THE JOURNAL OF MEDIEVAL LATIN

EDITOR
Greti Dinkova-Bruun, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

REVIEW EDITOR
Cillian O’Hogan, University of Toronto

Founding Editor
Michael W. Herren, York University and University of Toronto

Associate Editors
Alexander André University of Toronto
Robert Getz University of Toronto
Andrew Hicks Cornell University
Bernice M. Kaczynski McMaster University
John Magee University of Toronto
Tristan Major Qatar University
Jean Meyers University of Montpellier
Stephen Pelle University of Toronto
David Townsend University of Toronto
Gernot Wieland University of British Columbia

Advisory Board
Walter Berschin University of Heidelberg
James P. Carley York University
Paolo Chiesa University of Milan
Michael Lapidge Clare College Cambridge
Andy Orchard Pembroke College Oxford
Danuta Shanzer University of Vienna
Brian Stock University of Toronto
Jan M. Ziolkowski Harvard University

Publications of The Journal of Medieval Latin
General Editors: Michael W. Herren, Robert Getz, Alexander Andrée

The Journal of Medieval Latin is published annually by Brepols. For editorial policies and submission instructions, see the last page of the volume.
THE JOURNAL OF MEDIEVAL LATIN

Volume 30
2020

BREPOLS
Contents

vii Greti Dinkova-Bruun: Thirty Years of The Journal of Medieval Latin
ix In memoriam Édouard Jeauneau (1924–2019)
xvii In memoriam Richard Sharpe (1954–2020)
xxiii In memoriam Peter Dronke (1934–2020)

ARTICLES

1 EVAN WILSON
Stephen of Ripon’s Vita S. Wilfridi: Genre, Political Theory and Historical Representation in the Early Middle Ages

41 BENJAMIN GARSTAD
Charlemagne’s Failure of Charity in Ps. Turpin’s Chronicle and Beyond

67 JASON O’RORKE
On the Date, Authorship, and Newly Discovered Old Irish Material in the Ars Ambrosiana

85 A.G. RIGG (†)
Clerical Concubines: Three Poems

147 DAVID A. TRAILL
Payen Bolotin’s Targeting of the Tironensians and Cistercians in his De Falsis Heremitis

183 ISABELA GRIGORAȘ
Breuiarium Artis grammaticae Alcuini: Edition and Study

227 ÅSLAUG OMMUNDESEN
A New Manuscript Source for the Legend of Saint Clement in Denmark

257 JONATHAN RUBIN
The Manuscript Tradition of Burchard of Mount Sion’s Descriptio Terre Sancte

287 ANDREW KRAEBEL
English Hebraism and Hermeneutic History: The Psalter Prologues and Epilogue of Henry Cossey, OFM

369 FRANCESCO STELLA
Latin Poetic Stories About Muhammad and Their Stylistic Network
REVIEW ESSAY

399 Tristan Major
Editions of Texts for Teaching Medieval Latin: Martha Bayless, Fifteen Medieval Latin Parodies, Donka D. Markus, Reading Medieval Latin with the Legend of Barlaam and Josaphat, and Andrew Rabin and Liam Felsen, The Disputatio puerorum: A Ninth-Century Monastic Instructional Text

REVIEWS

411 V. Alice Tyrrell. Merovingian Letters and Letter Writers. (Bronwen Neil and Catherine Rosbrook)

413 Joshua Byron Smith. Walter Map and the Matter of Britain. (Dylan Wilkerson)


419 Sarah B. Lynch. Elementary and Grammar Education in Late Medieval France. (Hedwig Gwosdek)

422 Paulina Taraskin. Reading Horace’s Lyric: A Late Tenth-Century Annotated Manuscript from Bavaria (British Library, Harley 2724). (Sinéad O’Sullivan)

424 Hugonis de Sancto Victore De Oratione Dominica; De Septem Donis Spiritus Sancti, ed. Francesco Siri, CCCM 276. (David Foley)

429 INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS, VOLUME 30

Cover Image: Toronto, Library of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, MS Bergendal 1 (a. 1329), fol. 1r. The codex contains the Speculum sanctorale, Cronica imperatorum, and Cathologus summarum pontificum of Bernard Gui, OP (1261/1262–1331). The historiated initial shows Bernard presenting the volume to Pope John XXII.

The editors wish to acknowledge the University of Toronto, the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, and the Centre for Medieval Studies for their continuing support of The Journal of Medieval Latin.
“Although this man was literate, and he probably knew Hebrew, he is nevertheless
unworthy of such authority and should not be believed. Instead, return to the Hebrew
about which he spoke, and if he spoke the truth, then it is the Hebrew that should be
believed, not him.”1 Though Roger Bacon, OFM (d. ca. 1292) is unusually disdainful of
those of his fellow scholastics who depend upon Latin intermediaries – in this case,
the twelfth-century canon Andrew of St. Victor – for their knowledge of Hebrew, his
belief that the interpretation of Scripture should be grounded in a familiarity with the
text’s original languages was much more widespread, reflected in the interpretive
priorities of exegetes active in the decades following his death. The most influential
proponent of such scholastic Hebraism was undoubtedly Nicholas of Lyre, OFM
(d. 1349), who makes his facility with the language evident throughout his literal pos-
tils on the Old Testament, offering corrections to the Vulgate and drawing on medi-
eval Jewish sources to establish the text’s sensus litteralis.2 The success of these postils
was rapid, and within a decade of his death Lyre had become a standard authority, a
“commentator of first resort, based in large part on his perceived mastery of the

1 Roger Bacon, Compendium Studii Philosophiae, VIII, in Fr. Rogeri Bacon opera quaedam hactenus
sciverit Hebraeum, tamen quia non est dignus auctoritate tanta, non est ei credendum, sed
recurrendum est ad Hebraeum de quo loquitur, et si verum dicat, credendum est Hebraeo, sed non
ipsi.”

2 On Lyre, see Deana Copeland Klepper, The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian
Reading of Jewish Texts in the Later Middle Ages (Philadelphia, 2007), as well as the essays collected in
Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture, ed. Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith (Leiden, 2000); and
overview of recent work on scholastic literalism, see Alastair Minnis, “Figuring the Letter: Making
Sense of Sensus Litteralis in Late-Medieval Christian Exegesis,” in Interpreting Scriptures in Judaism,
Christianity and Islam: Overlapping Inquiries, ed. Mordechai Z. Cohen and Adele Berlin (Cambridge,
2016), pp. 159–82. On the topic of medieval Christian Hebraism more generally, the recent study by
C. Philipp E. Nothaft, Medieval Latin Christian Texts on the Jewish Calendar: A Study with Five Editions
and Translations (Leiden, 2014), is exceptionally useful; see especially chapters 3 and 4 on English
material.
Hebrew Bible.” Even as Lyre’s unrivaled influence ensured that later commentators would value readings based on the Hebrew text, however, his authority seems to have discouraged other exegetes from learning the language for themselves. In a way that Bacon would surely have condemned, Lyre’s “perceived mastery” of Hebrew led his postils to be used as a convenient intermediary. Likewise, and just as problematically, the dominance of his postils quickly overshadowed similar efforts to bring knowledge of Hebrew to bear on the interpretation of the Old Testament, evident in a host of commentaries that now survive in very few manuscripts and have received little if any scholarly attention. More than simply attesting to the wide influence of Bacon’s interpretive ideals, these works illustrate the variety of ways in which those ideals could be realized, and at least some of their authors were openly critical of Lyre’s approach.

English writers figure prominently among the neglected scholastic Hebraists contemporary to Lyre, and arguably none engaged more fully with recent trends in biblical interpretation than Henry Cossey (or “de Costesey”), OFM, regent master at Cambridge, ca. 1325–1326. Little is now known of Cossey’s life. His surname suggests his origin in the town of Costessey, outside of Norwich, and in all likelihood he made his profession in that city and was educated at its Franciscan studium, then going up to Cambridge to continue his theological training. His presence in Cambridge after his regency is indicated by his inclusion among a group of Franciscans who, in 1329 and 1330, were accused of heresy and ordered to be “kept in close custody” at the university, “in the charge of the vice-guardian and of Friar Thomas Canynge, then master of the school, till they could be sent to the papal court at Avignon for further examination.” Whether Cossey and his fellow Franciscans ever made

---

3 Klepper, *Insight of Unbelievers*, p. 5.
4 Klepper, “Nicholas of Lyra and Franciscan Interest in Hebrew Scholarship,” in *Senses of Scripture*, ed. Krey and Smith, pp. 289–311, usefully presents Lyre as reflecting an established interest, especially among Franciscans, in the study of Hebrew, but she does not fully account for comparable contemporary efforts, including the texts discussed here.
5 The dating is based on his position in the list of Franciscan masters at Cambridge in London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero A.ix., fol. 78r, on which see Andrew G. Little, *Franciscan Papers, Lists, and Documents* (Manchester, 1943), pp. 132–34.
7 The shift in practice, from sending English Franciscans to Paris for their theological training, to sending them to either Oxford or Cambridge, seems to have taken place in Cossey’s lifetime; see William J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1987), p. 68.
the trip to the curia is unknown. Bale reports that he died at Babwell Friary (Suffolk) in 1336 and, without giving any indication of his source, claims that he studied at Oxford – a suggestion that becomes all the more intriguing in light of the material discussed below. 9 Though certainly not as prolific as Lyre, Cossey was nevertheless an accomplished exegete, writing commentaries on Luke and Wisdom which no longer survive, as well a commentary on the Apocalypse, drawing on Joachimite sources and enjoying fairly wide circulation among English Franciscans. 10 His most ambitious and innovative work, however, was almost certainly his commentary on the Psalms, now preserved uniquely in Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11 [= Ch]. 11 The prologues suggests that Cossey was “arrest[ed] for revelatory authorship,” apparently referring to the Joachimite content of his Apocalypse commentary. Later in the same study, however, Kerby-Fulton endorses Little’s conclusion (Books Under Suspicion, p. 82).


