (Cathol. Univ. of Am., Stud. in Med. Hist., New Ser., iv, 1942), p. 120, quoted by B. Blumenkranz, Les auteurs chrétiens latins, p. 112, n.4. A.L. Williams completely denies that the work was directed against Jews (Adversus Judaeos, p. 219). However, one should at least admit the possibility that there were Jews in Ildefons's environment against whose opinions he might have been reacting, although one can hardly speak of a systematically planned attack, as Dr. Blumenkranz appears to do when he writes: 'Tout le long du traité, des objections juives ont été combattues; cette préoccupation se fait encore sentir dans la dernière partie du traité....' (Les auteurs chrétiens latins, p. 116). It is easier to agree with the same author when he says elsewhere: 'Diesem ganzen Ideenbereiche (sc. the problems concerning the virgin birth) in dem die Zweifel der Juden von so manchen Häretikern geteilt wurden, ist die Sonderschrift des Ildefons von Toledo, De virginitate perpetua sanctae Mariae, gewidmet' ('Die jüdischen Beweisgründe', p. 136).

In the eyes of Ildefons, however, much of this belief is beyond argument: 'Sed illud est inaestimabile, illud incomprehensibile, illud inenarrabile....ut virginitas conceptu clarescat....'¹. In his treatment of the actual text, Is.vii.14, he repeats the argument from the novelty of the sign.²

Alvare of Cordova, who lived about two centuries later, mentioned the Isaiah text in an exchange of letters with Eleazar, formerly a Christian and chaplain of Louis the Pious, but at the time of writing recently converted to the Jewish religion. In dealing with the text he relies heavily on Jerome, since he wants to prove that Jerome's translation of the passage in Isaiah is far better than that of the Septuagint, which Eleazar uses.³

Paschasius Radbertus in his Expositio in evangelium Matthaei treats the text in almost identical terms with Jerome's, including his allusion to the Punic language.⁴

Next we come to the account of a disputation which took place

1. Op. cit., ii (ed. Blanco, p. 72).

2. Ibid., iii (ed. Blanco, pp. 75-76).

3. Epistolario de Alvaro de Cordoba, ed. P.J. Madoz (Madrid, 1947), ep. xvi, pp. 226-28.

4. Expositio in evangelium Matthaei, ii.1 (P.L.120, 115C-116A): '....Nam et lingua punica, quae de fontibus Hebraeorum ducitur, proprie vero <virgo> Alma appellatur. Unde, quia Hebraei pene omnium linguarum verbis utuntur, forsitan propheta hoc sibi ascivit in eloquium, ut per hoc figuraretur qualis erat futura, quia Alma in lingua nostra sancta intelligitur'. Cf. above pp. 147, 148. It is amazing that Dr. Blumenkranz fails to realize Paschasius' dependence on Jerome and remarks in his note on the meaning of alma in 'our language': 'Les exégètes chrétiens aiment à découvrir aux termes bibliques en grec, latin ou hébreu, des significations dans leur langues nationales. Paschase Radbert trouve ainsi une signification particulière à l'alma, 'jeune fille', du texte hébreu d'Isaie, vii.14: Puisque les Hébreux se servent de presque toutes les langues, peut-être le prophète en tint-il compte en choissant ce mot, car alma signifie dans 'notre' langue (latine): 'sainte'.' (Les auteurs chrétiens latins, p. 193).

c. 1090 between Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster, - a pupil of Anselm and an anonymous Jew with whom he had become acquainted through business relations and with whom he was now on friendly terms.¹ The Jew, who was educated at Mainz, is described as an experienced controversialist and well read in Christian literature.² Gilbert too, 'with his store of biblical knowledge, with his cool and judicious mind',³ was well suited for a discussion of this kind, which 'by its nature was exegetical rather than speculative'.⁴ The disputation took place in an atmosphere of courteousness and tolerance, and was apparently intended as a scholarly exercise. The popularity it enjoyed can be guessed from the large number of still existing manuscripts of the treatise; while it is interesting to note that at a later date (c.1125), when the relations between Jews and Christians were deteriorating, an adaptation of the disputation came into circulation, in which the Christian and not the Jew became the interrogator and in which much of its original broadmindedness has disappeared.⁵ A new edition of the text has been published recently by Dr. Blumenkranz,⁶ who, like most scholars, assumes that the treatise is a more or less faithful recording of an actual historical discussion. 'Nous avons ici une espèce de "procès-verbal" d'une discussion réelle', he remarks in Les auteurs

1. For the dating of the dispute, see R.W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster', Med. and Renais.Stud., iii (1954), 81.

2. 'Nescio unde ortus, sed apud Maguntiam litteris educatus, legis et litterarum etiam nostrarum bene sciens erat, et exercitatum in scripturis atque disputationibus contra nos habet ingenium'. Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio (ed. Blumenkranz, p. 27. On this edition see n. 6 below).

3. R.W. Southern, op. cit., p. 82.

4. Ibid., p. 80.

5. Dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum de fide catholica (P.L. 163, 1045), cf. B. Blumenkranz, Les auteurs chretiens latins, p. 287.

6. id. Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Iudei et Christiani (Strom. Patr. et Med., iii, 1956).

chrétiens-latins.¹ Mr. Werblowsky, however, in a review of Dr. Blumenkranz's edition disputes the authenticity of the discussion in its present form. To him 'it seems extremely unlikely that an actual discussion would have exhausted itself in listening and replying to Jewish objections against Christianity. The fact that the Jew's brief arguments send the abbot off on long expositions of his faith suggests the contrary: the Jew is a stage-hand, enabling Crispin to develop his views in a dialectical viva voce...it is a necessary part of the technique of fides querens intellectum'.² Also, according to Mr. Werblowsky, the Jew's knowledge of Christian literature is too good to be true: he does not only quote from the New Testament, but even from the Roman missal. In spite of all this, Mr. Werblowsky does not want to dismiss the dispute as pure fiction, but allows for some actual discussions Gilbert had with a Jew as the original incentive for the composition of the work. It is, however, difficult to accept all of Mr. Werblowsky's arguments: One would expect of a Jew who is described as an experienced controversialist a fairly thorough knowledge of at least some aspects of Christian writings, in particular of the New Testament;³ His quotations from the Roman missal are in any case rather superficial, and one can well imagine that a tolerant and courteous person like Gilbert, who seems to have suggested the debate in the first place, might have taken some pleasure in quietly listening to the objections of his Jewish partner against the Christian faith and in replying to them as well as he could. On the other hand,

1. p. 279.

2. R.J.Z. Werblowsky, 'Crispin's Disputation', J.J.S., xi (1960), 70.

3. In a previous chapter we have alluded to Jacob ben Reuben's knowledge of Christian authors and doctrine. He was able to quote from Jerome, Augustine and Gregory. Cf. above p. 27.

it seems that one has to allow for a larger amount of Gilbert's editing standing between us and the original disputation than Dr. Blumenkranz realised, in accordance with Professor Southern's opinion that the treatise took several years to complete.¹

This is what Gilbert's Jew says about our Isaiah text:

'Nam illud Isaie vaticinium, quod ad vestrum accipiendo sensum male omnino depravatis: Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium, et vocabitur nomen eius Emmanuel, hoc est: nobiscum deus, quid ad rem, unde agimus? Non iam ab homine inquit corrupta, sed viro nupta, virgo adhuc existens, concipiet et pariet filium. Animo libenti accipimus de Christo dictum: Et vocabitur nomen eius nobiscum deus, hoc est, tante dignitatis tanteque gratie erit apud deum, ut in eo et per eum dominus, id est domini virtus sit nobiscum.... Propheta igitur, rem sacre commemorans et nascituri Christi eminentiam prenuncians, nichil de eo absurdum, nichil de eo contra naturam dixit futurum.... Propheta dixit: Concepit et filium peperit. Vos ex sensu conicitis et commentatum usque quaque divulgatis: 'Et post partum virgo permansit'. Nusquam id a propheta dictum accipitis².... Nam et illud, quod universi vos christiani ore tam securo adversum nos profertis: Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium, Isaias non dixit, non scripsit, sed tantum: Ecce, inquit, abscondita concupiet et pariet filium. Tamen, si hoc ipsum dixisset Isaias, quod dicitis: Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium, non tamen addidit, quod vestra ex parte additis, quod virgo in conceptu et mansit et post partum virgo permansit. Hec nec Isaias, nec ullus alius propheta.³

Gilbert answers with very much the usual arguments, pointing out that the prophecy only makes sense if taken spiritually:

'Illud denique quod negatis esse scriptum in Isaia: Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium, LXX vestri interpretes, fide et scientia approbati testes, ita interpretati sunt, et ita interpretari propheta ipse voluit dicendo et scribendo: Ecce abscondita, sicut dicitis, concipiet et pariet filium. Nam, si communi sensu absconditam, id est domi reclusam,

1. Op. cit., p.81, '....it took a considerable time to complete and may have occupied Gilbert's mind for several years'. See further on the problem of the authenticity of these dialogues B. Blumenkranz, 'Anti-Jewish polemics and legislation in the Middle Ages: literary fiction or reality?', J.J.S., xv (1964), 125-140. The author does not reply to Mr. Werblowsky's arguments here.

2. Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio (ed. Blumenkranz, p.44).

3. Ibid., p.55.

intellexit et nil aliud, quid mirum, quid novum in eo conceptu, et cuius mysterii signum conceptum illum esse voluit? Propter hoc, inquit, dabit dominus ipse vobis signum. Ecce abscondita concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen eius Emmanuel.... Omnia ergo hec, nisi ad figuram et spirituali atque mystico sensu dicta accipiuntur, puerili omnino sensu et inani dicta esse a propheta considerantur. Quod quia credi et dici absurdum est, abscondita, id est ab amore viri et omni contagione peccati conservata concepit, sicut angelus ad virginem respondit: Quomodo, inquit illa, fiet istud, quoniam virum non cognosco? Et respondens angelus dixit illi: Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi. Umbran, inquit, faciet tibi ab omni abscondendo fervore libidinis. Propterea, quod nascetur ex te sanctum, vocabitur filius dei.^{1.2}

The Jew agrees with Gilbert that we have here to do with a messianic prophecy, thus going a very long way indeed with his opponent. He even agrees with him that the woman had not yet known a man at the time when Isaiah predicted the birth of the child; but what he finds impossible to accept is the Christian view that during conception and after childbirth the woman would still remain untouched. This Isaiah, nor any other prophet could never have said. It is the merit of Mr. Werblowsky to have called our attention to the fact that it is here the Jew who puts forward the interpretation of הבִּטּוּלָה as abscondita, which was, as we have seen, normally used as an argument on the Christian side for the interpretation of virgo, while the Jews preferred the more neutral iuencula.³ However, Mr. Werblowsky is most probably right when he remarks that it is almost impossible not to see the hand of the editor at this particular point: however

1. Lk. i. 34, 35.

2. Op. cit. p. 59.

3. R.J.Z. Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 73. The author points here to Jerome's incorrect etymology of הבִּטּוּלָה, as if it was derived from בִּטּוּלָה - to hide, instead of from בִּטּוּלָה - to be (sexually) mature. However, Jerome thought himself in good company, as he had found this etymology both in the Septuagint and in Aquila (cf. above p. 148). We need not feel therefore quite as sorry for him as Mr. Werblowsky does when he says: '....poor Jerome, harassed by his Jewish interlocutors, is driven to adopt 'almah=abscondita as a Christian etymology, which would explain why Scripture preferred 'almah to bethulah when referring to the most perfect kind of virginity'.

willing a Jew might be to understand the Christian interpretation of this text, it seems unlikely that he would have claimed that the prophet meant here abscondita, rather than iuuencula, even if the argument was not in the first place about the translation of נבט, but about the impossibility of the virginity of the woman post partum.¹

Finally the discussion of Jacob ben Reuben with a Christian priest should be mentioned.² Although this debate took place too late (c.1170) to influence Andrew's ideas, it is an interesting example of a Jewish recording of such a disputation. Besides, several of the arguments mentioned here in the discussion of Is.vii.14 are also put forward by the Jews Andrew came in contact with, which indicates that they were apparently commonly used by Jewish controversialists. Since we shall refer to these points in our discussion of Andrew's interpretation of the passage, they do not need to be mentioned here separately.

II

Having surveyed the various interpretations of Isaiah vii.14 as used in the controversy between Jews and Christians up to and including Andrew's time, we can now turn to his own explanation of the text.³ He begins by referring to the messianic contents of the verse, calling it a most manifest prophecy of the conception and birth of our Saviour, and of the integrity and virginity of his mother. However, he does not dwell long on the traditional exposition, but turns immediately to the interpretation of the perfidii Iudei, those 'enemies of the truth'. At first he gives the impression of being indignant at their ideas and he

1. Ibid., p. 73. Cf. also p. 74.

2. Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite, Milhamoth Adonai (cf. above p. 27).

3. Cf. above pp. 142-145.

argues against them, but this attitude changes rapidly, and in the end he seems completely captured by their point of view.

The first Jewish objection he mentions is that the Hebrew does not use the word bethula, of which virgo would have been the proper translation, but alma which, as they say themselves, can mean both iuuencula and abscondita. We have here the same situation as in Gilbert's dialogue, namely that a Jew interprets הַבְּתוּלָה as abscondita, using it as an argument against its laden interpretation as virgo. Andrew apparently preferred this interpretation and refers frequently to alma in this sense.

It seems that the Jewish commentators of his day commonly understood הַבְּתוּלָה as a young (married) woman. Rashi, for example, comments on verse 14: 'Look an הַבְּתוּלָה, that is my (sc. Isaiah's) wife shall conceive....'¹. In a note of the editor we read that הַבְּתוּלָה according to the Rabbis means a wife, but always a young wife. In this context he mentions the commentary of a later exegete Isaac Abravanel (d. 1508) ad loc., who referred to Proverbs xxx.19, the way of a man with a maid, to confirm this opinion, since it says in verse 20, such is the way of an adulterous woman.² Jacob ben Reuben refers to the same passage in his Milhamoth Adonai, but quotes verse 18, I know not, as proof that הַבְּתוּלָה means a young woman.³ Ibn Ezra deals with the word in the same way as Jacob ben Reuben:

'We know that a male child is called בֶּן, a female child בַּת or הַבְּתוּלָה - the feminine of בֶּן, whether she be a virgin or not; for הַבְּתוּלָה signifies a person of a certain age, like the masculine בֶּן; and in הַבְּתוּלָה בֶּן גֵּרָם הַיָּמָּה the way of a man with a young woman (Prov.xxx.19) הַבְּתוּלָה is certainly not a virgin; because at the beginning of that passage it is said, which I know not (vs.18)'.⁴

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p. 54.

2. Ibid., n. 31.

3. Milhamoth Adonai, v. 4

(ed. Rosenthal, p. 87).

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is. p. 42.

The fact that the only two places where we have noted a Jew translating אֶבְרָתָא as abscondita are in the works of Christian scholars quoting Jewish opinions makes one think that either they themselves suggested this possibility to their Jewish opponents, or that they mistook it for a correct interpretation and put it in the mouth of the Jews, without the latter having actually used it in that sense. Perhaps it was no more than wishful thinking!

Returning to Andrew, he brings against the Jewish objection the usual question: how can such an ordinary event be taken for a sign for Ahaz of the future liberation from the threat formed by the alliance between Rezin and Pekah? To this the Jew answers that the quality of a sign could be seen in the circumstance that the young woman would conceive the first time the man knew her. Secondly that she would give birth to a son, and lastly that she would call him Immanuel.

Of this Jewish argument there are several variations. The Gaon for example, according to Ibn Ezra, said that the sign consisted in the child being a male child;¹ but he himself is 'of the opinion that the sign is that the child was to eat butter and honey; for it is not usual for children to eat these things immediately after their birth'.² Rashi sees the sign in that a young woman who never had prophesied before, became filled with a prophetic or holy spirit and could predict the helpful presence of the Lord, which she expressed in the name she was going to give to the child.³ Others, according to him, look for a sign in the fact that the woman was a virgin and was not

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 42.

2. Ibid., p. 42.

3. This proved that the woman was really a prophetess, according to Rashi, and thus it could be said of her in Is.viii.3 And I went unto the prophetess. Comm. on Is., p. 54.

able to have children.¹

The next thing the Jew asks is how an event, which according to the Christian interpretation was to take place 600 years later, could have been for the house of David and Ahaz a sign of their liberation from the hands of Rezin and Pekah? Then he says something which must have made a deep impression on Andrew: 'You, he reproaches the Christian interpreters, do not pay any attention to the context. While everything cries out against it, you cling to one single little verse'. In order to illustrate this he proceeds by giving a summary of the Jewish interpretation of the whole of Isaiah's prophecy.

The argument of the distance in time between the prophecy of Isaiah and its fulfilment according to the Christian interpretation occurs likewise in Ibn Ezra's commentary. He writes in the course of his explanation of verse 14:

'....It is to me a matter of surprise that there are those who say that the prophet here refers to Jesus, since the sign was given to Ahaz, and Jesus was born many years afterwards; besides, the prophet says: For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and to choose the good, the land shall be forsaken;² but the countries of Ephraim and Syria were wasted in the sixth year of Hezekiah, and it is distinctly said of whose two kings etc.'³

Also Jacob ben Reuben uses this argument:

'If this Immanuel is your Messiah, he must have been born in the days of Ahaz, as it is written, For before the child shall know how to refuse evil and to choose good, the land whose two kings you abhor shall be forsaken. And those two kings are Rezin and Pekah, the son of Remaliah.... And everyone knows that your Messiah was not born earlier than at the end of the second Temple, a gap of several hundred years. And there is nothing that you can say to this'.⁴

1. Ibid., p. 55.

2. Is.vii.16.

3. Comm.on Is., p. 41. Ibn Ezra refers here to the end of verse 16, where it is indicated that the land of both Rezin and Pekah will be forsaken by that time.'

4. Milhamoth Adonai, v. 4 (ed. Rosenthal, pp. 87-88).

The objection raised by the Jews to the Christians' neglect of the context of the prophecy seemed valid to Andrew. He therefore reproduces their complete argument without a word of criticism. It must have reminded him of his own principle that a text should always be explained within its context and in the light of the historical information which can be found there.¹ It appears that the Jew combines in his interpretation the chapters vii and viii. It all proceeds in a logical manner, he claims; everything that has been promised comes true. It is predicted that a young woman, the wife of Isaiah, who had never conceived before, will conceive of a son. Isaiah writes in a large book its two names, 'Hasten to take the spoils away' and 'Make haste to take away the prey', thus indicating that during the youth of the child the riches of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria will be taken away.² And indeed, the woman conceived and gave birth to a son, who ate the type of food he was predicted to eat. Besides, before the boy could say 'father' or 'mother' Pekah was beaten and killed by Hoshea, and Rezin conquered by the Assyrians. Thus you see, the sign was given and the event followed. The Jew keeps on repeating

1. Cf. above, p. 13.

2. According to some interpreters, for example Ibn Ezra, the name refers to a different child of the prophet. '....each of the three sons received a name that contained some hint at future events; Immanuel implied that God would help them and be with them during the troubles caused by the two kings: Maher Shalal (Is.viii.3), that the time for the exile of Samaria had arrived; Shear Yashub (Is.vii.3), that the remnant of Israel would repent.' (Comm.on Is. pp. 41-42). Rashi, on the other hand, argues against this opinion in his explanation of Is.viii.3. 'This is the same son, whom the prophetess called Immanuel, he remarks, for whereas the Lord will help Hezekiah when he shall reign, it cannot be said that this is another son of the prophet. For we have said that this prophecy (sc.Is.vii.14) took place in the fourth year of Ahaz and that in that same year of Ahaz Pekah was killed. Thus, how could it be that in one year two children would be born, the one after the other?'. (Comm.on Is., p. 59).

this motto as a challenge to the Christians. It is also the main argument against which Andrew confesses his inability - or his unwillingness? - to reply.

After this extensive account of the Jewish interpretation of Isaiah's prophecy, Andrew resumes his own explanation of the literal sense of the passage, in which he mentions briefly that the predicted birth of the child of the iuuencula, or abscondita, will be a guarantee for the people of Judah that they will certainly be liberated from the fear for the kings of Samaria and Syria.

III

We may assume that when Andrew came to the interpretation of Is.vii.14 he found himself for the first time in a real impasse. Thus far he had inserted in his commentaries Jewish explanations and traditions which could roughly be characterized as 'interesting'. In the case of the prophecies of Isaiah in this and later chapters, however, a Jewish interpretation would be of a totally different quality: at worst, it would rob the prophecies of their messianic-christological character; at best limit their scope as referring to Jewish-messianic expectations only. The interpretation of these passages raised, of course, the whole question whether the Old Testament prophecies were addressed to the Jews or to the Christians, who alone would be able to understand them. Apparently Andrew found much in the explanation of the Jews that attracted him, like the stress on the historical course of events in which sign and token followed each other in a short period of time, and the straightforwardness of their interpretation, which excluded every reference to a supernatural event. On the other hand, as has already previously been alluded to, Andrew was not a spiritual anarchist who had set his mind on destroying the dogmas of the Church, but rather someone who had trained himself in

separating his scholarly activities from his duties as a churchman.¹ Therefore we must believe in the sincerity of the first words of his interpretation, which explain the prophecy as referring to the birth of Christ. Of this he was firmly convinced, no matter how the Jews explained. That he, all the same, pays such an unnecessary, as it would seem, attention to their point of view could be explained as follows. First of all, the interpretation of Is.vii.14 had always been a controversial point between Jews and Christians; therefore it is hardly surprising that Andrew and his Jewish informants dwelled on it longer than usual. Secondly, during these discussions he heard much what was entirely in line with his own ideas on the literal interpretation of the text. This was precisely what encouraged him to record the Jewish exposition in such great detail, and what made him reluctant to refute their arguments; since that would have seem to him like undermining the very principles upon which he was building his own work. Lastly, Andrew, apparently, did not regard it necessary for every one to accept the Jewish interpretation and looked upon the section concerned more or less as a digression, as can be gathered from his words: 'Nos itaque....ceptam literalis sensus explanationem exequamur'.²

Andrew was not a great dialectical thinker who pondered deeply over the consequences of inserting in his commentaries Jewish explanations of texts normally regarded as referring to Christ. He

1. Cf. above p. 14, n. 3 and p. 106. That Andrew introduces the interpretation of the Jews in the manner he does, calling them distorters of the truth and such like things, should be seen against the background of his circumstances and position. He might have thought it the only way of passing the censorship of the Church. Not very sincere, but understandable perhaps. In any case, it is extremely rare for him to do this kind of thing. (Cf. below ad Is.xi.10 (p. 170f.) and Is.xl.1 (p. 213)).

2. Fo. 15d (49c).

realized that they presented a problem, as we can guess from his wording, but he did not consider one explanation to be exclusive of the other. What he wanted to show was that the Jewish interpretation often seemed more in accordance with the letter of the text and therefore more acceptable in a literal explanation of the Old Testament, without, in so doing, necessarily denying its references to Christ.

CHAPTER VI

Isaiah xi, a twofold explanation.

I

Andrew's comments on Isaiah xi provide another example of how he tried to follow the Jewish exegesis as closely as possible without coming into conflict with the authority of the Church. The most notable feature of his treatment of this chapter is the twofold explanation he gives of the verses 9 to 16. We shall follow his interpretation more or less verse by verse.

1. Et egredietur virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice eius ascendet. Duarum tribuum spe bona iacentes animos erexit et de gravi desperationis somno suscitavit incumbentes, capiti eorum periculi promittens evasionem et imminentis inimici subversionem; decem tribus, de quarum restitutione in proximo nichil penitus dixerat, in presenti capitulo non modicum confortat. Promittit namque tam illis quam duabus tribubus quod sicut virgula et flos de radice stirpis egreditur, de Iesse filius sit egressurus, qui septiformi spiritu repletus, in iustitia et equitate servos^a suos iudicaturus sit et arguiturus. Alienos vero et terrena Deo postposito amantes virga oris sui percussurus et ipsum excellenter impium, Antichristum videlicet, omnium caput impiorum, spiritu labiorum suorum interfectorus. Quanta pax et tranquillitas inter inimica etiam animantia, quanta Domini misericordia super Israel et Iudam in eos, in unum a quatuor plagis terre convocandos et conciliandos,^b in diebus illius qui de Iesse nasciturus est futura, paucis explicat. Canticum etiam quod transito flumine, quod in septem rivis, ut sicco per illud pede populus qui undique vocandus est transeat, Dominus percussurus est, filii Israel cantaturi sunt, supponit.¹

Andrew begins his annotations with an introduction in which he points out that the promises of this chapter refer to the two as well

hands of Beniamin, how could they be of any use to the ten tribes

a. M. om. servos. ^{was carried away in captivity} therefore, they should

b. C. om. conciliandos. ^{peace} 'let' in this context, according to his,

1. Fo. 20c (52d).

1. Cf. below p. 176 ff.

2. Fo. 20c (52d-53a).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comp. 53 Ig., p. 59. On R. Moses Hakohen (flourished c. 1150-60) see S. Poznanski, More B. Samuel Hakohen Ibn Chiquitilla nebel son artilleren Fragmenten seiner Schriften (Berlin, 1895).

as to the ten tribes. It should be noted that he explains the words of the prophet as containing hope for the two tribes in their actual historical situation, namely the destruction of the Assyrian army which was then attacking Jerusalem (Is. xxxvii). At the same time, however, they have a much deeper meaning in that they promise that he who will bring peace and justice to the whole of Israel will be born from the root of Jesse. Note also that Andrew seems to take the prophecies as referring exclusively to the Jewish people. On the figure of the Antichrist mentioned here we shall comment later on.¹ The song of praise he refers to can be found in Isaiah xii.

After this introduction Andrew returns to the explanation of the letter:

id. 'Nunc littere insistamus. Et egredietur virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice eius etc. Ad duas tribus de periculo et mentis anxietate liberandas, que predicta sunt faciet Dominus; ad tam decem vero quam duas in terram suam revocandas et conciliandas et in unum populum redigendas egredietur virga de radice Iesse'.²

Both the historical and the messianic interpretation have support from Jewish commentators. Ibn Ezra, for example, commented:

'The majority of commentators apply this chapter to the Messiah, as if the prophet said, The Assyrian army, which is now attacking Jerusalem, will perish; but besides this partial deliverance, a time of complete redemption will come for Jerusalem. R. Moses Hakohen refers the chapter to Hezekiah, on account of its being the continuation of the prophecy recorded in the previous chapter'.³

Rashi remarked here that if these words of consolation referred only to Hezekiah and his people, namely that they would not fall at the hands of Sennacherib, how could they be of any use to the ten tribes who had already been carried away in captivity? Therefore, they should be explained of the Messiah. 'Rod' in this context, according to him,

1. Cf. below p. 176 ff.

2. Fo. 20c (52d-53a).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 59. On R. Moses Hakohen (flourished c. 1050-80) see S. Poznanski, Mose B. Samuel Hakohen Ibn Chiquitilla nebst den erhaltenen Fragmenten seiner Schriften (Berlin, 1895).

means the royal staff or sceptre. The verses 1 to 11, he claimed, should be explained as words of consolation for the ten tribes in exile.¹

2. 'Et requiescet super eum spiritus Domini. Super florem qui de radice eius ascendet et super filium qui de Iesse nascetur, requiescet tamquam in propria mansione spiritus Domini. Secundum nos, qui ista de Domino exponimus, spiritus Domini^a Spiritus Sanctus, tertia videlicet in Trinitate persona, accipitur. Secundum Hebreos vero, qui ista de eo quem adhuc expectant Messia exponunt, spiritus Domini speciale donum divinitus inspiratum accipi potest, iuxta quod alias legitur, Auferam de spiritu qui in te est, id est de speciali dono, et dabo etc.² Spiritus sapientie et intellectus etc. Septem specialia dona enumerat, quibus repletus erit secundum eos Messias, quorum primus ponitur sapientie spiritus, id est sapientia a Domino inspirata. Sapientia autem est, ut a veteribus philosophis definitum est, rerum divinarum et humanarum causarumque, quibus he res continentur, scientia.³ Ad hunc modum cetera que sequuntur specialia dona diligens lector exequatur'.⁴

Andrew takes it absolutely for granted that the Christian commentators interpret this chapter of Christ and nowhere disputes the validity of this interpretation. All he wants to do is to show that the Jews explain it in a different way, which happens to be of interest to him.

His point, that according to the Jews the spirit of the Lord, the רוח ה' יהוה, is a special divine gift, is implied in many places in the Old Testament, and was as such known to all students of Scripture. The

reason Andrew makes his remark here is to contrast this Jewish view with the Christian reference to the Trinity and to point out that, according to them, it was one of the seven special gifts with which their Messiah

a. C. om. Secundum.....Domini.

1. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 84. Jerome refers to the Jewish explanation of 'rod' as royal staff: 'Virgam et florem de radice Iesse, ipsum Dominum Iudaei interpretantur, quod scilicet in virga regnantis potentia, in flore pulchritude monstretur....' Comm. in Es., iv (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 147, l. 9).

2. Possibly a reference to Num. xi. 25.

3. Derived indirectly from Lucretius, De rerum natura libri sex, v. 10.

4. Fo. 20c, d (53a).

would be endowed; a tradition, in fact, which ~~could very well be~~ based on this text. The only reference to it I have found is in Ginzberg's Legends, where he alludes to i. Chron.iii.24, And the sons of Elioenai were Hodaiah, and Eliashib, and Felaiah, and Akkub, and Jehanan, and Dalaiah, and Anani, seven.¹ Ginzberg notes here:

'Anani mentioned in i Chron. loc. cit. is said in these sources² to be the name of the Messiah (= "the one from the clouds"; comp. Sanhedrin 98a in reference to Dan.vii.13....)....and 7420 following this name describes the Messiah, "the one endowed with seven (420) divine gifts". Comp. Is.xi.2'.

The insertion of Lucretius' definition of sapientia, quoted almost automatically, without any attempt to relate it closely to the text under consideration, shows again how well versed Andrew was in the tradition of the pagan classics.

3. 'Non secundum visionem oculorum iudicabit. Non secundum quod testes, qui multis de causis a veritate tramite recedunt, se vidisse vel audisse perhibebunt, vel quod etiam ipsius oculi et aures videbunt et audient, sed in iustitia, id est secundum quod iustitia et equitas esse dictaverit, iudicabit, id est iudicialiam proferet sententiam et arguet, id est accusebit inique agentes in equitatis libra et hoc faciet pro mitibus et mansuetis tractabilibus et tamquam....^a qui sunt in terra'.³

A mistrust of witnesses who rely solely on what they see and hear was common enough in Andrew's day.⁴ We find it repeated in Ibn Ezra's interpretation of this verse too. He first points out that the ear and the eye are easily deceived and then remarks: 'He will not judge according to what he seems to see or to hear, because the testimony of witnesses might be false'.⁵

a. The text seems corrupt here: C. reads mansuetis, M. manui suctis.

1. L. Ginzberg, Legends vi. 381.

2. Ginzberg mentions here: Tanhuma Bereshit, i. 140; Tanhuma Toledot, xiv; Aggadat Bereshit, xliv. 89; Targum on i Chron.iii.24.

3. Po. 20d (53a).

4. Cf. O. Lottin, Psychologie et Morale aux xii^e et xiii^e siècles (Gembloux, 1957-60) v. nox. 481-82 (pp.313-14). Paul Hyems drew my attention to this circumstance.

5. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p. 60.

7. Cf. below pp. 185-87.

We shall deal with Andrew's explanation of verse 4 later on in this chapter.¹

6,7- 'Habitabit lupus cum/agno. Ad felicitatem temporum spectare videtur, quod lupus cum agno et pardus cum edo pacem habituri sunt et quod eadem tecta sine <lesione ullius>^a eorum vitulum, leonem et ovem simul includent. Et puer parvulus minabit eos. Ad pastum puer parvulus hec animalia ducet, que nunc audaces viri videre formidant. An ad eundem pastum leo, vitulus et ovis ibunt? Ibunt quia vitulus et ursus simul pascentur, pacem inter se fetibus eorum habentibus, et eisdem cibis alentur, quia leo carnis edulio supersedens, cibis quibus bos consuevit vescetur. (8) Et delectabitur infans ab ubere etc. Ablactandus infantis delectatio erit immittere se in foramine aspidis, ablactatus autem in caverna basilici mittet manum, cuius aspectum aves et volantes ferre non possunt.² De que legitur: "Ante venena nocens".^{3,4}

Andrew seems to assume that what has been described in these verses will literally happen in the messianic age. This, according to Jerome, is how the Jews and Judaizers interpret.⁵ Ibn Ezra takes it figuratively: 'The peace that will be in his days is now figuratively described.'⁶

II

From verse 9 onwards Andrew gives two interpretations. Although he first continues his exposition in the normal way and only then attempts a different interpretation, it will facilitate a comparison of the two to put them together in parallel columns. Why he adopted this method we shall attempt to explain below.⁷

a. C. reads sine illius lesione, M. sine illesione ullius.

1. Cf. below p. 176 ff.

2. Cf. Isidore, Etymologiae, xii.iv (ed. Lindsay, xii.iv, 6): 'Basilicus....adeo ut eum videntes fugiant, quia olfactu suo eos necat; nam et hominem, vel si aspiciat, intermit. Siquidem et eius aspectu nulla avis volans inlaesa transit, sed quam procul sit, eius ore combusta devoratur'.