10 See Richard Sharpe, A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540 (Turnhout, 2001), pp. 165–66. Sharpe includes Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawl. C. 16 among the manuscripts of Cossey on the Apocalypse, though, as Little, Franciscan Papers, pp. 140–41, demonstrates, the commentary in this manuscript is distinct from the text preserved in the other witnesses, and the attribution in Rawl. C. 16 therefore appears to be mistaken. Confusingly, without offering any evidence, Kerby-Fulton, Books Under Suspicion, p. 83, claims that the work in Rawl. C. 16 is actually Cossey’s second commentary on the same biblical book, with its more conservative contents reflecting his timidity after the arrest of 1329–1330. For discussion of the authentic commentary’s Joachimite contents, see David Burr, Olivi’s Peaceable Kingdom: A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary (Philadelphia, 1993), pp. 255–63.

11 For a description of this manuscript, see M.R. James, Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of Christ’s College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 28–36, supplemented below. It is attributed to Cossey in its opening (fol. 1r, reproduced below in Fig. 2): “Opus fratri Henrici Costeseye magistri de Ordine Fratrum Minorum.” Based on its provenance and dating, discussed below, there is no reason to doubt this attribution. Two potential further copies are attested but do not survive, one in the library of the Friars Minor in London (seen by Leland, a partial copy, ending after Psalm 61, and lacking any note of its incipit) and another in Norwich (seen by Bale, though the incipit recorded does not match the surviving text); see The Friar’s Libraries, ed. Kenneth Wood Humphreys, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 1 (London, 1990), p. 219; and Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale’s Index of British and Other Writers, ed. Reginald Poole with Mary Bateson (Oxford, 1902), p. 160. Cossey’s Psalter commentary is quoted to begin a sermon in Oxford, Bodleian
and epilogue to this commentary are edited and translated here for the first time. These texts show Cossey to have been among the earliest and most attentive readers of Lyre’s literal postils on the Psalter, as well as the recent commentary on Jerome’s Hebraicurn translation by Nicholas Trevet, OP (d. ca. 1334), and Cossey uses his knowledge of Hebrew, in addition to his scouring of patristic writings and several more obscure sources, to offer a thorough critique of his contemporaries’ interpretive efforts.

After identifying the commentary’s major sources and assessing the evidence for its composition in distinct stages, indicative of its author’s prolonged care and attention, this study focuses on Cossey’s hermeneutic commitments, the ideas of proper interpretation which were supported by his work with the Hebrew text, and which informed his criticisms of Trevet and Lyre. Though Cossey was devoted to the general notion of scholastic literalism, his prologues reveal an understanding of the Psalter’s literal sense that is more capacious and flexible than these other exegetes allowed, and he is therefore willing to interpret portions of the text as prophetic and Christological, offering the kind of readings that his contemporaries had consigned to the Psalter’s spiritual or mystical senses. At the same time, Cossey is especially vigorous in his attempts to “demystify” the biblical text and to see the Psalter as a collection of songs composed by a range of different authors, and he therefore maintains that the Psalter is, in many respects, comparable to the Church’s hymnary. These seemingly contradictory moves, arguing for a text that is at once more rarefied and more mundane, derive from Cossey’s rigorous commitment to his authoritative sources: the Hebrew text of the Psalms, other biblical and para-biblical writings, and the works of the Fathers. In his overriding adherence to these sources, and his excoriation of scholastics who would go beyond them and present their conjectures as though they were fact, Cossey’s work is arguably the fullest realization of Bacon’s ideals for biblical commentary, at the same time as it captures some of his Franciscan predecessor’s prickly, even rebarbative attitudes. 12

Sources and Setting

As the notes to the edition indicate, Cossey’s careful citations make it relatively easy to identify almost all of the major and minor sources of his commentary, and many of the patristic works to which he refers – the letters of Jerome, for example, and Augustine’s De ciuitate Dei and De doctrina christiana – are so commonly attested as to make Library, MS Laud. misc. 213, fol. 192r; see Henry O. Coxe, Quarto Catalogues, II: Laudian Manuscripts, rev. by Richard W. Hunt (Oxford, 1973), col. 185.

12 Immediately before the passage quoted above, Bacon expresses his belief that “post Bedam non fuit aliquis cui ecclesia dederit auctoritatem in expositione Scripturae” – “after Bede there has not been anyone to whom the Church has given authority in the exposition of Scripture” (ed. Brewer, p. 482).
his use of them unremarkable. Likewise, his recourse to twelfth-century works, including Peter Comestor’s *Historia scholastica* and Peter Lombard’s *Magna glosatura in Psalmos*, is standard among scholastic exegetes. At least some of Cossey’s sources, however, are more noteworthy, including the text of the Psalter on which his work was based, and his use of this material can allow the composition of his commentary to be dated and localized with perhaps surprising precision.

Throughout his text, as noted above, Cossey responds to the Psalter commentaries of two contemporary Christian Hebraists, Nicholas of Lyre and Nicholas Trevet, both of whom are named, and their writings quoted and paraphrased, in his prologues. Though Cossey seems to be familiar with Lyre only through his writings, his references to Trevet are suggestive of a more personal acquaintance, seen in the prologues when he describes the Oxford-trained Dominican as “hic senex” – “this old man.” Trevet’s work can be dated ca. 1317–1320, at which point he would have been in his early sixties, while a note commonly found in manuscripts of Lyre’s literal postil on the Psalter dates that portion of his larger project to 1326. Cossey therefore must have prepared his commentary after his Cambridge regency, in 1326 or 1327 at the earliest, supporting William J. Courtenay’s suggestion that such commentaries, especially by mendicants, “were not the result of magisterial lectures, as has often been assumed, but the fruit of several years of study, reflection, and writing,” benefitting

---

13 See for example, Prol. 1.21, 73; and Prol. 3.11, 34, 37, 46–53, 66–75, etc. (Throughout the following, my edition of Cossey’s text will be cited by prologue and line number.) For the wide attestation of the *De ciuitate* and the *De doctrina*, as well as Jerome’s letters, in English libraries, see, e.g., *Registrum Anglie de Libris doctorum et auctorum ueterum*, ed. Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, with Roger A.B. Mynors, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 2 (London, 1991), pp. 13, 19, and 90; Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis*, ed. Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 11 (London, 2004), pp. 27, 34, and 284–300.


15 For Lyre, see Prol. 3.77, 115, 195, 207, 234. For Trevet, see Prol. 3.11, 66, 77, 121, 425.

16 Prol. 3.16.

17 For the note dating Lyre’s work, see Charles-Victor Langlois, “Nicolas de Lyre, Frère Mineur,” in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 46 vols. as of 2018 (Paris, 1733–), 36:373. Trevet’s commentary was apparently written at the request of John of Bristol, then Prior Provincial of the English Dominicans (cf. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 1ra), whose tenure began in 1317 and extended to 1327. Trevet’s retirement from Oxford to London ca. 1320, however, provides a more likely *terminus ante quem* for the commentary’s composition. See Emden, *Biographical Register of Oxford*, 3:1902, as well as James Clark’s more recent *ODNB* entry.
from “the freedom from lecturing and administrative duties that the end of the re-
gency entailed.”

Following his regency, then, Cossey appears to have returned to his studies, learn-
ing enough Hebrew to parse the text of the Psalms and assess the merit of its different Latin translations and glosses. Indeed, though he begins his third prologue by announcing that he will follow the “common” translation – i.e., the widely used Galli-
can version, Jerome’s second attempt to revise a preexisting Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint, as opposed to his final rendering, based on the Hebrew text and therefore called the Hebraicum – in practice this version serves as a simple starting-
point for his glosses, and he constantly compares it to other Latin renderings, as well as to his own transliteration of the Hebrew. This continuously comparative method appears to reflect the material copy of the Psalms on which Cossey based his work, a volume he associates with Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), bishop of Lincoln and for-
merly lecturer to the Oxford Franciscans. (The precise nature of this attribution will be discussed below.) Cossey describes this book as “psalterium domini Lincolniensis, ubi tria uel quattuor simul coniunctim psalteria continentur” – “the lord of Lincoln’s psalter, containing three or four psalters together,” and he further indicates that one of these “three or four” texts is in Hebrew, while another is a Latin translation interlin-
eated in the Hebrew. As Beryl Smalley observed, this account of Grosseteste’s psal-
ter precisely matches the presentation of texts in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10 and Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.8.6, where Jerome’s Gallican and Hebra-
icum versions are presented in parallel columns, with a third column taken up by the Hebrew text with interlinear Latin (see Fig. 1). Elsewhere in his commentary,


19 Prol. 3.1–5, 87–102. For examples of this comparative approach, see below.

20 For the quotation, see Ch, fol. 14r, lower margin. In addition to the next passage on the interlinear rendering, see the examples from Psalms 105, 118, and 126 quoted by James, Descriptive Catalogue, pp. 33–34.

Fig. 1. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10, fol. 2r: Quadruple Hebrew-Latin psalter. Reproduced by permission of the President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
Cossey notes the uncertain status of the interlinear rendering, writing that “Ecclesia uero non adhuc autentizauerit superscriptionem quam superscribi dominus Lincolniensis in psalterio suo Hebraico de uero ad uerbum sicut in Hebreo” – “the Church has not yet authorized the superscription which the lord of Lincoln made to be interlineated in his Hebrew psalter, following the Hebrew word for word.”\(^{22}\) Still, he finds it convenient to quote this version throughout his commentary, referring to it as the “superscriptio Lincolniensis,” and, on the basis of these quotations, Smalley was able to establish that he did indeed consult a manuscript closely related to Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10, one that likely shared an exemplar with that copy or was itself Corpus’s exemplar.\(^ {23}\)

The high regard in which Cossey appears to have held Grosseteste’s quadruple psalter helps to account for several details in his prologues. It is in this volume, for example, that Cossey almost certainly found the anonymous preface (“in quadam prefacione, ... nescio cuius sit”) which he discusses and quotes in full as part of his larger consideration of the Psalter’s authorship.\(^{24}\) This early medieval text is rarely attested in English manuscripts, but it does appear in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10, fol. 1r, and its presence in Grosseteste’s psalter could therefore explain why, though he disagrees with many of its claims, Cossey devotes so much space to it in his own prologue.\(^ {25}\) Even more substantially, his work with Grosseteste’s psalter can account for one of the most significant mistakes in Cossey’s prologues, one with repercussions for his commentary as a whole. As part of his detailed account of the Psalter’s translation history, Cossey attempts to identify the versions of the Latin Psalter currently in use in Rome, on the one hand, and in the wider Church, on the other, with two of the three texts prepared by Jerome. Throughout this discussion, Cossey appears to be working with the Latin texts of the Psalms copied in the first two columns of Grosseteste’s psalter, and, since he recognizes one of them as the version in common use, he mistakenly assumes that the other must reflect the use of Rome. (He apparently does not know that these are the Gallican and Hebraicum versions, respectively.) Likely reflecting the distinction between common and Roman use presented in the Franciscan rule and repeated at the start of his third prologue, this assumption leads Cossey to conclude, incorrectly, that the text in common use (the Gallican) was Jerome’s first version, since it matches the translation of the Greek Septuagint of Psalm 89 provided in Jerome’s letter to Cyprian, while the text he takes to represent

\(^{22}\) Ch, fol. 18v. This uncertainty may account for his hedging, “three or four,” in the earlier quotation.


\(^{24}\) Prol. 3.130–172.

\(^{25}\) For early examples, see St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS Sang. 22, pp. 4–7 (saec. IX, last quarter); London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian A.i, fols. 4v–5r (part of a ninth-century addition to the eighth-century psalter). For the text, see Donatien De Bruyne, *Préfaces de la bible latine* (Namur, 1920), pp. 43–44.
Psalter Prologues and Epilogue of Henry Cossey

Roman use (the Hebraicum) is either Jerome’s second version, emending the earlier rendering in light of the Greek and Hebrew of Origen’s Hexapla, or his third version, prepared directly from the Hebrew, since it comes close to the Hebrew original translated in the same letter. Throughout his commentary, then, Cossey believes that by grounding his readings in the common (Gallican) text, he is glossing a straightforward translation of the Septuagint, and, when he compares it to other versions, he refers to the Hebraicum translation as being found “in psalterio Romano” or simply as “Ieronimus,” reflecting his belief that, in contrast to his earlier revisions, this is the only version that can properly be called Jerome’s translation. Though unfortunate, this mistake reflects Cossey’s effort to scrutinize the underpinnings of an exegetical commonplace, his insistence on working from the evidence of his patristic sources, and, again, his valuing of a volume he associated with the bishop of Lincoln.

This psalter was not Cossey’s only source for the Hebrew text of the Psalms. Throughout his commentary, though with less frequency than his references to Grosseteste’s book and its superscriptio, he also cites a volume variously described as “psalterium I. dudum conuersi, “psalterium Hebraicum illius iam conuersi magistri,” and “psalterium Hebraicum magistri Iohannis.” Cossey turns to this volume to compare its readings of specific Hebrew words to what he found in his other psalter, and to challenge some of Trevet’s claims about the Hebrew text, especially its presentation in contemporary manuscripts. Though it is possible that Cossey simply acquired this

---

26 Regula Bullata, III, in Opuscula Sancti Patris Francisci Assisiensis, ed. Kajetan Esser (Grottaferrata, 1978), p. 229: “Clerici faciant divinum officium secundum ordinem sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae excepto psalterio, ex quo habere poterunt breviaria” – “Clerics should perform the Divine Office according to the order of the Roman Church, with the exception of the psalter, for which they may have their breviaries,” cf. Prol. 3.1–2 (and note) and 53–55. For the comparisons with the translations in Jerome’s letter, see Prol. 3.85–114. Here, and throughout the following, references to the Psalter follow the Septuagint numbering unless otherwise indicated.

27 See the examples of Psalm 5.10, discussed below. On the status of Jerome’s earlier versions as revisions rather than translations, see Prol. 3.56–77. James, Descriptive Catalogue, p. 35, is therefore misleading in his account of the different Latin versions of the Psalms used by Cossey, believing him to have access to all three of Jerome’s renderings.

28 Ch, fols. 168r, 14r, and 155r, respectively.

29 For comparison of Hebrew texts, see the example from Psalm 82 quoted by James, Descriptive Catalogue, p. 33. For criticism of Trevet, see the discussion of Psalm 2, quoted by James, Descriptive Catalogue, p. 35: though without naming him, Cossey is here quoting and rebutting Trevet’s claims (cf. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 6rb). He likewise draws on both Grosseteste’s and master John’s psalters to dismiss what Trevet says about the title of Psalm 76: “Et dicit Triuet quod istud, Asaph Psalmus, in ueris exemplaribus non habetur: sed istud est mirabile, cum in utroque psalterio, quorum unum erat diligentius scriptum et quo correctum, planissime scribatur” – “And Trevet says that this, A Psalm of Asaph, is not to be found in true exemplars: but this is strange, since it is written very clearly in both psalters, one of which was very diligently written and therefore correct” (Ch, fols. 122v–123r).
book from John, perhaps even at second-hand, his description of its owner as a “master” holds out the possibility that this John could have been responsible for teaching Cossey how to read Hebrew, and, indeed, Cossey’s ongoing engagement with someone familiar with Jewish interpretive traditions is suggested elsewhere in his text. Commenting on the title (titulus) or superscription to Psalm 5, for example, he reports, “Dicunt Hebrei quod Ieronimus fuit deceptus” – “The Hebrews say that Jerome was mistaken” with regard to the meaning of נחלות, which the saint had rendered hereditatem (Gallican) or hereditatibus (Hebraicum), but which his source (or sources) claims to be “nomen cuiusdam instrumenti uel cantilene in templo que cantabatur ad instrumentum” – “the name of a certain instrument or of a song which is sung with an instrument in the temple.”

This opinion can be found in Rashi’s exposition of the Psalms, but, though Cossey cites Rashi elsewhere in his commentary, these references are consistently borrowed from Lyre, and it therefore seems likely that such vaguer accounts of what “the Hebrews say” derive instead from his conversations with a Jewish convert. The most likely candidate is surely the “master John” whose psalter he consulted.