3. This quotation could not be traced.

4. Fo. 20d-21a (53a,b).

5. Jerome, Comm. in Es., iv (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 150, l. 10).

6. Ibn Ezra, op. cit., p. 60.

7. Cf. below pp. 195-97.

9- Non nocebunt. Inde est quod hec facere possunt, quia non nocebunt. Nec hoc vulgo erit, sed in solo monte sancto [et] meo. Montem autem sanctum suum non solum montem Moria ubi templum, vel montem Sion et collem Ierusalem appellat, sed totam promissionis terram, quia montuosa est. Quia repleta est terra scientia Domini etc. Hec que supra memoravimus bona erunt in terra, quia scientia Domini, id est notitia culture Domini, tanta replebit terram affluentia quanta est copia aque marine terram cooperientis. Quod est breviter dicere divine culture abundans erit scientia, sicut magna est aque maris abundantia.¹

'Potest et sic legi ab eo loco, Non nocebunt et non occident in universo monte sancto meo. Cohabitare poterunt immitibus mitia, ludere cum venenatis infantia, quia in universo monte ubicumque terrarum sit sancto meo, mihi sanctificato vel venerabili quia meus est, non nocebunt ut consuerunt, nec vulneribus nec aliquibus iniuriis afficient; vel si contigerit ut in aliquibus quandoque noceant, non adeo nocebunt ut occidant. Superflue cum premissum esset non nocebunt supponit et^a propheta non occident, nisi sub hoc sensu quem diximus. Quia repleta est terra scientia Domini. Hinc est quod ferocia queque non nocebunt in monte sancto meo, quia tanta plenitudo scientie Domini in universa terra futura est, ut etiam bestie et venenosa quelibet animantia sciant hominibus et iumentis non esse nocendum. Huius autem scientie tanta erit redundatio^b quam redundantes sunt et copiose mare operientes aque, id est quam plene et quam magne quelibet aque, sive sint flumina, sive rivi, vel torrentes, sive quolibet alio nomine vocentur, in exitibus suis ubi intrantes mare ipsum cui superfluunt operire videntur.²

Also in Ibn Ezra we find a connection between the behaviour of wild animals and the fact that the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord: being with the Latin translation, rather than with the Hebrew text. It

'They shall not hurt etc. The asp and cockatrice do no harm, as if all Palestine were full of the knowledge of the Lord; for it is an acknowledged fact that he who knows the Lord will never destroy, but always build and improve'.³

Since this explanation is more or less suggested by the text itself, there is no need to make Andrew dependent on the Jewish commentator.

The difference between Andrew's first and second interpretation is that

a. M. supponeret, C. supponit et;

b. M. redundantia.

1. Fo. 21a (53b).

2. Fo. 22a (53d-54a).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm. in Is., p. 61.

in the first one he explains the text as referring to the promised land, in the second one as referring to the whole earth.

10- 'In die illa radix Iesse, qui stat in signum populorum; ipsum etc. In tempore que fient que predicta sunt <ad> Messiam, ad quem sicut ad signum regis vel imperatoris equitum peditumque caterve confluere solent, omnes undique populi confluent. Gentes deprecabuntur. Ut in suos illas recipiat. Et sepulcrum eius. Quia morietur et ipse utpote homo, tamen cunctis erit honorabile. Vel requies eius, civitas que precipue illius mansio futura est, Ierusalem videlicet, ex inhabitatione eius in ea honorabilis et famosa erit'.¹

'Stat in isgnum populorum! Populi sui, Ephraim videlicet et Iuda, confluent ad eum, ut ad perticam in signum stantem et erectam confluitur. Ipsam gentes deprecabuntur. Non solum populi sui ad eum undique confluent, sed etiam gentes ut in populis suis illas numeret eum deprecabuntur. Sepulcrum eius. In Hebreo positio eius. In magno honore et veneratione locus ubi erit sessio et accubitio eius, que sunt positiones eius, mansio eius videlicet, habebitur'.²

It seems that Andrew has still in mind the Messiah as conceived by the Jews. To him even the gentiles will flock. He gives two possible explanations of sepulcrum eius: it can mean grave, because the Messiah will die like a human being. Although this notion can be found in various Jewish sources,³ Andrew fails to realize in his first interpretation that the Hebrew has here בית קברו 'his restingplace', and thus he associates the idea of the death of the Messiah like a human being with the Latin translation, rather than with the Hebrew text. It can also be taken as his residence, namely Jerusalem, he continues, which will be honoured by his presence. In his second interpretation, which as we shall see is the one most influenced by Jewish exegesis, he again explains sepulcrum as residence, this time correctly referring to the Hebrew.

1. Fo. 21a,b (53b).

2. Fo. 22b (54a).

3. Cf. below p. 172.

5. Cf. li Reg. xlviii. lii Reg. xviii.

id.- 'Cum superius dictum sit quod de Iesse tamquam de radice Messias, tamquam virga et flos, egressurus sit,¹ in presenti^a de Messia agens, quomodo eum Iesse radicem nominat? Si non de Messia vel potius de Domino nostro Iesu Christo hic agitur, de quo igitur^b alio hic propheta loquitur? Nequaquam dici potest quod de Iesse, patre David iam mortuo, hic agitur. Que est igitur ista radix Iesse de qua hic agitur, que in signum populorum est statura et quam multitudo gentium est deprecatura? Messias sive Christus noster dicitur radix Iesse, non quod Iesse de illius semine secundum carnem descenderit, cum ipse potius eorum sit secundum carnem pater, sed quia ipsi aliquorum radix, qui de ipsis carnaliter vel spiritualiter nati vel nascituri sunt, de Iesse radice egressi vel egressuri sunt. Vel radix ponitur pro sobole et propagine'.³

'Radix Iesse. Messias qui de Iesse oriundus, qui aliorum futurus est radix, id est stabile firmamentum et radicatum. Non dicitur Messias radix quod alii de ipso tamquam de radice carnaliter nascituri sunt, cum sit angelus Domini exercituum futurus, id est angelicam in perpetua virginitate vitam ducens, sed propter causam quam ^{Paulo}superius assignavimus.² Fabulantur Hebrei illum eo ipso die quo templum a Nabuzardan succensum est et destructum natum fuisse; interim dum tempus miserendi eorum veniat in loco sibi a Domino delegato mansitare, in diebus ultimis venturum esse, que supra dicta sunt facturum et tandem in senectute bona plenum dierum, ut hominem, nature debita soluturum. Illum Iesse potius quam David, quamquam rex et celebrioris nominis et maioris auctoritatis fuerit, radicem in Scripturis appellari dicunt, quod nunquam vel in modico Dominum offensurus sit, sicut nec Iesse, vir sanctissimus et optimus et Domino per omnia placens nunquam offendisse legitur. David vero, in ceteris quidem Domino placuit, in sermone autem Urie maiestatis eius oculos graviter offendit'.^{4,5}

In particular Andrew's first interpretation is difficult to understand. He was apparently bothered by the difference of expression in verse 1 and verse 10. The plural he uses in the last half of the explanation, eorum, ipsi, de ipsis, seems to indicate that he has both the Jewish Messiah and Christ in mind. Also the reference to

a. M. reads in presentiare, C. in presentiarum;

b. C. hic.

1. Is.xi.1.

2. Cf. parallel column.

3. Fo. 21b (53b).

4. Fo. 22a,b (53d-54a).

5. Cf. ii Reg.xi.2 ff and in particular iii Reg. xv.5.

descendants carnaliter vel spiritualiter is hard to explain. The problem is mentioned again in the second interpretation. Here he denies the possibility of descendants of the Messiah secundum carnem. The allusion to the Messiah as a heavenly angelic being could either be derived from some late Jewish apocalyptic sources, often referred to by Andrew's informants in the course of this chapter as we shall see. For example the Similitudes of Enoch, xlvi where it is said:

'And there I saw one who had a head of days,
And his head was white like wool,
And with him was another being, whose countenance had the appearance
of a man,
And his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels'.¹

Or it could be an allusion to the monkish way of life. For monks were said to lead an angelical life on earth in imitation of Christ.²

Andrew introduces the next tradition about the Jewish Messiah with the words -- alas all too common in his day -- fabulantur Hebrei. Most likely, here again, they serve to disguise his real interest.³ That the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of the Temple is a well-known Jewish tradition, to which, for example, Ibn Ezra refers in his explanation of Isaiah liii.⁴ It can be found in Echa Rabbati,

1. Similitudes of Enoch, xlvi.1 (ed. Charles, ii.214). We have used the edition of R.H. Charles, The apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913). In these apocalyptic writings (cf. also e.g. iv Ezra) it is a matter of interpretation whether to explain the Messiah in terms of a supernatural being, or whether this figure 'as it were of a man' (iv Ezra, xiii.1 ff.) or 'that Son of Man' (Similitudes, xlvi.2; xlvi.2) was meant to be of no superhuman origin. D.S. Russell, for example, stresses the supernatural character of the Son of Man as found in the Jewish apocalyptic sources (The method and message of Jewish apocalyptic, pp. 324-52), while G.F. Moore, Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era, the age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, Mass., 1940-44), ii.331-49 expresses himself more carefully. He mentions that in any case the Tannaim regarded the Messiah as 'a man of human kind' (op. cit., ii.349), and points out the simultaneousness between these sources and some apocalyptic writings: iv Ezra and ii Baruch, for example, contemporary with disciples of Johanan ben Zakkai and their successors (op. cit., ii.344).

2. J. Leclercq, La vie parfaite (Paris, 1948), cap.1, pp. 19-56: La vie angélique.

3. Cf. above, p.161, n.1 and below p.213 ff ad Is. xl.4.

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 240, cf. below p.245.

1.16.¹ The reference to the concealment of the Messiah by the Lord may be found in apocalyptic sources. In iv Ezra the Messiah is described as that Man 'whom the Most High is keeping many ages and through whom he will deliver his creation'.² In the Similitudes of Enoch reference is made to the Son of Man, hidden from the beginning.³ Likewise in some rabbinic writings we have this notion of the hiding of the Messiah, for example in the Talmud, tractate Sanhedrin 98a, which we shall have opportunity to quote fully below.⁴ There shall be a time of misery on earth, Andrew informs us, while the Messiah is waiting to come out in the open. This is an obvious allusion to the so called 'travail of the Messiah', תְּבִיבֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ, a time of general distress and need before the appearance of the Messiah; descriptions of which can be found in Jewish as well as in Christian literature.⁵

Lastly Andrew mentions the death of the Messiah ut hominem after he has fulfilled his task on earth. This idea we find clearly expressed in iv Ezra vii, where it says:

'And it shall be, after these years, that my Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath. Then shall the world be turned into the primaeval silence seven days, like as at the first beginnings; so that no one is left'.⁶

-
1. Echa Rabbati, 1.16 (ed. Freedman, vii.136).
 2. iv Ezra, xiii.26 (ed. Charles, ii.618).
 3. Similitudes of Enoch, lxii.7 (ed. Charles, ii.228).
 4. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 98a (ed. Epstein, p. 664), cf. below p.204. On the problem of the pre-existence of the Messiah see E. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien (Skrifter utgivna av kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet, I Lund, liii, 1955), in particular cap. 2, pp. 41-98: 'Der verborgene Messias im Judentum,' and the sources mentioned there; see also G.F. Moore, op. cit., ii, 344 and 349.
 5. For example Mekilta, tract. Vayassa, vi (ed. Lauterbach, ii.123); Mk.xiii.5 ff. et par.; Didache, xvi.3 ff. The conception goes back to Micha iv,9,10 (cf. Hosea xiii.13). See also G.F. Moore, op. cit., ii.360-63 and D.S. Russell, op. cit., pp. 271-76 and the literature mentioned there.
 6. iv Ezra, vii.29-31 (ed. Charles, ii.582).

After this the Most High will take over as the time for the final events has come.

From our discussion of Andrew's second interpretation of verse 10 thus far it would seem that his Jewish teachers were drawing heavily on apocalyptic sources. For although we noticed that some of the notions could be found in rabbinic literature as well, it is in the apocalyptic writings that we find a compact accumulation of all the various ideas referred to by Andrew here. Also the frequent allusions to the Antichrist in this chapter points to apocalyptic influence.¹

Interesting finally is the reason the Jews give, according to Andrew, for the fact that the Messiah is said to come forth out of the root of Jesse, rather than of David. This indeed goes back to an old tradition. In Ginzberg's Legends, for example, it is mentioned that 'Jesse was one of the greatest scholars of his time, and one of the four who died wholly untainted by sin';² the others being Benjamin, Amram, the father of Moses and Kilab, the son of David.³

11- 'In die illa adiciet Dominus secundo manum suam etc. Cum sub Messia florebut tempora, Dominus qui potentiam suam exercuit quando populum suum de manu Pharaonis eripuit, adiciet iterum potentiam suam ad possidendas populi sui reliquias que relicte erunt ab his qui subiciuntur. Ab Assyriis et ab Egypte et a Phetros etc. Ab Assyriis scimus/decem tribus non semel vastatas esse, et sub Osee totas simul abductas et in civitatibus Medorum collocatas.⁴ Sesac, rex Egypti, sub Roboam

'Adiciet Dominus secundo manum suam. Ad possidendum populum suum qui in Egypto duris sed et fedis luti et lateris operibus premebatur, primo manum, id est potentiam, suam Dominus extendit. Secundo quando de Babylone Cyro captivitatem relaxante sub Iesu, sacerdote magno, filio Iosedec et Zerobabel cum in terram suam reduxit.⁵ Quomodo nunc secundo et non potius tertio dicit Dominum manum suam adiecturum ad possidendum residuum populi/sui, si^a de illis agitur quos in diebus sui Messie sic Iudei a quatuor plagis

a. C. sed.

1. Cf. p. 176 ff.

2. L. Ginzberg, Legends, iv. 81.

3. Ibid., vi. 245. Cf. also Bab. Talmud, Baba Batra 17a (ed. Epstein, pp. 86-87).

4. iv Reg. xvii. 6 (Hoshea reigned from 731-723).

5. In fact the people returned under guidance of, among others, Zerubbabel and Jeshua (Ezra ii. 2), while the Temple was rebuilt under supervision of Zerubbabel and Joshua the high priest (e.g. Hagg. i. 14).

cepit Ierusalem et si quos voluit secum abduxit.¹ Pharao Nechao Iosiam, regem Iuda, interfecit et filium eius Ioachaz cum iam tribus mensibus regnasset et quos placuit cum illo asportavit.² Preterea Ierusalem a Romanis subversa et tota regione vastata, multa Iudeorum milia a victoribus in Egypto sunt vendita,^a unde et in alias que supponuntur nationes per distractionem devenire poterant. Forsitan et a victoribus ipsis predictarum regionum et civitatum negotiatoribus venditi sunt. A quibus populis et nationibus multi Iudeorum relinquuntur qui, ut putant, in diebus sui Messie a Domino possidebuntur.³

terre in Palestinam congregandos somniant? Sed, ut illi aiunt, quando de Egypto educti sunt nullius ditione vel dominio subditi, a solo possidebantur Domino. Similiter in ultima de cunctis nationibus in terram suam reductione, nullius preter Domini dominio subicientur et ab eo solo possidebuntur. De Babylone vero per manum Domini educti, regibus Persarum servientes, non a solo possidebantur Domino. Ideoque hanc liberationem inter ceteras, ut aiunt, propheta numerare noluit. Et quoniam ultima reductio similis erit prime, secunda quasi indigna numerari quod non plene a Domino, cum et ab aliis possiderentur pretermissa, secundo dixit, non tertio. Vel sic. Quando de Egypto educti sunt non adiecit manum suam Dominus ad possidendum populum suum, quia tunc primo illos de alienorum potestate liberavit. Cum vero de Babylone illos eduxit, tunc primo adiecit. Si in ultimis vero temporibus eos, ut putant, congregaturus est, tunc secundo ad possidendum populi sui reliquias manum suam adiciet.⁴

In his first interpretation Andrew gives a mixture of historical information and Jewish messianic expectations, but the latter are not so outspoken and fit well into the whole framework of his explanation of this chapter, which in the first instance aims at a direct, to the point interpretation of the text. Generally, as has already been mentioned, only in his second treatment of the verses 9 to 16 he gives extensive Jewish explanations and takes great pains to insert as much information

a. C. venditi.

1. iii Reg. xiv. 25 (Rehoboam reigned from 931-915).

2. iv Reg. xxiii. 29-34 (Josiah reigned from 637-608).

3. Fo. 21a, b (53b, c).

4. Fo. 22b, c (54a, b).

as possible. But even in his first interpretation Andrew did not listen to Jerome:

'In die illa, hoc est in illo tempore, de qua et supra dictum est, cum surrexit radix Iesse in signum populorum (sive ut dominetur gentium) apponet Dominus secundo manum suam, ut nequaquam iuxta nostros Iudaizantes in fine mundi, cum intraverit plenitudo gentium, tunc omnis Israel salvus fiat. Sed haec omnia in prima intelligamus adventu.'¹

The point raised by Andrew in his second interpretation is a much discussed problem among the Jewish commentators. Andrew follows Rashi here very closely, for the latter says:

'For the second time. In the same way as the Lord acquired the Israelites and delivered them from the Egyptians, when their liberation was pure or perfect, without any slavery; but the liberation which took place in the time of the second Temple cannot be reckoned to belong to that category, for the Jews at that time were subjected to Cyrus, king of the Persians'²

Ibn Ezra gives a slightly different version.

'The second time, with regard to the deliverance from Egypt. This verse may be taken as a proof that the prophet in the whole passage refers to the Messianic period;³ for the restoration during the second temple was not complete, since not all the tribes, and not even all the men of Judah, returned to Palestine.'⁴

13. 'Et auferetur zelus Ephraim et hostes Iuda peribunt. Posset intelligi quod odium Ephraim adversus Iudam auferendum esset, illis inter se reconciliatis et pacificatis, nisi statim subderetur et hostes Iuda peribunt. Quod si de omni hoste Iuda generaliter intelligatur, consequitur ut et Ephraim pereat, nisi forte non omnimodo quilibet hostes Iuda perituri

13. 'Zelus Ephraim. Mali de Iuda qui zelati sunt Ephraim. Et hostes Iuda peribunt. Iniqui de Ephraim, qui hostiliter egerunt contra Iudam. Ephraim non emulabitur Iudam. Quamvis, mortuo et ab Antichristo perempto Messia de Ephraim, ille Messias de Iuda superstes erit et magna decorabitur gloria, tum propter multa eius alia bona/, tum propter Antichristum ad vocem deprecationis eius et orationis

1. Jerome, Comm.in Es., iv (C.C.S.L. 73, p. 154, 1.13).

2. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p. 86.

3. Cf. Ibn Ezra's introduction to Is.xi, above p. 164.

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p. 61.

sunt, sed in hostilitate perseverantes, scilicet ut iam hostes non sint qui reconciliati sunt. Advertendum est quod postquam in unum fuerint congregati et a quatuor terre plagis directi, auferendum dicit zelum Ephraim et hostes Iuda perituros. Quod est dicere, quisquis in illis diebus zelum vel odium, iram vel/invidiam adversus Ephraim exercuit, de medio auferetur et adversus Iudam quisquis hostiliter egerit penitus peribit.¹

instantiam a Domino interfectum, tamen Ephraim Iude^a non invidabit. Tradunt namque Iudei duos contra^b Antichristum venturos Messias, alterum de Ephraim, alterum de Iuda, illumque de Ephraim ab Antichristo Gog, scilicet principe capitis Mosoch et Thubal, interfectum iri.²

In his first interpretation Andrew carefully analyses the text to see which of the different possible explanations is suitable. He chooses one on grounds of what has been said in the preceding verse, and explains the text as referring to a united Israel, formed by Ephraim and Judah jointly. We shall discuss the second interpretation together with what has been said by Andrew earlier on in this chapter about the figure of the Antichrist, namely in the introduction and in verse 4:

'....de Iesse filius sit egressurus, qui septiformi spiritu repletus, in iustitia et equitate servos suos sit iudicaturus et arguiturus. Alienos vero et terrena Deo postposito amantes virga oris sui percussurus et ipsum excellenter impium, Antichristum videlicet, omnium caput impiorum, spiritu labiorum suorum interfecturus.'³

4. 'Et spiritu labiorum suorum interficiet impium. Gog, quem ipsi Antichristum vocant, qui Enoch et Eliam et virum bonum Messiam de tribu Ephraim occisurus est, sola ad Dominum premissa labiorum suorum oratione vel maledictione interfecturus est.'¹

13. 'Ephraim non emulabitur Iudam. Quamvis, mortuo et ab Antichristo perempto Messia de Ephraim, ille Messias de Iuda superstes erit et magna decorabitur gloria, tum propter multa eius alia bona/, tum propter Antichristum ad vocem deprecationis eius et orationis

a. C. mihi(?).

b. C. om. contra.

1. Fo. 21c,d (53c).

2. Fo. 22c,d (54b).

3. Fo. 20c (52d).

4. Fo. 20d (53a).

instantiam a Domino interfectum, tamen Ephraim Iude non inuidebit. Tradunt namque Iudei duos contra Antichristum venturos Messias, alterum de Ephraim, alterum de Iuda, illumque de Ephraim ab Antichristo, Gog, scilicet principe capitis Mosoch et Thubal, interfectum iri.¹

That Andrew explains verse 4 in the light of the struggle between the Messiah and the Antichrist (cf. also the introduction) could be a reference to ii Thess.ii.8, where we read: And then he will be revealed, that wicked man whom the Lord Jesus will destroy with the breath of his mouth.... However, the fact that he describes the Antichrist as the leader of the impious may indicate that he got his information from elsewhere. For it is in the Jewish sources primarily that we find an Antichrist-like figure accompanied by his followers in battle with the Messiah.²

Although the term 'Antichrist' occurs for the first time in the New Testament,³ the ideas underlying this conception are much older and go back to the Jewish apocalyptic literature from Daniel onwards.⁴ This form of literature draws heavily again on the vision concerning Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, of Ezekiel 38-39. In these apocalyptic sources the Antichrist is usually a political figure,

1. Fo. 22c,d (54b).

2. Of course, Paul himself was strongly influenced by Jewish apocalyptic ideas, and Andrew may have thought of the Pauline text when he explained the passages in Isaiah. However, Paul's Antichrist seems to be a single person, rather than the leader of a group. In any case, the overall impression of Andrew's explanation of the verses 4 and 13 is that he based them mainly on Jewish conceptions.

3. For example i John ii.18,22; ii John 7. It should be noted that in the New Testament the main characteristic of the Antichrist is that of a false prophet or teacher.

4. On the Antichrist see W. Bousset, Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche (Göttingen, 1895). Id. 'Antichrist', Encl.Rel.Eth., i.578-81. Also H.H. Rowley, The relevance of Apocalyptic (repr. 2nd. edn., London, 1961), passim.

5. R.J. Schoeps, Paulus, die Synagoge und Antichrist im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte (Göttingen, 1937), p. 137.

earliest reference to the Messiah ben Joseph can be found in the Talmud, appearing under different names,¹ and represented as the leader of evil forces in their struggle with the Lord. It is only in post-talmudic times that we find the conception of ^{both} a false prophet, as in the New Testament, and of the tyrant of the end of days combined in one person, namely in the figure of Armilus, who will kill the Messiah ben Joseph in battle.²

The Messiah ben Joseph or ben Ephraim, as he is called likewise, suddenly appears in the literature about 150 A.D.³ Various reasons have been given in an attempt to explain the origin of this Messiah.⁴ It is generally assumed that too many different expectations had been lodged in one person, which gave rise to difficulties as, for example, how to explain passages like Zech.xii.10,and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced: and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn, of a Messiah elsewhere pictured as a victorious ruler. Therefore, we can agree with Schoeps when he writes: 'Was nun die Entstehung dieser zweiten Messias angeht, so dürfte der innere Grund in der Doppelheit der biblisch-apokalyptischen Messiasvorstellung selber liegen'.⁵ The

1. He can be identified with Antiochus Epiphanes (Daniel) or Nero (probably in the Sibylline Oracles, iii.63 ff). In the last mentioned source, as well as in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, his name is Beliar, cf. Russell, op.cit., pp. 276-80.

2. H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, (München, 1922-1928), iii.637-38. Hereafter this work will be referred to as Strack-Billerbeck.

3. Ibid., ii. 292.

4. Ibid., ii.292-97; A. Wünsche, Die Leiden des Messias (Leipzig, 1870), pp. 64-65 and 109-21; G.F. Moore, op.cit., ii. 370-71. Cf. also A. Neubauer, The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish interpreters (Oxford etc. 1876-77), ii.xxxix-xl. Hereafter this work will be referred to as Isaiah 53.

5. H.J. Schoeps, Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte (Tübingen, 1959), p. 139.

earliest reference to the Messiah ben Joseph can be found in the Talmud, tractate Sukkah 52a, which deals with the explanation of the text of Zech.xii.10-12¹. The passage reads:

'What is the cause of the mourning? [mentioned in Zech.xii.12]. R. Dosa (c.180) and the Rabbis differ on the point. One explained, The cause is the slaying of Messiah the son of Joseph, and the other explained, The cause is the slaying of the Evil Inclination. It is well according to him who explains that the cause is the slaying of ~~the~~ Messiah the son of Joseph, since that well agrees with the scriptural verse, And they shall look upon me, because they have thrust him through, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son.²

Another early source in which the two Messiah figures are mentioned together is the Midrash Tehillim, where on Psalm lx.9 we read: 'God said....in the everlasting time-to-come I shall deliver you through the Messiah the son of Ephraim, and through the Messiah the son of David of the tribe of Judah.'³

The Messiah ben Ephraim is always the Messiah who dies, usually in his fatal struggle against the forces of evil.⁴ As we have already heard, he is to be killed by Armilus, an Antichrist-like figure. The earliest reference to the latter provides the Targum on Isaiah xi.4, where it is said that the Messiah ben Ephraim will be killed by Armilus,

1. Cf., however, J. Jeremias, ' παλις Ιησους im Spätjudentum in der Zeit nach der Entstehung der LXX', in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (hereafter referred to as ThW), ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart, 1933-.....), v.685. The author sees in a passage in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, namely in the Testament of Benjamin, iii.8, (possibly second or first century B.C.) already a reference to the Messiah ben Joseph. It says: In thee (sc. Joseph) shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven (sc. Is. lxxiii)....., and that a blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men, and a sinless one shall die for ungodly men.....' (ed. Charles, ii.356). E. Sjöberg, op.cit., pp.257-59 disagrees with this interpretation.

2. Bab. Talmud, tract. Sukkah 52a (ed. Epstein, 246).

3. Midrash on Psalm lx, § 3. Quoted from The Midrash on Psalms, transl. W.G. Braude (Yale Judaica Series, xiii, 1959), i.515-16.

4. Cf. below chapter VII.

who in his turn will be slain by the breath of the mouth of the Messiah ben David.¹ Most frequently he is mentioned in a number of short midrashim dating from the late middle ages, but containing very much older material, which have been collected by A. Jellinek in the so called Bet ha-Midrasch.² For example in the Midrasch Wajoscha Armilus is pictured as the successor of Gog, who kills the Messiah ben Joseph and is killed himself by the breath of the mouth of the Messiah ben David.³ In the Signs of the Messiah we find that Armilus is explicitly identified with the Antichrist;⁴ while in the Messiah Aggada the Messiah ben Joseph is slain by Gog and Magog.⁵ Bousset, in his Antichrist, concludes:

'Im ganzen aber mag das Urteil gewagt werden, dass der gesammte jüdische Sagenkreis mit der Gestalt des Armilus und den beiden Messiasen in dieser Verbindung sich im 7.-8. Jahrhundert unter Einfluss der Sage vom Antichrist gebildet hat....Während die Tradition vom Antichrist vom Christentum aus dem Judentum übernommen wurde, so hat dann die entwickelte christliche Überlieferung im 6.-8. Jahrhundert wieder auf die jüdische Eschatologie zurückgewirkt.'⁶

When we return to Andrew's interpretation, we note that his introductory remarks do not bear any specific Jewish traces, except for the fact that he describes the Antichrist as the leader of the impious. It is different, however, with the verses 4 and 13. He had heard of the tradition of the Messiah ben Ephraim, who was to be killed by the leader of

1. Strack-Billerbeck, iii.639.

2. A. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch, Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der ältern jüdischen Literatur (Leipzig, 1853-57), i-iv; (Vienna, 1873-77), v-vi. Extracts and translations can be found in Strack-Billerbeck, iii.639-40 and A. Wünsche, op.cit., pp. 118-21.

3. Bet ha-Midrasch, i.56.

4. Ibid., ii.60.

5. Ibid., iii.141.

6. W. Bousset, Der Antichrist, pp. 70-71.

the forces of evil. Although we do not find in the Jewish literature a direct identification of Gog with the Antichrist, we have found that it is said that the Messiah ben Ephraim will be killed by Armilus, or, elsewhere, by Gog and Magog. On grounds of the part played by Gog in the apocalyptic writings known to medieval scholars, and on grounds of what we had heard from Jewish traditions about the killing of the Messiah ben Ephraim by an Antichrist-like figure, or perhaps even by Gog (and Magog), it was a logical step for Andrew to assume that the 'Antichrist' of the Jews must be Gog; realizing as he did that the name 'Antichrist' would be rather inappropriate to use if he was quoting a Jewish interpretation, and possibly preferring the more familiar name Gog to the unknown Armilus.

In verse 4 Andrew indicates that the Antichrist will be killed by the prayer or malediction of the Messiah, while in verse 13 it is the Lord himself who kills him, though not until after prolonged pressure of the Messiah. We find both these views in the Jewish writings as well.¹

When he says that the Messiah ben Ephraim in spite of his bad fortune will not envy the Messiah ben Judah, he has an interesting parallel in the Aggadat Bereshit, lxiii. There it says:

'You find everywhere that these two tribes Judah and Joseph have been enemies and opponents.... But will the One who is appointed for war, who comes forth out of Joseph, and the Messiah who comes forth out of Judah also be opponents in future? Not at all, there will be no envy between them, as it is said in Is. xi. 13, Ephraim shall not envy Judah and Judah shall not vex Ephraim'.²

We find the same idea in Rashi, who also states that the Messiah

1. Cf. above p. 180, and the Signs of the Messiah (Bet ha-Midrash, ii.60), where it is said that the Lord kills Armilus.

2. Aggadat Bereshit, lxiii (ed. Buber, p. 44a). The passage is quoted in Strack-Billerbeck, ii.299.

ben Ephraim and the Messiah ben Judah will be not jealous of each other.¹

It finally remains to be discussed what Andrew says in verse 4 about Enoch and Elijah. There is a tradition, he notes, that Gog the Antichrist not only kills the Messiah ben Ephraim, but also Enoch and Elijah. This is, contrary to the previous ones, basically a Christian, not a Jewish tradition. We find it, for example, in the apocalyptic writings of Ephraem Syrus, in a sermon entitled De fine extremo. There we read in sections 11 and 12 that when the Son of Destruction had dragged the whole world into his plans, Enoch and Elijah were sent to argue against him. They challenge him to prove that he is God by quickening the dead. When he is unable to do so a great anger against the saints comes over the wicked one, and with a furtively picked up sword he cuts off the necks of the two righteous men in a most villanous manner. Fortunately Michael and Gabriel interfere and bring the prophets back to life.² We have here Enoch and Elijah in the function of witnesses of the rapidly approaching end of the world, which is a wellknown notion in the patristic literature, based on Revelation xi.3ff.³ The Jewish sources, on the other hand, know only of Elijah as a witness of the end of time.⁴ Andrew apparently combined the Christian legend with the Jewish tradition of the killing of the Messiah ben Ephraim by the Antichrist. Although it is not mentioned that Gog killed Elijah and Enoch, his identification of the Antichrist with Gog caused him to say that it was Gog who killed all three of them.

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., pp.86-87. Ibn Ezra remarked: '....Ephraim will not be jealous, that the Messiah will be of the tribe of Judah....'. (Comm.on Is., p.62).

2. Sancti Ephraem Syri Hymni et Sermones, ed. Th.J.Lamy, (Meholén, 1882-89), iii.208-10; cf. W. Bousset, op.cit., pp.134-36 with references to other sources dealing with the death of Enoch and Elijah.

3. Ibid., p. 136, where it is noted that among others Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, v.5,1 and Tertullian, De anima 1 mention Enoch and Elijah as witnesses.

4. Ibid., p.137.

15. 'Et desolabit Dominus linguam maris Egypti etc. Mos Hebreorum est eo quod lingua in medio oris sit, linguam maris medium ipsius appellare. Medium maris quod Egyptum preterfluit et altam eius abyssum, ut viam faciat populo suo ad veniendum^a in terram suam, de his que ultra sunt terris Dominus desolabit, ^b id est ab aquis superiacentibus et piscibus ibi natantibus nudum et solitarium reddet. Vel linguam maris Egypti^c vocat flumen Nilum, qui tenet in mari formam quam lingua habet in ore. Unde subdit: Et levabit manum suam super flumen^d etc. In eo quod dicit levabit manum, formam exprimit percussuri. Spiritus. Vel ire vel urentis venti. In septem rivis. Expectant miseri spe cassa Iudei^e ut Dominus percutiens flumen Nilum per septem rivos dividat^f illud, ut per sic divisum et diminutum calceati transeant, qui ab Assyriis relictii in terram promissionis reversuri sunt. Verum si ab Alexandro Macedone, ut in historiis habetur, in septem rivos est divisus et illi a Romanis ita sint amplificati ut pene Nilus exsiccatus serperet, ut siccis pedibus transirent, quomodo tunc percutietur ut in septem rivos dividatur, cum iam/percussus est? Sed nec ipse propheta dicit eum percutiendum in septem rivos, [sed] ut septem de eo rivi fiant, sed in septem^g rivis suis iam factis, ut parvi minores reddantur et pene excissati calceatis viam prebeant.

'Et desolabit. In Hebreo planius: siccabit. Super flumen. Flumen istud de quo hic agitur est Euphrates, quod in Scripturis Veteris Testamenti flumen simpliciter et sine determinatione appellari solet'.¹

- a. C. adveniendi;
- b. C. subiacentibus;
- c. C. om. Egypti.
- d. Both C. and M. read mare, V. renders flumen;
- e. C. videri;
- f. C. dividans;
- g. C. om. septem rivos....sed in septem.

1. Fo. 22d (54b).
 2. Fo. 22d (54b).
 3. Cum haec Isaias predicaret, etiam Nilus divisus erat, quem postea Alexander in septem rivos divisit. Regente autem Octaviano Augusto...regem Aegypti in morte Cleopatre destruxerunt et divisum est in septem principes. Nilus quoque qui antequam ab Alexandro divideretur inaccessibilis erat, cum septem rivos ampliasset pene exsiccatus per inaccessibiles pedibus transirent'.

16. Qui relinquetur ab Assyriis.

Ab Assyriis populus Domini, cui iter paratur ad nationes depredandas, precipue relictus dicitur, quia tote decem tribus ab illis bello superate, cum possent interfici lege victorie vite^a sunt reservate. In die illa. Cum fuerit tibi via ad expugnandos et deprecandos quos volueris a Domino'.¹

16. 'Et erit via populo meo etc.

Ad parandam populo qui relinquetur ab Assyriis viam, ut de ultra montes Medorum et Persarum, quo transtulerunt eos Assyrii, in Palestinam veniant, non Nilus, sed Euphrates per rivos dividendus et siccandus predici debuit. De Media enim et Perside in Palestinam venientibus, Euphrates, non Nilus, transeundus est. Neque enim de predictis locis per Egyptum in Palestinam venitur, ut per Nilum transeundum sit'.²

Andrew begins the first explanation in his familiar 'to the point' manner. He refers to a Hebrew use of language in explaining the term 'tongue of the sea', and then points out how the Lord intends to dry out the sea which bounds Egypt. Even the fishes have not been forgotten. However, the actual meaning of the verb 'to dry out' is 'to cut off', 'to separate'. Therefore we must have some explanation of the Egyptian sea' as a description of the Nile. In line with his whole explanation of this chapter, he takes the drying out of the Egyptian sea as something which will happen when the Jews shall return to Israel in the messianic age. Quite unexpectedly, however, he then turns to the pitiable Jews, from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Rashi also interpreted 'the river' as the Euphrates, to be crossed by those who had been led into exile by the Assyrians.

divide the river Nile into seven separate streams. This is very

unlikely, Andrew points out, since the Nile had already been divided

into seven rivers by Alexander the Great on his entry into Egypt. This

This is the only chapter in Andrew's commentaries we have seen fact was well known to medieval commentators; it was mentioned for across where he gives two continuous, different interpretations of the example in the Gloss.³ Therefore, he suggests how the text could be text. One possible explanation of this method adopted by him could be understood without coming into conflict with history, thus harmonizing that it shows the ambiguous position, already previously alluded to, Scripture with the latter. It should be noticed that Andrew calls

^a. C. victe.

1. Fo. 21d-22a (53d).

2. Fo. 22d (54b).

3. The Gloss notes: 'Cum haec Isaias predicaret, nondum Nilus divisus erat, quem postea Alexander in septem rives divisit. Regnante autem Octaviano Augusto....regnum Aegypti in morte Cleopatre destructum est et divisum est in septem principes. Nilus quoque qui antequam ab Alexandro divideretur immeabilis erat, cum Romani rives ampliassent pene exsiccatus per imas valles serpebat, ut siccis pedibus transirent'.

attention to the incorrectness of the Jewish expectations in his first explanation of the text - it would hardly have fitted into his judaizing second interpretation. Secondly, he refutes the Jews with a historical argument. It shows that he did not always uncritically reproduce their explanations, but expected them at least to be in agreement with relevant historical facts.

In his second explanation Andrew refers to the Hebrew text: where the Vulgate reads desolabit, the Hebrew has siccabit. The first time he had already explained the text according to this meaning, but in a rather indirect manner. His later interpretation may have been influenced by Rashi who explained the Hebrew סַחַח as 'to make dry'.¹ However, the actual meaning of the verb סַחַח in the hif'il is 'to cut off', 'to separate'. Therefore we have here again a case where Andrew takes an explanation of a Hebrew word for its meaning. His reference to the use of the expression 'the river' in the Old Testament is correct; we find it for example in Psalm lxxii.8, May he have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Rashi also interpreted 'the river' as the Euphrates, to be crossed by those who had been led into exile by the Assyrians.²

III

This is the only chapter in Andrew's commentaries we have come across where he gives two continuously different interpretations of the text. One possible explanation of this method adopted by him could be that it shows the ambiguous position, already previously alluded to,³

1. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 87. Ibn Ezra commented on the verse: 'And shall utterly destroy....The Israelites shall then cross upon dry land, and the sea shall not hinder them by rapidly returning to its bed.' (Comm. on Is., p. 62).

2. Rashi, op. cit., p. 87. Ibn Ezra interpreted 'the river' as the Nile. (op. cit., p. 63).

3. Cf. above p. 160 ff.

4. Cf. above p. 170.

5. Cf. above p. 165.

he found himself in - on the one hand, he did not want to create the impression that he was denying the exegesis of the Church; on the other hand, he was fascinated by the Jewish way of dealing with the text. If he indeed gave the two expositions for this reason, then the first interpretation would be the one in which he tried to harmonize his literal explanation of the text with the traditionally accepted Christian exposition; while the second one would be the judaizing interpretation, which, he hoped, would go unnoticed because of the acceptability of the first one. We shall, therefore, examine the validity of this hypothesis for each of the two interpretations.

As far as his first explanation and his comments on the verses 1 to 8 are concerned, these indeed show a certain tendency to compromise and harmonize. Andrew goes about his task carefully, combining a literal exposition of the text with references to Christ and the Christian interpretation. For example in verse 2: 'According to us, who explain these things of the Lord, the Spirit of God means the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity....'¹ and in verse 10: 'If not of the Messiah, or rather of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom else does the prophet speak here?'.² To this he adds occasionally the Jewish point of view, and, since the Jews happened to expect that the letter of the prophetic text would be fulfilled in the days of their Messiah, it is hardly surprising that Andrew's 'literal' explanation is often influenced by the Jewish expectations concerning the messianic age.

It is worth noting that Andrew accepts the Jewish exposition as an interpretation in its own right. For example in his comments on verse two, where we read: 'According to us, who explain these things of the Lord.... According to the Jews, however, who interpret these things of the Messiah whom they are still expecting....'³, we find both

1. Cf. above p.165.

2. Cf. above p.170.

3. Cf. above p.165.

CHAPTER VII

interpretations together on equal terms. On the other hand he does not hesitate to criticize the Jewish views, as we saw, if he regards them as far-fetched or historically not correct.¹ This indeed shows his independent attitude towards his sources, whatever their origin.

As far as the second interpretation of the text is concerned, it seems somewhat naive and, therefore, unsatisfactory to suppose that Andrew intended to safeguard himself by this device of giving two independent explanations after each other. After all, his critics were bound to read both. A much more satisfactory solution would be to imagine that Andrew, after finishing his first interpretation, discussed the matter once more with a Jewish scholar. Whether he did so on purpose, or whether they met by chance is impossible to say. The result of this meeting was that Andrew got so much new material that he decided to write a second interpretation, in which he would be able to include his newly acquired knowledge. This procedure would explain, for example, why he refers only in the second exposition to the Hebrew text (verses 10 and 15), which he could have done without any fear of criticism the first time.² Furthermore, in verse 10 b, Radix Iesse etc., the fact that he first refers to his other explanation and then mentions what the Jews say indicates that, while still agreeing with his previous comments, he only later heard the Jewish view.³ Also his remarks on the various returns of the Jewish people from exile (vs.11)⁴ and on the two Messiah figures (vs. 13)⁵ give one the impression that he did not know about these traditions earlier on.

1. Cf. above p. 183.
2. Cf. above p. 169 and p. 183.
3. Cf. above p. 170.
4. Cf. above p. 173f.
5. Cf. above p. 175f.

1. Chapters VII-IX below.

CHAPTER VII

exposition of the

knowledge of

prophecy

Isaiah xl to lxvi, different ways of approach.

We shall now¹ concentrate on Andrew's interpretation of Isaiah xl to lxvi, since a judaizing explanation of these chapters, in particular of the passages dealing with the Servant of the Lord, would present him with many problems.

One of the difficulties in analyzing and annotating the commentary of a medieval scholar on such a much studied text as Isaiah xl to lxvi is to avoid looking at it from the point of view which modern text criticism takes. One has to bear in mind that until the twelfth century nobody had ever thought of ascribing different parts of Isaiah to separate authors. And when Ibn Ezra makes a first daring attempt, he does so on grounds which are totally different from those of biblical scholars nowadays.² No one had as yet tried to point out different layers and trends of tradition. Prophecy was an accepted phenomenon as such and had not yet been subjected to a critical interpretation. When Andrew, for example, clearly sees the prophet behind the prophecies in these chapters and pays attention to the historical situation in which Isaiah addressed his people, or when Ibn Ezra states that the prophecies concerning the Babylonian exile were not really 'prophecies', predicted long beforehand, but had been put down only to encourage faith in the final redemption of the messianic age, then they establish themselves as independent, critical commentators of the sacred text. These and such-like considerations will make it obvious that the best way to come to a fair appreciation of a medieval

2. Cf. below p. 191.

1. Chapters VII-IX below.

exposition of Isaiah xl to lxvi is to discard, for the moment, all one's knowledge about a Deutero- or even a Trito Isaiah, and to read the prophecies as the medieval commentators themselves did.

I. The Fathers and Andrew.

A quick glance at the patristic commentaries shows that in the writings of the Fathers we do not yet find, as a rule, the idea that chapters xl to lxvi form a marked contrast to the preceding ones. Only Chrysostomos says, according to the Gloss, that from the beginning of chapter xl we can learn that God's punishment, as previously described, is not only a bad thing to be feared, but also serves as a means of reconciliation with him.¹ The Fathers are not at all concerned with the problem of defining to which period the prophecies were intended to refer, and who was meant by the figure of the Servant of the Lord. For them these chapters, and in particular Is. lli.13 to liii.12, were the most significant and complete messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. They announced the coming and suffering of the Messiah, the event which marks the decisive change in the history of men and the beginning of God's redemptive work, when the message of salvation and joy is being carried to North and South, to East and West, until, at the end of time, all nations shall be gathered together into the true Israel, which is the Church.

It is obvious that this interpretation, with its stress on the eschatological character of the prophecies, completely overlooked their historical setting. The words of the prophet reveal the chain of events which will be set into motion by the coming of the Messiah, and only as such they are of value for the pious reader in his search for

1. The Gloss ad loc.

their real meaning.

Andrew takes chapters xl to lxvi as a coherent whole. 'From here until the end of the book the prophet deals with the consolation of the people', he remarks.¹ In so doing, he makes a clear division between, on the one hand, the preceding chapters, which speak of God's judgment upon Jerusalem, the invasion of the Assyrian army, its ultimate destruction and the death of Sennacherib, the description of which events is followed immediately by the prediction of the Babylonian captivity; and, on the other hand, chapters xl to lxvi, which speak of times of peace and joy, when Israel will be esteemed highly by all her present enemies, of return from the exile, and reconciliation with the Lord.

This division, dictated as it were by the biblical text itself, can also be found with the medieval Jewish commentators. Among these commentators, for whom the interpretation of Isaiah's prophecies was still 'open', we find, of course, a great variety of explanations. To them we shall now turn.

II. The medieval Jewish commentators.

Many medieval Jewish commentators, as we said, make a division between chapter xxxix and chapters xl to xlvi. Rashi, for example, says in his interpretation of Is. xl. 1:

'Here the prophet goes back to his prophecies of the future, and as from here until the end of the book there are words of consolation, the text makes a distinction in this way between words of consolation and punishment. Thus the meaning of the verse is: Comfort ye, o my prophets, comfort ye my people.'²

The most radical distinction is made by Ibn Ezra. We shall quote his introductory remark to chapter xl in full, as it casts an interesting

1. Fo. 63a (89d).

2. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 223.

light on his conception of the prophecies:

'This chapter has been placed here for the following reason: in the preceding chapter it is predicted that all the treasures of the king, and even his sons, will be carried away to Babylon; this sad prediction is followed properly by words of comfort. These first comforting promises, with which the second part of the book of Isaiah begins, refer, as R. Moses Hakkohen believes, to the restoration of the temple by Zerubbabel;¹ according to my opinion to the coming redemption from our present exile; prophecies concerning the Babylonian exile are introduced only as an illustration, showing how Cyrus, who allowed the captive Jews to return to Jerusalem, [was appointed for that mission by the Almighty long before].² About the last section of the book there is no doubt, that it refers to a period yet to come, as I shall explain. It must be borne in mind, that the opinion of the orthodox, that the book of Samuel was written by Samuel, is correct as regards the first part, till the words And Samuel died (i Sam.xxv.1)....The words Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship (Is.xlix.7) support this view, though they may also be explained as follows: Kings and princes will arise, etc., when they hear the name of the prophet, even after his death. The reader will adopt the opinion which recommends itself most to his judgment.'³

Two points are noteworthy in these rather cryptic remarks. First, that according to Ibn Ezra the prophecies concerning the return from Babylon are not real prophecies; they have an illustrative purpose and value only. He bases this idea on the assumption that the last half of Isaiah was written by a prophet who lived during the exile when the fall of Babylon was imminent, or even just after the return to Jerusalem, and who uses the present events, which no longer needed to be predicted at that stage, to illustrate what will happen when the messianic age occurs. As surely as the inhabitants of Judah have returned from the Babylonian captivity, so surely will the ultimate redemption take place.

1. Cf. Ezra iii.8 ff.

2. The Hebrew text is defective and should be completed as shown according to the editor (Comm.on Is., p. 170, n.3).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., pp. 169-71.

This is the eternal value of the 'prophecies' concerning the return from Babylon, that they will strengthen the faith of Israel in those passages of the prophecies which refer to the messianic age and keep alive the hope of redemption from their 'present exile'.¹

Secondly, that according to Ibn Ezra it is impossible that even a divinely inspired prophet can anticipate the exact history of the days to come.² This is illustrated by what he says about the first book of Samuel, who can only have been the author of that part of the book which describes events that took place during his lifetime. Likewise the second half of the book of Isaiah, which contains allusions to events that took place after the death of the prophet, cannot have been written by Isaiah himself. He proves this with the text Kings shall see and arise, which refers, according to him, to the prophet who eventually will be honoured by kings and princes when they see his prophecies fulfilled. Since the context alludes to the situation during Cyrus' reign, the prophet lived at that time and must consequently be someone different from the author of the first half of the book.³

However, Ibn Ezra seemed to realize that to attribute the last half of Isaiah to a different author was rather a bold thing, and therefore left it to his readers to decide whether or not they wanted to accept his point of view; he even provided them with a different interpretation

1. Cf. for this evaluation the editor's notes, op. cit., p.170, n.2.

2. Cf. the editor's notes, Comm. on Is., p.170, n.5. See also then H.A. Fischel, 'Die deuterjesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder in der jüdischen Auslegung', Hebr.Un.Coll. Ann., xviii (1943-44), 56: 'Er kommt zu dieser Ansicht auch aus seiner Auffassung der Prophetie, die für ihn nicht historische Einzelheiten über Jahrhunderte vorauszuschauen vermag oder beabsichtigt'.

3. Cf. Comm. on Is., p.171, n.7.

1. Comm. on Is., p. 210. For the edition used see p. 210. The references to Jewish sources in this chapter have mainly been taken from the literature used or have been given to me by various Jewish scholars.

of the text, by which, in fact, he destroyed his own theory. As it was, his opinion did not meet with much approval. Only the fifteenth century Spanish exegete Isaac Abravanel (1437-1508), one of the pioneers of modern biblical criticism, followed him here. And anyway, if the prophecies concerning historical facts in these chapters are not prophecies at all, the whole historical background becomes of little or no importance, and it does not make much difference who exactly the author was. This consideration may account for the fact that Ibn Ezra does not deal more extensively with the question of authorship. It is difficult to see, however, how he combines this view of the prophecies with the interpretation of the second half of Isaiah in his actual commentary, which is almost exclusively literal. Or it may be that Ibn Ezra often gives in a short prologue or in a brief summary his own personal opinion, while in the commentary itself he is concerned only with the text, its direct meaning, its historical setting, and its grammatical structure.

As a last example of the medieval Jewish works we take the commentary on Isaiah by David Kimchi. This commentator does not make an explicit division between the fortieth chapter and what preceded it. All he says is: 'All these consolations are for the days of the Messiah', and continues with his interpretation.¹

In general, we can say that also in the Jewish commentaries Isaiah xl to lxvi is regarded as a description of the messianic age, when God alone will be king after taking revenge on Israel's enemies; then he will show himself as the almighty Lord of the world, the God of Israel; then the sufferings of Israel will have sufficed to reconcile all

1. Comm. on Is., p. 281. For the edition used see p. 210. The references to Jewish sources in this chapter have mainly been taken from the literature used or have been given to me by various Jewish scholars.

all, the first Jewish commentaries.

nations with their Creator, and a time of universal blessing will come.

This general picture, of course, leaves ample room for different interpretations of the various details of the prophecies. Since the Jews are still expecting their Messiah there is, as we have already said, much more speculation in their commentaries than in those of the Christian writers as to whom is meant in these chapters by the Servant of the Lord. In the Targum, for instance, he is referred to as the Messiah. For example Is.xlii.1, Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth, is rendered: 'Behold my servant, the Messiah, I will draw him near, my chosen one in whom my word delights'. Or Is.lii.13, Behold my servant shall deal prudently, reads in the same: 'Behold my servant, the Messiah, shall prosper'. Later on we shall return to the exposition of the Targum.¹ All we can say at the moment is that under influence of the identification of the servant with the Messiah in the Targum, this became the commonly accepted interpretation for the opening verses of the main servant chapter. There is no reason, however, to assume that this interpretation was now automatically applied by commentators to the whole of the chapter, as was the case in the Targum. For we have to bear in mind, especially in dealing with the earliest Jewish commentaries, that they did not interpret passages as a whole, but only scattered verses which do not necessarily have any logical connection. These commentaries have much more the character of a collection of loose sayings and opinions, where association rather than the order of the biblical book determines the next comment, and where what has been said about one verse should not be extended to the following.² After

1. Cf. below p. 201f.

2. Cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism, iii.166, n.255.

all, the first Jewish commentator who gave a continuous exposition of the text of the biblical books was Saadya in the tenth century.

III. Did the old synagogue know of a suffering Messiah?

A) In pre-Christian times and the first century A.D.

As Isaiah lii.13 to liii.12 is very much the nucleus of the servant passages, we shall deal with this section now. Since the history of its interpretation according to the Jewish commentators is long and complicated, we can only mention a few of its aspects here.¹ The first question to be considered is: did the old synagogue know of a suffering Messiah?

Special attention has been devoted by both Jewish and Christian scholars to the interpretation of Isaiah liii in the last centuries before Christ and the first centuries of the Christian era.² The main subject of discussion is what part the figure of the suffering servant of the Lord as described in Is. liii could have played in late Judaism. Was there any reason to associate him with the Messiah, or in other words: is there a place in the late Jewish theology for a suffering and dying Messiah to whose death reconciliatory, redemptive power is attributed? Some think there is. A. Wünsche for

1. For a collection of Jewish interpretations of Is. liii from the earliest down to the seventeenth century, which in particular for the later period is almost exhaustive, see A. Neubauer, Isaiah 53.

2. Of the most importance for this chapter: G.H. Dalman, Der leidende Messias nach der Lehre der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrtausend (Karlsruhe, 1887) and id., Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Sühnleiden des Heilsmittlers (Leipzig, 1890); H.A. Fischel, 'Die deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder in der jüdischen Auslegung', Hebr. Un. Coll. Ann., xviii (1943-44), 53-76; J. Jeremias, 'Zum Problem der Deutung von Jesaja 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum' in Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne, Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel (Neuchâtel etc., 1950), pp.113-19; H.J. Schoeps, Paulus; 'Jesaja 53 in der älteren jüdischen Literatur', note in Strack Billerbeck, i.481-85; H.W. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum (3rd edn., Berlin, 1952); A. Wünsche, Die Leiden des Messias.

example says:

'Dass aber die Lehre von einem leidenden Messias ein dem Alten Testament naturwüchsig angehörendes Product ist, beweist die alte Synagoge',¹

and further on:

'Die Lehre von einem leidenden und sterbenden Messias und der durch ihn gestifteten Versöhnung spielt überhaupt in der alten Synagoge eine so grosse Rolle, dass wir ein Werk des alten, nicht lehrstreitigen rabbinischen Schriftthums aufschlagen mögen, welches wir wollen, wir immer etwas von dieser Lehre finden'.²

Other authors, however, are more careful, and rightly so it seems.

What is, on the other hand, certainly an authentic Jewish thought, firmly rooted in the Old Testament, is the idea of propitiatory, vicarious suffering. It can be shown from two different notions. One is the Mosaic sacrificial system, with its fundamental conception that the life of an innocent animal, given in stead of the human soul, purges the sins of the offerer. We find this idea clearly expressed in texts like Lev.xvii.11, For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul, on which text Rashi comments:

'For the life of the flesh of every creature is dependent on its blood and it is for this reason that I have placed it on the altar to make expiation for the life of man; let life come and expiate for life.'³

At the same time this expiatory offering - the word often used in the Hebrew text, זָבַח , is the same as occurs in Is.liii.10 - serves as a means to maintain God's covenant with his people, for it restores the

damage in this relationship done by the individual sinner. For example

1. Tanhuma, Hava Sarah, vi.

2. Gen. xviii.23 ff.

1. A. Wünsche, Die Leiden des Messias, p.v.

3. Lev. xvii.11 ff.

2. Ibid., p.3.

4. Tanhuma, Hava Sarah, ix and Bablioth, xlviii.

3. Rashi, Commentary on the Pentateuch, ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, ii.79).

Lev.v.14-17:

And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, If a soul commit a trespass, and sin....in the holy things of the Lord; then he shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram....And he shall make amends for the harm that he has done in the holy thing....and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be forgiven him.

The second notion is that of the meritorious and reconciliatory character of the suffering of the righteous. The idea that the righteous, and among them in particular the patriarchs, had found special favour in the eyes of the Lord, can be derived from many places in the Old Testament. Indeed so much were they esteemed and loved by him, that it was said that this world and the world to come were created for the sake of Abraham.¹ Powerful is the intercession of the righteous on behalf of others, as appears from Abraham's intercession for Sodom and Gomorrah², or Amos' prayer for Israel.³ In Ex.xxxii.31-32 we can read that Moses was prepared to atone with his own life for the sins of the people who had made the golden calf:

And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.

This conception of the merit of the fathers, the תורת אבות, which are of a vicarious nature and to which frequently appeals are made as a ground for God's love towards his people,⁴ together with the ideas lying behind the expiatory offering in which the life of an animal is substituted for a human being, must have led to the belief

1. Tanhuma, Hayye Sarah, vi.

2. Gen. xviii.23 ff.

3. Amos vii.1 ff.

4. Tanhuma, Wayyera, ix and Hukkoth, xlvi.

also that the suffering and death of the righteous also had a reconciliatory and vicarious value. חַוְּתָה הַיָּדוּת חַכְפָּרָת - 'the death of the righteous reconciles', is an expression often used in the Talmud.¹ Or we read that Resh Lakish, who lived about 250 said: 'May I be an expiation for R. Hiyya (c.200) and his sons'.² How familiar the whole idea was can be seen from the fact that this saying 'אֲנִי חַכְפָּרָה' - 'may I be an expiation', was used as 'a respectful way of mentioning one's deceased parent or teacher'.³ In the Mekilta on Ex.xii.1, which speaks of the willingness of Moses and David to sacrifice their lives as a vicarious expiation,⁴ we read: 'Thus you find everywhere that the patriarchs and the prophets offered their lives on behalf of Israel'.⁵ In Is.liii we find this conception developed in its most complete form, but it is not until the seventies of the first century^{A.D.} that we find more systematic thinking about the whole idea, mainly under the influence of R. Aqiba.

Next we have to investigate whether any of the above mentioned ideas were associated with the Messiah. In Strack-Billerbeck we read: 'Bei solcher Wertschätzung der Leiden würde es gewiss nicht überraschen, falls die Messiasbilder, die die alte Synagoge gezeichnet hat, von Anfang an einzelne Leidenszüge aufwiesen'.⁶ According to G.F. Dalman

of the attitudes in this context see W.D. Davies, *Jesus and the Jewish Law*, (London, 1962), pp. 278-80.

1. Bab. Talmud, Makkoth 11b and Moed Katan 28a. For further references cf. A. Wünsche, Die Leiden des Messias, pp. 20-23.

2. Bab. Talmud, Sukkah 20a (ed. Epstein, pp. 86-87).

3. Ibid., p. 87, n.1. Cf. also H.J. Schoeps, Paulus, p. 130.

4. For David see ii Sam.xxiv.17.

5. Mekilta, tract. Pisha, i (ed. Lauterbach, i.11). For further references see Strack-Billerbeck, ii.280-82 (not all applicable though) and G.F. Moore, Judaism, i.535-545 and iii.164, n.249.

6. Strack-Billerbeck, ii.282.

almost all the rabbinic traditions of a suffering Messiah go back to of Is. liii, but these belong, of course, to a later period.¹

There are, however, according to some scholars, interpretations which possibly show signs of an early messianic understanding of Is. liii. For these we have to go back to the apocalyptic literature. There we find passages in which the description of the Messiah figure has so much in common with the servant of Isaiah, that it seems justified to assume that they were influenced by Is. liii.² For example the Similitudes of Enoch,³ iv Ezra⁴ and ii Baruch. There is a possibility that the LXX understood Is. liii of the Messiah, because of its translation of 724 by πατὴρ, which should refer to a father-son relationship between God and the servant, though this is not much more than an assumption.⁵ It is further interesting to note that the Thanksgiving Scroll of Qumran applies Is. liii to the Teacher of Righteousness, in order to describe him as a man of suffering.⁶

1. G.H. Dalman, Der leidende Messias, p. 2.

2. For a critical evaluation of this possibility see H.W. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, pp. 42-47. E. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, Exkurs ii, 'Zur Frage des Alters des Glaubens an den leidenden Messias im Judentum', pp. 256-59, denies a messianic interpretation of Is. liii in these early sources.

3. For a discussion of the Similitudes in this context see W.D. Davies, Paul and rabbinic Judaism (repr. 2nd edn., London, 1962), pp. 278-80.

4. Cf., however H.A. Fischel, 'Die deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder', p. 61, n.44: 'Ob in iv Ezra 5 (7) 28 f. und 11 (13) 37 eine Auslegung oder Anspielung auf unsere Lieder enthalten ist, ist nicht auszumachen, da die recht allgemein gehaltene Beschreibung des sterbenden Messias nicht notwendig eine Deutung der Ursprungsstelle impliziert'. Kittel, ThW, v. 685.

5. Cf. W. Zimmerli, 'πατὴρ υἱοῦ, die Übertragungen in LXX', Kittel, ThW, v. 675-76: 'Dann dürfte der griechische Übersetzer in Jes. 52.13-53.12 eine messianische Gestalt beschrieben finden, auf deren Kommen er wartet'.

6. The Thanksgiving Hymns, ed. M. Mansoor (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, iii, 1961), ii.8, p. 105; iv.8, p. 123; vii.1, p. 148.

Prof. Jeremias sees in the already quoted passage of the Testament of Benjamin, which he took to refer to the suffering of the Messiah ben Joseph,¹ one of the earliest proofs of a messianic understanding of Is.liii. The suffering of the servant is here of a vicarious nature. If his interpretation of this doubtful and much interpolated text is right, then this would be the only place where the Messiah ben Joseph is mentioned in connection with Is.liii.²

Summarizing we can say that in the above mentioned passages we have reminiscences of Is.liii, which point to a messianic understanding of the chapter in pre-Christian times; but we have to add that, although we have not been able to examine the sources closely, nowhere ^{is} full understanding of the prophecy to be found. Therefore we must agree with H.W. Wolff when he writes:

'Wir müssen also feststellen, dass in dem gleichen Augenblick, da das Spätjudentum Züge des Knechtes aus Jesaja 53 in sein Messiasbild einzeichnet, die Botschaft dieser grossen Prophetie von der Einzigartigkeit seines Leiden, von der Frucht seiner Stellvertretung und der Vollendung seines Sieges für die spätjüdische Gemeinde verlorenging'.³

It is in particular doubtful how much attention was paid to the suffering of the servant-Messiah, even where it was mentioned in the above sources. Some scholars point to the fact that Jesus had to explain to his disciples that he was going to suffer and die, for example Mark viii.31:

1. Cf. J.E. Schreier, *Kritik*, p. 137.

2. Cf. W.D. Davies, *Paul and rabbinic Judaism*, p. 203: '....the

3. J. Jeremias, 'Παλις Διο. im Spätjudentum', in Kittel, *ThW*, v.685.

Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, ii.273-74: 'Die alte Synagoge kennt einen leidenden Messias, dem aber kein Tod beschieden ist, das ist der Messias ben David, und sie kennt einen sterbenden Messias, von dem aber kein Leiden ausgesagt wird, das ist der Messias ben Joseph'.

4. H.W. Wolff, *op.cit.*, p. 43.

And he began to teach them that the Son of Man had to undergo great sufferings, and to be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and doctors of the law; to be put to death, and to rise again three days afterwards.

From texts like this they draw the conclusion that the conception of a suffering and dying Messiah was not popular at the time.¹ Others, on the other hand, think that Jesus and his followers were hardly standing alone when they applied Is. liii to the Messiah.²

As a result, therefore, of our inquiry into the interpretation of Is. liii in pre-Christian Judaism we may conclude that, in view of the appreciation of the suffering of the righteous and of the messianic understanding of Is. liii in some apocalyptic and other writings, the possibility of a conception of a suffering Messiah in early Judaism is not out of the question.³

B) Messianic interpretations of Is. liii in the beginning of the Christian era.

As far as the first centuries of the Christian era are concerned, we find, as we have already seen, that the Targum interprets the servant chapter of the Messiah. But it does this in such a way, that apart from the first three verses, not much of the original version is

1. For example G.H. Dalman, Der leidende Messias, p. 5 and Strack-Billerbeck, ii.274-83.

2. E.g. J.H. Schoeps, Paulus, p. 137.

3. Cf. W.D. Davies, Paul and rabbinic Judaism, p. 283: '....the assumption is at least possible that the conception of a suffering Messiah was not unfamiliar to pre-Christian Judaism'. Also H.J. Schoeps, op.cit., p. 137: '....wird doch in der jüngsten Forschung sogar eine vorchristliche Verbreitung dieser Vorstellung angenommen', and J. Jeremias, 'παλιθιον im Spätjudentum'; Kittel, ThW, v.685: 'Die messianische Deutung einzelner Gottesknechtabschnitte des Deuterjesaja ist mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit bis in vorchristliche Zeit zurückverfolgbar'. However, E. Sjöberg, op.cit., Exkurs ii, pp. 256 and 264-65, argues that only the experiences of A.D.70 and of the Bar Kochba war in the second century could have given rise to the idea of a suffering Messiah.

left.¹ In particular the verses which speak of the suffering of the servant have been distorted, and are interpreted as referring to either Israel or the nations; his bearing of Israel's sin is reduced to intercession on their behalf; and his death is merely exposure to deadly perils.² A further source for a messianic interpretation in this period is Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho.³ Its value as a source of information has been disputed on grounds of the artificial character of the discussion.⁴ However, it seems unnecessary to assume that because of this the arguments used by the 'partners' in the discussion are completely out of touch with reality. They almost certainly reflect some of the opinions of the Jews in Justin's surroundings, namely Palestine in the days of the Bar Kochba war. The Palestinian Jews indeed did, according to him, expect the Messiah to suffer, for this

1. The text can be found in The Targum of Isaiah, ed. and transl. J.F. Stenning (Oxford, 1949), pp. 178-81.

2. Cf. G.F. Dalman, Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Sühnleiden des Heilsmittlers, p.3: 'Das Targum zu den Propheten hütet sich freilich, den Messias als leidenden erscheinen zu lassen, findet sich aber doch genötigt Jesaja 53 vom Messias zu erklären und gewinnt nur durch eine Reihe exegetischer Künsteleien welche kein Jude später zu wiederholen gewagt hat, die Möglichkeit, trotzdem das Leiden von ihm fern zu halten'; also ibid., Der leidende Messias, pp.22-24, and Strack-Billerbeck, ii.284. According to prof. Jeremias this was done to prevent the Christians from appealing to Is. liii as an Old Testament prophecy of Christ's suffering and death. ('Zum Problem der Deutung von Jesaja 53', p.115; cf. also p.119).

3. Justin Martyr, the Dialogue with Trypho, transl. A.L. Williams (Translations of Christian Literature, Ser.I, Greek Texts, 1930.)

4. G.F. Dalman, Der leidende Messias, p.8 refers to a 'dem Juden abgerungenen Zugeständnis'; H.A. Fischel, 'Die deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder', p.62, n.48 remarks: 'Tryphos Eingeständnis in Justins Werk, dass Kap.53 auf einen leidenden Messias ausgelegt werden könne, gehört zur konstruierten Diskussion des Buches'. Cf. also E. Sjöberg, op.cit., Exkurs i, 'Justin und das Problem vom leidenden Messias im Judentum', pp. 247-254.

was plainly foretold in the Scriptures, as they say. But what made it impossible for them to accept Jesus as their Messiah was the manner of his death, because it is written in the Law: For he that hanged is accursed of God.^{1,2}

The earliest rabbinic writings which associate the suffering servant of Is. liii with the Messiah date from the beginning of the third century, but, of course, incorporate material which goes back to an earlier period. The oldest source (c.200) which ascribes a meritorious character to the suffering of the Messiah can be found in the Babylonian Talmud, tractate Sanhedrin 98b. It reads:

'Rab said: The world was created only on David's account. Samuel said: On Moses' account; R. Johanan said: For the sake of the Messiah. What is his the Messiah's name?.... The Rabbis said: His name is 'the leper scholar', as it is written, Surely he has borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him a leper, smitten of God, and afflicted.^{3,4}

By 'the Rabbis' are meant the pupils of the editor of the Mishna, Rabbi (= Jehuda I, c.135-c.220), of whom it is said that he took illnesses upon himself on behalf of others for thirteen years, and who was regarded by his contemporaries as a type of the Messiah. Thus if the Messiah is called by Rabbi's disciples 'the leper scholar' or, according to another translation, 'the leprous one from the house of

1. Deut. xxi.23.

2. 'But we doubt whether the Christ was crucified with such dishonour, for he that crucified is said in the Law to be accursed, so that with regard to this it is hardly possible that I can be persuaded. It is clear that the Scriptures proclaim that the Christ is liable to suffering, but whether it is to be by a form of suffering that is accursed by the Law, we desire to learn, if you can bring forward any proof on this point also'. (Dialogue with Trypho, lxxxix.2 ed. Williams, pp.190-91).

3. Is. liiii.4.

4. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 98b (ed. Epstein, pp.667-68).