Taken together with his use of Grosseteste’s psalter, these references to a Jewish convert and teacher named John suggest that, though he is otherwise associated with Cambridge, Cossey studied Hebrew and composed his commentary on the Psalms at Oxford. In response to the decree from the Council of Vienne (1312) that major universities should make provision for the teaching of Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Greek, in 1320 the Archbishop of Canterbury, Walter Reynolds (d. 1327), worked to secure the funding needed for Hebrew instruction at Oxford, and for much of the following decade, perhaps through 1327, that post appears to have been filled by a Jewish convert named John of Bristol. Since the council’s decree did not include

30 Ch, fol. 20r.
31 See Mayer I. Gruber, Rashi’s Commentary on Psalms (Leiden, 2004), p. 188. The single citation of Rashi in Cossey’s prologues is, as noted below, borrowed from Lyre; see Prol. 1.140–41. Later in his discussion of the title of Psalm 5, Cossey cites Rashi on the performance of this psalm in the temple: “Et hic dicit Rabi Salomon quod iste psalmus factus est a Dauid ad hoc quod sacerdotes et Leuite decantarent ipsum ad impetrandum diuinum auxilium contra hostes irruentes in terram Israel, que erat hereditas Domini diuisa per duodecim tribus” – “Rashi says that this psalm was made by David for priests and Levites to sing to obtain divine aid against enemies invading the land of Israel, which was the inheritance of the Lord divided among the twelve tribes” (Ch, fol. 20v). This claim, considerably expanded from Rashi’s original (cf. Gruber, Commentary, p. 188), is borrowed verbatim from Lyre’s postil, for which see Biblia sacra cum Glossa ordinaria nouisque additionibus, ed. François Feruardent (Venice, 1603), III, sig. p7v, with Cossey simply adding a final dependent clause to gloss the passage. The notion that Cossey’s “Hebrei” represent conversations with a contemporary interlocutor is supported by other references to this source, cited as “moderni Hebrei” at the start of his gloss, for example, of Psalm 47 (Ch, fol. 84v).
32 This John of Bristol should not be confused with the Dominican prior provincial of the same name, mentioned above. On the decree and its implementation in England, see Robert Weiss, “England and
Cambridge, it is plausible that Cossey would have traveled to Oxford to study with this John, to confer with him about Jewish interpretations of the Psalms, and to consult his Hebrew psalter.\(^\text{33}\) Further, working in the library of the Oxford Greyfriars, Cossey would have had access to Grosseteste’s manuscripts, donated to the convent library after the bishop’s death.\(^\text{34}\) Evidence from Thomas Gascoigne’s later use of the collection, between 1434/5 and 1456, indicates that at least some of these books were then identified with the bishop by their classmark, including what Gascoigne calls “psalterium suum quod non scribitur manu propria domini Lincolniensis registratur ibidem Episcopus Lincoln. F” — “his psalter, which is not copied in the hand of the lord of Lincoln, registered as Bishop of Lincoln F.”\(^\text{35}\) If this was indeed the quadruple psalter consulted by Cossey, its classmark alone could account for his association of it with Grosseteste. His use of the Greyfriars library would also help to account for one of the more obscure sources appearing in Cossey’s prologues, namely, the *Institutes* of Junillus (or Junilius) Africanus (fl. 541–549).\(^\text{36}\) This Antiochene text was rare in later medieval England, but it is also quoted by William Woodford, OFM in his *Quattuor Determinationes*, prepared at Oxford in 1389–1390, thus placing a copy of it, at least


\(^{33}\) Other English mendicants moved between universities, including Robert Holcot, OP (d. 1349), who may have taught at Cambridge after his Oxford regency; John Bacontorpe, OCArm (d. 1345/1352), who studied at Oxford and had his regency at Paris before teaching at Cambridge; and Richard Conington, OFM (d. 1330), who was regent master in theology in Oxford and then in Cambridge. See Beryl Smalley, “Robert Holcot, OP,” *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 26 (1956), 5–97, at p. 9; Beryl Smalley, “John Bacontorpe’s Postill on St Matthew,” *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 4 (1958), 91–145, at p. 93; and Victorin Doucet, “L’œuvre scolastique de Richard de Conington, OFM,” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 29 (1936), 396–442, at pp. 396–97.


\(^{35}\) Oxford, Lincoln College, MS Lat. 118, p. 306. Robert M. Ball, “Robert Grosseteste on the Psalms,” in *Grosseteste*, ed. Cunningham, pp. 79–108, at 81, suggests that Gascoigne is attempting to describe a second copy of Grosseteste’s commentary on Psalms 1–100, though it seems significant that, in describing the autograph copy of the commentary, he specifies that this is a “psalterium expositum.” Cf. *The Friars’ Libraries*, ed. Humphreys, p. 228: “There seems to be no evidence that this contained a commentary.”

\(^{36}\) Prol. 1.46–47 and Prol. 3.175–177.
later in the century, in the Greyfriars library.\textsuperscript{37} Likewise, if less remarkably, all of the patristic sources referenced in Cossey’s prologue are almost certain to have been in Grosseteste’s collection.\textsuperscript{38} Finally, since his involvement in the arrests of 1329–1330 and his death in Babwell indicate that Cossey’s relocation to Oxford was only temporary, his decision to quote at length from various texts – including, for example, all of the anonymous preface found in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10, mentioned above, and the \textit{Testamenta duodecim patriarcharum}, discussed below – could be explained as an effort at preserving sources to which he knew he would only have temporary access.

And this brings us back to Smalley’s claims about the role of Grosseteste in the creation of the interlinear translation, the “\textit{superscriptio Lincolniensis},” preserved in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10 and Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.8.6, and apparently consulted by Cossey in the Greyfriars library. Smalley took Cossey’s various comments as an authorial attribution, a claim that Grosseteste prepared the \textit{superscriptio}. She believed this attribution to be generally accurate, though she thought that it was more likely that the \textit{superscriptio} had been made at Grosseteste’s request than by the bishop himself, and she also suggested that Grosseteste composed a brief prologue, quoting from the \textit{superscriptio}, that survives uniquely in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10.\textsuperscript{39} Further, noting that the quotations in this prologue


\textsuperscript{38} See Hunt, “Library of Grosseteste,” pp. 133, 136, and 141–42. Grosseteste’s copy of Augustine’s \textit{De ciiutate Dei} is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 198, in the Greyfriars library until given to Gascoigne. Grosseteste’s copy of the letters of Jerome is described by Gascoigne, Oxford, Lincoln College MS Lat. 117, p. 473, as bearing the classmark \textit{Ieronimus L}. The remaining texts are included in the list of works indexed by Grosseteste in Lyon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 414, fols. 17r–32r, suggesting their presence in his collection.

\textsuperscript{39} Smalley, \textit{Hebrew Scholarship}, pp. 5 and 7–8, where she says that “the problem of [the prologue’s] authorship must be further examined.” In \textit{Study of the Bible}, p. 343, she simply states: “I think that the author of the prologue was Grosseteste.” The prologue is edited in \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Oxford}, ed. Peter E. Pormann (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 66–69 (see pp. 5–8 for translation), described as “presumably a copy of that written by Grosseteste” (p. 65).
correspond more closely to the interlinear text in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.8.6 than to that in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10, Smalley observed that the interlinear translation in Corpus (and in its twin, consulted by Cossey) reflects some effort at revision and correction, and that Trinity therefore contains the earlier version of the translation, originating (she believed) from Grosseteste’s circle. In this scenario, then, Cossey was working with a copy of the *superscriptio* derived, at some remove, from the original form of the “Grosseteste” text.

There are several problems with this account. If, for example, the *superscriptio* did originate with Grosseteste’s circle, then the revision identified by Smalley must have been prepared very quickly, perhaps implausibly so, since the scripts used for the Gallican and Hebraicum translations and the Latin superscription in Corpus date the book to Grosseteste’s lifetime, perhaps more likely before his departure from Oxford in 1235 than after. Further, though Smalley focused in particular on Cossey’s association of the *superscriptio* with Grosseteste, the description quoted above appears to refer to the physical book as a whole, reflecting not an attribution so much as a note on provenance, Cossey’s belief that he was in possession of Grosseteste’s manuscript (“psalterium domini Lincolniensis”), which contained (“ubi ... continentur”) multiple texts of the Psalms. Likewise, while his account of Grosseteste having the *superscriptio* written in this psalter (“superscribi fecit ... in psalterio suo”) may describe the commission of a text, as Smalley believed, it seems more likely (and straightforwardly) to refer to the physical act of having the interlinear version, whatever its origin, written in the volume that reached Cossey.