Rabbi', then it is obvious that they expected him too to suffer for others in the same way as their master did, for which they appealed to Is. lili.¹

In Sanhedrin 98a we read that the Messiah sits at the gate of Rome among the poor sick:

'R. Joshua ben Levi (c.250) met Elijah standing by the entrance of R. Simeon ben Yohai's (c.150) tomb. He asked him: 'Have I a portion in the world to come? He replied, 'If this Master desires it'. R. Joshua ben Levi said, 'I saw two, but heard the voice of a third'. He then asked him, 'When will the Messiah come?' -- 'Go and ask himself', was his reply. 'Where is he sitting?' -- 'At the entrance'.² 'And by what sign may I recognise him?' -- 'He is sitting among the poor lepers: all of them untie [them] all at once, and rebandage them together, whereas he unties and rebandages each separately, [before treating the next], thinking, should I be wanted, [it being time for my appearance as the Messiah] I must not be delayed [through having to bandage a number of sores]'.³

1. The Hebrew 'בית רבי' can be translated in different ways. In general 'בית רבי' means 'the house of the rabbi', i.e. the school, which meaning is given in the English version, 'the leper scholar', as well as in the German translation, 'der Aussätzige des Lehrhauses' (Der Babylonische Talmud, ed. Goldschmidt, vii.430). In this special case, however, 'בית רבי' can also be understood as 'the house of Rabbi', in which case the similarity of the sufferings of the Messiah with those of Rabbi is even stronger (Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, ii.286 and G.H. Dalman, Der leidenden Messias, pp.11-12). The latter notes that 'בית רבי', stricken, of the Isaiah verse quoted in the saying is especially used of leprosy in later rabbinic Hebrew. Cf. also Jerome ad loc.: 'Et nos putavimus eum esse immundum, sive in dolore, ut Septuaginta transtulerunt, pro quo Aquila et Symmachus posuerunt leprosum, Theodotio flagellatum. Quod aliis verbis Hebraico idiomate lepra intellegitur, iuxta illud quod in psalmo scriptum est: Et flagellum non appropinquabit tabernaculo tuo (Ps.xci.10)....Pro eo quod Symmachus transtulit: 'Εν λέπρῃ ὄντα, hoc est in lepra, Aquila posuit ἀσθενὲς, id est leprosum, quod multi non intelligentes, putant relictum, et alii καθήμενος, id est sedentem' (Comm.in Es., xiv, C.C.S.L. 73A, p.589, l.68).

2. Other translations have 'At the gate of Rome', for example the German edition, op.cit., vii.427: 'Am Thor Roms'.

3. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 98a (ed. Epstein, p.664).

4. In particular Sanhedrin 98a, vii.427.

5. See also reference to G.H. Dalman, Der leidende Messias pp. 10-25, Sanhedrin, vii.427 and G.H. Dalman, 'Die Aussätzigen des Babylonischen Talmud', p. 42.

This tradition places the time of the suffering of the Messiah before his public appearance. In the same tractate, Sanhedrin 93a we read that the Messiah was loaded with 'good deeds and suffering as a mill is laden'.¹ Another early reference to the suffering of the Messiah can be found in Ruth Rabba, v, where it says:

'And Boaz said unto her at meal time: Come hither, and eat of the bread, and dip thy morsel in the vinegar....'²

R. Jonathan interpreted this verse in six ways....The fifth interpretation makes it refer to the Messiah. Come hither: approach to the royal state. And eat of the bread refers to the bread of royalty; And dip thy morsel in the vinegar refers to his sufferings, as it is said, But he was wounded because of our transgressions.^{3,4}

One of the sources which deals most extensively with the suffering of the Messiah is Pesikta Rabbati, but as this is a ninth century collection it falls outside our scope.⁵

On grounds of what has been said, we can conclude that the conception of a suffering Messiah was definitely known to the rabbis of the first centuries A.D.; but we have to point out that during that period the idea became never very widely accepted, as can be seen from the comparatively small number of sources which mention it.⁶ For the

great majority of the rabbis the expected Messiah was the exalted king of the house of David, who would rule in peace and bring prosperity to his people. And in this context there was hardly room for the figure

1. Ibid., 93a (ed. Epstein, pp. 626-27).

2. Ruth ii.14.

3. Is. liii.5.

4. Ruth Rabba, v.6 (ed. Freedman, viii.61-64).

5. In particular Pesikta Rabbati, xxxiv-xxxvii.

6. For further references see G.H. Dalman, Der leidende Messias, pp. 10-29, Strack-Billerbeck, ii.286-87 and H.A. Fischel, 'Die deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder', p. 62.

of a suffering servant, who would surrender his life as a ransom for many.¹

Nevertheless, the conception was never abandoned completely and it keeps emerging throughout the ages until as late as the seventeenth century.² Rashi is said to refer to it in his commentary on the Talmud;³ Ibn Ezra claims that still in his days many expound the chapter of the Messiah, following an old tradition;⁴ and Maimonides explains some verses of Is. liii as referring to the Messiah in his Iggereth Taiman, a letter he wrote in 1172 to the Jews in Yemen.⁵

In fact, during the period from about 300 to 1100 the idea of a suffering Messiah had become more popular, while in general there was much more speculation about the Messiah figure and the events concerning the end of time. Vivid pictures were drawn of the apocalyptic struggle of Gog and Magog and the part played by the Messiah ben Joseph. However, this period did not really create any new ideas, but merely developed old themes. It was not until the twelfth century, as we saw above,⁶

1. Mk. x. 45.

2. Namely in a commentary of R. Solomon de Marini, rabbi at Padua (d. 1670), printed in A. Neubauer, Isaiah 53, pp. 324-39; cf. also p. xliv.

3. Ibid., p. xlv. The author refers here to Raymundus Martini's remark, that Rashi explains the words 'among the poor lepers' [transl. ed. Epstein] of the above (p. 204) mentioned passage of Sanhedrin 98a by reference to Is. liii. (Pugic Fidei, ed. de Voisin, fo. 281).

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 240, cf. below p. 245.

5. Iggereth Taiman, Moses Maimonides' epistle to Yemen, ed. A. S. Halkin, Engl. transl. B. Cohen (The Louis M. and Minnie Epstein Ser., i, 1952), p. xvii. In his commentary on Isaiah, Maimonides explains the chapter of the Messiah because of the traditional interpretation, although he confesses that he would have preferred to interpret the servant of Israel. (Cf. A. Neubauer, op. cit. p. 78).

6. Cf. chapter II.

7. The same author gives this explanation of Isaiah's servant in Is. liii (ibid., p. 324).

8. Parashat Terumah, par. 5, cf. also B. S. Talmud, Parashat Terumah, par. 5. In 50.4-9 depends with an entire sentence bearing the title 'The servant of the Lord'. Also Ibn Ezra explains most of the servant passages of Isaiah.

that a new approach to biblical interpretation broke through, and this also influenced the understanding of Is. liii.

IV. Some non-messianic interpretations.

Having dealt with the sources which associate Is. liii with the Messiah, we shall now briefly mention which other interpretations of the servant passages of the second half of Isaiah were given by the Jewish commentators.¹ As we have already said, the description of the figure of the servant left ample room for various interpretations, and thus we see that the texts were applied, for example, to Moses², or to Phineas,³ who was sometimes identified with Elijah 'on the ground of the zeal for God displayed by both'.⁴ R. Jonah (fourth century) explained the servant of R. Aqiba;⁵ others of Noah or David⁶, and Saadya of Jeremiah.⁷ Isaiah, of course, took a prominent place among the people to be chosen for identification with the servant. For example, Judah ben Simon (c. 330) explains Is. 1.6, I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair, as referring to the prophet himself.⁸ We find this confirmed by Jerome, who remarks that

1. For what follows I am much indebted to H.A. Fischel, op.cit., pp.62-64 and 58-60. See also his chronological table of the various interpretations of the servant passages (pp. 74-76).

2. By R. Simlai (third century) in Bab. Talmud, Sotah 14a (ed. Epstein, pp. 73-74). Also Sifre Deut., ccclv. on Deut. xxxiii. 21. Cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism, i.550 and iii.166, n.254.

3. Sifre Num., cxxxi on Num. xxv. 7-13. Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., i.549 and iii.165, n.525.

4. Ibid., iii.165, n.253.

5. Ibid., i.229, n.3.

6. Cf. J. Jeremias, 'παλις ἰσοῦ im Spätjudentum', Kittel, ThW, v.684.

7. Ibn Ezra mentions this explanation of Saadya (Comm. on Is. ad Is. liii. 13, p.240).

8. Pesikta de-Rab Kahana, cxxv b. Cf. also H.A. Fischel, op.cit., p.63; 'Zu 50.4-9 dagegen gibt es keine andere Deutung als die auf Jesaja....' Also Ibn Ezra explains most of the servant passages of Isaiah.

the Jews interpret this verse of Isaiah.¹ The servant figure was also applied collectively to the prophets, rabbis and righteous of Israel. But in all these cases the application does not comprehend more than one or two verses of the whole chapter. Prof. Jeremias notes in his article 'παλιθίου im Spätjudentum': 'Nur vereinzelt hat also das palästinische Judentum den deuterocesajanischen Gottesknecht auf die Berechten, Propheten und Schriftgelehrten gedeutet, beziehungsweise bezogen'.²

Another possibility was to explain the servant of Israel.³ Origen, for example, refers to it in his Kata Κεδοου. The passage reads:

'I remember once having used the prophecies in a disquisition with those called wise among the Jews, whereon the Jew said that these things were prophesied of the whole people as one, which was both dispersed abroad and smitten, that there might be many proselytes, on the ground that Jews were scattered in the many nations.'⁴

This explanation, as far as Is. lxi is concerned, did not become widely accepted; in fact, we do not find it again until it is put forward by Rashi in his commentary on Isaiah (cf. below).⁵ But then it catches the imagination of the great medieval commentators such as Ibn Ezra, David Kimhi, Joseph Kara, and Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite; and it became a symbol of hope for the Jews in times of hardship and distress.

1. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xiv (C.C.S.L. 73A, p. 553, l.18).

2. J. Jeremias, op.cit., p. 684, where further references can be found.

3. Cf. H.A. Fischel, op. cit., pp. 58-60.

4. Origen, Kata Κεδοου, i.55. The quotation is taken from A. Neubauer, Isaiah 53, p. xli-xlii.

5. Rashi, Comm. on Is. ad Is. lxi.13, p. 280. op.cit., p. 51.

6. Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite, Halakot Gedolot, V. Text in A. Neubauer, op.cit., p. 53.

Here follow their interpretations:

Rashi	Ibn Ezra ¹	David Kimchi ²	Joseph Kara ³	Jacob ben Reuben ⁴
My servant Jacob, that is the righteous people of Israel....	My servant. The Israelites, who are the servants of the Lord....	This parashah refers to the captivity of Israel, who are called here 'my servant'....	My servant Israel will be high and lifted up.	His servant..., so here the same expression is used of no one except Israel, who was afflicted and smitten..., and of whom therefore the whole parashah is to be expounded.

references. Secondly he has to describe himself by the present point of view and finally his degree of dependence on others.

We shall notice that here also Andrew's primary concern is the understanding of the direct meaning of the text. He will be to illustrate the words spoken by the prophet in their historical situation. In this respect his interpretation of these chapters has much in common with the medieval Jewish commentators. From them he learned that it was possible and worthwhile to concentrate on the literal sense of these prophecies, even if they do have a deeper meaning. He here, as we have seen, was of the opinion that they referred to 'the coming redemption of our present exile',² while Kimchi said that all these consultations would become a reality in the days of the Messiah.³

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is. ad Is. lii. 13, p. 240.

2. David Kimchi, introductory note to Is. lii. 13 ff. Text in A. Neubauer, op. cit., p. 49.

3. Joseph Kara ad Is. lii. 13. Text in A. Neubauer, op. cit., p. 41.

4. Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite, Milhamoth Adonai, V. Text in A. Neubauer, op. cit., p. 60.

CHAPTER VIII

Some notes on Andrew's interpretation of Isaiah xl to lii.12.

Discussing Andrew's interpretation of Is.xl to lii.12,¹ we shall pay in particular attention to the following points: first whether, when he follows the Jewish commentators, he prefers to do so when their explanations are historical, or whether he equally frequently incorporates interpretations which obviously contain eschatological or messianic references. Secondly how far he commits himself to the Jewish point of view; and lastly his degree of dependence on Jerome.

We shall notice that here also Andrew's primary concern is the understanding of the direct meaning of the text. His aim is to illuminate the words spoken by the prophet in their historical situation. In this respect his interpretation of these chapters has much in common with the medieval Jewish commentators. From them he learned that it was possible and worthwhile to concentrate on the literal sense of these prophecies, even if they do have a deeper meaning. Ibn Ezra, as we have seen, was of the opinion that they referred to 'the coming redemption of our present exile';² while Kimchi said that all these consolations would become a reality in the days of the Messiah.³

1. The main servant-chapter, Is.lii.13-liii.12, will be dealt with in the next chapter.

2. Cf. above p. 141.

3. Although David Kimchi's commentary on Isaiah, written in the beginning of the thirteenth century, was too late for Andrew to use, we refer to it here occasionally in order to give some more examples of Jewish interpretation. It has been used in the Latin translation of C. Malanimeus, Rab. Davidis Kimchii commentarii in Jesaiam prophetam (Florence, 1774). The reference under consideration can be found on p.281.

But all the same, these scholars gave interpretations of the text which in the first instance illuminated the literal meaning of the prophecies.

In dealing with Andrew's commentary we shall follow the normal procedure of quoting and annotating selected passages.

I

Chapter xl.

1. 'Consolamini, consolamini, popule meus. Ab hoc loco usque ad finem libri in consolatione populi propheta demoratur. Consolamini vos in vicem, vel passive.
 (2) Loquimini ad cor Ierusalem. Vos prophete et sacerdotes, que placeant et cor Ierusalem delectent loquimini. Et advocate. A mestitia et dolore pristino. Completa est. Vexatio et molestia illius finita est'.¹

With these words Andrew clearly indicates the different character of the second half of the book of Isaiah. He speaks of the prophet as announcing the end of the exile, apparently without any difficulty in adjusting himself to the lapse of time between the first half of the book and the days of captivity.² From now onwards the fate of Israel has changed radically; the day of liberation is drawing near, and the prophet can speak words of consolation, which are agreeable to the heart of Jerusalem. Without any doubt, Andrew takes the words of the prophet here as referring to the historical situation of the people of Israel, who are about to return to their country.

3. 'Vox clamantis, vel secundum Hebreos: clamans, in deserto.'^a
 Vox quedam in desertis et solitudinibus hoc clamat: Parate viam Domini. Parate vos et ambulate viam que ducat vos ad

a. C. vel secundum hoc: clamantis in deserto.

1. Fo. 63a (89d).

2. In one or two places Andrew speaks of the prophet as seeing things in his mind which were to take place many years later, thus indicating the distance in time between prophecy and fulfilment (cf. below pp 225-26; 229).

rather vague manner, which is

trad ^a <Dominum> et templum sanctum eius.... Tradunt Hebrei, cum captivi tenerentur in aliqua terra et voluntas Domini erat ut in suam redirent, vox quedam audiebatur, nec cuius esset videbatur, que de reditu illos admonebat. Et ut certissime Domini illam et non hominis vocem esse pateret, in saltibus et lucis, que loca femine frequentare non solent, gracilis et quasi feminea, in vicis vero et in urbibus, ubi viri minus audiri solent,^b grossior et virilis ea vox audiebatur. Vel sic. Vox clamantis, Domini scilicet, vel clamans, subauditur: hec est. In deserto parate viam Domini, rectas facite semitas Dei nostri. Repetitio. Quod enim supra parate viam [hoc], hic rectas facite semitas. Quod/supra in deserto, hic in solitudine dicit. Hinc patet quod sic debet distingui, quod statim in sequentibus ponit vox dicentis (vs. 6), nec in deserto apponit. Vel ad angelorum ministeria vox^c hec clamitat, ut in deserto ubi vie non sunt, viam veniendi ad Dominum populo suo pararent,^d quorum opere et non humano in parando^e viam quod subditur fieri potest.¹

The way of the Lord has a twofold meaning: it leads the Israelites back to their God; and it is the road on which they return to their country. The last interpretation corresponds to Rashi's explanation, who also interprets the verse of the return of the Jews to Jerusalem. The voice, according to him, is the holy spirit.² Andrew apparently found it more difficult to give a literal explanation of the words vox clamantis vel clamans in deserto, which, of course, every Christian reader immediately associated with John the Baptist. What he tries to do is to analyze objectively the surface meaning of these words. In so doing he seeks the help of Jewish commentators, and finally lists three different possibilities. Initially he calls the voice vox quedam in a

a. M. and C. domum.

b. C. solebant.

c. C. vos.

d. C. parent.

e. C. imperando.

1. Fo. 63a,b (89d-90a).

2. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 224.

rather vague manner, which he then specifies by first quoting a Jewish tradition concerning the return of the Jews to their country, which I have not been able to find in the Jewish sources. A second possibility is to take vox clamans or clamantis by itself and to interpret thus: this is the voice of God; while he argues that in deserto belongs to parate: prepare a way in the desert, and not to vox. Lastly he suggests that it could be a voice which calls upon the angels to prepare the road on which the Israelites would return. This interpretation seems to indicate that the event of the return and the extraordinary quality of the road on which the Israelites were to travel (cf. vs.4) were indeed of such a character, that they can be conceived of only as prepared by God himself. For it is a typically Jewish idea to describe divine interference in the fate of men as achieved by angels, who act, as it were, as personal agents of the Lord.¹

4. 'Omnis vallis implebitur,^a et omnis mons etc. Hoc modo parabitur via ad ambulandum in ea facillima et optima et planissima et rectissima. Subsidentia vallium ita implebuntur et ardua montium et collium sic humiliabuntur, ut relique planitie coequentur et sola sit equalitas. Et quoniam in via et plana pravitas et asperitas nocere possent subdit: Et erunt prava in directa, et aspera in vias planas. Pro pravis, id est distortis et indirectis viis, erunt vie directe et pro asperis leves et plane. Hic inter cetera Iudeorum simplicitas, vel potius fatuitas sibi promittit, quando de cunctis locis in quibus dispersi sunt dispersos Israel Dominus congregabit, quod, sicut dictum est vox clamantis audietur, et valles implebuntur,^b et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur, et erunt prava in directa, et aspera in vias planas.'^c

a. M. and V. exaltabitur.

b. M. exaltabuntur.

1. Cf. also Is.xli.2 (below p. 216); xlii.19 (below p. 221) and in particular xliii.8 (below p. 222). Ibn Ezra, for example, explains the voice in Is.xl.6 as the voice of an angel, thus indicating that the Lord addresses the prophet through an angel rather than directly. (Comm. on Is., p. 172).

2. Fo. 63b (90a).

Andrew explains first in some detail how the words of the text can be visualized, very much in the same way as Rashi does.¹ His interpretation is reminiscent of the one he gave of Is.xi.15, where he likewise concerned himself with the technical details of the drying up of the Egyptian sea.² Then follows one of his rare outbursts against the Jews, who expect a literal fulfilment of the text when the Lord will finally gather his dispersed people.³ It may be that because of the obvious messianic connotations of these texts for Christian readers Andrew felt compelled to disagree with the Jews; but all the same, he liked to mention their point of view as an illustration of a literal understanding of the text. Another possibility is that Andrew's literal interpretation served only as an explanation of the actual words of the text, but did not imply the expectation of a literal fulfilment of them. He may have regarded the words of Isaiah as prophetic imagery, indicating how speedy and easy the return of the Jews would be.⁴ In that case, he would indeed have considered the Jewish view as rather naive.

Andrew's interpretation of this text is a typical illustration of the difficulties he encountered in explaining the literal sense of these prophecies. As we saw, he first gave an explanation of the literal meaning of the text, since that was what he set out to do, even though he must have realized that things had not happened in that way during the actual return of the Jews from Babylon. Then he adds that

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.224.

2. Cf. above p. 183.

3. Ibn Ezra, for example, explained: (4) 'Every valley that is now low, shall then be exalted. (5) When God will perform this miracle, then his glory will be revealed'. (Comm.on Is., p. 172).

4. Cf. David Kimchi's remark: 'This is figurative language, expressing the thought that the journey back to Jerusalem would not be tiresome for them'. (Comm.on Is., p. 282).

the Jews expect these things to happen in the days of their Messiah, for because this is a Jewish interpretation, he takes it as belonging to the literal sense. On the other hand, he knows that the Church refers these texts to the activity of John the Baptist and the coming of Christ. This means that if he explained these verses of the days of the Messiah he would, according to medieval understanding, give a spiritual explanation. If he explained them as referring to the Jewish messianic age only, he would be accused of judaizing and of denying the true meaning of the prophecies. Therefore he compromises in two ways: in the first place by not committing himself to saying to which period he took the prophecies to refer; and secondly by seeming to disagree with the Jewish messianic interpretation.

5. 'Et revelabitur gloria Domini. Gloriosa facies Domini, que nunc velatur et occultatur, tunc omnibus revelabitur et manifestabitur.'¹

The liberation of the Jews from captivity will reveal God's glory. Andrew does not say explicitly whether he takes this as referring to the return of the Jews from Babylon, or to the messianic age; but according to his remark at the beginning of the chapter, that from now onwards the prophet speaks words of consolation to the people of Israel, it seems most likely that we have to understand these words as referring to the historical situation. This is also born out by his interpretation of the following verse:

6. 'Vox dicentis. Domini videlicet ad me Ysaïam'.²

27. 'Quare dicis, Iacob, et loqueris Israel? Videns se populus Domini a pessimis et idolatris captivari et affligi dicebat, et si non totus, aliqua pars eius: Abscondita est via mea a Domino'.³

1. Fo. 63b (90a).

2. Fo. 63b (90a).

3. Fo. 64b (90d).

Esraechite=Orientale Abraham sei, da er auch in unserem Verse als der aus dem Osten bezeichnet wird'.^{1,2}

We find this confirmed by Ibn Ezra who stated that the ancients referred this text to Abraham, but that he himself preferred to explain it of Cyrus, because all the chapters are connected by their contents and the name of Cyrus is explicitly mentioned further on.³ Rashi⁴ and Kimchi⁵ explained the text of Abraham, while Kimchi mentioned that Abraham's feet did not ache from the long journey. The matter of fact manner in which Andrew explained the passage of Abraham seems to suggest that he derived his interpretation from Jewish sources rather than from Jerome, who classified it among interpretations he did not agree with. On grounds of the Latin text which uses future tenses here,⁶ Andrew finally notes that it is also possible to explain these texts of Cyrus, which is yet another of Jerome's rejected interpretations.⁷

On verse 14, Fear not thou worm Jacob, he remarks:

14. 'Vermis. Qui es debilis et fragilis sicut vermis. Iacob dicitur vermis,^a quia sole ore, id est precibus et orationibus more vermis pugnat....'⁸

a. C. om. Iacob....vermis.

1. Cf. Bab. Talmud, Baba Bathra 15a (ed. Epstein, p. 73) and Sanhedrin 108b (ed. Epstein, p. 747).

2. L. Ginzberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', vi (in Jewish studies in memory of George A. Kohut, p. 310).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., pp. 180-81. The author refers here to Is. xlvi.11, xli.25, xlv.28 and xlv.1 respectively.

4. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 231.

5. Kimchi. Comm. on Is., p. 296.

6. The difference in tenses between the Hebrew and the Latin version commented on by Andrew lies mainly in the structure of the Hebrew itself, which does not indicate different tenses in the same way as Western languages. The tenses used here in the Hebrew text are so called imperfecta, which usually have a future connotation, but can in archaic and poetic language be used for expressing events of the past.

7. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xii (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p. 469, l. 76): 'Quae nos super persona Christi et vocatione gentium et praedicatione evangelii atque idolorum condemnatione interpretati sumus, quidam ad Cyrum regem Persarum referunt, quod suscitaverit eum adversum Babylonios de Oriente, et parere suae fecerit iussioni, prosternens ei gentes plurimas, et gladio illius et arcui cuncta subiciens....'.

8. Fo. 65a (91a).

We have here a striking similarity between Andrew and the Jewish commentators, for Rashi says that a worm has strength only in its mouth¹ and the Midrash Tanhuma, according to Kimchi, explains: 'The worm, though weak, attacks the strong tree, but only with its mouth. In the same way also Israel's only strength in attacking the wicked is in her mouth by prayer'.²

25. 'Suscitavi ab Aquilone et veniet ab ortu solis. Ego suscitavi quendam ab Aquilone et ille veniet ab ortu solis et ab Aquilone,^a id est ab aquilonari Oriente. Vocabit nomen meum. Iosephus scribit, universis sibi subditis nationibus, Cyrum qui ab aquilonari Oriente venit in Asiam, solum Dominum Deum esse per epistolas mandasse et Deum deorum vocasse.³ Et adducet magistratus quasi lutum. Summos terrarum magistratus, reges videlicet et principes, quasi lutum pedibus suis subdidisse et sicut figulus humum conculcasse Cyrum regem Persarum et Grece et Latine testantur historie'.⁴

Both Rashi and Ibn Ezra⁵ interpret the text of Cyrus, although Rashi mentioned that the Targum took all these texts as referring to the Messiah and the ultimate redemption of the Jewish people.⁶

Chapter xlii.

On verse 1, Behold my servant, whom I uphold, he comments:

'Ecce servus meus. Illos quia iniusti non suscipiam, sed servum meum Israel, qui non idolorum, sed mee servituti se

a. C. om. et....Aquilone.

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.234.

2. Kimchi, Comm.on Is., p.299.

3. Josephus, Antiquitates, xi.1,1 (The Loeb Classical Library, vi.315): 'For he stirred up the spirit of Cyrus and caused him to write throughout all Asia, "Thus says King Cyrus: Since the Most High God has appointed me king of the habitable world, I am persuaded that He is the god whom the Israelite nation worships, for He foretold my name through the prophets and that I should build His temple in Jerusalem in the land of Judaea"'.
 4. Fo. 65b (91b).
 5. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.185.
 6. Rashi, op.cit., p.238.

4. Fo. 65b (91b).

5. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.185.

6. Rashi, op.cit., p.238.

mancipavit. Et electus.^a Id est quem ex aliis omnibus in populum mihi peculiarem elegi complacuit'.¹

Andrew follows the Jewish commentators in explaining the servant collectively of Israel. We find this interpretation among others in Rashi.² Ibn Ezra, however, remarks: 'Most of the commentators refer this expression (sc. my servant) to the pious Israelites; the Gaon to Cyrus; I to the prophet, who speaks here of himself as in xlix.6'.³

id. 'Dedi spiritum meum super eum. Sapientiam et intelligentiam ad recte iudicandum illi contuli. Iudicium gentibus proferet. Gentes etiam iudicii veritatem ab eo requirent et illis proferet'.⁴

On Israel, his chosen servant, the Lord has bestowed the gift of true judgment. Therefore, the gentiles will come to Israel to seek judgment. This idea is further developed in the verses 3 and 4:

3. 'Calamum quassatum non conteret. Fragiles et contritioni proximos non conteret. Linum fumigans non extinguet. Extinctioni et morti vicinos non extinguet, sed potius fovebit et enutriet. (4) Tristis. Non durus et asper, sed hilaris et affabilis erit.⁵ Donec ponat in terra iudicium. Non turbabitur donec ponat in omnibus terre sue finibus, vel in omni terra iudicii equitatem. De omnibus qui in terra sunt, in diebus novissimis, ut asserunt, populus ille iudicaturus est. Unde subditur: Et legem eius insule expectabunt. Insule, id est gentes, legem illius iuxta quam vivit imponi sibi expectabunt'.⁵

We have here a picture of Israel as the righteous judge, who will not rest until she has brought justice to all the ends of the earth. Andrew keeps close to the text in explaining the figurative language of the prophet. But when exactly does he expect all this to come true?

a. M. and C. electum.

b. C. erat.

1. Fo. 65c (91c).

2. Rashi, Comm.in Is., p.239.

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm.in Is., p. 186.

4. Fo. 65c (91c).

5. Fo. 65d (91c).

In other words, does he take these texts as a description of Israel as it was, or rather ideally should be, in Old Testament times; or do the texts contain a promise to be fulfilled in the end of days?

Of course, Israel was called to be 'a light of the gentiles' (cf. Is.xlii.6) and she was meant to set them an example, but the full meaning and consequences of her election would not be revealed until the last days. Therefore the present and future aspects of texts like these are inseparable. In Andrew's interpretation, however, such theological ideas are not really touched upon. He merely explains the letter of the text, and in so doing mentions that the Jews expect that Israel will judge all the inhabitants of the earth in the age to come. The inclusion of this interpretation seems to indicate that he expected all this to happen in the eschatological future, rather than that he took the texts as a prophetic picture of Israel during and after her return from exile; but as in his explanation of Is.xl.4 he does not commit himself explicitly.¹ It furthermore illustrates again that Andrew was of the opinion that a Jewish messianic interpretation had its place in an exposition of the literal sense; at the same time, it makes one realize once more how deeply influenced he was by Jewish exegesis when he was writing his comments on these chapters.

Rashi is one of the Jewish commentators who explain these verses as referring to the messianic age. In his interpretation he frequently quotes eschatological predictions of other prophets, for example Micha iv.2, where we find the idea that the gentiles expect Israel to teach them the right way of life; while in his explanation of verse 2 he mentions that there is no need for Israel to raise her voice, because the gentiles

1. Cf. above pp. 213-215.

5. The same; *ibid.*, p. 131.

will come to her of their own free will, for they have heard that the Lord is with her (Zach. viii.23).¹

19. 'Quis cecus nisi servus meus? Ne quis putaret gentiles illum paulo superius (vs. 18) surdos cecosque vocasse, hic determinet qui sic appellat. Nuntios. Angelos vel prophetas.'²

Andrew follows here Jerome at a point where the latter disputes a Jewish interpretation.³ They both explain the verse of Israel. Rashi⁴ and Ibn Ezra,⁵ however, interpret the text of the prophet, mainly it seems on grounds of a different rendering of the Hebrew text. For while the Vulgate reads: quis caecus nisi servus meus, et surdus ad quem nuntios meos misi?, the Hebrew renders בְּיָדֵי מַלְאָכָי וְבְיָדֵי נְבִיאֵי יְהוָה 'who is blind, but my servant, or deaf as my messenger that I send?'

It should finally be noted that Andrew suggests here again the possibility of divine interference in the history of man by means of angels.

Chapter xliii.

1. 'Redemi te. De fornace ferrea et servitute Egypti.... Meus. Qui te redemi, et a periculis maximis liberabo et ab aqua et igne salvabo....(6) Affer filios meos. Populo precipit ut infirmiores quosque et labori vie minus sufficientes, qui sunt eius filii et filie, quia eos paterne diligit^(a) secum afferant, nullumque post se^(b)

a. C. diligunt.

b. C. posse.

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., pp.239-40.

2. Fo.91d (66b).

3. Jerome, Comm.in Es., xii (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p.486, l.33): 'Ne quis putaret hoc quod dicitur: Surdi, audite, et caeci, intuemini ad videndum, ad gentium populum pertinere, qui prius surdus et caecus fuerat, ut Iudaei stulta interpretatione approbare contendunt; ipse propheticus sermo demonstrat, qui surdi et caeci intelligi debeant'.

4. Rashi, op.cit., p. 242.

5. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.191.

relinquant....(8) Educ foras populum cecum etc. Angelo qui dispersos Israel in terram suam ad/ducendos congregaturus est, imperat ut de omnibus locis, in quibus inclusus tenetur, populum reputatione cecum et tamen oculos habentem, surdum et tamen audientem, id est qui iudicatur nichil scire cum sciat et nichil intelligere cum tamen intelligat, foras educat. Vel populo gentium imperat ut multitudinem idolorum suorum que nec vident nec audiunt cum et oculos et aures habeant, e templis foras, ut ad interrogata respondeant, educat....(9) Quis in vobis animadvertet^(a) istud. Ad gentes simul congregatas loquitur, querens quis deus inter illos animadvertat illud quod factururus est ipse in futuro et que prima sunt et a principio preterierunt audire vos faciat.... (10) Vere vos testes mei. Illi testes dare non poterunt, sed ego possum, quia vos prophete et servus meus quem elegi vere testes mei estis, ut qui sciatis et credatis mihi et intelligatis quia ipse ego sum solus et omnipotens Deus....(12) Annuntiavi. Salvationem vestram. Alienus. Deus. (14) Propter vos misi in Babylonem. Propter vos liberandos Darium et Cyrum in Babylonem emisi.¹

The things God did for Israel in the past are a guarantee of what he will do for them in the future. Andrew takes these words as a promise to the Israelites in exile. Jerome remarked that the Jews explained the verses 1 to 13 of the second advent of their Messiah, 'when after the fulness of the gentiles all Israel will be saved'.² This reference to the last days is^{also} reflected in Rashi's interpretation of the words when thou walkest through fire, thou shalt not be burned (vs.2), which he explains by referring to Mal. iv.i, which is clearly an eschatological prophecy.³ Most of this passage, however, he explains of the return of the Jews from exile. We find a historical interpretation also in Ibn Ezra who, for example, explained the waters

a. V. annuntiet.

1. Fo. 66c,d (92a).

2. Jerome, Comm.in Es., xii (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p.488, l.56): 'Hebraei de secundo Salvatoris haec interpretantur adventu, quando post plenitudinem gentium omnis salvandus sit Israel...'

3. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.244.

and fire mentioned in verse 2 of the armies of the Medes and Persians.¹

In verse 8 Andrew refers again to the drastic interference of the Lord in the fate of Israel as achieved by an angel,² who is to gather together this ignorant and unintelligent nation, in order that it may return to its country. The other possible interpretation he gives refers to the great tribunal, mentioned by the prophet, which is about to begin, and where both Israel and the gentiles with their idols will have to appear. In his description of this tribunal Andrew follows the text closely. He does not say whether or not he regarded the passage as prophetic imagery, intended to express the greatness of the Lord. There are, however, many references (e.g. vs.14) to the historical situation of the people of Israel in exile, indicating that this is the situation he has predominantly in mind, rather than a tribunal at the end of time.

Chapter xliv.

On verse 2b, Noli timere, serve meus Iacob, et rectissime quem elegi, Andrew comments:

'Rectissime. Pro Israel rectissimum, quia sic^a secundum litteras quibus scribitur nomen sonat, posuit'.³

In his remark that the word Israel means 'the most upright', or 'the most just one' we have an interesting survival of Jerome's dubious etymology. For the latter notes in his explanation of this verse:

'Alio nomine Israelem vocat, Isurun (יִשְׂרָאֵל) enim verbum hebraicum, ceteri Ἰσραήλ, sive Ἰσραήλ, id est, rectissimum et rectum interpretati sunt.... Proprie enim iuxta Hebraeos et litterarum fidem, Israel, rectus Dei dicitur.'⁴

a. C. and M. hic.