---

40 Smalley, *Hebrew Scholarship*, p. 8

41 Smalley, *Hebrew Scholarship*, p. 6, dates this script to “about the second quarter of the thirteenth century, probably the ‘thirties or ‘forties,’” and subsequent descriptions date the volume on the authority of Smalley’s assessment: see Raphael Loewe, “The Mediaeval Christian Hebraists of England: The *Superscriptio Lincolniensis*,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 28 (1957), 205–52, at p. 214: “assigned by Miss Smalley, on western palaeographical grounds, to ca. 1230–40”; Olszowy-Schlanger, *Les manuscrits Hébreux*, p. 157: “datée des années 1230–1240 par B. Smalley”; and *Hebrew Manuscripts*, ed. Pormann, pp. 65 and 69: “produced in the second quarter of the thirteenth century according to Smalley ... probably dating to the 1230s or 1240s.” The script is, however, almost certainly earlier than Smalley allowed: in private correspondence, Ralph Hanna has suggested that it could be as early as 1210, while Elaine Treharne dates it between 1220 and 1240, and my own work with the catalogues of English dated and dateable manuscripts would favour the earlier side of their range. All of this – indeed, including Smalley’s dating – renders problematic Loewe’s contention that the creation of the *superscriptio* postdates Grosseteste’s elevation to the episcopacy; “Medieval Christian Hebraists,” p. 213.

42 In her discussion of the prologue in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10, Smalley suggests that Grosseteste’s role, as described in Cossey’s “quam superscribi fecit,” is reflected in the prologue-author’s account of his own activities: “scripturam Ebreorum edisseram,” on which she comments: “He does not claim to be [the *superscriptio’s*] author: he has ‘edited’ it” (*Hebrew Scholarship*, p. 7). Similarly, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, ed. Pormann, p. 8, translates “edisseram” as “publish.” In medieval usage, however,
If Cossey was right to claim that he was working with a book once owned by the bishop of Lincoln, and if the version of the superscriptio in this manuscript and in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10 represents at least a partial revision of an earlier interlinear translation, then it would be unlikely that the superscriptio was, in the first instance, prepared “at the bishop’s behest.” Instead, Grosseteste appears to have found this interlinear translation, either on its own or already as part of a multi-text psalter, and decided that it was a useful tool for biblical studies, and he therefore had a copy of it prepared for his own consultation. If Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 10 was copied from Grosseteste’s manuscript, rather than sharing an exemplar with it, it could be that the bishop was responsible for the revisions Smalley observed, and it may also have been at his request that the preface quoted by Cossey, but omitted in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.8.6, was included at the head of this psalter – but this is now impossible to know with any certainty, just as it is hard to be certain of how long the superscriptio was in circulation before reaching Grosseteste. Regardless, it was because of the bishop’s decision to have this volume produced, as well as his donation of it to Greyfriars, that it was able to be consulted by Cossey in the creation of his commentary, serving as a foundational source for his study of the Hebrew text and its Latin translations.

Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11 and the Making of Cossey’s Autograph

More than a century stands between Cossey’s work in Oxford and the production of Ch, dateable on the basis of its script to the middle of the fifteenth century. Apart from some material added on the flyleaves, this volume contains only Cossey’s text, and a note added at the start of the commentary places it in the library of the Carthusians of Coventry (see Fig. 2). The book was almost certainly a product of its original owner’s time at university, prepared as he pursued his theological studies and, like many of the scholastic volumes identified in surviving Carthusian booklists, edisserere means “to expound” or “to interpret” (cf. DMLBS s.v. edisserere), and the prologue-author, reflecting a common scholastic understanding of translation as a function of exposition, does therefore claim that he created the superscriptio.

Smalley, Hebrew Scholarship, p. 5.


The St. Anne’s Charterhouse ex libris seen in Fig. 2 is written in the same hand as that in London, British Library, MS Royal S.A.v, fol. 134r, distinct from (and, of course, later than) the notice of that book’s donation by Robert Odyham on the front flyleaf, discussed by Edward A. Jones, “A New Look into the Speculum Inclusorum,” in The Medieval Mystical Tradition: England, Ireland, and Wales. Exeter Symposium VI, ed. Marion Glasscoe (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 123–45, at 136.
Fig. 2. Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11, fol. 1r: The opening of Cossey’s first prologue, including attribution and later ex-libris. Reproduced by kind permission of the Master and Fellows of Christ’s College, Cambridge.
taken with him when he entered the charterhouse. More specifically, \textbf{Ch} appears to have been prepared either directly or at one remove from Cossey’s working copy, likely kept in the library of the Greyfriars at either Oxford or Cambridge, and, insofar as it at least partially preserves the material disposition of the text in its exemplar, this belated manuscript provides a valuable witness to the process by which Cossey composed his commentary.

Though unusually detailed and still generally reliable, M.R. James’s description of \textbf{Ch} passes over one of the most striking details of the manuscript, that is, the numerous notes that are written in the hand of the main scribe and crowd its margins. Admittedly, some of these notes are relatively commonplace, marking divisions or drawing attention to specific topics treated in the text, but others are more substantial, apparently reflecting further work with Cossey’s sources after the initial drafting of his commentary. Toward the end of his prologues, for example, Cossey claims that a “glosa sancti Ieronimi,” by which he appears to mean a comment attributed to Jerome in the \textit{Magna glosatura}, indicates that the Psalter should be divided into five books based on the appearance of the phrase “fiat fiat” (אני אני), while a nearby marginal note specifies that this comment originates in Jerome’s \textit{Ep. 36}, to Marcella. That is, whoever was responsible for this annotation has traced the patristic source of a detail which, in preparing the commentary, Cossey had taken from an early scholastic intermediary. A similarly retrospective or supplementary effort appears in Cossey’s account of the meaning of \textit{ה닐ות} in the title or superscription of Psalm 5, already mentioned above. In the main text of the commentary, Cossey presents his Hebrew sources, on the one hand, and, on the other, Jerome as offering two potentially viable though mutually exclusive interpretive options. The writer responsible for the marginal note, however, finds reasons to doubt one of them:

\begin{quote}
Quod autem male intelligant per \textit{nehilot} instrumentum uel modulacionem instrumenti patet ex eo quod Dauid in fine libri huius, cum enumerat [enumert \textbf{Ch}] omnia instrumenta musica in quibus monet laudare Deum, non enumerat \textit{nehilot} [ne \textbf{Ch}], quod tamen fecisset cum aliis, si in usu tunc fuisse. Item apparet quod fingunt ea que dicunt,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{46} Compare, for example, the books given to Witham by John Blacman, ca. 1463–1474, which, in addition to constituting “the largest and most comprehensive collection of devotional and mystical writings known to have been owned by any individual in late medieval England,” as it is described by Roger Lovatt, “The Library of John Blacman and Contemporary Carthusian Spirituality,” \textit{Journal of Ecclesiastical History} 43 (1992), 195–230, at p. 195, include volumes of scholastic philosophy and theology almost certainly acquired during his studies; see \textit{The Libraries of the Carthusians}, ed. A. Ian Doyle, published with \textit{Syon Abbey}, ed. Vincent Gillespie, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 9 (London, 2001), pp. 639–51.

\textsuperscript{47} James, \textit{Descriptive Catalogue}, pp. 31 and 34, quotes from two of these notes without further comment.

\textsuperscript{48} For examples of structural glosses, see the marginal “primum” and “secundum” in Fig. 2; for subject matter glosses, see Prol. 2.1 note; 2.21 note; and Prol. 3.19 note.

\textsuperscript{49} Prol. 3.523–524 and note.
cum nesciant exprimere quale instrumentum uel qualis cantilena erat illa quam ipsi dicunt uocari nehiloth (fol. 20v, outer margin).

It is clear that those who understand nehiloth to refer to an instrument or the playing of an instrument are mistaken, since at the end of the book, when he enumerates all the musical instruments on which he teaches us to praise God, David does not list nehiloth, which he would have done, along with the others, if it was then in use. Likewise, it seems that these people are making up what they say, since they do not know how to explain what kind of instrument or song it was that they say is called nehiloth.

The work of the commentary evidently continues in its margins, with the note’s author consulting the Hebrew text of Psalm 150.3–5 and, for his second counter-argument, either drawing attention to the vague generality of what “the Hebrews say” or, perhaps more likely, pursuing this point further by addressing more questions to a contemporary Jewish conversus. This continuity is even more apparent in other marginal glosses, which the scribe not only ties (as in this last example) to specific points in the text, but which he also attempts to integrate into the prose of the commentary itself, making the text and marginal gloss legible as an uninterrupted whole. After Cossey quotes the Gallican text of Psalm 5.10, for example, the scribe inserts a signe-de-renvoi, tied to a passage in the lower margin of fol. 21r:

In Psalterio Romano: *Non est in ore eorum rectum* (ueritas est quedam rectitudo, secundum Anselmum, libro de ueritate) *interiora eorum insidie.* In Hebreo sic: *Non est in ore eorum apparatus, inter eos falsitas.* In Hebreo enim non habetur riyr [sic], quod signat uanum et inane, sed hawwot, quod signat falsitatem, et datur etc.