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p.193.

2. Cf. above pp. 213. 13.

3. Fo. 67b (92c).

4. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xii (C.C.S.L. 73A, p.496, 1.33).

This interpretation of the name Israel goes back to a passage in the Hebrew Questions on Genesis, where Jerome in his exposition of Gen. xxxii 27 - 29 argues that Josephus thought that Jacob was therefore called 'Israel', because he had stood firm, or fought, against the angel,¹ but that he himself had not been able to find this interpretation anywhere in the Hebrew text. He prefers to interpret the name Israel as 'princeps Dei':

'Sarith enim, quod ab Israhel vocabulo derivatur, principem sonat. Sensus itaque hic est: Non vocabitur nomen tuum subplantator, hoc est Iacob, sed vocabitur nomen tuum princeps cum deo, hoc est Israhel'.²

This means that according to Jerome the word Israel is derived from the verb לָחַם - to rule, to dominate, which interpretation he could have found in Aquila and Symmachus, who translated the text of Genesis respectively $\text{ὅτι ἕρπυς μίτρα Δεοῦ}$ and $\text{ὅτι ἕρπυς πρὸς Δεον}$.³ Rashi also explained in this way: 'It shall no longer be said that the blessings came to you (sc. Jacob) through supplanting and subtlety, but through noble conduct, הִלָּחֵם , and in open manner'.⁴

V. Jerome's final conclusion about the meaning of the word Israel in his Hebrew Questions is: 'Hinc enim Israhel per has literas scribitur,

1. Josephus, Antiquitates, i.20, 2 (ed. Blatt, p.166). The Hebrew texts reads: $\text{וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה שָׂרִיִּשׁ וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה שָׂרִיִּשׁ$

The explanation suggested by the text itself evidently derives the first part of the name Israel from the verb לָחַם - to fight, to battle.

2. Jerome, Hebraicae Quaestiones in Libro Geneseos on Gen.xxxii.27-29 (C.C.S.L. 72, p.40, 1.18).

3. Cf. E. Sachsse, 'Die Etymologie und "alteste Aussprache des Namens יִשְׂרָאֵל ', Z.A.W., xxxiv (1914), 2: 'Die alten Übersetzer scheinen somit an eine denominale Form von לָחַם - Fürst gedacht zu haben'.

4. Rashi, Commentary on the Pentateuch, ad Gen.xxxii.29 (ed. Silbermann, i.160).

iod sin res aleph lamed, quod interpretatur princeps dei, sive directus dei, hoc est $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\upsilon\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta\iota\omicron\upsilon$. This last interpretation derives the name from the verb יָשָׁב - to be straight, to be upright.¹

Andrew, automatically as it were, refers to Jerome's standard explanation of the word Israel as 'rectus' or 'rectissimus', without realizing that the Hebrew uses a different word here which indeed means 'rectus', 'the upright one'. This last explanation can be found in Ibn Ezra, who remarks: יְשׁוּרֻן - Jesurun. It is originally an adjective, derived from יָשָׁב - right; there is no other instance of this form'.²

Chapter xlv.

1. 'Hec dicit Dominus christo meo Cyro etc. De se loquens voluit dicere: hec dicit Dominus quam hec dico ego, et propter nomen dignitatis et potentie et ut arrogans loquendi genus evitaret....(2) Ego ante te ibo. Hic incipiunt que Dominus dicit Cyro....(3) Arcana sua.^a Secretis in locis recondita vel celata tibi revelabo et discooperiam, ut scias ego Dominus solus Deus sum, qui nomen tuum antequam natus et conceptus sis voco. (4) Propter servum meum Iacob. Hec supradicta propter servum meum Iacob tibi faciam. Et vocavi. Ante conceptionis tue tempus tuo te nomine per

a. V. arcana secretorum.

1. This interpretation has found more recent defenders in E. Sachsse, op.cit., pp. 14, 15 and M. Naor, יְשׁוּרֻן und יִשְׂרָאֵל , Mitteilungen i, Z.A.W., xlix (1931), 319. Cf. also G.A. Danell, Studies in the name Israel in the Old Testament (Uppsala, 1946), p.27, who summarizes the results of modern research as follows: 'There are thus grounds for believing that the names Israel, Jeshurun and Asher are identical.. The basic meaning of the common root of the names יָשָׁב / יָשָׁב would be "consistent, reliable, successful, happy" (Sachsse, Naor). But of course this interpretation of the name is not proved and probably not provable either. The consideration most in favour of this theory is that it at the same time solves the riddle of the name Jeshurun'.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.199.

3. Here ends Andrew's commentary on Isaiah in MS.Maz.175 (Fo.92d).

5. Sachsse, op.cit., (O.S.S. 1.75), p.27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

prophetam meum Ysaïam vocavi. Assimilavi te. In hoc te Y/saac et Iosue [de] ceterisque bonis, quibus antequam nascerentur nomen indi <cavi>^a, similem feci, quod nomine tuo antequam nascereris vocavi....(5) Et non cognovisti me. Non mihi, sed viribus tuis asscripsisti quod fortiter egisti'.¹

After one of his characteristic remarks on a particular expression in the text, Andrew points out that the Lord addresses Cyrus, here, emphasizing that his whole career is predetermined by divine decision. He has given him all that he possesses; this should be sufficient reason for Cyrus to recognize the greatness and uniqueness of the Lord. This last notion is a predominant theme in Jerome's interpretation. Andrew mentions that Cyrus had been called by the Lord through his prophet Isaiah long before his conception, and adds that this circumstance places him in one line with men like Isaac and Joshua, who were specially favoured by the Lord; an idea he took from Jerome.² He does not go into the question whether the 'Lord's anointed' in verse 1 could have been an allusion to the Messiah, a point which both Jerome³ and Rashi⁴ take up. Nor does he mention an interesting tradition, recorded by Josephus and referred to by Jerome, that Cyrus had actually read the prophecies of Isaiah in which his name was mentioned, and that he therefore had a particular love for the Jews as worshippers of the Lord.⁵

a. <avi> erased.

1. Fo. 67d-68a.

2. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xii (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p. 505, l. 44), see note 2.

3. Ibid.: 'Haec autem, inquit, tribui tibi propter Iacob servum meum, et Israel electum meum, et vocavi te nomine tuo, sicut vocavi Abraham, Isaac et Iacob; et multo ante praedixi, ut Isaac et Iosiam; ne putareris ille esse Christus, cui assimilatus es, et in cuius typo et imagine praecessisti'.

4. Rashi, Comm. in Is., p. 253, where he refers to the interpretation of 'our rabbis'. For a discussion among the rabbis whether or not Cyrus was the Messiah see e.g. Bab Talmud, Megillah, i. 12a (ed. Epstein, pp. 67-68).

5. Jerome, op. cit., (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p. 504, l. 41). Cf. Josephus, Antiquitates, xi. 1, 2 (The Loeb Classical Library, vi. 315-17). See also L. Ginzberg, Legends, vi. 436, where he mentions the tradition that Daniel showed the prophecies of Isaiah to Cyrus.

14. 'Labor Egypti et negotiatio Ethyopie etc. Hoc inter cetera in novissimis diebus Iudei sibi promittunt, quod cultores terre Egypti et negotiatores Ethyopie et potentes viri Sabaim ad eos, ut de eorum populo et sibi subiecti sunt, transibunt. Post te ambulabunt. Tunc sicut dominus preibit et illi sicut clientes subsequenter....Deprecabuntur. Tamquam populum Dei, dicentes tantum in te et in nullo alio populo est Deus et ad te quam sicut Deum adoraturi sunt loquentes, dicent: (15) Vere tu es Deus absconditus....'¹

After a historical interpretation of the verses 8 to 13, which Andrew took as referring to Cyrus, we suddenly find a Jewish messianic explanation. As in his notes on Is.xlii.4, Andrew gives this interpretation without any further comment, and in this case it is the only interpretation he mentions. It is interesting to note that he could not have derived his information from Rashi or Ibn Ezra, as both these commentators give a historical explanation of the verse.² Ibn Ezra for example remarked:

'This verse shows that Cyrus was also to conquer Egypt³ and to carry the inhabitants thereof away into captivity; the way, as is well known, led through Palestine, which is situated in the midst between Elam and Egypt'.⁴

15. 'Vere tu es Deus absconditus. Tu es Deus hactenus a nobis occultatus! Deus eras, sed hoc hucusque nesciebamus. Tu es Deus, te ipsum Israel salvans'.⁵

While Rashi interpreted verse 14 of Jerusalem, Ibn Ezra of Cyrus, and Andrew of the people of Israel, all three agree in their interpretation of verse 15, in that they understand the text as words of the gentiles, who address either the Lord or Israel as the people of the Lord. Rashi remarks: 'The prophet says: all this has the Holy One done to liberate us from the Babylonian captivity'.⁶

1. Fo. 68b.

2. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.256. He interprets the verse as addressed to Jerusalem.

3. In fact not Cyrus, but Kambyses, his successor, conquered Egypt in 525.

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.208.

5. Fo. 68b.

6. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.256.

Chapter xlvi.

10. 'Voluntas mea. Que est vocans avem, id est alacrem et impigrum Cyrum de Perside, que in Oriente est. (11) Et de terra longinqua. Repetitio. Voluntatis. Qui voluntatem meam in liberando populum meum completurus est. Locutus sum. Predixi me istud facturum et ad effectum perducam. (12) A iustitia. A iustitie operibus. (13) Iustitiam meam. Per iustum regem liberationem vestram. Vel iustam in Babylonios ultionem. Mea. Quam daturus sum. Gloriam. Salutem gloriosam'.¹

To refer these texts to Cyrus is according to Jerome a Jewish way of interpreting; he prefers to explain them of Christ.² This, however, did not restrain Andrew from giving a historical interpretation as the only possible one. Ibn Ezra likewise explained the passage of Cyrus; for example on verse 11 he comments: 'A ravenous bird. Cyrus. He is called a bird because he flew, as it were, to fulfil my will. I have spoken and I will do it'.³

Chapter xlvii.

4. Redemptor noster, sanctus Israel. Ultione de te capta, dicit populus meus Dominus exercituum, cui non est qui resistat, qui vocatur sanctus Israel, ipse est redemptor noster, de manu Babylonis nos liberans'.⁴

In his explanation of this chapter Andrew continues historical with Again a historical explanation of the words redemptor noster.

When Israel sees the fall of mighty Babylon, she will realize that

this is the work of the Lord, and she will recognize him as her redeemer.

Both Ibn Ezra and Andrew take the words as spoken by the people of Israel;⁵

while Rashi remarks: 'The prophet says: all this has the Holy One done to liberate us from the Babylonian captivity'.⁶

1. Fo. 68d.

2. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xiii (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p.519, 1.30).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p.212.

4. Fo. 69a.

5. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p.214.

6. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p.262.

Chapter xlviii.

On verse 14b, The Lord has loved him, Andrew comments:

'Eum. Cyrum, quem in superioribus avem vocaverat.
(15) Directa. A me. (16) Accédite. Verba prophete.
Ibi eram. Prophetali ~~in~~ visione presens. Spiritus
eius. Sapientia vel voluntas'.¹

He gives here ^{what is} a Jewish interpretation according to Jerome.² We

find that Rashi and Ibn Ezra explain in the same way as Andrew.

An obvious difficulty for the interpreter are the words, from the time that it was, there I am, or as the Vulgate has it, ibi eram.

Andrew's solution is rational and straightforward. Ibn Ezra says:

"The meaning of the sentence is the following: When this decree was made by God unto the angels, the representatives of the respective countries (cf. Dan.x.20), I was also there."³ Rashi explains that the Almighty, when he decided that he would eventually destroy Babylon, had decided also that he would send Isaiah to prophecy all these events, although he was not yet born at that time.⁴

Chapter xlix.

In his explanation of this chapter Andrew combines historical with

1. Fo. 69b.

2. Jerome, Comm.in Es., xiii (C.C.S.L. 73A, p.530, l.40). "Quod Dominus dilexerit eum, haud dubium quin Cyrum Dariumque significet, qui fecit voluntatem Domini contra Bablyonem et brachium suum exercuit in Chaldaeis. Et ipse locutus est et vocavit eum nomine suo, et adduxit eum, et directa est via eius, ut nullus viribus eius auderet resistere. Unde provocat eos ut accedant et audiant, et Domino praedicente cognoscant venturum esse regem Persarum atque Medorum, qui subruat Bablyonem, deleatque Chaldaeos. Et ut haec annuntiet, dicit se propheta missum a Domino et spiritu eius. Hoc iuxta Hebraeos et eorum opinionem."

3. Ibn Ezra, op.cit., p. 221. In a note the editor remarks: 'The angels receive from the Almighty the power to act, with regard to a certain event, and this authorisation is called by Ibn Ezra "the decree of the Almighty"'. (note 24).

4. Rashi, op.cit., p.267.

eschatological explanations. He interprets some passages as referring to Israel, some to Isaiah, and some to Isaiah as representing the whole of Israel.

4. 'In vacuum laboravi. Perversos et in malo obstinatos ad Dominum convertere laborans. Vane fortitudinem meam consumpsi. Impiis et ad Dominum nolentibus predicando converti....(5) Ut reducam Iacob ad eum. Dominus, inquit propheta, intus in anima dicit mihi ut reducam ad eum qui de Iacob ad idola recesserunt, et tamen Israel non usquequaque ad illum congregabitur et ego, quia pro posse iussis illius parui, honoratus sum a Domino.¹

The verses 4 and 5 are explained as referring to Isaiah, who has come to the sad conclusion that all his work has been in vain, for Israel refused to return to the Lord. Ibn Ezra interpreted in the same way. On the second half of verse 5, however, et Israel non congregabitur, Andrew does not follow the Jewish commentator, who took the Hebrew $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יִקְרָב אֵלָיו}$ as meaning: and Israel will be gathered unto him, rather than: and Israel will not be gathered, by reading $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יִקְרָב}$ instead of $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יִקְרָב}$.² Jerome too had mentioned these two possible readings, he rejected the former one, and saw in the text an obvious proof of the unbelief of the Jews, wondering how the 'vulgata editio' could have changed this 'fortissimum contra Iudaeorum perfidiam testimonium'.³ One wonders whether in this case Jerome's strong words deterred Andrew from following the Jewish reading?

6. 'Dedi te in lucem etc. Ad amplavi ad gloriam tuam ministerium tuum, dans te gentium illuminatorem et salutis a me in illis collate usque ad ultimos terre annuntiatorem. Hac quam scripsit prophetia, salutem Domini usque ad ipsos terre fines Ysaïas annuntiavit.⁴

only very briefly here:

1. Fo. 69c.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p.223.

3. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xiii (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p.537, l.30). Cf. also L. Ginzberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', (in Jewish studies etc., p.312).

4. Fo. 69c,d.

5. Cf. above pp. 191-92.

Jews and gentiles alike were to benefit from the destruction of Babylon and the righteous reign of Cyrus. This is the good tidings which Isaiah is called upon to announce and which will make him like a 'light to the gentiles'. Both Andrew and Rashi explain the text as referring to the historical situation, and they consider it a great honour for the prophet to be chosen for this task. Rashi remarks:

'It is but a little thing....that you should be my servant, whose task it is to raise up Jacob and to bring back to me the captive Israelites. But look, I have given even more to you, I have given you for a light to the gentiles, that you may prophecy the fall of Babylon, which brings joy to all the world.'¹

7. 'Contemptibilem animam. Gens Hebreorum ceteris gentibus et numero pauciores et viribus inferiores, propter ritum et cerimoniarum singulariter et precipue circumcisionis asperitatem contemptibilis habebatur et abominabilis. Servum dominorum. Qui multis servivit dominis. Reges videbunt. Suscitationem et glorificationem tuam nec impedire poterunt. Consurgent principes. Tibi deferentes. Propter Dominum. Quem tecum esse viderint.'²

It is interesting that Andrew gives as the reason why Israel was despised by the gentile nations the peculiarity of her ritual laws and customs, rather than the deplorable political circumstances she found herself in. This could, of course, very well be a reflection of the general attitude towards Jewish rituals in his own day. The second half of his exposition consists of a vivid prophetic picture of the honours which will be bestowed on Israel in the near future. Ibn Ezra, who in his introduction to chapter xl uses the latter half of this text as an argument for his deutero-Isaiah theory,³ refers to it only very briefly here:

'I have already alluded to the inference that may be drawn from those words. Most of the commentators

1. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 286.

2. Fo. 69d. op. cit., pp. 286-287.

3. Cf. above pp. 191-92.

explain this sentence thus: Kings, like Cyrus, will arise and worship when they hear the words of the prophet'.¹

From his introductory notes we know that he means that according to this interpretation this honour will be bestowed upon Isaiah after his death.²

9. Super vias pascentur. Greges populi mei et oves pascue mee absque periculose labore epulabuntur, ut greges qui secus vias et in plano camporum equore pascentur. (11) Semite. Qui de presse subsederunt. (12) Ecce isti. Undique ad terram suam populus meus advolabit. (14) Et dixit Syon. Syon captivitatis sue tempore dixit. (16) In manibus meis descripsi te. Sic memorie mee impressus es ac si descripta in manibus meis fuisses.³

The explanation of the verses 9, 11 and 12 reminds one of Andrew's remarks on Is. xl.3 and 4, where there was the same ambiguity in his comments. Do we find in these verses a prophetic way of expressing the times of peace which Israel is soon to know, or do they refer to a messianic future? One could argue that the fact that Andrew interprets verse 14, and, as we shall see, some of the following verses of the time of the exile, suggests that the first possibility is the most likely one; but it is almost impossible to be sure. As far as the Jewish commentators are concerned, Rashi explains the passage as referring to the historical situation;⁴ but Ibn Ezra is somewhat vague here.⁵

a. C. om. et....Syon.

b. C. tibi; V. te.

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p.224. on the interpretation of 'aliqui doctores catholici', who interpret this whole chapter historically.
2. Cf. above p.191.
3. Fo. 69d. He also mentions Rashi's explanation of verses 9-12 here. (Cf. Parallels ad loc.)
4. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p.269.
5. Ibn Ezra, op.cit., pp.224-25.

17. 'Structores. Reedificatores. (18) Isti. Quasi digito ostendens multitudinem que ad illam in novissimo conflixura est 'isti' dixit. (18) Tibi. Ad honorem vel utilitatem tuam. Nunc. Paulo post. (20) Ut. Qualiter exaltabo signum meum, faciam ut in vobis afferendis et in terram vestram portandis ita gentes meam voluntatem ut exercitus imperatoris sui signum sequentur (22) Et erunt reges nutricii tui et regine nutrices tue. Hec sicut multa alia sibi Iudei promittunt.'¹

The interpretation Andrew gives of verse 17, refers obviously to the historical situation. In the next verse the expression in novissimo is ambiguous. Does it refer to the end of time, or does it simply mean 'in the end'? His interpretation of nunc in verse 19/^{seems} to point to the latter. In verse 22 we have a definite reference to Jewish messianic expectations. That he says 'these things and many others' suggests that he realized that the Jews expect many of the prophecies of Isaiah to be fulfilled in the days of their Messiah. That he refers to those expectations only here makes one think that Andrew regarded his own interpretations of this chapter as referring to the historical circumstances, rather than to the end of time. Also his explanation of the remaining verses bears this out.² Rashi, in his explanation of verse 24, paraphrased an old tradition, which goes back to the time when the coming of the Messiah was automatically identified with the destruction of the Roman empire. He remarks: 'You think that it is impossible to take away from Esau (i.e. the Roman empire) the lawful captives of the house of Jacob.'³

1. Fo. 70a.

2. Fo. 69d. *Comm. in Is., xiv (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p. 553, l. 18).*

3. Interesting is Lyre's comment on the interpretation of 'aliqui doctores catholici', who interpret this whole chapter historically: 'Praeterea sic exponentes magis iudaizant quantum ad hoc quam doctores Hebraeorum antiqui, qui aliqua dicta in hoc c[apitulo] referunt ad tempus Christi'. He also mentions Rashi's explanation of verse 24 here. (Lyre, Postillae ad loc.)

3. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 271.

Chapter 1.

4. 'Dominus dedit mihi linguam eruditam etc. Ad vos veniens Dominus, inquit propheta, nec viriliter agentes, nec sibi obedientes invenit. Me autem, cui ipse linguam tam eruditam dedit ut sciam etiam reum in causa defendere, et fortiter contra adversa agentem et sibi in omnibus obedientem <invenit.>

Erigit mane etc. Singulis diebus, vel in summo diluculo prophetam vocans se illum attente, quasi erecta aure, quasi magistrum, audire faciebat'.¹

To explain this chapter of Isaiah is, according to Jerome, a Jewish way of interpreting.² In Rashi we find the idea that Isaiah obediently fulfilled his task;³ while Andrew's interpretation of erigit mane has much in common with Ibn Ezra: 'The Lord stirreth me up every morning; he stirreth up my ear, that I may listen as pupils do, for I am the pupil of the Lord'.⁴

6. 'Corpus meum percutientibus dedi. Contumelias et illusiones quas hic enumerat forsitan in diebus Manasse, qui Ierusalem a porta usque ad portam prophetarum sanguine replevit,⁵ propter verbum Domini propheta sustinuit. Salvatorem autem nostrum, excepta barbe et genarum vulsione, quod tamen etsi scriptum non sit, neque enim omnia scripta sunt, forsitan pertulit, hec omnia pertulisse evangelio docente didiscimus. (7) Petram durissimam. Que nullis ictibus cedit. Simile in Ezechiele legimus: Ecce dedi faciem tuam valentiores faciebus eorum, ut adamantem et silicem.⁶ Quod ille adamantem, hic petram durissimam nominat.⁷

First Andrew suggests when the sufferings of the prophet as mentioned in the text could have taken place. Then he refers quite

1. Fo. 70a.

2. Jerome, Comm.in Es., xiv (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p.553, l.18).

3. Rashi, Comm.on Is., pp.271-72.

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.229.

5. Cf. ii Reg. xxi. 16.

6. Ez. iii.8,9.

7. Fo. 70a.

unexpectedly to the sufferings of Christ as we know them from the gospels, comparing His sufferings with those of Isaiah, and noting that perhaps not all of them were recorded by the evangelists. It is possible that Andrew's reference to Christ was sparked off by a remark of Jerome. For we have already heard that Jerome said that the Jews interpret this chapter of the prophet; but he goes further and argues that they do so in order to avoid explaining these prophecies of Christ, thus interpreting them in a poor and perverse manner.¹ It seems possible, therefore, that Jerome's strongly expressed disapproval of the Jewish way of interpreting caused Andrew to insert here a reference to Christ. That he was influenced by Jerome in his interpretation of this text is also shown by the fact that Jerome had quoted the same Ezekiel text as Andrew. It should, however, be noted that all Andrew does in referring to Christ is to draw a parallel, to point out a similarity. He is in no way treating the text as a prophecy of Christ's sufferings; in other words, he does not give a christological explanation. It is as if he were showing his readers that here is a Christian commentator at work, who by no means intended to 'avoid explaining these prophecies of Christ', but who happened to be patiently awaiting the salvation of the Lord, his explanation of verse 6 concerned with a different aspect of the interpretation of the biblical text. Besides, in his explanation of a similar text, Is. xlii.3,4, he remarked that the

Chapter li.

5. 'Prope est iustus meus etc. Iustum et salvatorem suum, id est quem ipse daturus erat. Vel Cyrum, vel secundum nos Dominum et salvatorem nostrum, vel secundum Hebreos suum Messiam intellige'.²

2. As has been alluded to previously, Andrew's idea of what does and does not belong to the literal sense was rather vague. Therefore when

1. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xiv (C.C.S.L. 73 A, p.553, l.34): 'Hoc illi dixerint, qui omni ratione conantur de Christo evertere prophetias, et ad perversam intelligentiam prava interpretatione torquere....'

2. Fo. 70b. as being included in the original meaning of the prophet himself, as Langton will do after him. Cf. Study, pp.169-70 and 232-33.

3. Fo. 70b,c.

4. Cf. above p.219.

A most remarkable explanation! Andrew lists several possibilities: he first gives a historical interpretation by referring the text to Cyrus; then a christological one; and finally a Jewish messianic one. He goes here a step further than in his comments on Is. 1.6 in that he actually explains the text christologically: the Lord's righteous one is our Messiah. It should further be noted that Andrew puts the Christian and the Jewish messianic interpretation side by side, thus making them both equally valid, very much in the same way as in his explanation of Is. xi.2 and 10.¹ There is no trace here of that superiority so often found in the works of Christian theologians dealing with Jewish exegesis. Lastly, his explanation of this text illustrates again that according to Andrew literal exposition does not exclude a deeper spiritual understanding of the same text; but the exploration of this understanding lies outside his scope.²

id. 'Insule expectabunt. Gentes me iudicem et salvatorem expectabunt et potentem quam in medio eorum facturus sum salvationem patienter expectabunt. (6) Liquescent. Defluent et ad nihil ^a abibunt celum istud quod super nos est et terra quam calcamus, cum utrumque novum a Domino creabitur.³

Although Andrew does not say explicitly when the gentiles will be patiently awaiting the salvation of the Lord, his explanation of verse 6 indicates that he is thinking here of an eschatological future. Besides, in his explanation of a similar text, Is. xlii.3,4, he remarked that the Jews expected these things to come true in the days of the Messiah.⁴ In the next verse, however, he refers again to the historical situation:

a. C. abuntur.

1. Cf. above, pp.165 and 170.

2. As has been alluded to previously, Andrew's idea of what does and does not belong to the literal sense was rather vague. Therefore, when he occasionally remarks that certain prophecies are understood by the Christian interpreters as referring to Christ (cf. above pp.142, 165 and 170), it is not always clear whether or not he regards such interpretations as belonging to the literal sense. In any case, he does not take such interpretations as being included in the original meaning of the prophet himself, as Langton will do after him. Cf. Study, pp.169-70 and 232-33.

3. Fo. 70b,c.

4. Cf. above p.219.

'Opprobium. Super vastitate et captivitate vestra'.¹

9. 'Consurge, consurge, induere fortitudinem, brachium Domini. Orat propheta ut virtus et potentia Domini in adversarios populi consurgat, fortitudinem ut loricam induens et fortiter ut olim agat. Superbum vulnerasti. Superbum et draconem illum vocat, qui in Ezechiele dicit: Mea sunt flumina et ego feci ea. Ad eundem vero propheta idem dicit: draco magne, qui cubas in aquis.² Pharao appellatur draco propter multas quibus Egyptus abundat aquas.³

The prophet appeals to the days of old, when the strong arm of the Lord helped the Israelites to escape from Egypt. Ibn Ezra refers to the same Ezekiel text in his interpretation of this verse;⁴ Rashi too explains the dragon of the Pharao.⁵

14. 'Cito veniet gradiens ad aperiendum. Cito veniet qui reditum tibi, carcerem tuum aperiendo, daturus est.... Non deficiet panis. Non deerit tibi, nunc tribulato et exterminato, cibus.⁶

The end of the exile is drawing near, since the army of Cyrus is hastening on. Again a historical explanation.

17. 'Elevare, elevare. Erigendam quasi de stercore Ierusalem et tamquam de pulvere suscitandam, que calice ire Domini inebriata est, sermo propheticus predicat.... (2) Proiecti sunt. Extra terre sue terminos.... (23) Incurvare. Sicut lapides in luto collocantur ne transeuntium pedes polluantur, sic hostilis immanitas Iudeos pedibus suis substernebat'.⁷

Andrew explains these texts as referring to the humiliation of the Israelites during the exile, which will soon be ended.

1. Fo. 70c.

2. Ez. xxix.3.

3. Fo. 70c.

4. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.234.

5. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.275.

6. Fo. 70c.

7. Fo. 70c,d.

Chapter lii.1-12

On the last part of verse 1, for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean, Andrew comments:

1. 'Et. Id est incircumcisos etiam omnes et imundos reputant; per vias Ierusalem in novissimis diebus a Domino restitute nullus, ut asserunt, sicut olim incircumcisos pertransibit'.¹

Here again Andrew gives a Jewish messianic explanation as the only possible one. Ibn Ezra remarked in a short introductory note to this chapter:

'All agree that this prophecy has reference to the time yet to come....How could it be referred to the deliverance and return of the captives in Babylon, when it is said: the uncircumcised and unclean shall no more come unto thee'.²

11. 'Recedite, recedite, exite inde. Imperat eis qui in Babylone erunt, ut inde recedant et exeant et ne in aliquo <loco>, quo contaminari solent homines et pollui, se contaminent, quia non vacui exituri sunt, sed vasa Domini [sed] que Nabuchodonosor asportavit, Cyro Darique permittentibus, secum relaturi.³ Eius. Babylonis....(12) Congregabit vos^a. Congregari vos faciet in terra vestra.'⁴

Andrew explains these verses historically, while most Jewish commentators refer them to the messianic age. Ibn Ezra, for example, said: 'Depart ye. From Babylon, according to R. Moses Hakkohen. I think that these words are addressed to those that are still in exile among the nations. The repetition of Depart ye is to indicate that it is to be done immediately'.⁵ Rashi commented on verse 11, go ye out from thence: 'From thence, that is from the middle of Edom or Esau.

For all the following consolations are spoken only with regard to the

a. C. nos; V.vos.

1. Fo. 70d.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.236.

3. Cf. Jerome, Comm.in Es, xiv (C.C.S.L. 73A, p.584, 1.9), where he says that the Jews interpret in this manner; see also the Gloss ad loc.

4. Fo. 71a.

5. Ibn Ezra, op.cit., p. 238.

ultimate exile'.¹ Kimchi also referred to the present exile of his people, remarking: 'Thence, namely from the place of exile; unclean, namely the Christians and the Turks among whom you are exiles.'²

II

Before turning to Andrew's interpretation of the servant-chapter we shall first look at the three points we set out to discuss in the beginning of this chapter,³ starting with his use of Jerome. The fact that Andrew follows Jerome in some places makes it all the more significant that he rejects him in others, as it shows that he gave much thought to the validity of the latter's interpretation. Several points are worth noting in the use he makes of Jerome. In the first place, Andrew goes much further than his predecessor in his acceptance of Jewish exegesis. Where Jerome often mentions the Jewish point of view only to disagree with it, Andrew is nearly always ready to agree, and he often gives an interpretation which was rejected as Jewish by Jerome, for example on Is.xli.2-4⁴ and xlvi.10-13.⁵ Secondly, occasionally Andrew follows Jerome on points where the latter disputes the Jewish interpretation in very strong terms, for example on Is.xlii.19⁶ xlix.5⁷ and 1.6.⁸ In all these cases, however, he never repeats Jerome's anti-Jewish outbursts. In general we can say that he uses Jerome in a most intelligent and independent manner.

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., pp.279-80.

2. Kimchi, Comm.on Is., p.380.

3. Cf. above p.210.

4. Cf. above pp.216-217.

5. Cf. above p.228.

6. Cf. above p.221.

7. Cf. above p.230.

8. Cf. above p.234f.

indicates that he realized that the Jews

often As far as his references to Jewish interpretation are concerned, there is no indication that Andrew distinguished between historical and messianic interpretation, although he must have realized that the Jews also knew of a deeper meaning of the text (e.g. Is.li.5).¹ This is hardly surprising, since we find in the Jewish commentaries often the same mixture of references to the historical situation of the people of Israel and to the messianic future as in Andrew. This can partly be explained from the characteristics of the prophetic text itself, which contains an abundance of promises for the historical and eschatological future, and partly from the character of Jewish interpretation which, whatever its contents, almost always ends with a vague note of messianic hope as a means of comfort for the sufferings of Israel in the present age.² Andrew reproduced in his own comments this ambivalence of the Jewish commentators to such an extent that it is sometimes impossible to decide to which period he intended certain texts to refer (e.g. Is.xl.4, xlix.9-16 and 17-22).³

Although there are a great many references to Jewish interpretation, Andrew is usually careful not to commit himself too openly to their point of view, in particular not where it concerned messianic expectations. Once he speaks scornfully of the Jewish hopes (Is.xl.4);⁴ in general, however, he refers to their expectations without further comment, for instance Is.xlii.3,⁵ xlv.14⁶ and lii.1.⁷ On one occasion he

1. Cf. above p. 235.

2. Cf. above p. 235.

3. Cf. R. Loewe, 'The Jewish midrashim and patristic and scholastic exegesis of the Bible', Studia Patristica, i (1957), 506. Although the author has in particular the rabbinic exegesis in mind, the same applies to the commentaries of the medieval exegetes we are dealing with.

4. Cf. above p. 235.

5. Cf. above pp. 213 and 232, 233 respectively.

6. Cf. above p. 213.

7. Cf. above p. 219.

8. Cf. above p. 227.

9. Cf. above, p. 238.

indicates that he realized that the Jews interpret the prophecies more often of the messianic age than he has recorded (Is.xlix.22).¹ On the other hand, the fact that he sometimes gives a Jewish messianic interpretation as the only possibility, for example Is.xlv.14² and lii.1³, shows how valuable he regarded their exposition for an explanation of the literal sense of Isaiah's prophecies, even though he does not say so explicitly.

Also in cases not directly connected with messianic promises we discovered a continuous influence on Andrew of the Jewish commentators, for example Is.xli.2-4, which he interprets of Abraham,⁴ or Is.xliii.1, where he interprets the servant collectively of Israel⁵, not to mention many minor points.

Summarizing, we can say that Andrew's comments on the second half of Isaiah can be roughly classified in four groups:

- I) Historical interpretations, which form the great majority of his comments. This becomes particularly obvious on reading the whole of his commentary on these chapters, rather than selected passages. There is much correspondence here with the medieval Jewish commentators, while he also derived some information from Jerome.

1. Cf. above p. 233.
 2. Cf. above p. 227.
 3. Cf. above p. 238.
 4. Cf. above p. 216.
 5. Cf. above pp. 218-19.

- II) References to the messianic future, which are practically always derived from Jewish sources.
- III) Ambivalent interpretations, which can be explained either way. In this respect, ^{too} he was influenced by the Jewish commentators.
- IV) The two references to Christ or the Christian Messiah (Is.1.6 and li.5), which stand out so surprisingly.

by referring to the Jewish sources...
 interpretations...
 We shall not...
 information.