The marginal note appears to end mid-sentence, but its final two words actually repeat the text that follows immediately after the signe-de-renvoi in the body of the commentary: “et datur intelligi quod non solum falsum locuntur, sed menciuntur, quia in corde eorum est falsitas” – “and it is given to understand that they do not just speak falsely but they lie, for falsity is in their hearts.” This marginal gloss, in other words, has been designed to accommodate the pre-existing text of Cossey’s commentary and to be inserted seamlessly into his interpretation of the psalm. The gloss’s author appears to have found more material related to the general notion that this verse is about lying – a definition from Anselm’s *De veritate* and the specification of the Hebrew word translated in the Gallican as “uanum” – and has added this to bolster his interpretive claim.50 As with the apparent consultation of Jewish sources in

the previous example, here too the discussion of the Hebrew and, in this case, the reference to Jerome’s Hebraicum translation as the “Roman Psalter,” support the notion that these marginal notes were created by Cossey himself, continuing to refine his commentary after its initial composition.

All of these examples are relatively brief, but in several other instances, almost all contained in the manuscript’s second quire, Cossey appears to have revisited and reconsidered his text at greater length. In the middle of his account of the superscription or title of Psalm 6, for example, a sign draws attention to a marginal note in which Cossey summarizes and dismisses Trevet’s interpretation of שֵׁםִינית as describing a kind of song associated in particular with Mattithiah and his companions (cf. 1 Par. 15.21), and the marginal material ends, again, with two words that match the text immediately after the sign. 51 This addition from one of his major sources seems gratuitous, and if Cossey meant to present it as a less compelling alternative, he could simply have included it when initially preparing his commentary. It makes better sense, however, when taken together with a much larger addition concerning the psalm’s title, a note of over five hundred words that begins in the outer margin of fol. 21v, fills the lower margin, and continues into the lower margin of the facing recto (Fig. 3). In the main text of his commentary, immediately after the point at which Trevet’s discussion of שֵׁםִינית is to be inserted, Cossey reports that “the Hebrews say” this word describes an eight-stringed instrument, and, just as the ten-stringed psaltery evokes the Decalogue, so too is this instrument associated with the circumcision on the eighth day (cf. Gen. 17.12). 52 Another sign then directs attention to the longer addition, where Cossey expands on this point, first explaining that deprecatory songs were set to the accompaniment of this instrument,

51 Ch, fol. 21v (outer marg.): “Dicunt Triuet quod seminith nomen est cantici quod spectabat ad Mathathiam et socios eius, sicut habetur Paral. 15, ubi dicitur: Porro Mathathias et Eliphalu et ceteri in citharis suis pro octaua canebant. Vnde omnes psalmi qui habent in titulis pro octaua spectabant ad Mathathiam et socios eius. Sed melius uidetur, ut dicunt Hebrei” – “Trevet says that sheminith is the name of a song which pertained to Mattithiah and his companions, as in 1 Par. 15, where it is said: And Mattithiah and Eliphelehu and the rest sang for the octave on their citharas. And so it is that all the psalms which have for the octave on their citharas. And so it is that all the psalms which have for the octave in their titles pertain to Mattithiah and his companions. But it seems better, as the Hebrews say.” For the main text of the commentary, following the signe-de-renvoi, see the next note.

52 Ch, fol. 21v: “Dicunt Hebrei quod seminith, hoc est octaua, est nomen musici instrumenti eo quod octo cordas habeat sic nominati. Sicut infra testatur psalterium decacordum, id est decem cordarum, in memoriam Decalogi habebatur, ita et aliud psalterium ob memoriam circumcisionis, que octaua die fiebat, uel citharam octo cordarum habeabant. Ergo decucabula pro octaua et epinichion sunt nomina cantilenarum in Hebreo” – “The Hebrews say that sheminith, i.e., octave, is the name of a musical instrument so named because it should have eight strings. Just as below it is attested that the psaltery is thought to be decacordal, i.e., ten-stringed, to commemorate the Decalogue, so too they held this other psaltery or cithara to have eight cords to commemorate the circumcision, which was done on the eighth day. Therefore, the words for the octave and epinicion are the names of songs in Hebrew.”
Fig. 3. Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11, fol. 21v: The end of Cossey’s commentary on Psalm 5 and the start of Psalm 6, including substantial marginal additions in the hand of the main scribe, which continue onto the facing recto. Reproduced by kind permission of the Master and Fellows of Christ’s College, Cambridge.
ut quasi significacione ipsius instrumenti Deum alloquerentur dicentes: Domine, noli uindicacionem sumere de peccatis nostris, sed respice ad patres nostros et ad pactum quod pepigisti cum eis, cuius pacti signum in carne nostra gerimus [gimus Ch] et in instrumenti modulacione designamus, et miserere ut non uincamur ab inimicis et confundamur (fol. 21v, outer marg.).

so that, as though by the signification of this instrument, they addressed God and said: Lord, do not exact vengeance for our sins, but consider our forefathers and the agreement you made with them, the sign of which we bear on our flesh and denote by playing this instrument, and have mercy, so that we are not conquered and confounded by our enemies.

The discussion in the marginal addition then shifts to the significance of למנצח, and especially its confusion with לנצח by the translators of the Septuagint, a mistake which explains (he says) the Gallican rendering “in finem,” as opposed to “uictori” in the Hebraicum and “pro uictoria” in the “superscriptio Lincolniensis.” While the Septuagint translators could simply have been confused, Cossey thinks it more likely that they intentionally disguised the word’s proper meaning, since, he says, it identifies certain psalms as prayers for victory in battle, and the Hebrew translators working at the behest of an Egyptian king might not have wanted this foreign ruler to use these psalms to pray for his own military triumphs. Then, still in this larger marginal note,

53 Ch, fol. 21v (lower marg.): “Lamenaseha, quod interpretatur ‘pro uictoria’ uel ‘ad uictoriam’ uel ‘uictori’. Menaseha enim signat ‘uictoriam’, sed littera lameth preposita signat genitium uel datium casum, uel prepositionem ‘in’, ‘ad’, uel ‘pro’. Vbicumque itigur ponitur lamenaseha intendo quod psalmus ille est deprecatiories pro uictoria habenda de inimicis uel pro uictoria euadenda ab inimicis. Humilior enim est hec deprecacio et in tanto magis accepta Deo ubi rogatur non ut uincat, sed saltem ut non uincatur. Vel est psalmus regraciatoriories pro uictoria habita. Est autem hec depreccatio pro euadenda uictoria cordis contritii et humiliati, ideo penitencialis oracio est. ... Videtur autem quod Septuaginta fuerunt decepti similitudine istorum uocabulum lanesah, quod infra, Ps. 9, ubi nos habemus sicut Septuaginta transtulerunt, Inimici defecerunt framee in finem, habetur in Hebreo lanesah, putantes lamenaseha idem signari, uel (quod melius [meus Ch] puto) a proposito hoc fecerunt nolentes regi alienigene psalmos pro uictoria a Deo impetranda manifestare, sicut ubi in Veteri Testamento ad misterium Trinitatis aliquid pertinere uidetur gratis Septuaginta aliter transtulerunt, sicut dicit Ieronimus in prologue super Pentateucum: ‘Vbicumque inquit sacrarum aliquid scripturarum testator ... ’” – “Lamenaseha, translated ‘for victory’ or ‘to victory’ or ‘to the victor’. For menaseha means ‘victory’, but the letter lamed as a prefix indicates the genitive or dative case, or the preposition ‘in’, ‘to’, or ‘for’. Therefore, wherever lamenaseha appears I consider that psalm to be deprecatory, seeking victory over enemies or in evading enemies. For that petition is humbler and therefore more acceptable to God when one does not ask to conquer but that one not be conquered. Or the psalm [i.e., in which lamenaseha appears] is an expression of thanks for a victory won. But this [i.e., Ps. 6] is a contrite and humble heart’s petition to evade [an enemy’s] victory, and therefore it is a penitential prayer. ... But the Seventy seem to have been deceived by the similarity with the word lanesah, which below, Ps. 9, where we have what the Seventy translated as The swords of the enemy have failed unto the end, the Hebrew has lanesah, and [it seems that the Seventy] thought lamenaseha meant the same thing [as lanesah]. Or (and I think this the better option) they did this on purpose, not wishing to disclose to
he returns to Trevet, whose gloss on the title of Psalm 4 includes the claim that לֹהָנְצָה is a kind of song. Cossey finds this inconsistent with Trevet’s interpretation of שְׂמֵינִית, since the psalm would then seem to be identified, gratuitously, as two different types of song, and, noting the further complication introduced by the Septuagint’s apparent mistranslation of לֹהָנְצָה as though it were לֹנְנֶצָה in 1 Chron. 15.21, he concludes that it is best to follow his Hebrew sources on the meaning of all of these terms. Still, he holds open the possibility that, in some cases, שְׂמֵינִית could be transferred from the instrument to describe a song as well.