13. 'The...
 words...
 of...
 be recognized...
 interpretation...

14. 'The...
 prophetic...
 words...
 is, this...
 has...
 business...
 compare...
 honor...
 with...
 others...
 honor...

1. Cf. above p. 227-7.
 2. See 11a. The passage (Isaiah 11:1, 2) is...
 translated in...
 3. ...
 4. ...

CHAPTER IX

The servant-chapter, Is. lii.13 to liii.12.

In a previous chapter, dealing with the exegetical tradition of this passage, we saw how Rashi broke away from the traditional interpretation by referring the servant collectively to Israel, and how this new interpretation found widespread approval among the Jewish commentators.¹ We shall now investigate Andrew's explanation and his main sources of information.

I

13. 'Ecce intelliget servus meus. Cum hec omnia evenerint, servus meus Ysaias, qui me dicente hec predixit, intelligens et sapiens habebitur et exaltabitur et ab omnibus magnificabitur et valde gloriosus habebitur.'²

Andrew explains the servant here of the prophet, whose wisdom will be recognized when his prophecies have been fulfilled. A very unusual interpretation indeed for a Christian commentator! He continues:

14. 'Sicut obstupuerunt super te multi. Ad ipsum prophetam Dominus sermonem convertit, dicens: Sicut tunc, quando exaltaberis et elevaberis obstupebunt multi super te, quia illa supradicta predicere potuisti, sic antequam hec eveniant inglorius et sine omni honore inter ceteros homines erit aspectus eius, populi videlicet mei, qui congregandus est, et forma eius erit ingloria et sine honore inter filios hominum. Vel de ipso dicitur quod ante sublimationem eius, videlicet ^a Manasse, inter ceteros homines futurus sit inglorius et forma eius inter filios hominum, subauditur: erit ingloria et sine honore. Quod ad ipsum loquens de ipso 'eius' dicit,

a. C. et.

1. Cf. above p. 208 f.

2. Fo. 71a. The passage (from liii.2b onwards) is printed and partly translated in Study, pp. 391-92 and 165 respectively.

3. Fo. 71a, b.

4. Cf. above p. 191.

prophetalis consuetudo locutionis facit, que sepe personas mutat.¹

He continues:

Vel totum de populo legatur sic: Congregatis in terram suam a Domino filiis Israel, ipse populus Domini servus intelliget, id est intelligenter et sapienter se habebit et exaltabitur operibus <et> potentia et elevabitur super inimicos suos et sublimis valde in dignitatibus erit et gloria; sicut olim quando in terra Chanaan triginta reges et eorum populos pedibus tuis supposuisti,² obstupuerunt super te multi, sic ante illam exaltationem tuam inglorius es etc.³

Andrew suggests three different ways of interpretation here. First, the text can be understood of the Lord, speaking to the prophet and comparing Israel's fate with that of Isaiah. Secondly, the text can be explained of the prophet himself, who will be without fame and honour before his death under Manasse, but who will be greatly honoured when all that he predicted will have come to pass. This way of interpreting reminds one of Ibn Ezra's remark in his introduction to the second half of Isaiah, when he says that the text kings shall see and arise etc. (xlix.7) can be taken as referring to the recognition of Isaiah long after his death.⁴ The last possibility is to understand the whole passage of Israel.

We shall now turn once more to the Jewish commentators to see to

1. The problem of the use of different persons is also commented on in the Gloss ad loc., but in a frame of mind strikingly different from Andrew's. A much closer parallel, however, can be found in the interpretation of David Kimchi, who remarked: 'The prophet speaks at one moment in the second person, at another in the third, saying 'at thee', but 'his countenance', 'his form'; this is the custom of scripture in countless passages'. (The translation is taken from A. Neubauer, Isaiah 53, p.49, which we shall use for Kimchi on this chapter. We shall refer to this work simply as 'Neubauer'). David Kimchi's exposition of the servant-chapter is of some interest for Andrew's interpretation, as David claims here explicitly to be following his father Joseph, who was a contemporary of Andrew.

2. Josh. xii.7-24.

3. Fo. 71a,b.

4. Cf. above p.191.

what extent they have influenced Andrew's interpretation. Ibn Ezra

begins his explanation of the servant-chapter with a short introduction:

'The passage which follows offers great difficulties. The Christians refer it to Jesus and explain "my servant" to indicate the body. This is wrong; the body cannot be wise, even during the life of man. Again, what is the meaning of he shall see his seed (liii.10), he shall prolong his days (ib.)? This was not in fact the case. Again, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong (liii.12).¹ The best proof, however, is the circumstance that this passage is preceded by the Lord will go before you etc. (lii.12), which undoubtedly refers to the Israelites, and is followed by Sing, O, barren etc. (liv.1), which is likewise addressed to the Israelites'.

Then his actual interpretation begins:

'My servant. The Israelites, who are the servants of the Lord, and are now in exile. Many believe that Messiah is meant by this expression, because our ancient teachers said that Messiah was born on the day on which the temple was destroyed, that he was, as it were, bound in chains etc.,² but many verses in this passage cannot be explained on this supposition.... The Gaon R. Saadiah refers the whole passage to Jeremiah. His explanation is beautiful.... But I think that this passage must be connected with the chapters that precede and follow.... The singular, "my servant", is used, because the prophet speaks of everyone who is a servant of the Lord and suffers in exile, or because '724 (= '724 4, 1'4 6 ° "my servant Israel") refers to the whole nation; the latter reason is more probable'.³

1. In a note the editor remarks: 'This, if taken literally, was not the case; if in any figurative sense, the whole argument is destroyed which is based on the supposition of a minute coincidence of the facts here predicted, with the incidents of the life of Jesus'. (Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p.239, n.20). This was, of course, the usual mode of argumentation in disputes between Jews and Christians. David Kimchi argues likewise at the end of his explanation of Is. liii that many expressions in this prophecy are not applicable to Christ, and challenges the Christians to explain this (Neubauer, p.55) Cf. above p.26.

2. Echa Rabbati, i.16 (ed. Freedman, vii.136). Ibn Ezra's editor remarks: 'The passage must be taken in a figurative sense, namely, that on the day on which the temple was destroyed, it was already decreed, by the Almighty that it should again be rebuilt, but that the restoration would be dependent on the return of the Israelites to God and his word.' (Op.cit., p.240, n.22). The Messiah, in chains, had to wait for this.

3. Ibn Ezra, op.cit., pp.239-40.

We see how Ibn Ezra carefully considers various explanations and chooses to interpret the servant collectively of Israel. The disconcerting factor in his explanation of this chapter, however, is a remark he makes at the very end of his exposition, saying that in his own opinion the servant refers to Isaiah:

'I have thus explained the whole passage, on the supposition that it refers to Israel; but my opinion is, that "my servant", mentioned here (lii.13), is the same as that of xlii.1, xlix.3, liii.11, the same who says of himself: I gave my back to the smiters etc. (1.6). In my commentary on chapter xl, I mentioned briefly the leading principle of my opinion, which considers all these chapters (from xl) as connected with each other'.¹

Rashi, in his Commentary on Isaiah, explained verse 13 as: 'Behold, in the latter days my servant Jacob will prosper, that is the righteous ones who are among this people Israel'.² He referred to the verses 14 and 15 to the gentiles, who first pitied Israel because of her wretchedness, but now Israel is strong and powerful, and she casts down the horns of the nations which have scattered her; a picture taken from the prophecies of Zechariah.³ This collective interpretation must be understood, according

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., pp.246-7. The editor remarks here: 'The explanation given in the whole chapter seems to be only a concession made to the general opinion, that these chapters from xl-lxvi, have no inner connection throughout, and that in this portion 724, "my servant" refers to Israel. His own opinion is that "the servant of the Lord" is the prophet, who was in Babylon in exile with his brethren, illtreated there and insulted....but ultimately, when his words were proved to be true by facts, honoured and respected by all'. (Ibid., pp.246-47, n.19). The collective interpretation was apparently already so widely accepted in Ibn Ezra's day that he felt compelled to explain correspondingly. As we noted before, he often puts his own individual opinion in a short introduction, or as here, at the end of his exposition, without really integrating it into his interpretation. Cf. above, p.193.

2. Rashi, Comm. on Is. p.280. Cf. above p.209. We know from Raymundus Martini's Pugio Fidei, that Rashi had explained these texts of the Messiah in his glosses on the Talmud, which were of an earlier date. Cf. above, p.206.

3. Zech.i.19-21.

to him, as referring to messianic times. He makes this quite clear, as we shall see, on several occasions. It is borne out here by the reference to the essentially eschatological prophecy of Zechariah and by the words 'in the latter days' in verse 13.

Since Rashi's collective interpretation of the servant was followed by most of the leading Jewish commentators, there is good reason to suppose that whatever Jewish scholar Andrew consulted on the exposition of this chapter, the collective interpretation was mentioned to him. As regards his suggestion that the servant could also be understood of Isaiah, this too is based on Jewish explanations, for he says at the end of his interpretation that some Jews explained the whole passage of Isaiah.¹

It should be noted that while Jewish commentators such as Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Joseph Kara and Kimchi explain the servant-chapter as referring to the messianic age, although many of their comments can at the same time be explained of the historical situation, Andrew limits himself strictly to a historical interpretation.² Furthermore, the collective interpretation is the only one which he follows up throughout the chapter; the other two possible explanations of the servant he suggested at the beginning of his exposition were apparently considered as less suitable.

15. 'Iste asperget gentes multas. Iste idem cuius aspectus erit inglorius, multas gentes sanguine suo asperget. Super ipsum continebunt reges os suum. Vel obstupescentes virtutem eius reges tacebunt, pre stupore loqui non valentes, vel pre timore

1. 'Quidam etiam Hebreorum totam hanc pericopem super Ysaia interpretantur'. (Fo.71d). For this interpretation cf. above pp.207-8.

2. This ambiguity (of the Jewish commentators) is in particular prominent in Kimchi's interpretation, who at the beginning of his explanation states that the prophecy refers to the captivity, but seems to have in mind here the captivity in which the Jews are, as it were, still held in his own day (cf. above p. 239), rather than the period of exile in Babylon exclusively.

mutire etiam non <audentes>^a. Quibus non est narratum de eo videbunt.^b Usque ad eos sibi subiciendos pertransibit, qui nec famam illius audierunt, sicque videbunt eum quibus de eo narratum non est. Et qui non audierunt. Repetitio.¹

Andrew gives an explanation of the direct meaning of the text, referring to Israel's unexpected triumph over the gentile nations. Ibn Ezra remarks that the heathen people could not believe that Israel would ever be delivered,² which is a good example of an interpretation which can refer to both the historical and eschatological situation.

liii.1 'Quis credidit'^c auditui nostro? Non est mirum, inquit propheta, si illi non audierunt, quia quis eorum quibus ea que a te audivimus locuti sumus, credidit? Et cui illorum qui <crediderunt>^d et brachium, id est virtus et potentia, Domini revelatum est? Ac si diceret, cur audirent, quod futurum esse non crederent?³

The deliverance of the Jews seemed too unlikely to the gentiles to be believable when it was predicted to them as a forthcoming event. It is this sceptical attitude of the gentiles towards the prophecies concerning the liberation of Israel which Andrew particularly stresses in his explanation. The Jewish commentators explain basically in the same way. Rashi, for example interpreted: 'Had we, they (sc. the gentiles) will say to each other, had we heard from others what now we are beholding, who would ever have believed it?'⁴ Ibn Ezra remarked:

a. C.audientes.

b. V.viderunt.

c. C.credit; V.credidit.

d. C.credidit.

1. Fo. 71b.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.241.

3. Fo. 71b.

4. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.281 (Neubauer, p.37).

'Then the non-Israelites shall say: Who would have believed, that it would turn out as we have heard?';¹ while Kimchi noted: 'Then the gentiles will say: Who was there that believed the report which we have heard concerning him (sc. Israel) from the prophets' lips, or from those who spoke in their name?'²

2. 'Et ascendet sicut virgultum coram eo. Iste qui gentes multas aspersurus est coram Domini brachio, sicut virga que <cum celeritate>^a in altum crescit et sicut radix de terra sitiante, vel potius sicut in Hebreo est, inhabitabilis, ascendet et in brevi in sublime se attollet.'³

A description of the swiftness with which Israel will rise in worldly power. The remark about the Hebrew shows how eagerly Andrew sought for the 'Hebrew truth' in this chapter; but it also illustrates how far from perfect his Hebrew still was, as the word used in the Hebrew text, יָבֵשׁ, means 'dry', 'waterless', ^{country}. Perhaps a Jew told Andrew about the vast desert areas in and near Israel, where nothing can grow for lack of water, and where it is almost impossible for human beings to live. From this Andrew must have drawn the conclusion that the word used in the Hebrew meant uninhabitable rather than dry. Another possibility is that Jerome or the Gloss were his source of information, since Jerome remarks that Aquila rendered 'impassable' here, which remark found its way into the Gloss.⁴ A district without roads is almost certainly unfit for human habitation, hence Andrew's conclusion.

id. 'Non est ei species, neque decor. Ad illud tempus propheta recurrit quando hic idem populus gravi in Babylone captivitate premebatur, quando revera nullus erat ei neque decor neque species. Et vidimus eum.'

a. C. sub sceleritate.

1. Ibn Ezra, op.cit., pp.241-42.

2. Quoted in Neubauer, p.50.

3. Fo.71b.

4. Jerome, Comm.in Es., xiv (C.C.S.L. 73A, p.588, l.35), '....pro sitiante, Aquila interpretatus est invia' and the Gloss ad loc.

Ego et alii prophete, vel pluraliter propheta loquitur.
Et non erat aspectus. Quod male est quasi non esse
 dicitur, unde: Ne tradas sceptrum tuum his qui non
 sunt.¹ Et desideravimus eum, quasi (3) despectum et
 novissimum virorum. Suspiravimus et do/luimus eum esse despectum
 et abiectissimum hominum. Quia suspiria desiderium elicit,²
 desideravimus et pro suspiravimus non absurde legi potest.²

The text of the last part of verse 2 and the beginning of verse 3
 reads according to the Vulgate: Non est species ei neque decor; et
 vidimus eum, et non erat aspectus, et desideravimus eum; (3) despectum
 et novissimum virorum, virum dolorum....; this passage renders in the
 Hebrew text:

לֹא-פָנֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא-דֶקֶר וְלֹא-בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 וְלֹא-פָנֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא-דֶקֶר וְלֹא-בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 וְלֹא-פָנֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא-דֶקֶר וְלֹא-בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Andrew explains as directly and rationally as possible. Israel
 has, as it were, 'lost her face' during the exile and has almost ceased
 to exist, which unfortunate situation was witnessed by the prophet.
 So far the text does not give any problems, and Andrew just follows and
 expounds it. The last part, however, et desideravimus eum, proved more
 complicated. As it stands it seems illogical: nobody in particular
 desires a degraded and rejected nation. Therefore Andrew attempts to
 change the text through first connecting desideravimus eum with
despectum et novissimum virorum by adding the word quasi, and secondly
 by changing in a most subtle manner the meaning of desideravimus.
 After these adjustments he is able to harmonize the text with his
 explanation of it, namely that the prophet deplores here Israel's state
 of rejection and humiliation during the captivity.³

1. Esther xiv.11(V.).

2. Fo.71b,c.

3. Miss Smalley noticed that 'one copy has a disapproving note in the
 margin...."Satis violenter hunc textum exsequeris dum nimis iudaizare
 tu niteris"'. (Study, p.164). The remark can be found in a fifteenth
 century manuscript, now MS.Bibl. Nat.Lat. 574, fo.70v.

The Jewish commentators found this text difficult as well, and a great many different interpretations have been put forward. The Targum, for example, paraphrased thus: '....his (sc. the Messiah's) complexion shall be a holy complexion, and all who see him will look wistfully upon him'.¹ Rashi explained:

'Before such greatness came upon it, this people was in deep depression and sprang up out of itself like one of the suckers of a tree, or like a root out of dry earth: from the first it had no form and comeliness, and when we saw it without any comeliness how could we desire it?'.²

Ibn Ezra is of the opinion that the negation לֹא not only refers to חֵרֶם לֹא , but also extends its force over וְנִחַחְרָהוּ , and in this way he reads: 'There is no beauty, nor do we desire him'.³ In a commentary attributed to Eliezer of Beaugency yet another possibility is mentioned: 'And who before had no form and no comeliness and no beauty when we looked at him, but is now so graceful and comely that we ourselves desire to be like him'.⁴

id. 'Virum dolorum. De populo agens tamquam de uno homine loquitur, quem vocat virum dolorum, id est tribulationibus et miseriis, unde dolores, circumdatum et coopertum. Scientem. Experientem. Absconditus. Qui <propter> obliquam feditatem abscondi solet. Unde nec reputavimus eum. Quia sic absconditus et despectus vultus eius, nos etiam ipsi, pene desperantes de eo, numero hominum eum non reputavimus, id est populus <propter> nimiam abiectiorem vix se inter homines reputavit'.⁵

In what Andrew says about the manner in which the prophet speaks of Israel we have an almost verbal parallel with Rashi, who remarked in his explanation of despised and rejected of men: 'Despised and rejected was

1. Quoted in Neubauer, p.5.

2. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.281 (Neubauer, p.37).

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm.on Is., p.242.

4. Quoted in Neubauer, p.67.

5. Fo.71c.

the Israelite nation, for in this manner the prophet is accustomed to speak of all the Israelites as though of one man'.¹ He continued:

'And as one who hides his face from us. Because of their shameful and humiliating state the Israelites were, as it were, hiding their faces from us, the gentiles....that we might not see them, as a smitten [with leprosy] man covers his face for fear that someone might see him.'²

It should be noted that both Rashi and Andrew state that Israel is hiding her face, and not that we hid as it were our faces from him as the English version renders. The Vulgate gives yet another reading: et quasi absconditus vultus eius et despectus. The difficulty lies in the Hebrew text, which can be understood in several ways: וְכַח אֲשֶׁר

וְכַח אֲשֶׁר . The crux of the verse is the word וְכַח אֲשֶׁר. As a participle of the hif'il it can be taken to mean 'as one who hides' (Rashi and Andrew), but also 'as one who causes to hide'. This meaning is given in the Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros;³ we find it in the English translation and also Ibn Ezra took it in this sense.⁴ In this case וְכַח אֲשֶׁר is understood as 'from him' and not as 'from us', as Rashi and Andrew take it. The latter may well have been influenced by the Jewish commentator.

4. 'Vere languores nostros ipse tulit. His verbis innuit propheta quod populus, qui in captivitate Babylonica affligendus erat, non solum sua, sed et malorum luiturus erat peccata. Vere ille vir dolorum languores et dolores, quos ob nostra ferre debuimus peccata, portabit. Et nos putavimus eum quasi leprosum etc. Propheta se illis connumerat, qui populum in captivitatem iturum propter peccata sua captivandum et tanquam leprosum a populo Domini separandum, exigentibus peccatis suis, a

1. Rashi, Comm.on Is., p.281.

2. Ibid., p.282.

3. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, ed. Koehler, p.544.

4. 'And we hid, as it were, our faces from him. Even in our days there are people who turn aside at the sight of a Jew, lest they might be obliged to assist him'. (Comm.on Is., p.242.)

Domino percutiendum et humiliandum fore, <putaverunt>.^a
 (5) Ipse autem vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras.
 Sic nos putavimus, sed ipse vulneratus est propter
iniquitates nostras et attritus est propter scelera nostra.
 Ipse flagellatus est et lividus factus, ut nos pacem
 haberemus et sanaremur. Posteris, quibus castigatio
 illius pacem peperit, se connumerat.¹

A bold explanation for a Christian interpreter! There were those, among whom the prophet reckons himself here according to Andrew, who thought that Israel was to be sent into captivity as a punishment for her own sins. This, however, is not so the prophet then argues, because Israel in exile not only washed out her own sins, she also expiated the sins of the wicked, and she brought peace and healing for future generations.

Throughout his interpretation of these verses Andrew is most evasive in that he does not indicate whom exactly he means by the wicked whose sins Israel was to carry; nor by those who thought that Israel was to go into exile because of her own sins; nor by the future generations to whom Israel's suffering has brought peace. Does he refer here to various generations of Jewish people before and after the exile, or do these various groups of people include the gentiles as well? The first possibility seems to be the most likely one. In the first place because he explains this chapter entirely in the context of the exile and the liberation from it; and secondly because he nowhere explicitly alludes to a possible effect of the suffering of Israel on the gentile nations. Andrew takes it that the prophet speaks first of himself as belonging to the older generation for whose sins the people of the exile were to suffer (note the tenses: ferre debuimus and portabit). This was, of course, historically speaking

a. C. putavit.

1. Fo. 71c.

the correct situation. Then Isaiah identifies himself with posterity which was to gather the fruits of Israel's pain and grief.¹ In both cases the people of the captivity are seen as suffering not only for their own sins, but for those of past and future generations as well.

If our interpretation of Andrew's comments is correct, then the most remarkable feature of his explanation is that he takes the vicariousness of Israel's suffering during the exile in a very limited way. Two notions may have influenced him here. First, the idea often found in the Old Testament that the Lord punishes one generation with poverty or war because of its own wickedness and that of their fathers, and that this benefits the next generations to whom he will grant peace again. Secondly, possibly the Jewish concept of the vicarious character of the suffering of the righteous. By explaining the words of Isaiah along these lines Andrew keeps absolutely within the historical context of the prophecies. The only thing he is concerned with in his explanation is what Isaiah's words meant to the people to whom they were actually spoken. No mention is made of the significance of the suffering of the servant for the Jews of his own generation, let alone any allusion to the Christian interpretation.

Did Andrew explain in this way merely to avoid all theological complications, which he regarded as irrelevant for a literal exposition, or was it mainly under influence of the Jewish commentators that he wrote his comments? Rashi interpreted the verses 4 and 5:

'But now we see, say the gentiles, that Israel was not afflicted because of her own despondency, but that she suffered in order that atonement might be made for all

1. On verse 8, propter scelus populi mei percussi eum, Andrew comments: 'Populi mei. Prioris', and in the same verse on generationem eius quis enarrabit?: 'Etsi in captivitate et exilio et diminuto futuro sit numero, posteritatem eius quis enarrare poterit?', which interpretations also bear out that Andrew is referring here to different generations of Jewish people, rather than to Jews and gentiles alike.

people by Israel's sufferings. Hence the meaning of the text is: the sickness which ought to have fallen upon us was carried by Israel....We thought that Israel was hated by God, but it was not so, for surely she has been wounded because of our iniquities and bruised because of our sins.

(5) The chastisement of our peace was upon her. The chastisements of peace that was for us fell upon her. Israel was chastised in order that the whole world might have peace.¹

He gives a much deeper meaning to the prophecy than Andrew did by underlining the reconciliatory character of Israel's sufferings, which were to bring peace to the whole world. Rashi clearly takes the text as referring the end of time, when the gentiles will realize that their judgment about Israel was mistaken and will recognize that Israel had suffered for their sake.

Another Jewish commentator, Joseph Kara, explained:

'....but now we (sc. the gentiles) see that they had served the faithful God, and kept the law of Moses, and observed justice and right, and that they have been carrying sicknesses and pains which for our iniquities should have been borne by us....The chastisement upon him was our peace; i.e. by the humiliation involved in Israel's bearing the yoke of foreign kingdoms, peace was secured for us: because the Holy One created for himself one just nation in the world, which carried on itself all iniquities in order that the whole world might be preserved; and by his stripes there was healing for us.'²

What Kara states here reminds one of the many sayings which deal with the special position of Israel in God's creation; for example, that the whole world was created because of Israel.³ Here, however, we find the idea carried to its extreme conclusion: Israel is not only the cause of the world's existence, she is also the cause of its ultimate salvation.

1. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p.282 (cf. Neubauer, p.38).

2. Quoted in Neubauer, p.42.

3. E.g. Tanhuma Bereshit, x.

Kimchi has an exceptionally radical approach to the text. He first argues, quoting Ez.xviii.20,....the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, that a fortiori one man cannot suffer for another man, or one people for another people. He continues:

'Here the phrases put into the mouth of the gentiles, such as, he has carried our sicknesses etc., are merely the expression of their own thoughts; it is not asserted that Israel actually bore the iniquity of the gentiles, but the latter only imagine it to be the case when they see, at the time of the [final] deliverance, that the faith which Israel adhered to was the true one, while that which they themselves had adhered to was false....Here, then, they ask: what can be the cause of the pains endured by Israel in captivity? they cannot be attributed to their own iniquity, for they adhered to the truth, whereas we who enjoyed peace...., were adhering to falsehood; it follows, therefore, that the sickness and pain which ought to have fallen upon us has fallen upon them, and that they are our ransom and the price of our atonement'.¹

The idea of a vicarious suffering of Israel is here reduced to a mere projection on the part of the gentiles, who, with a guilty conscience admit that Israel suffered unjustly what they should have borne instead, and that therefore Israel bore, ^{as it were,} the price of their atonement.

Finally Ibn Ezra's interpretation. He too explains verse 4 as spoken by the gentiles, who caused Israel to be afflicted with grief and sorrow which they should have borne because their religion is false. Verse 5, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, he interprets as follows:

'The chastisement was inflicted upon him for the purpose of prolonging our peace, as we see; for with his stripes we are healed. The meaning of this verse is: God will in future visit those nations that trouble Israel with punishment (cf. Joel iv.21): but at present the chastisement of our peace is upon him; for it is well known that for as long Israel is in exile, the heathen

1. Quoted in Neubauer, pp.51-52.

2. A.V. Joel iii.21.

peoples will enjoy happiness; while of the time of our deliverance it is predicted: And there will be a time of trouble (Dan.xii.1)¹.

Ibn Ezra refers here to the end of time when the heathen nations will be punished for what they have done to Israel, while at present, while Israel is, as it were, still in exile, they enjoy peace and prosperity. We remember that Ibn Ezra at the beginning of his exposition of Is.xl to lxvi said that these chapters contained a promise for the Jewish people in their present exile; this is clearly demonstrated here. Nothing is said in his interpretation about Israel's suffering for the sake of the gentiles; on the contrary, a time of great trouble is predicted for them in the last days. Perhaps this explanation springs from the hostile attitude towards the Jews which was beginning to emerge in his time and the slandering stories which were told about the Jewish people, to which he occasionally refers in his comments on this chapter.

The comparison of Andrew's interpretation with those of the Jewish commentators has been illuminating in that it illustrates how far he was prepared to follow the Jewish point of view. He derived from them the idea of explaining this chapter of Israel, and possibly heard something about the concept of the vicarious character of the suffering of the righteous. He has in common with them the notion of an error of judgment as regards the reason for Israel's sufferings. But here their interpretations part: Andrew limits the significance of the prophetic words strictly to Israel, while the Jewish interpreters put the text in a much wider perspective, by either seeing Israel's sufferings as vicarious for the gentile nations (Rashi and Joseph Kara), or by referring to the final end of all Israel's sorrows and griefs in the last days (Ibn Ezra). Andrew does not mention these Jewish

1. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., pp.242-43.

interpretations and quite deliberately so it seems. For at this point he decided firmly that he could not go all the way with them. Perhaps he could safely disregard references to Christ here, after all he was explaining the literal sense; but to disregard Christ's vicarious suffering while mentioning the Jewish views of the suffering of Israel, even as quite neutral information, must have seemed to him as going a little too far. Here Andrew realized that there is a difference between saying that certain prophecies can be explained of the Jewish Messiah or of Christ, as he had done previously, and stating that through the suffering of Israel peace will be brought to the whole world, which he, in fact, would have been doing had he followed the Jewish interpretation in all its consequences. Therefore, he makes a conscious choice and compromises by avoiding both the Jewish and Christian spiritual interpretation and explains these texts as only concerning the people to whom they were actually spoken. In this context, of course, the idea of Israel's suffering as atonement for the sins of the whole world, is completely out of the question.

7. 'Oblatus est. Quasi hostia. Quia ipse voluit.
Quia ipsi Domino sic placuit. Non aperuit os eius^a
Ad contradicendum¹.

Ibn Ezra gives an interesting explanation of the words yet he opened not his mouth:

'This requires no explanation; for this is the case with every Jew in exile; when he is insulted he dares not reply, especially the pious one who devotes himself only to the service of God, and does not care for prosperity; nor does he know any prince or chief from whom to ask for assistance, when oppressed by man.'²

a. V. suum.

1. Fo. 71c.

2. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., pp. 243-44.

3. Fo. 71d.

8. 'De angustia et de iudicio sublatus est. Tandem, miserante Domino, de angustia, id est mentis anxietate, et iudicio, id est damnatione sub Cyro, tolletur'.¹

Andrew interprets the text of the release of the Jews from exile under Cyrus. Rashi explains it as a prophecy referring to the last days, when the gentiles will announce that Israel will be freed from the anxiety in which she was kept by them, and from the chastisements which she had endured.² Kimchi gives a rather ambiguous interpretation, remarking: 'From the coercion of exile, in which he was confined, and from the judgment of captivity when judgments were inflicted upon him, from all this he was taken and redeemed'.³

9. 'Et dabit impios pro sepultura sua^a et divitem pro morte sua. Percussus non interibit, sed impii et divites, Babylonii videlicet increduli et divitiis occupati, in sepulturam et mortem pro eo dabuntur. Quod est dicere illi parcetur et <isti>^b interibunt. Ipsum dicit daturum, quia causa quare dabuntur erit'.⁴

Andrew gives a historical interpretation of this text, for which there are no Jewish parallels.

id. 'Eo quod iniquitatem non fecerit. Hoc pro parte bonorum. Neque^c etc. Huiusmodi que nisi solis convenire electis possunt, electis dicuntur'.⁵

Because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth: these things can only be said of a small number of righteous people, according to Andrew. A very rational interpretation.

a. sua not in V.

b. C. illi.

c. C. sicut; V. neque.

1. Fo. 71c.

2. Rashi, Comm. on Is., p. 283.

3. Quoted in Neubauer, p. 53.

4. Fo. 71d.

5. Fo. 71d.

the 10. 'Et Dominus voluit conterere eum in infirmitate.
 Etsi bonus, placuit Domino in infirmitatibus carnis
 et multis molestiis, quibus caro infirmatur, illum
 affligere. Si posuerit animam suam pro peccato.
 Si patienter et equo animo pro peccato, non modo suo
 et etiam alieno, animam suam affligi sustinuerit,
 qui de eo seminati fuerint longevos videbit'.¹

The Lord intended to test Israel, and he promised to give a long life to her offspring, if she was prepared to bear patiently her soul's afflictions not only for her own, but also for other people's sins. Andrew still restricts the benefits of the suffering during the exile to the people of Israel only; and we can assume that he understands the peccata aliena as those of the past and future generations of this people.² Ibn Ezra takes the last half of the text as a promise for the messianic age:

'He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days. He and his children will enjoy the salvation, which the Lord will grant them. This refers to that generation which will return to God, that is, to the law of God, in the days of Messiah.'³

11. 'Videbit. Subaudi: quod videre desideravit. Possumus dicere quod de tenebris tribulationis et carceris eductus lumen videbit et intelliget, id est intelligentie dono donabitur. Saturabitur. Omnibus terre bonis usque ad satietatem reficietur. In scientia. Quam meo percipiet dono.'⁴

At last Israel will understand why she had to suffer. Andrew does not comment on the last part of the text, for he shall bear their iniquities, possibly because it seems a repetition of what has been said earlier on. Kimchi's explanation of these words is noteworthy, because here he refers without reservation to Israel as atoning for the sins of the world: '....and by his righteousness [he] will bear

1. Fo. 71d.

2. Cf. above pp. 252 - 254.

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 245.

4. Fo. 71d.

the iniquities of the gentiles, for by it there will be peace in the world, even for the gentiles'.¹

12. 'Dispertiam ei plurimos. Multos ditioni illius subiciam populos et quasi in donativum illi dispertiam. Tradidit. Hoc non potest nisi de illis dici qui voluntariam prophetarum consilio,^a unde ut Ieconias et qui cum eo Babylonis se tradiderunt, transmigracionem subierunt. In mortem. Angustiandam duris velut mortis angustiis. Cum sceleratis reputatus est. Pena sceleratorum in carceribus et ergastulis et duris operum laboribus promitti et damnati. Pro transgressoribus rogavit. Pro illis de populo suo, qui legem Domini transgrediebantur, pars electior, ut in melius commutarentur, Dominum simpliciter rogabat. Quidam etiam Hebreorum totam hanc pericopem super Ysaia interpretantur.²

Ibn Ezra commented on the first part of verse 12:

'All commentators agree that in this verse the prophet speaks of those that die for the unity of God, explaining the expression with the great.... to signify "the prophets" and they understand by the strong "the patriarchs". We know that this is true, but the subject has no connection with the subject of the chapter. I explain it as follows: I will certainly give to Israel a portion of the spoil and booty taken from many nations.... For. The reward for having poured out [his soul] etc.'³

Ibn Ezra's own interpretation has at first sight much in common with Andrew's, but on grounds of his previous explanations it is more probable that he expects this to happen in the end of time, when many troubles will come for the gentile nations; while Andrew refers the text to the historical situation of Israel after her return from captivity. Most interesting is the next part of his explanation. Jeconiah whom he mentions here is identical with Jehoiachin, the king of Judah, who was taken prisoner to Babylon in the year 597, together with the princes of Judah, the carpenters and smiths.⁴ Ginzberg, in

a. C. consilii.

1. Quoted in Neubauer, p. 54; cf. above p. 256.

2. Fo. 71d.

3. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is., p. 246.