Quite clearly, the work standing behind these two marginal notes represents an extension of Cossey’s exegetical efforts more generally, his decision either to continue developing his commentary after its initial composition or to return and augment his work on earlier psalms while he glossed later ones. Since all of the sources on which these notes draw were available to Cossey when he initially composed his

a foreign-born king the psalms for asking victory from God, just as wherever in the Old Testament something seems to pertain to the mystery of the Trinity, the Seventy freely translated it otherwise, as Jerome says in his prologue to the Pentateuch: ‘Wherever anything of sacred Scripture is witnessed … .’ For the full quotation of Jerome, see De Bruyne, Préfaces, p. 8; here and in the next few notes, it has seemed best to leave manuscript’s transliteration of words related to לֹהָנְצָה uncorrected in my translation.

54 Ch, fol. 21v (lower marg.): “Et dicit Triuet quod lanesah, id est epinichion, est nomen alicuius cantilene in templo, ut dicunt Hebrei, sed non unius solius, sed omnium que cantabantur ad uictoriam, sicut in quibusdam sequenciis solent aliqui versus repeti ad uictoriam, uel altitudinis uel velocitatis uel suavitatis, sed istud non congrue stat cum eo quod supra dixit, quod pro octaua est nomen cantici” – “And Trevet says that, according to the Hebrews, lanesah, i.e., epinicion, is the name of a certain song in the temple, and not of one in particular but of all that are sung for victory, just as some verses are customarily repeated in certain sequences for victory, and this kind of song is characterized either by high voice or by rapidity or by sweetness – but this is inconsistent with what he said before, that for the octave is the name of a song.”

55 Ch, fol. 21v (lower marg.) and fol. 22r (lower marg.): “Et est aduertendum quod, Paral. 15, Septuaginta pro lanesah transulerunt epinichion, id est super uictoria, ab epi-, quod est ‘supra’, et nichos, uictoria, sed forte codex Hebraicus ex defectu scriptorum habet ibi lanesah pro lamenaseha ... Vnde pocius adherendum est illis Hebreis qui dicunt quod seminith est nomen instrumentorum illorum quae octo cordis tangebantur ob memoriam circumcisionis quam nomen cantilenarum, sicut infra, Ps. 32, asor pro quo Septuaginta dixerunt decem cordarum. Signat enim idem quod decanum nomen. Vel pocius nominatiuum est talis instrumenti et cantilene. Et dicit Lira etc.” – “Note that, at 1 Par. 15.21, the Seventy translate lanesah as epinicion, i.e., up to victory, from epi- (meaning ‘above’) and nicos (‘victory’), but perhaps their Hebrew codex there read lanesah instead of lamenaseha by scribal error. ... But instead one should follow the Hebrews, who say that sheminith is the name of those instruments which are played with eight strings to commemorate the circumcision, rather than the name of songs, just as below, Ps. 32.2, asowr, for which the Seventy read of ten strings. For it signifies also the noun leader of ten. Or perhaps it derives from such an instrument and a song. And Lyre says, etc.” On transferring the name of an instrument to the song sung to its accompaniment, see Profl. 3.272–273.
commentary on Psalm 6 – they are cited in his prologue and in his work on earlier psalms – it seems most likely that he was aware from the outset of the discrepancy between the views of his Hebrew source and what he found in Trevet’s commentary, and he decided to return to this complicated issue after further study of the Hebrew text of the Psalter (and 1 Par., adduced by Trevet), as well as additional work with his other sources, including, presumably, whoever had introduced him to what he presents as the standard Jewish interpretation of the text. By the end of these additions, Cossey still arrives at the same conclusions as in the original version of his commentary, but the marginal notes elaborate considerably on those opinions, explaining the symbolic significance of an ancient instrument and its performance, and they lend further support, treating Trevet’s reading as a potentially legitimate alternative and explaining why, after careful consideration, it should not be preferred. Altogether, these marginalia illustrate the ongoing and incremental process of the commentary’s composition, suggesting that Cossey took note of various interpretive problems – uncertain sources, ambiguous Hebrew phrases, apparent contradictions in the glosses of his fellow Christian Hebraists – and he set about resolving them, entering the results in the margins of his working copy. At least some of this arrangement was preserved by the scribe of Ch.

As noted above, however, though shorter glosses persist throughout the volume, these longer marginal notes, ending with the resumption of the commentary’s prose, are generally limited to the second of the manuscript’s twenty-one quires. It could be that Cossey’s more substantial revisionary work was limited to the beginning of the Psalter, not including the prologue, or that, after a certain point, a scribe taking Cossey’s working copy as his exemplar simply decided that including both the main text and the longer marginalia was making his task too onerous. Other details, however, suggest another alternative, namely that, while Cossey’s marginal additions have been preserved in this configuration in quire two, in the remainder of the volume they have been incorporated into the prose of the commentary itself. Indeed, the scribe may have begun with this integrative approach, indicated by a major error in the copying of Cossey’s third prologue, edited below. In line with the opening division of its contents into ten sections, this prologue begins with an account of the Psalter’s translation history, followed by a consideration of its authorship. This second section is interrupted, however, by further comments on the history of the book’s translation,

56 As in the examples from Psalms 5 and 47 (see above, notes 30–31), discussion with his teacher seems to be indicated by his references (in notes 51–52 and 54–55) to what “the Hebrews say.” The interpretation of sheminith as an eight-stringed instrument may be found in Rashi (see Gruber, Commentary, p. 191), but the linking of that instrument to ritual circumcision must have come from another source, and it is also mentioned in passing by Trevet (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 13rb).
criticizing Lyre for repeating the commonplace of Jerome’s three translations and their later use, referring to the earlier discussion of Trevet to dismiss this view as overly simple, and then noting that one of Lyre’s dubious claims – that Jerome’s first translation is used in Rome – derives from the Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum of Martin of Opava, OP (d. 1278). This last detail is new, and, as with the additions discussed above, it seems likely to be the result of further research undertaken after Cossey’s initial treatment of the topic. The passage, in other words, contains material plausibly added to the margins of Cossey’s working copy, and, perhaps indicative of a missing or incorrectly positioned signe-de-renvoi, it appears to have been integrated into the main text of the prologue at the wrong point. Of course, had the scribe brought it into the text where it is positioned in the edition below, there would be no reason to identify it as a later addition, just as the more substantial marginal notes discussed above could have been incorporated into the prose of Cossey’s commentary without trouble. It is, therefore, almost impossible to know how many similar additions have been correctly positioned in the main text. Likewise, it is impossible to know if any material was included in the first version of the commentary but cancelled as part of the revision process, and therefore not included in Ch. Cossey may have focused his revisions on only some sections of the commentary, but the frequency and variety of the marginal additions attested in the second quire of Ch are just as likely to be representative of his practice across his working copy, indicating a sustained and careful effort at revision.

The preservation of so many of these authorial notes in Ch suggests that its scribe was either consulting Cossey’s working copy directly or, at most, at one remove, i.e., following an exemplar made from Cossey’s autograph. This observation in itself does not make the volume particularly unusual: other manuscripts of scholastic commentaries bearing signs of direct consultation of an authorial working copy may

---

57 Prol. 3.115–126 and notes.

58 The persistence of more substantial marginal additions in the scribe’s exemplar may be indicated by his decision to copy, in the lower margins of fols. 66v–67r, a series of parallel columns, tying lemmata from Psalms 33.12–34.3 to rhyming moral precepts, e.g. “Venite” (Psalm 33.12) tied to “Districtum iudicium formidare” and “Prohibeat linguam” (Psalm 33.14) tied to “Et fictum eloquium deuitare.” The distinctive form of this addition, as well as its general applicability across a series of verses, would have made it impossible for the scribe to incorporate it into the prose of the commentary, perhaps explaining its preservation as the only long marginal note outside of the manuscript’s second quire.

readily be identified, especially in the case of texts with only limited circulation.\textsuperscript{60} It does, however, indicate that the surviving text of Cossey’s commentary is the product of at least some revision. In line with the dating of the text to the period following his regency, this work cannot be seen as a \textit{reportatio} of his lectures or a straightforward illustration of his university teaching. The commentary is, instead, a scholarly tool that benefitted from its author’s efforts to learn Hebrew and to trace recent interpretive claims to their ultimate sources, clearing the ground in order to establish an authoritative reading of the Psalter’s literal sense and enabling later exegetes to continue the study of its original language. The marginalia in \textbf{Ch} illustrate, at least in part, the stages in which that work was done.