4. Cf. Jer. xxiv. 1 and ii Reg. xxiv. 15, 16.

his Legends, mentions a Jewish tradition which records that Nebuchadnezzar demanded the surrender of Jehoiachin; if this should be refused he would destroy the temple. Since the king did not desire that the city of Jerusalem should be exposed to peril for his sake, he delivered himself voluntarily to the Babylonian leaders, after they had sworn that neither the city nor the people were to suffer any harm. They did not keep their promise, however, and shortly afterwards the king, his mother and ten thousand of Jewish nobility and scholars were carried away into exile.¹ Although no mention is made here of a voluntary transmigration of the exiles, we certainly hear about Jehoiachin's noble surrender of himself, which makes it most likely that this was the tradition Andrew had in mind. In the beginning of the chapter we have already referred to his final remark.²

II

In the exposition of this chapter Andrew certainly carried his explanation of the literal sense to its extreme consequences. So far he had sometimes indicated that certain texts were interpreted of Christ by the Christian commentators, in particular where it concerned obvious christological prophecies; but no mention is made of such a possibility in the case of the Suffering Servant, whom he, without hesitation, identifies with either Isaiah or Israel. In view of the importance of this chapter for Christian readers this seems odd, and one can only guess what Andrew's motives were. It may be that he thought that if he ignored all references to Christ, it would be

1. L. Ginzberg, Legends, iv.286 and the sources referred to there.

2. Cf. above p. 247.

easier for him to give a purely historical interpretation. He likewise left out, as we have seen, all allusions to Jewish spiritual interpretation, and in so doing, he managed to avoid having to decide or seeming to decide in favour of either of them. Thus this practice had the advantage of making him less liable to be accused of judaizing. At the same time, it illustrates how Andrew carefully selects here the information he received from the Jews. Compared with his comments on Is.vii.14, where he sneers at the Jews while actually accepting their explanations, his approach to this chapter is more sophisticated. The fact that he nowhere, except at the very end and once in a note on the text, explicitly refers to the Jewish exegesis and nowhere mentions their, for Christians unacceptable, ideas about the vicarious character of Israel's sufferings for the sins of the world, may explain why Richard of St. Victor chose to attack him on the subject of the Blessed Virgin and not on the Suffering Servant.¹ For after all, Andrew does here exactly what was expected of him: he expounds the chapter according to the letter of the text, taking into account the historical background and the people to whom Isaiah addressed his words. And it is not until we begin to compare his exposition closely with those of the Jewish commentators that we discover exactly how deeply he was influenced by their ideas governing the interpretation of this chapter, in particular the idea of taking it as referring to the people of Israel.

Altogether, we have here an interpretation of this well known chapter of Isaiah, which is almost inconceivable as written by a medieval Christian commentator; and we can only regret not knowing what the reaction was of his twelfth century contemporaries on reading it.

1. As we know, Richard picked out Andrew's interpretation of the Virgin's conception from many instances: '....in quo nonnulla minus caute posita, minus catholice disputata inveni....' (De Emmanuele, Prol., P.L.196, 601-02). It seems most likely that the Suffering Servant was among the nonnulla he had in mind.

CHAPTER X

Conclusions.

Having surveyed Andrew's interpretation of Exodus and Isaiah, we are now in a position to make a comparison between the two, and to comment on the final outcome of our investigation. As far as the first point is concerned, after reading Andrew's commentary on Isaiah his interpretation of Exodus seems suddenly to be lacking in depth. The comments are mostly short and limited to the explanation of a single word or expression; there are many remarks on grammatical and textual problems, and there is a great concern about the differences between the Latin and the Hebrew rendering of the text. Andrew does not seem to involve himself much with the material he is dealing with, nor with the persons mentioned in the text. Another striking feature of this commentary is the large number of borrowings from other sources which he inserts into his work. Altogether, his commentary on Exodus in comparison with his interpretation of Isaiah gives the impression of being original, clever, critical and very interesting indeed, but, as Andrew has warned us himself, somewhat superficial. It cannot be stressed enough, however, that it is only in comparison with his interpretation of Isaiah that his commentary on Exodus makes this impression, and that this comparison does not make the latter any less valuable as such.

In the commentary on Isaiah, on the other hand, we find that the correct rendering of the text and grammatical problems are only of secondary importance, and that Andrew is often more concerned with the meaning of a verse or a passage as a whole than with individual words. His comments are mostly of a much more substantial character. He becomes more and more involved in his work as he goes on, and he also

pays a great deal of attention to the person of Isaiah as the author of the book. He depends much less on other sources here than in Exodus, mainly, of course, because there were not many available, but also because the content of Isaiah lends itself less to the insertion of short remarks and definitions taken from elsewhere than Exodus. And when he turns to the Jews for information, he does so in the first place for explanation and not for the text.¹

The main reason for these different ways of approach is inherent in the varying content of the biblical text itself. The prophecies of Isaiah demand a more extensive treatment than the chapters of Exodus, even in an exclusively literal interpretation. Besides, in Isaiah we find much intermingling of references to historical and future events. This meant that when ^{Andrew} took over interpretations from the Jewish commentators these were often coloured by their messianic expectations, which gave his interpretation a different, or according to some Christian theologians, dangerous outlook. Also, in Isaiah we come across a great variety of historical events which are closely connected with the actions and words of the prophet and need explaining, more than in Exodus. Lastly, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Andrew's interests and ^{exegetical} procedure shifted slightly in the course of his work, and that later he gave a wider interpretation to what an exposition of the literal sense should and should not include. He became more familiar too with the Jewish way of interpreting, and was thus able to record better and in greater detail what he heard from them; at the same time, this increasing preoccupation with Jewish exposition took to a certain extent the place of his interest in the Hebrew text. All

1. The differences between Exodus and Isaiah are, of course, most obvious in his comments on the prophetic chapters of Isaiah, in particular Is.xl to lxvi. Cf the notes at the end of chapter IV, p.141 above.

this makes the commentary on Isaiah seem, as indeed it is, much more a work of a later period of his life, when his exegetical methods had undergone a considerable development. Perhaps the fact that he was working with Jerome's great commentary in front of him, and that he was dealing here with a different type of material made him go about his task in a more thoughtful manner; and while there is still the same fascination for the Jewish interpretation, he became more and more aware of the problems involved in the use of Jewish exposition.

One of those problems was that his enthusiasm for the Jewish interpretation could easily be explained wrongly. Therefore, it seems, Andrew states occasionally that while the Jews interpret certain prophecies as referring to their Messiah, 'we' interpret them of Christ. Thus he indicates that he has no intention whatsoever of denying the deeper, spiritual explanation of these passages; only he is not concerned with them here. Also his rare outbursts against the Jews must be seen in this light. Usually these devices worked, but not always, as is shown by Richard of St. Victor's De Emmanuele.

What then was Andrew's attitude towards the Jewish exposition? We have seen that throughout his work he adopted almost without exception the method of inserting Jewish explanations without any further comment. Rather than intending this to express indifference on his part, Andrew used this method purely to convey his information in the most suitable manner possible. And indeed, the very presence of so many references to Jewish interpretation in the work of a medieval Christian commentator, unaccompanied by derogatory remarks, is in itself an indication of the author's sympathies. His impartiality and respect for the exposition of the Jews are in fact one of the most remarkable features of his work. He regards their explanation as valid in its own right, and at times puts their views on an equal level with those of the Christian interpreters. As a source

of information for his explanation of the literal sense of the books of the Old Testament they are invaluable, exactly because they kept so closely to the text he was explaining. Andrew was not enough of a theologian, nor had he the necessary systematic mind, to raise the complicated question whether the Jews would be able to understand the Old Testament prophecies in their full depth. But most certainly, if questioned on the subject, his reaction would have been that they were intended for both Jews and Christians, and he would possibly have argued that the Jews found the significance of the prophecies on the level of the literal interpretation, while for the Christians the spiritual sense disclosed their deepest meaning. This implies that Andrew was not a judaizer in the sense that he was actually attracted to the Jewish religion, his sympathies with them were solely on an academic level, although it is not altogether surprising that some of his contemporaries did not make such a subtle distinction and rushed to the wrong conclusion.

Another problem was posed by Andrew's own ambiguous concept of the content of 'the letter' and by his lack of discrimination between Jewish literal and spiritual interpretation. These weaknesses did not become very obvious in his exposition of Exodus because of the subject matter of this book itself, which is such that a literal interpretation is bound to be slightly superficial, while the information he derived from Jewish sources was almost by definition purely literal. But with Isaiah this became more complicated, for here the Jewish interpretation was not always entirely literal, although Andrew still inserts it into his comments as part of his literal explanation. An evidently messianic interpretation put forward by the Jews has for him somehow more to do with the literal sense than a Christian explanation of the same kind, which by the very nature of its references to another Testament and the person of Christ seemed to be further removed from

the text. This is borne out, for example, by the circumstance that all the allusions to a messianic future in Andrew's work refer to Jewish expectations, as references to the Christian hopes would be out of the question in a literal explanation. At the same time, Andrew must have realized, as we said, that some of the Jewish interpretations too went beyond the surface of the letter, in particular in those cases where he mentions that the text can be referred to both Christ and the Jewish Messiah. But he failed to draw the consequences of this for his own work, except on one occasion (cf. below).

His confusion at this point reminds one that Andrew was, after all, a pioneer, who had to map out his own territory. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that generally speaking his boundaries are vague; that in his enthusiasm to record as much Jewish material as possible he took in fact too much of this for 'literal' interpretation; and that, certainly in the eyes of his contemporaries, he extended the literal exposition far beyond its limits. And although it was not until St. Thomas that the exact content of the letter was determined, through Andrew's work the question was posed more urgently than ever before, and a new interest in the literary sense was aroused. He opened up a whole new field of biblical studies, which was soon to be integrated in the programme of the Paris schools. Another important aspect of the renewing and stimulating influence of Andrew was, of course, his serious attempt to go back to the original language of the Old Testament and ^{so} to come to a correct rendering of the Latin text. For although his linguistic achievements are not as impressive as his exegetical accomplishments as a whole, here too he pointed out the direction in which biblical study was to go.

Finally, our investigations have clearly shown a definite development in Andrew's own attitude towards his work. While in his

commentary on Exodus he appeared as a keen collector of information on the literal sense from all possible available sources, in his interpretation of Isaiah he selected his material in a much more thoughtful manner, and his exposition is far more comprehensive. As far as his recording of Jewish interpretation is concerned, what has emerged from our study, especially from the chapter on the Suffering Servant, is that Andrew began to discriminate in retailing what the Jews told him. On Exodus he seemed to have taken their teaching as it came, whereas in his exposition of Isaiah he was beginning to sense that it was sometimes necessary to separate Jewish historical from Jewish messianic interpretation. Although he did not use this discriminating faculty by any means to the full, it certainly indicates that he had become capable of a more accurate appreciation of his Jewish sources. In this respect, therefore, Andrew's work marks a step forward in the evaluation of Jewish interpretation by Christian commentators.

In the Prologue to the Prophets Andrew claimed modestly that he was working for his own pleasure only, and that 'no one was obliged to take his gift'. Little could he have guessed, when writing these words, how eagerly his 'gift' would be accepted and how timely, in fact, his presentation of it was. And even nowadays, almost 700 years after his death, his 'gift' is still well worth taking, because it represents a fascinating link in the history of biblical interpretation and in the relationship between Jews and Christians throughout the ages.

APPENDIX I

Some longer extracts from Andrew's commentaries.Exodus i-iii.11 (MS.B.Nat.Lat. 356).

Iste secundus liber Moysi Hebraice hellesmoth, Grece exodus Fo.40c (O.102c) dicitur.¹ Frequens consuetudo Hebreorum est voluminibus a primis dictionibus ex quibus incipiunt nomina eis imponere, ut bresith, id est in principio, hellesmoth, id est hec sunt nomina, vaiecra, id est et vocavit. Exodus Grece, egressus vel exitus Latine. Egressus sive exitus liber iste appellatur, quia de egressu sive exitu filiorum Israel de Egypto agit. Et quia historiam quam prosequi intendit/ in morte Ioseph terminando Fo.40d Genesim intermiserat, cum narrationis series exigeret ut ab intermissionis loco inciperet dicens: quo mortuo et universis fratribus etc. (vs.6), ut competentius de exitu filiorum Israel de Egypto agat breviter introitum eorundem in Egyptum recapitulat. Cum domibus. Id est familiis, uxoribus scilicet ac liberis. Ruben, Simeon etc. Primum omnes filios Lie, deinde Benjamin qui de Rachel, post quem filios ancille Rachelis, ad ultimum filios ancille Lie ponit. Erant omnes anime eorum qui egressi sunt de femore Iacob septuaginta. In hac numeri summa nec uxores, nec filie patriarcharum, nec ulla penitus femina preter Dinam et Saram filiam Aser, nec mancipia si qua habuerint, comprehenduntur. Omni que cognatione illa. Que scilicet cum Iacob in Egyptum intravit. Erant omnes anime que egressi sunt de femore/Iacob septuaginta.^a Alias: Fo.41a in septuaginta animabus descendit Iacob in Egyptum.² Filii Lie triginta tres, eius ancille Zelphe scilicet filii

a-Erant omnes.....pro sexaginta novem septuaginta positum est, follows in P. after Oneribus. Vel portandis, vel onerosis operibus (cf. next page).

1-Cf. the Gloss ad loc.

2-Cf. Deut.x.22, slightly misquoted.

sexdecim, filii Rachel quatuordecim, filii Bale septem. Qui omnes simul sunt septuaginta, sed Her et Onan, qui inter filios

Lie numerantur in terra Chanaan mortui in Egyptum non descenderunt. Quomodo ergo in septuaginta animabus descendit Iacob in Egyptum cum duo sint minus? Si ipse Iacob numeretur adhuc una anima erit minus; forsitan in loco defunctorum due ancille computantur si tamen ipse Egyptum intraverint, vel more Scripture que solidam numeri summam, quamvis parum desit vel super excrescat, ponere consuevit pro sexaginta novem septuaginta positum est. Venite. Locutio est.

Sapienter opprimamus eum. Arroganter superbi quod astute faciunt sapienter se facere iactant, cum sapientia si proprie accipiatur non sit nisi in bono¹, quasi diceret: et opprimendo provideamus ne contra nos multiplicetur et utilitatibus nostris eius oppressio subserviat. Oneribus. Vel portandis, vel onerosis operibus. Edificaverunt urbes tabernaculorum etc.

Secundum Hebreos vel pauperum, scilicet ut que prius debiles et pauperum mansiones erant, operatione Hebreorum facte sunt fortiores, vel positionum, id est ita fortes ut thesauri regis ibi reponerentur in custodia pro firmitate loci, sive ante fuerint ibi urbes, sive non.² Vel urbes tabernaculorum, id est castrorum, / ita scilicet firme et munite sunt ut castra.

Fo.41b

Obstetricibus Hebreorum. Obstetrices sunt quas, ut ita dicam ventrarias^a dicimus. Quarum duabus que multis aliis preerant, neque enim due sole tanto populo sufficere poterant, pharao iniunxit ut interemptis Hebreorum masculis feminas vivificarent. Quibus Deum timentibus et contra imperium regis mares conservantibus benefecit Deus et edificavit illis domos, id est in divitiis vel prole multiplicavit.³ Vel illis, id est filiis Israelis edificavit domos. (Cap.ii) Elegantem. Id est electe forme.

a- A non-Latin word. Andrew is gallicising; perhaps his O.F. was ventrière?

1-Cf. Cicero, De legibus, i, 22. 58.

2-Cf. Hugh, Notulae, c. 8 (P.L. 175, 61C); cf. above pp. 72-73.

3-Ibid., c. 8 (P.L. 175, 61D-62A).

Carecto. Carectum comprehensivum nomen est sicut coryletum, et significat locum ubi carex, acuta scilicet et sparti formam habens herba crescit. Sorore. Maria secundum Hebreos.¹ Per crepidinem alvei. Crepido dicta est quasi prerupti saxi altitudo. Dicunt quidam quod crepido est ripe concavitas.² In Hebreo per ripam alvei.³ Fiscellam. Vasculum in quo latebat puer in modum fiscelle factum. Papyrione. Loco ubi papyrus, que est genus iunci crescit. Moyses. Moyses hoc nomen ex mos et is compositum est. Mos lingua Egyptiaca dicitur aqua, is vero salvatus. Moyses igitur illi nomen ab / eventu inditum est, quia de aqua salvatus est. Verbun. Factum more Scripture. Sedit. Mansit. Sacerdoti Madian. Principi et summati. Solet Scriptura summam habentes potestatem sacerdotes appellare, quia sacerdotium summa potestas erat. Unde dicitur et filii David sacerdotes erant.⁴ Defensis puellis. Constat hoc facto quia non erat solus Moyses, sed comites secum habebat.⁵ Iethro. Hic et Cineus et Raguel et Hobab dictus est. Iuravit. Pactum inivit post multa verba habita ad invicem antequam pactum accederent, qui hic tacentur.⁶ Ab operibus, propter opera, recordatus est: antropospatos.⁷ (Cap.iii) Cognati sui. In Hebreo nusquam legitur Iethro cognatus Moysi, sed socer. Minasset. Duxisset. De medio rubi. In rubo ideo Dominum aiunt Hebrei apparuisse Moysi, ne possent inde sibi idolum sculpere Iudei; semper enim Deus idolatrie occasionem recidit.⁸ Arderet. Quia totus flamma succensus non comburetur,

Fo.41c

1- Cf. Josephus, Antiquitates, ii, 9.4 (ed. Blatt, p.199).

2- Notulae, c.8 (P.L.175, 62A).

3- Cf. Rashi ad loc. (ed. Silbermann, i.6).

5- Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 62A).

4- Cf. ii Reg. viii.18.

6- Notulae, c.8 (P.L. 175, 62A).

7- Cf. Du Cange, Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis, i.304: 'antropospatos- humana passio attributa Deo'.

8- Isidore, Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, ii.7 (P.L.83, 290A); cf. above p.73.

quia nec vastatus, nec consumptus erat. Terra sancta. Non propter aliud quam propter divinam presentiam.¹ Calciamentum iubet removere, quia locus in quo stat sanctus est. Non est consuetudo Iudeis ut sancta loca calciati ingrediantur. Vidi afflictionem. Compassionis / et misericordie respectu.

Fo.41d

Audivi, sciens, descendi: omnes nostro more. Bonam et spatiosam; fluit lacte et melle. Id est abundat omnium dulcedinum et suavitatum copia. Ecce bonam. Loca Chananei etc. Scilicet ubi tot gentes habitant. Ecce spatiosam. De Gergeseo quandoque tacet, quandoque mentionem facit in Deuteronomio quidem², qui in aliis libris raro eius recoli³, quem aiunt Hebrei sponte de terra Chanaan cedens illis recessit. Quis sum ego? Humiliter se excusat indignum se tanta legatione et imparum tanto negotio, quod ultra suas vires esse cernebat, iudicans. Ego ero tecum. Ab iniuria lesionis te protegens et que per te minus potens adimplens.

Exodus xiv.3-31 (MS.B.Nat.Lat. 356).

Coartati. Iosephus dicit quod ex una parte mons intransgressibilis, ex altera mare coartabat eos.³

Fo.49d (O.106a)

Glorificabor. Id est gloriosus apparebo. Trecentos.^a

In Hebreo sexcentos; forsitan trecenti currus electi erant et preter illos alii trecenti qui comprehenduntur in eo quod dicitur quicquid in Egypto curruum fuit.⁴

Forsitan non erant. Verba sunt desperantium, vel irrisio est. Non erat in Egyptum locus ubi tantus populus sepeliretur, ideo adduxi/sti nos in solitudinem, ut suppeteret locus ad nos sepeliendum. Quasi diceret:^b non videmus nos ex ducatu tuo aliud consecutos. Magnalia.

Fo.50a

a- V. sexcentos; cf. above p. 78, n. 5 .

b- P. om diceret.

1- Notulae, c. 8 (P.L. 175, 62A).

2- E.g. Deut. iii. 14.

3- See for the whole passage Josephus, Antiquitates, ii. 15-16 (ed. Blatt, pp. 213-16); cf. also above pp. 62-65.

4- Cf. above p. 79 .

Magna et mirabilia eius opera. Quos nunc videtis. In Hebreo planius: ut nunc videtis, vivos scilicet et persequentes. Possumus et nostram litteram ad eundem sensum exponere: quos, id est quales nunc videtis, vivos scilicet et persecutores. Tacebitis. Ut nec etiam verbo opus sit vobis contra eos agere. Vel tacebitis: quiescetis. Quid clamas? Clamorem tacentis intentionem devotionis et desiderium amantis appellat, ac si diceret: talis devotio et tanta dilectio, ut exaudiatur, non eget longo clamore. Scient. Scire cogentur. Ego. Discretive. Tollens se. De loco ubi erat interposuit se inter exercitus hostium et suorum. Tenebrosa. Egyptiis; illuminans Hebreis. Quasi murus. Alta et^a non magis ad eos accedere valens, quam si murus esset; vel instar muri muniens eos a lateribus ab incursu hostium. Vigilia matutina. Quarta scilicet et ultima vigilia noctis. Et. Ea adventante. Ecce respiciens Dominus super castra Egyptiorum. Respicit Dominus placatus, respicit et iratus. Hunc / respectum timens propheta ait: Respice in me et miserere mei.¹ Respexit Dominus non ad salvationem, sed ad perditionem. Super castra Egyptiorum. Super exercitum Egyptiorum et est metonymia. Per columnam ignis et nubis. Gravissima imbrium tempestate, ut dicit Iosephus, illos afflixit et in solito tonitruo equos eorum adeo perterruit ut, relicto itinere sicco, in medias undas precipites irent. Creberrimo quoque fulmine currus eorum subvertit et bonam partem equitum fulguris incendio vastavit. Diluculo. Prima lucentis diei parte. Priorem locum. Unde Hebreis transitum concedens in cumulum sese unda attollens recesserat, fugientes Egyptii propter plagam nubis et ignis que, ut supra diximus, in eos desevebat, occurrentibus aquis involuti sunt. Nullum moveat cum nube interposita sese

a-P. vel.

1- Ps. xxiv. 16.

invicem videre non poterant, cum proficiscerentur filii Israel, quomodo scire potuerunt Egyptii; vel si mare eos ingredi viderunt, quomodo viso miraculo a persequendo non cessaverunt? Facile ex tumultu moventium sese castrarum quod proficiscerentur sentire poterant.¹ Quos tanta prius miracula non moverant / quominus eos persequerentur, quomodo hoc miraculo ut a persequendo desisterent moverentur, cum precipue sese sicut et illos absque periculo per medias undas sicco vestigio incedere viderent, et a Domino cor eorum induratum esset, ut eos persequerentur? Forsitan etiam ex historiis veterum audierant^a quod aliquibus aliquando aliquod mare transitum prebuerit, sicut eis, qui cum Alexandro Macedone erant cum Darium persequeretur, Pamphylium mare divisum <transitum> prebuisse narratur, idēoque minus ex eo quod tunc factum est moti sunt. Iosephus dicit quod dum Egyptii sese armarent ad persequendum Hebreos per medium mare, quod eos iam ingressos viderant, illi festinantes usque ad oppositum litus pertransierunt; Hebrei vero dicunt quod cum ad medium mare perventum esset per longam maris viam eos obliquasse, usque dum intransgressibilem montem qui ante eos fuerat preterissent, et tunc ad litus Egypti redisse. Unde postea in desertum Ethan, ubi tertia eorum mansio fuit venisse leguntur.²

Fo.50c

Preterea Egyptios/viderunt mortuos super litus maris. Super illud sine dubio litus ad quod ipsi pervenerant. Egyptii, etsi in principio noctis mare intravissent persequentes Hebreos, non potuissent usque ad vigiliam matutinam equinoctialis pene noctis, in ignota via, in tenebris nubis et noctis incessu castrensi, nisi forte angustissimum sit, ad medium eius pervenisse. In vigilia

Fo.50d

a- O. audierant.....idēoque: audierant quod eis, qui cum Alexandro Macedone erant cum Darium persequeretur, Pamphylium mare divisum transitum prebuerit, ideoque...

1- Cf. Notulae, c. 8 (P.L. 175, 65B,C).

2- Num.xxxiii.1 ff.

matutina periclitari ceperunt et versus castra fugere; primo diluculo redeuntibus aquis ad priorem locum submersi sunt. Cum tribus ferme horis ad litus suum ea qua fugientes velocitate festinarent, patet quod prope litus suum perierunt. Natura autem maris est ut quicquid infra medium perit ad proximum litus proiciat. Cum ergo Egyptios in litore maris proiectos et mortuos viderent, verisimile videtur quod ad idem litus redierunt unde primo mare ingressi sunt. Manum magnam. Potestatem magnam.

Exodus xx.1-17 (MS.B.Nat.Lat. 356).

Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus qui eduxi. Hoc non est unum aliquod de preceptis, sed dicit cuius precepta sunt.¹ Maximum enim Dei beneficium commemorat, ut eius legem et mandata libentius amplectentur. Non habebis deos alienos coram me. In Hebreo in multis locis ubi nos habemus coram, habet contra. Sensus est: non habeas idola et imagines deorum qui sunt alieni a me, nec adorabis deos gentium, quod facere est contra me. Idioma est Hebraee linguae futurum indicativi pro presenti imperativi ponere.² Non facies tibi sculptile. Diligentius exequitur quod breviter dixerat. Neque omnem similitudinem. Hoc volunt quidam inter idolum et similitudinem differre, quod idolum ex nullius rei existentis similitudine, ut si quis humanis membris caput canis aut arietis formet sumptum, sed otiose confictum sit. Similitudo vero sit que ex imagine rei existentis sit, sicut quando imago hominis aut avis aut serpentis in aliqua materia formatur.³ Sub terra. Vel de magna abyssu omnium aquarum matrice, que in terre visceribus est dicit, vel de equoribus et fluminibus que ripis et litoribus subsunt. Non adorabis ea, neque coles. Adorare est

Fo.56b (107d)

Fo.56c

1- Cf. Origen, Hom. 8 in Ex., quoted in the Gloss ad loc.

2- Cf. above p. 81.

3- Cf. Origen, Hom. 8 in Ex., quoted in the Gloss ad loc.

inclinationem capitis, vel aliquo huiusmodi venerari. Colere vero est toto mentis affectu et studio ei quod colitur manicipari.¹ Utrumque vetat idolis fieri. Ego sum Dominus Deus^a tuus. Non idola. Fortis. Cuius ire nemo resistere potest. Zelotes. A simili illius qui ex nimio amore zelat uxorem suam, non ferens quod alicui aliquod signum amoris demonstret, Dominus populum suum zelat, non ferens quod aliquam cum idolis familiaritatem aut fedus ineat. Visitans iniquitatem patrum in filios in tertiam et quartam generationem. His verbis quam districtus iudex^b sit in inimicos, et quam clemens et misericors in amicos declarat. Non solum de patre cum peccat ultionem capio, sed in filium et nepotem et pronepotem vindictam extendo, ut non solum de punito doleat qui peccat, sed quod suis cladis auctor extiterit graviter crucietur. Sepe etiam filiorum vel nepotum molestius quam proprios ferre solent cruciatus. Tunc tamen precipue graviter ferunt, cum ipsi ipsorum cruciatuum causa existunt. Ideo usque ad tertiam et quartam generationem et non ultra se dicit peccata patrum in filios vindicaturum, quia usque ad has generationes vivere solent homines et posteritatem suam videre.² Quidam totum ad misericordiam referunt, dicentes quod peccantibus, etiam his qui Deum oderunt, non statim in ipsos vel filios ipsorum ulciscitur, sed usque in tertiam vel quartam generationem vindictam differt, / sicut de Achab et Iehu legimus;³ in his vero qui amant eum in multa milia extendit misericordiam suam. Non est iniustitia si Deus temporaliter punit filium pro

Fo.56d

Fo.57a

a-P. om. Dominus; O. om. Deus; V. ego sum Dominus Deus.

b- O. ultor.

1-Cf. the Gloss ad loc.

2- Cf. Notulae, c. 8 (P.L.175, 68A).

3- iii Reg. xxi.29.

peccato patris cuius carne est, vel etiam eternaliter si renatus non est, vel si impia patris facta imitatur, quia talis filius non solum pro suis, sed etiam pro impietatibus patris punietur. Non assumes nomen Domini^a Dei tui in vanum. Secundum preceptum legis in quo periurium prohibetur. In vanum assumit nomen Dei qui vel mendaciter, vel pro nichilo iurat, cuiusmodi hominem non habebit Dominus insontem, sed potius tanquam noxium puniet.

Sanctifices. Ab omni opere cessando et ceremonias eius observando. Honora patrem tuum et matrem tuam. Debitam venerationem exhibendo et necessaria ministrando, iuxta quem sensum apostolus dicit: Presbyteri duplici honore habeantur.¹ Ut sis longevus. Id est ut diu vivas. Non occides. Manu, vel mente, vel subtrahendo auxilium vite ei cui potes dare. Reos quos iudex occidit, non ipse sed lex qui iubet occidit. Non mechaberis.² Non cuilibet miscearis excepto federe matrimonii; per partem enim totum vult intelligi. Non furtum facies. Quamlibet rei aliene usurpationem quod vitium est rapacitatis interdicit.

Fo.57b

Falsum testimonium. Hic omnis falsitas et omne mendacium prohibetur. Non concupisces domum proximi tui. Decimum et ultimum preceptum hoc est, cui nonum preceptum interseritur cum ordinis series exigeret ut preponeretur, quod est de non desideranda uxore aliena et differt ab eo quod adulterium prohibetur, quia ibi actus, hic desiderium mali resecatur. Secundum Augustinum concupiscentia uxoris aliene et concupiscentia domus aliene tantum in peccando differunt, ut illi quod dictum est non concupisces domum proximi tui adiuncta sint alia, ei vero quod dictum est non concupisces uxorem proximi tui non sint aliqua adiuncta. Nonum preceptum tantum concupiscentiam uxoris aliene, decimum vero cuiuslibet alterius rei concupiscentiam interdicit.

a- P. and O. om. Domini.

1-Cf. i Tim. v.17, slightly misquoted.

2-Cf. for the remaining part of the passage Augustine, Quaestiones Ex. 71 (C.C.S.L. 33, p. 103, l. 1153).

Isaiah vii. 1-13 (MS.Pem. 45).

Et factum est. Huiusmodi versiculum naturam Fo.14b (M.48c)
 sequens sic incipit: in diebus Achaz; frequenter Hebrei
 et noster Lucas in sententiarum principiis ponere (et factum est)^a
 consueverunt. Ubicunque ponitur sic est ac si diceretur:
 et fuit vel contigit. In diebus Achaz filii. Ab hoc
 loco usque ad eum: in anno in quo mortuus est rex Achaz,¹
 que sub Achaz visa vel dicta sunt narrantur. Ascendit.
Secundum situm terre. Et non potuerunt debellare eam.
 Hac quidem vice, quando sub Achaz contra eam ascenderunt
 qui prius magna illam percusserant plaga, debellare non
 potuerunt. Nuntiaverunt domui David dicentes. Vel ipsi
 reges adversarii, pavoris incutiendi causa,^b per nuntios
 mandaverunt sic dicentes, vel perfuge, vel si qui
 eorum cum hostibus erant amici, vel qui rumoribus
 deportandis inserviunt. Requievit Syria super Ephraim.
(Syria) qui^c Iudam et alias gentes expugnandas laborans
 super decem tribus, que Ephraim a rege suo Ieroboam
 dicte sunt, requievit, pacem, fedus et amicitiam cum
 illo coniungens. A facie venti. A presentia venti, vel
 locutio est: a vento scilicet. Relictus est. Vel ad
 nominis interpretationem alludit, Iasub enim reliquus
 interpretatur, vel quia relictus est a fratre suo Rabsace,
 qui ad hostes transisse putatur.² Ad extremum aqueductus.
 Ad finem et extre/mitatem illius aqueductus qui a superiore Fo. 14c
 piscina, quod nos vivarium nominamus, descendebat. Agri
fullonis. Ager iste unde vicus vel platea nomen trahit,
 inde fullonis forsitan dictus est, quod in eo vel terra
 qua pannis mundificandis et lavandis fullones utuntur

a- C. and M. om. et factum est.

b- C. eam.

c- C. Syrusqui; M. Syrus super.

1- Is. xiv.28.

2- Cf. Jerome, Comm. in Es., xi (C.C.S.L. 73, p.431, l.86); see also
 L. Ginzberg, 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern', vi, in Jewish studies
in memory of G.A. Kohut, pp.306-07.

abundabat^a, vel cardi fullonici ibi nascebantur, vel fullones eum quandocumque inhabitabant, vel iure hereditario possidebant. Vide ut sileas. Nichil quod ad^b rebellandum pertinet agas dicasve. In Exodo similis locutio invenitur: Dominus pugnabit pro vobis, vos autem tacebitis.¹ Noli timere et cor tuum ne formidet. Terror, timor, pavor, exanimatio, conturbatio et formido secundum Stoicos hanc habent distantiam, ut terrorem dicant metum concutientem; timorem metum mali appropinquantis; pavorem metum mentem loco moventem; examinationem metum subsequentem et quasi comitem pavoris; conturbationem metum excutientem cogitata; formidinem metum permanentem.² Hec est istorum, si proprie accipiantur, differentia; pro se invicem tamen poni solent. Fumigantium istorum. In eo quod fumigantes et non ardentis eos titiones appellat, quod molestiam qualemcumque inferre, sed non deperdere possint innuit. In ira furoris Rasin. Ira, si proprie accipiatur, est libido puniendi eius qui videatur lesisse iniuria.³ Quoniam autem ira Rasin contra Iudam nequaquam iusta erat, neque eum iniuriose leguntur lesisse, furoris apposuit, ut^c eum contra equitatem adversus eos in iram exarsisse demonstraret. Sensus est: non formidet cor tuum ab iniustia regis Rasin^d filiique Romelie ira. Eo quod consilium inierit contra. Versus qui sic incipit eo quod consilium, verbi^e finem capit: non erit istud (vs. 7).

a- C. abundat.

b- C. ad quod.

c- C. non.

d- M. Aram.

e- M. ibi.

1-Ex. xiv.14.

2- Cicero, Tusculanae Disputationes, iv. 8, 19.

3- Ibid., iv. 9, 21.

Littera sic legitur: Dominus Deus dicit hec, que
 supponuntur videlicet, non / erit istud. Quod quidem
 non dicit propter iustitiam Iude, sed propter
 iniustitiam Rasin et filii Romelie. Et hec dicit
 Dominus quod Syria ceperit malum, o Iuda, adversum te
 consilium. Suscitemus eum. Excitemus a sue securitatis
 somno. Et evellamus eum ad nos.^a Sicut virgultum
 quod radicitus evellitur, sic Iudam cum omnibus que ad
 eum pertinent ad se trahere volunt. In Hebreo complanemus
 vel adequemus. Quod est dicere: omnibus murorum et
 edificiorum suorum munimentis ad solum usque complanatis
 et adequatis trahere eum ad nos. Et exponamus regem in
medio eius filium Tabeel. Sunt qui putant quod Phacee
 dictus sit filius Tabeel,¹ et hoc sit consilium quod
 Syria et Ephraim contra Iudam inierint, ut Iuda complanato
 Phacee sicut super Ephraim ita super Iudam regnaret.
 Vel quia Tabeel interpretatur bonus nobis,² talem
 voluerunt^b super Iudam regem ponere, qui bonus illis
 et secundum illorum voluntatem esset. Istud. Quod
 machinantur. Non stabit. Non perseverabit. Sed caput Syrie
Damascus. Non erit quod illi disponunt, quod Ierusalem
 qui caput est civitatum caput et princeps sit Phacee et
 Rasin caput Samarie, sed sicut^c hactenus fuit, Damascus
 caput et princeps civitatis^d Syrie et huius caput Rasin.
Et adhuc sexaginta et quinque anni. Non dicit quod a
 tempore quo ista dicebat in diebus Achaz usque ad illud
 quo Ephraim desineret esse populus Domini sexaginta et
 quinque anni restarent, sed quot anni adhuc restarent usque
 dum complerentur qui omnes a tempore quo prophetare cepit
 Osee, qui hoc prius predixit^e, sexaginta et quinque anni

a- V. avellamus.

b- C. noluerunt.

c- C. secundum.

d- C. cum.

e- C. non dixit.

1-Cf. Ibn Ezra, Comm. on Is. , p.39.

2-Cf. Rashi, Comm. on Is. , p. 52.

futuri essent. Si non credideritis non permanebitis. In Hebreo non credetur vobis.¹ Quod non credituri estis que dico, inde est quod a nemine credetur vobis, id est quia scitis^a vos tales cui nullus credere debeat, ex vobismet ipsis alios mentientes, nulli credendum iudicatis. Et adiecit Dominus loqui ad Achaz. Locutus fuit Dominus per prophetam in superioribus et adiecit superiori locutioni ut adhuc per eundem illi loqueretur. / Pete tibi signum etc.

Fo. 15a

Ut certum habeas quod non sit tibi formidandum a duabus caudis titionum, pete tibi signum fieri quo impetrato nichil sit quod dubites. A Domino Deo tuo. Non ab idolis quorum te cultui mancipasti signum petas, sed a Domino qui tuus Deus esse debet. Sive in profundum inferni, sive in excelsum^b supra. Inde^c tibi pete signum fieri, unde a nullo hominum tibi dari possit, scilicet vel de inferno qui in profundo est, vel de celo quod in excelso est. Non petam et non tentabo Dominum. Ideo non petam quia hoc esset temptare Dominum, quod lege prohibeor.² Audite ergo domus David. Quia in petendo signo ex Domini mandato rex consentire noluit, ad populum se propheta convertit, dicens: vos domus David, audite que vobis dicturus sum. Numquid parum vobis est molestos esse hominibus, quia molesti estis et Deo meo? An est parum vobis quod mihi meique similibus hominibus molesti estis, quos despectui habetis, quod iccirco dico, quia etiam Deo molesti estis a quo signum, etiam^d iussi, petere non vultis. In Hebreo: si parum est vobis quod homines fatigatis, quia et Deum meum fatigatis. Sensus satis unus, licet verba sint diversa. Propter hoc.....³

a- C. facitis.

b- C. om. excelsum.

c- C. idem.

d-C. et.

1- Cf. Rashi, Comma. on Is., p. 53.

2- Cf. Deut. vi.16.

3- Cf. above p. 142 ff.

Isaiah lli. 1-10 (MS.Pem.45).

Et. Id est incircumcisos etiam omnes Fo.70d
 et immundos reputant; per vias Ierusalem in novissimis
 diebus a Domino restitute nullus, ut asserunt, sicut
 olim incircumcisos pertransibit. Gratis venundati
estis. Vos servos meos nullo mihi pretio dato
 vobisque nichil in illos peccantibus hastes servitute[m]
 redigerunt. Ergo vos de manu illorum sine omni
 pretio rediman[is] absque ulla causa, hoc est quod superius
 dictum est gratis. Calumniatus est. Quasi suum sibi
 vindicare voluit. Numquid mihi est hic? Cum populus
 meus sine causa de terra sua ablat[us] sit, $\langle \text{quid} \rangle^a$ ego
 in celo moror et non potius liberare meos quos inique
 dominatores eorum opprimunt descendendo? Nostris, ut
 sepe dictum est, de Deo loquens Scriptura sermonibus
 utitur. Blasphematur. Quando hostes Deum suum populum
 de manu ipsorum liberare non posse dicebant, nomen
 Domini blasphemabatur. Die illa. Liberationis sue.
 Tunc sciet populus meus quia ego qui quondam per
 prophetas et ministros loqui solebam tunc presens adero.
Quam pulchri super montes pedes etc. Ipse adero
 presens, et qui adventum meum antequam veniam prenuntient
 premittam, quorum pedes super montes, ut a longe audiantur,
 stantes iocundi et amabiles, ut ea que pulchra sunt,
 videntibus erunt. Non ideo dicit annuntiantis et
 predicantis singulariter, quod de uno solo hoc intelligat,
 sed consuetudo Scripture est quod de pluribus intelligit
 nonnunquam singulariter dicere. Vox speculatorum tuorum.
 Subauditur: audita est. / Speculatores, quos ad Fo.71a
 speculandum Domini adventum super edita terrarum loca
 posueris, veniente Domino alta voce clamabant et simul cum
 ipso clamore quo illum adesse significabant, laudabunt

a- C. qui.

quia manifeste et aperte videbunt eam habitatores
 Syon ad eam convertere. Paravit Dominus brachium.
 Fortitudinem suam qua suos ad se reducet non in
 occulto, sed videntibus cunctis gentibus faciet, et
 salvationem quam ipse facturus est tota usque ad
 terminos ^{et fines} suos terra videbit. Recedite, recedite,
exite inde. Imperat eis qui in Babylone erunt ut
 inde recedant.....¹

1- Cf. above p. 238.

APPENDIX II.

TABLE I (acknowledged borrowings on Exodus)¹

Text	Hugh, Notulae	Josephus, Ant.	Augustine, Quaest. Ex.	Bede, De Tab.	Various sources
ii.5	quidam	Josephus			
iii.12	alii	Josephus			quidam ? (from Hugh as quidam)
iii.14	quidam				
iv.10	quidam (=Rash-bam)		Augustine: Q. 7 (also in Gloss)		alii (Gloss: Origen)
iv.24					alii ?
iv.25, 26	quidam		Augustine: Q. 8 (also in Gloss)		quidam? nostri dicunt: Aug. Q. 12 (also in R. Maurus)
iv.27					quidam?
x.21		Josephus			quidam? (Bede?)
xii.25					Isidore
xii.25					alii (=Isidore)
xii.42	quidam				quidam?
xiii.18	quidam				dicunt (=Isidore)
xiii.21	ut aiunt		Augustine (wrongly by attributed)	Bede	
xiv.2		Josephus			quidam? (Bede?)
xiv.24		Josephus	Augustine: Q. 10 (also in Gloss)		
xiv.27		Josephus			
xv.10	quosdam	Josephus		Bede	
xv.14	qui putant		Augustine: Q. 11		
xv.18	quidam	Josephus			
xv.20	quidam (=Rashi)				secundum Ieronium sec. eodem sec. Cassiodorum (=Gloss; Strabo)
xv.25	fuissent qui (=Bede)	Josephus		Bede	
xvi.5					quidam ? (Bede?) (=Rashi?)
xvi.29		Josephus	Augustine		secundum eos (=Andrew ad xvi.5)

1. Cf. above pp. 46-56.

TABLE I (Cont.)

Text	Hugh, Notulae	Josephus, Ant.	Augustine, Quaest. Ex.	Bede, De Tab.	Various sources
Chapter xvi.31	from other sources				apocrypha
1	title: Jerome				scriptura (=Sap. Sal)
xvii.9	Bede, Gloss				quidam (=Gloss: Srabo)
xvii.9	11: Hugh	Josephus			
xvii.10	4: Josephus	Josephus			
xx.4	2: Isidore, Bede H. Maurus, Gloss			1	quidam (=Gloss: Origen)
xx.5	22: Hugh-Rashba			8: Ibn Ezra 12: Rashi	quidam?
xx.14			2, 3 Augustine: Q.71 (also in Gloss).	10: Rashi, Ibn Ezra	
xxii.15	quidam			24: Talmud, Makilta	
xxiii.11			25, 26 Augustine: Q.89 (also in Gloss)		
xxiii.15					secundum quosdam? (=Jews?)
xxiii.15					quidam? (=Jews)
xxiii.19	12: Rupert, Gloss Makilta, Rashi, Ibn Ezra				sunt qui? (=Theodoretus? and Jews?)
xxiv.1	quidam				
xxv.27	quidam				
xxvi.1			Augustine (wrongly attributed)	Bede	
xxvi.4	21: Hugh				quidam? (Bede?)
xxvi.7			7 Augustine: Q.108 (also in Gloss)		
xxvi.9		Josephus		12: Bede	
xxvi.19	2: Gloss (Origen)		13 Augustine: Q.110		
xxvi.23		Josephus			
xxvii.5	quidam (=Rashi)		14 (1: 2e); once >		
xxvii.5	fuerunt qui (=Bede)		15 >		
xxviii.14			16 (1: 2e); once	16: Makilta, Rashi	
xxxvi.31			17	17 Bede	
xxxviii.7		Josephus	Augustine		quidam? (Bede?)

> indicates that the text does not belong exclusively to the one column.

TABLE II (acknowledged Jewish borrowings on Exodus).¹

Chapter	From other sources	Linguistic remarks	Exegetical Matter	Jewish Customs
i	title: Jerome, Bede, Gloss			title
xvi				
xviii	11: Hugh			
ii	4: Josephus	5		
iii	2: Isidore, Bede R. Maurus, Gloss		1	5
xiii			8: Ibn Ezra	
	22: Hugh=Rashbam		12: Rashi	
iv		2,3	10: Rashi, Ibn Ezra	
		24: Rashi >	24: Talmud, Mekilta	
xvi				
xvii		25,26(3 times); once >		25
		12: Rashi >		
vi				
x				9
xviii				
xii	12: Rupert, Gloss =Mekilta, Rashi, Ibn Ezra	51		2
				25
xiii			3: refers to xii.22 >	3
		3: refers to xii. 42=Rashi >		
	21: Hugh	18: Rashi		
xiv		7		
		13	27	
xv		1	12: Mekilta, Rashi	
	2: Gloss(Origen)	13 (twice); once Rashi	13: Rashbam	
	5: Hugh	14 (twice); once >		
		15 >		
		16 (twice); once Rashi	16: Mekilta, Rashi	
		17	17	
			18: Targum, Rashi	
			25	

1. Cf. above pp.72-103.

> indicates that the text does not belong exclusively to the one column.

TABLE II (Cont.)

Chapter	From other sources	Linguistic remarks	Exegetical Matter	Jewish Customs
xvi			13: Josephus	
xviii			8=111.1	
xx		3 (twice); once >		
xxi			32	
xxiii		19: Menachem? 21 >		19: Mekilta, Rashi
xxv		4 29 34: Rashi		
xxvi		7	9	
xxvii	3: Hugh			
xxvii	4, 5: Hugh	5 (twice); both Rashi and >		
xxviii	14 (twice); both Hugh 30 (twice); both Hugh 36: Hugh			
xxxv		35		
xxxviii		4	7: Rashi	

Paris, MS. Maz. 175 (Bibliothèque Mazarine), containing Andrew on Isaiah with the general prologue to the Prophets, from the end of the twelfth century. From St. Victor at Paris. This manuscript is incomplete (cf. above p. 104); it is described by A. Molinier, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Mazarine* (Paris, 1865), 1.60-61.

Paris, MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356 (Bibliothèque Nationale), containing Andrew on the Septateuch, dating from the middle of the twelfth century. Probably from the abbey of Beaupré near Beauvais. Cf. *Study*, pp. 126 and 175.

II - Patristic and Medieval Authors.

Agostino, *De Tripartito Tabernaculo*, I: *De Tabernaculo Regis*, *La lingua litterali*. (P.L. 198).

Andrew of St. Victor, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (MS. B. Nat. Lat. 356; Ladd loc. cit.).

Commentary on Isaiah (MS. Psa. 45; Maz. 175).

Andrew of St. Victor, SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY. Edited by J. P. F. ...
 St. S. Victor, *Il suo commento a S. Giovanni* Biblica, xxxvi (1955), 305-31.

Commentary on Ecclesiastes. Edited by G. Galambos, *De Historiis*
 The bibliography does not include as a rule sources which have been
 quoted only once and which are referred to with dates and place of
 publication in the footnotes, unless they are of importance to the
 understanding of the thesis generally. The pagan classics Andrew
 refers to are not mentioned specially either. There is a separate
 section for Jewish sources.

I - Manuscript Sources.

- Cambridge, MS.Pem.45 (Pembroke College), containing Andrew on Isaiah,
 Jeremiah and Daniel, dating from the thirteenth century. From
 St. Edmundsbury. The manuscript is described by M.R. James,
A descriptive catalogue of the MSS in the library of Pembroke
College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 44-45.
- Oxford, MS.Laud.Lat. 105 (Bodleian Library), containing Andrew on the
 Octateuch, Chronicles and Minor Prophets, dating from the middle
 of the thirteenth century. From the Cistercian abbey of Eberbach
 near Mainz. Cf. Study, p.176.
- Paris, MS.Maz. 175 (Bibliothèque Mazarine), containing Andrew on Isaiah
 with the general prologue to the Prophets, dating from the end of
 the twelfth century. From St. Victor at Paris. This manuscript
 is incomplete (cf. above p.104); it is described by A. Molinier,
Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Mazarine (Paris, 1885),
 i.60-61.
- Paris, MS.B.Nat.Lat. 356 (Bibliothèque Nationale), containing Andrew on
 the Heptateuch, dating from the middle of the twelfth century.
 Probably from the abbey of Beaupré near Beauvais. Cf. Study,
 pp.126 and 175.

II - Patristic and Medieval Authors.

- Adam the Scot, De Tripartito Tabernaculo, i: De Tabernaculo Moysis
in sensu litterali. (P.L. 198).
- Andrew of St. Victor, Commentary on the Pentateuch (MSS.B.Nat.Lat.356;
 Laud Lat.105).
- " Commentary on Isaiah (MSS.Pem.45; Maz.175).

- Andrew of St. Victor, Commentary on Jonah. Edited by A. Penna, 'Andrea di S. Vittore. Il suo commento a Giona' (Biblica, xxxvi (1955), 305-31.
- " Commentary on Ecclesiastes. Edited by G. Calandra, De historica Andreae victorini expositione in Ecclesiasten (Palermo, 1948).
- " A list of MSS of Andrew's commentaries is given in Study, pp. 175-78. His commentaries are also listed in F. Stegmüller, Repertorium biblicum medi aevi, nos. 1295-1329; MS. Laud. Lat. 105 is not mentioned however.
- " For Andrew see further: Study, ch. iv: 'Andrew of St. Victor', pp. 112-85 and two articles by Miss Smalley in Rech. Théol. anc. méd. x (1938), 358-73 and xi (1939), 145-67 (see under Smalley). Also 'The Anglo-Norman Chronicle of Wigmore Abbey', ed. J. C. Dickinson and P. T. Ricketts (Trans. Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club, xxxix, 1969, part iii).
- Augustine, Quaestionum in Heptateuchum Libri VII, II: Quaestiones Exodi (C.C.S.L., 33).
- Bede, De Tabernaculo (P.L. 91).
- Gilbert Crispin, Disputatio Iudei et Christiani, ed. B. Blumenkranz (Strom. Patr. et Med., iii, 1956). A later edition, in which the Jew is shown in a much less favourable light, under the title Dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum de fide catholica (P.L. 163), is wrongly ascribed to Willem of Champeaux (cf. above p. 151).
- The Gloss, Biblia sacra cum glossa ordinaria et Postilla Nicolai Lyrani (Lyons, 1589), 6 vols. Used were vol. i for Exodus, vol. iv for Isaiah.
- Haimo of Auxerre, Commentariorum in Isaiam (P.L. 116).
- Hugo of St. Victor, Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon (P.L. 175).
- " Didascalion de studio legendi, ed. C. H. Buttner (The Catholic University of America, Studies in medieval and renaissance Latin, x, 1939). The Bible in the early Middle Ages (Woodstock Papers, 1951).
- " De Scripturis et scriptoribus sacris praenotiuunculae (P.L. 175).
- Ildefons of Toledo, De virginitate beatae Mariae, ed. V. Blanco (Textos Latinos de las edad media española, seccion 3a, 1937).
- Isidore, Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford (1911), 2 vols. 3-38.
- Jerome, Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum (C.C.S.L., 72).
- " Hebraicae quaestiones in Libro Geneseos (C.C.S.L. 72).
- " Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XVIII (C.C.S.L. 73 and 73A).
- Pseudo-Jerome, Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libros Regum et Paralipomenon (P.L. 23).

- Josephus, Antiquitates. Edited by F. Blatt, The Latin Josephus, i: Introduction and text Antiquities I-V (Copenhagen, 1958). For the remaining books the edition of the Loeb Classical Library was used.
- Justin, Dialogue with Trypho. Cf. Justin Martyr, The Dialogue with Trypho, transl. etc. A.L. Williams (Translations of Christian Literature, Ser. I, Greek Texts, 1930).
- Peter Comestor, Historia Scholastica, Liber Exodi (P.L.198).
- Priscian, Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri XVIII, ed. M. Hertzius (Leipzig, 1855-58) 2 vols.
- Raban Maurus, Commentaria in Exodum (P.L.108).
- Raymundus Martini, Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos, ed. J. de Voisin (Paris, 1651)
- Richard of St. Victor, De Emmauele (P.L.196).
- Rupert of Deutz, In Exodum commentariorum (P.L.167).
- " In Esaiam Prophetam (P.L.167).
- Vulgate, Biblia sacra vulgatae editionis cura monachorum Abbatiae pontificiae sancti Hieronymi in urbe Ordinis sancti Benedicti ([Rome], 1959).
- III - Non-Jewish Sources.
- A) Primary Sources.
- The Bible, Old Testament: the 'Authorized Version'; New Testament: the New English Bible.
- Chenu, M.-D., 'Les deux âges de l'allégorisme scripturaire au moyen âge', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xviii (1951), 19-28.
- " La Théologie au douzième siècle (Paris, 1957).
- Iubac, H. de, Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'écriture (Paris, 1959-64), 4 vols.
- McNally, R.E., The Bible in the early Middle Ages (Woodstock Papers, iv, 1959). In the back the author lists early medieval biblical commentaries with their editions, pp. 89-117.
- Pollit, H.J., 'Some considerations on the structure and sources of Hugh of St. Victor's Notes on the Octateuch', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxiii (1966), 5-38.
- Smalley, B., 'Andrew of St. Victor, Abbot of Wigmore: a twelfth century Hebraist', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., x (1938), 358-73.
- " 'The school of Andrew of St. Victor', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xi (1939), 145-67.

Smalley, B., The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (2nd edn., Oxford, 1952).

" 'A commentary on the "Hebraica" by Herbert of Bosham', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xviii (1951), 29-65. See also under Loewe (IVA).

Spicq, C., 'Pourquoi le moyen âge n'a-t-il pas davantage pratiqué l'exégèse littérale?', Rev. Sc. Phil. Théol., xxx (1941-42), 169-79.

Wasselynck, R., 'L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxii (1965), 157-204.

" 'La présence des *Moralia* de S. Grégoire le Grand dans les ouvrages de morale du XII^e siècle'. Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxv (1968), 197-240.

B) Secondary sources.

Bible, The Cambridge History of the Bible, ii: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation, ed. G.W.H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969).

Calandra, F., See under Andrew of St. Victor.

Cavallera, F., Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre (*Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, études et documents*, i and ii, 1922). Only vol. i was used.

Du Cange, C.D., Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis, ed. L. Favre (Niort, 1883-87), 10 vols.

Codefroy, F., Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du ix^e au xv^e siècle (Paris, 1881-1902), 10 vols.

Kittel, G., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart, 1933-....), i-.... Only vol. v was used.

Landgraf, A., 'Zur Methode der biblischen Textkritik im 12. Jahrhundert', Biblica x (1929), 445-74.

Penna, A., See under Andrew of St. Victor.

Smalley, B., 'Gilbertus Universalis, bishop of London (1128-34) and the problem of the "Glossa Ordinaria"', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., vii (1935), 235-62. Continued in Rech. Théol. anc. méd., viii (1936), 24-60 and

under the title 'La Glossa Ordinaria, Quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laon', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., ix (1937), 365-400.

" 'Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romaine: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées', Cah. Civ. Méd., iv (1961), 15-22.

" 'Ralph of Flaix on Leviticus', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxv (1968), 35-82.

" 'An early twelfth-century commentator on the literal sense of Leviticus', Rech. Théol. anc. méd., xxxvi (1969), 78-99.

" 'L'exégèse biblique du 12^e siècle' in Entretiens sur la renaissance du 12^e siècle, ed. M. de Gandillac and E. Jeauneau (Paris, 1969).

- Southern, 'St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster', Med. and Renais. Stud., iii (1954), 78-115.
- Spicq, C., Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge (Paris, 1944).
- Stegmüller, F., Repertorium biblicum medii aevi (Madrid, 1940-41), 7 vols.
- Walther, H., Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters (Munich, 1963-69), 6 vols.

IV - Jewish Sources

Also works of Christian authors which deal either or not exclusively with the history, literature or religion of the Jews are included in this section if they were used for information on these aspects of their contents.

A) Primary Sources.¹

- Altaner, B., 'Zur Kenntnis des Hebraischen im Mittelalter', Biblische Zeitschrift, xxi (1933), 288-308.*
- Bekor Shor, G. Walter, Joseph Bekhor Schor, der letzte nordfranzösische Bibelexeget (Breslau, 1890).*
- " Sepher Rabbenu Yoseph Bekhor Shor: perush 'al ha-Torah, ed. J.I. God (Jerusalem, 1956-60), 3 vols. Used indirectly.
- Berger, S. Quam notitiam linguae Hebraicae habuerunt Christiani mediae aevi temporibus in Gallia (Nancy-Paris, 1893).*
- Blumenkranz, B., 'Die jüdischen Beweisgründe im Religionsgespräch mit den Christen in den christlich-lateinischen Sonderschriften des 5. bis 11. Jahrhunderts', Theol. Zeitschr., iv (1948), 119-47.
- " Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidental (Etudes Juives, iii, 1960).
- " Les auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme (Etudes Juives, iv, 1963).
- " For the edition of Gilbert Crispin's disputation with a Jew, see Lévy under Gilbert Crispin (section II).
- Cowley, A.E., A concise catalogue of the Hebrew printed books in the Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1929). Editions of most of the Hebrew works referred to in this thesis can be found here. Trans. Jew. Hist.
- Eliezer of Beaugency, Commentaries on the later prophets by R. Eleazar of Beaugenci, i: Isaiah, ed. J.W. Nutt (London, 1879). Engl. introduction with Hebrew text.

1. Sources marked *, although not always of primary importance and outdated at times, are mentioned here, as they may serve as a first introduction to Jewish medieval biblical exegesis and Hebrew knowledge among Christian commentators.

- Friedländer, M., See under Ibn Ezra.
- Geiger, A., Die nordfranzösische Exegetenschule (Leipzig, 1855).*
- Ginzberg, L., The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia, vol. i-v: 1909-25; vol. vi: 4th edn., 1959; vol. vii (index): 1946).
- " 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern, ii: Exodus' in Livre d'hommage à la mémoire du Dr. S. Poznanski (Warsaw, 1927), pp. 199-216.
- " 'Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern, vi: Der Kommentar des Hieronymus zu Jesaja' in Jewish studies in memory of G.A. Kohut (New York, 1935), pp. 279-314.
- Hirsch, S.A., 'Early English Hebraists: Roger Bacon and his predecessors' in A Book of Essays (London, 1905), pp. 1-72.*
- Ibn Ezra, The commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah edited and translated by M. Friedländer (Ibn Ezra Lit., i: Engl. transl, 1873; iii: Hebrew text, 1877).
- " Ibid. Essays on the writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra (Ibn Ezra Lit., iv, 1877).
- Jacob ben Reuben the Rabbanite, J.M. Rosenthal, 'Prolegomena to a critical edition of Milhamot Adonai of Jacob ben Reuben', Am.Ac.Jew.Res., xxvi (1957), 127-37.
- " Jacob b. Reuben the Rabbanite, Milhamoth ha-Shem, ed. J. Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1963). Used indirectly.
- Kara, Joseph, M. Littmann, Joseph Kara als Schriffterklärer (Breslau, 1887).*
- Kimchi, David, The commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah, i: chapters i-xxxix, ed. L.Finkelstein (Columbia Oriental Studies, xix, 1926). Engl. introduction with Hebrew text. Used was for Is.liii the Latin edition of C.Malanimeus, Rab. Davidis Kimchii commentarii in Jesaiam prophetam (Florence, 1774).
- Kimchi, Joseph, L.I.Newman 'Joseph ben Isaac Kimchi as a religious controversialist' in Jewish studies in memory of I.Abrahams (New York, 1927), pp.365-72.
- Lévy, A., Die Exegese bei den französischen Israeliten vom 10ten bis zum 14ten Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1873).*
- Littmann, M., See under Kara.
- Loewe, R. 'The mediaeval Christian Hebraists of England', Trans.Jew.Hist. Soc.Eng., xvii (1953), 225-49.
- " 'Herbert of Bosham's Commentary on Jerome's Hebrew Psalter', Biblica, xxxiv (1953), 44-77, 159-92, 275-98. See also under Smalley (IIIA).
- Walter, G., Les Juifs d'Angleterre, ed. I. Epstein (London, 1935-48), 34 vols.
- Moore, G. F., Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era, the age of the Talmud (Cambridge, Mass., 1900-44), 3 vols.

- Loewe, R., 'The Jewish midrashim and patristic and scholastic exegesis of the Bible', Studia Patristica, i, part i (1957), 492-514.
- " 'The "plain" meaning of Scripture in early Jewish exegesis', Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies, i (1964), 140-85.
- Mekilta, Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, ed. and transl. J.Z. Lauterbach, (Philadelphia, 1933-35), 3 vols. /Moore
- Neubauer, A., The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish interpreters, i: Texts by A. Neubauer; ii: Transl. by S.R. Driver and A. Neubauer (Oxford, 1876-77). Reprint: Ktav, New York, 1969
- Newman, L.I., See under Kimchi, Joseph.
- Rahmer, M., Die Hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus (Breslau, 1861).*
- Rashbam, D. Rosin, R. Samuel b. Meir als Schriffterklärer (Breslau, 1880).*
- " Commentarium...in Pentateuchum..., ed. D. Rosin (Breslau, 1881). Hebrew text; used indirectly.
- Rashi, Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos...and Rashi's Commentary, transl. into Engl. and annotated by M. Rosenbaum and A.M. Silbermann (London, 1946), 2 vols.
- " Commentary on Isaiah. Used was the Latin edition of J.F. Breithaupt, R. Salomonis Jarchi, Commentarius Hebraicus in Prophetas Maiores et Minores, i (Göttingen, 1713). For a critical Hebrew edition cf. The commentary of Rashi on the Prophets and Hagiographs, ii: Isajah, ed. I. Maarsen (Jerusalem, 1933).
- " Rashi Anniversary Volume, ed. H.L. Ginsberg (Am. Ac. Jew. Res., Text and Studies, i, 1941).
- " H. Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian scholars (Pittsburgh, 1963) and its review by R. Loewe in R.E.J., Historica Judaica, 4th Ser., T.iii, cxxiii (1964), 537-40, which warns one to read this work with great circumspection.
- Rosenthal, E.I.J., 'The study of the Bible in medieval Judaism' in The Cambridge History of the Bible (Cambridge, 1969), ii.252-79.
- Rosenthal, J.M., See under Jacob b. Reuben.
- The Soncino Chumash, ed. A. Cohen (London, 1947).
- Steinschneider, M., 'Christliche Hebraisten, A: Mittelalter', Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie, i-ii (1896-97), 50-54.*
- Strack, H.L. and Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Munich, 1922-28), 4 vols.
- Talmud, The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein (London, 1935-48), 34 vols.
- Walter, G., See under Bekor Shor.
- /Moore, G. F., Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era, the age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, Mass., 1940-44), 3 vols.

B) Secondary Sources.

- Abrahams, I., Jewish life in the Middle Ages, ed. C. Roth (London, 1932).
- Bacher, W., 'Jewish Bible exegesis', J.E., iii.162-74.
- Baer, I., see under Rashi.
- Baron, S.W., A social and religious history of the Jews (2nd edn., New York, 1952-69), 14 vols. Only vols. iv and v were used.
- " 'The Jewish factor in medieval civilisation', Am.Ac.Jew.Res., xii (1942), 1-48.
- Blondheim, D.S., Les parlers Judeo-Romans et la Vetus Latina (Paris, 1925).
- Blumenkranz, B. 'Anti-Jewish polemics and legislation in the Middle Ages: Literary fiction or reality?', J.J.S., xv (1964), 125-40.
- Bousset, W., Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche (Göttingen, 1895).
- " 'Antichrist', Encl.Rel.Eth., i.578-81.
- Casper, B.M., An introduction to Jewish Bible Commentary (New York-London, 1960). A simple introduction.
- Charles, R.H., The apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, vol.i: 1913; vol. ii repr. 1969). Only vol ii was used.
- Dalman, G.H., Der leidende Messias nach der Lehre der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrtausend (Karlsruhe, 1887).
- " Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Sühnleiden des Heilsmittlers (Leipzig, 1890).
- Davies, W.D., Paul and rabbinic Judaism (repr. 2nd edn., London, 1962).
- Fischel, H.A., 'Die deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder in der jüdischen Auslegung', Hebr.Un.Coll.Ann., xviii (1934-44), 53-76.
- Friedländer, M., See Ibn Ezra.
- Golb. N., 'New light on the persecution of French Jews at the time of the first crusade', Am.Ac.Jew.Res., xxxiv (1966), 1-63. Id. 'Monieux' Proceedings of the American Philosophical Soc., 113, 1. Feb. 1969.
- Ibn Ezra, 'Ibn Ezra in England', Trans.Jew.Hist.Soc.Eng., ii (1894-95), 47-60 (Hebrew appendix 61-75).
- Jellinek, A., Bet ha-Midrash, Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der ältern jüdischen Literatur (vol.i-iv: Leipzig, 1853-57; vol.5-6: Vienna, 1873-77). Used indirectly.
- Jeremias, J., 'Zum Problem der Deutung von Jesaja 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum' in Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne, Mélanges offerts à M.Maurice Goguel Neuchâtel etc., 1950), pp.113-19.
- " 'παις θίου im Spätjudentum in der Zeit nach der Entstehung der LXX', Kittel, ThW, v. 676-713.
- Kasher, M.M. and Mandelbaum, J.B., Sare ha-elef: a millennium of Hebrew authors, 500-1500 C.E. (New York, 1959). Used indirectly.

- Katz, J., Exclusiveness and tolerance. Studies in Jewish-gentile relations in medieval and modern times (Scripta Judaica, iii, 1961).
- Kisch, G., The Jews in medieval Germany (Chicago, 1949).
- Koehler, L., Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. A dictionary of the Hebrew Old Testament in English and German, ed. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner (Leiden, 1958).
- Kohut, G.A., 'Royal Hebraists', in Jewish studies in memory of I. Abrahams (New York, 1927), pp. 221-43. This study is of relevant importance only.
- Krauss, S., 'Church Fathers', J.E., iv. 80-86.
- Kronberg, N., See under Rashi.
- x Liebeschütz, H., 'Relations between Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages', J.J.S., xvi (1965), 35-46.
- Mann, J., Texts and studies in Jewish history and literature (vol. i: Cincinnati, 1931); vol. ii: Philadelphia, 1935).
- Midrash Rabbah, transl. under editorship of H. Freedman and M. Simon (London, 1939), 9 vols.
- Moore, G.F., 'Christian writers on Judaism', Harvard Theol. Review, xiv, 3 (1921), 197-254.
- Newman, L.I., Jewish influence on Christian reform movements (New York, 1925); in particular pp. 55-59 and 315-59.
- Parkes, J. The Jew in the medieval community (London, 1938).
- Rabbinowitz, L., The social life of the Jews of Northern France in the xii-xiv Centuries as reflected in the rabbinical literature of the period (London, 1938).
- Rashi, I. Baer, 'Rashi and the historical reality of his time', Tarbiz xx (1949), 320-32. Used indirectly.
- " Berliner, A., 'Zur Charakteristik Rashi's' in Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann (Breslau, 1900), pp. 260-78.
- " N. Kronberg, Raschi als Exeget (Halle, 1882). A rather uncritical study of the commentator.
- Rosenthal, E.I.J., 'Anti-Christian polemic in medieval Bible commentaries', J.J.S., xi (1960), 115-35.
- Russell, D.S., The method and message of Jewish apocalyptic (London, 1964).
- Schoeps, H.J., Paulus, Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte (Tübingen, 1959).
- Sjöberg, E., Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien (Skrifter utgivna av kungl. humanistiska vetenskapsamfundet, I Lund, liii, 1955); in particular ch. ii, pp. 41-98 and Exkurs i and ii, pp. 247-73.
- x Levy, R., Trésor de la langue des juifs françaises au Moyen Âge (1964).

- Tanhuma, Midrasch Tanchuma, ed. S. Buber (Wilna, 1885). Used indirectly.
- Targum, The Targum of Isaiah, ed. and transl. J.F. Stenning (Oxford, 1949).
- Werblowsky, R.J.Z., 'Crispin's Disputation', J.J.S., xi (1960), 69-77.
- Williams, A.L., Adversus Judaeos. A bird's eye view of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance (Cambridge, 1935).
- Wolff, H.W., Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum (3rd edn., Berlin, 1952).
- Wünsche, A., Die Leiden des Messias (Leipzig, 1870). This work should be consulted with some circumspection.
- " Bibliotheca Rabbinica. eine Sammlung alter Midraschim...ins Deutsche übertragen... (Leipzig, 1880-85), 34 prts.
- Zimmerli, W., 'Παλις Δίον', die Übertragungen in LXX', Kittel, ThW, v. 672-76.