\textit{Psalmic Literalism: Cossey’s Hermeneutic Commitments}

Cossey’s avowed interest in the literal sense of the biblical text is typical of scholastic exegetes, as is his broad definition of that sense as the \textit{mens} (“mind” or “intention”) of its human authors.\textsuperscript{61} As the examples discussed above have already indicated, however, this general framework left ample room for disagreement, and throughout his commentary Cossey frequently queries, challenges, or simply rejects what he found in the work of his fellow Hebraists. While many of these disagreements arise from his reading of specific details in the Hebrew text, in general, and especially in the prologues, Cossey adopts an idiosyncratic approach to the Psalter’s literal sense that necessarily sets him at odds with his recent scholastic sources. More thoroughly than any of these antecedents, Cossey considers the Psalter as an ancient Hebrew equivalent to the medieval Church’s book of hymns, though distinct in both the specific ritual uses for which it was composed and, of course, its divine inspiration, seen especially in the prophetic foresight of one of its principal authors, David. Cossey is committed primarily to reading the Psalms in these terms, and he often has trouble reconciling these priorities with the purportedly literalistic glosses found in the commentaries of Lyre and Trevet.

Cossey’s understanding of the Psalter as an ancient book of hymns is made clear at various points in his prologues, when he turns, for example, to familiar Latin hymns to illustrate the different meters in which, following Jerome, he believed the Psalms to have been composed, and in his briefer discussion of the Psalter’s \textit{divisio}, where he holds out the possibility that, though now unrecoverable by commentators, the


\textsuperscript{61} Prol. 1.16 and Prol. 3.465–466.
ordering of different psalms may reflect their use in the liturgies of ancient Israel.62 It is also reflected in his discussion of the \textit{finalis causa} of the Psalms, the heading under which exegetes addressed “the ultimate justification for the existence of a work, the end or objective (\textit{finis}) aimed at by the writer.”63 Following an etymology of \textit{psalterium} also found in Cossey’s prologues, Trevet had identified the “final cause” of the Psalms as the praise of God, and Lyre likewise focused on “praise” as the single mode in which the Psalter is composed.64 Cossey argues for a more nuanced approach. Certainly, he says, praise is one of the primary purposes of some psalms, but many more are written for other ends – some are complaints, some are meant to teach proper belief, some are expressive of repentance, etc. – and, in many cases, several of these ends can be found in one and the same psalm.65 The unity of the Psalter as a whole, then, should be identified only with the formal consistency of its component parts, each of which is \textit{hymnidicus} – “written as a hymn,” as well as the ritual setting in which they were meant to be performed.

This approach to the Psalter as a collection of hymns may help to explain why Cossey readily accepts Jerome’s claim that many different authors were responsible for their composition. These authors, he says, are named in the superscriptions or titles, and when psalms lack such references, their author or authors must remain unknown. By following Jerome, Cossey departs from a longstanding interpretive tradition, which, on the authority of Augustine, saw David as the sole author of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{Prol. 1.101–132 and Prol. 3.526–529, and see too Prol. 3.270–271. Note that, in the first case, this work leads Cossey to conclude that the meters of the psalter must be different from Latin meters. Certainly, earlier commentators draw attention, in passing, to the meters supposedly present in the Hebrew text of the Psalms, noting that these meters are not preserved in the Latin translations, but Cossey’s account is unusual for its length and detail. See, e.g., Andrew Kraebel, “Poetry and Prophecy in the Psalter Commentaries of St Bruno and the Pre-Scholastics,” \textit{Sacris Erudiri} 50 (2011), 413–59, at p. 448. Likewise, Cossey’s understanding of the Psalter’s meter does at times appear to influence his reading of specific verses, e.g., on Psalm 6.4: “\textit{Et tu Domine usquequo}, suple ‘differs remissionem.’ Homo enim anxius et territus non profert frequenter completam sentenciam, et eciam propter metrum aliqua uocabula subintelligenda non scriebantur” – “\textit{And thou, Lord, how long}, supply ‘do you delay forgiveness.’ For an anxious and frightened person often does not utter a complete sentence, and also on account of the meter certain words that should be inferred have not been written” (Ch, fol. 22r).}
\footnote{Alastair Minnis, \textit{Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages}, reissued 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 2010), p. 29.}
\footnote{According to Trevet, “\textit{Causa uero finalis notatur in eo quod dicit tibi, scilicet Deo inquam laus omnis creature debet ordinari}” – “The final cause is noted when he says to you, i.e., I say that all of a creature’s praise ought to be directed to God” (Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 2rb). For Lyre, see \textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o2vbD. Most of Lyre’s prologue is translated in \textit{Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100–c. 1375: The Commentary-Tradition}, ed. Alastair Minnis and A. Brian Scott with David Wallace, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1991), pp. 271–74.}
\footnote{Prol. 1.34–65.}
\end{footnotesize}
Psalter: this view is dominant in early scholastic exegesis, including the *Magna glosatura*, and it can still be found in more recent works, such as the unfinished commentary of Thomas Aquinas, OP (d. 1274).\(^{66}\) Trevet notes both opinions in his prologue, and, in his commentary, he sometimes raises the possibility that specific psalms could have been written by authors other than David.\(^{67}\) In general, however, lacking other evidence, he tends to assume Davidic authorship. Though he acknowledges that Psalm 41 may have been composed by the sons of Korah, for example, when these figures are mentioned again in the superscription to Psalm 43, Trevet simply refers back to his earlier remarks and proceeds to discuss the psalm as composed by “the Prophet,” the common antonomastic title given to David in scholastic exegesis.\(^{68}\) It is for the same assumption of Davidic authorship that Cossey chastises Trevet in his account of Psalm 1, included in the prologues edited below, and, in this case, the Dominican’s error is (for Cossey) compounded by discussing the psalm as though it had been positioned at the head of the collection by David rather than by its postexilic compiler, identified by Jerome as Ezra.\(^{69}\) Lyre, in contrast, comes

\(^{66}\) For the Lombard, see PL 191:59B. For Aquinas’s views on the Psalter’s authorship, see Thomas Ryan, *Thomas Aquinas as Reader of the Psalms* (Notre Dame, IN, 2000), pp. 15–16.

\(^{67}\) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 2rb: “Causa efficiens notatur in hoc secundum quod dicitur psallam. Hoc enim ex persona David dicitur, qui uel omnes psalmos secundum Augustinum uel saltem maiorem partem eorum eciam secundum Hebreos compositu” – “The efficient cause is indicated insofar as he says *I will sing psalms*. For this is said in the *persona* of David, who composed either (according to Augustine) all of the psalms or at least (according to the Hebrews) the greater part of them.”

\(^{68}\) Regarding the reference to the *filii Core* in the title to Psalm 41, Trevet writes that it “significat hunc psalmum pertinere ad filios Chore, uel quia fuerunt auctores psalmi uel quia ipsi fuerunt materia psalmi uel quia psalmus iste fuit eis deputatus ad cantandum uel secundum aliquem modum ad eos pertinebat” – “signifies that this psalm pertains to the sons of Korah, either because they were the psalm’s author or because they were themselves the subject matter of the psalm or because this psalm was assigned to them to sing or reflecting some other way in which it pertained to them” (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 76rb). He then avoids the question of authorship by writing that this psalm “was composed” (“editus est”) in the *persona* of one lamenting for the captivity in Babylon, and he proceeds to gloss the psalm as written in this voice (fol. 77ra). Glossing the title of Psalm 43, he notes that this is “secundus in quo ponitur lebene Chore pro quo habemus filiorum Chore, de quo in titulo [xli] dictum est” – “The second which includes the phrase *libne-qorah*, for which we have of the *sons of Korah*, discussed in the title to Ps. 41.” When giving his *divisio* of the psalm, he then notes that, in the first portion, the psalmist “docet quomodo de Dei beneficiis fuit Propheta eruditus” – “teaches how the Prophet was learned concerning the gifts of God,” and then, when he turns to gloss the psalm itself, he begins: “Docuit Propheta per quos Dei beneficis cognouit” – “The Prophet taught how he recognized the gifts of God” (fol. 79va–b). On the antonomastic reference to David as “the Prophet,” see Prol. 3.277–278.

\(^{69}\) Prol. 3.425–458. Compared to other scholastic exegetes, however, Cossey’s discussion of the role of Ezra as compiler is relatively brief; see further Kraebel, *Biblical Commentary and Translation*, chapter 1.
closer to Cossey’s view of mixed authorship, regularly identifying the authors of psalms with figures named in their superscriptions and, when such names are lacking, reporting attributions found in his Jewish sources. In his prologue, Lyre reports both the single- and multiple-authorship theories, expressing his preference for the latter, but, unlike Cossey, he nevertheless maintains that it is proper to identify David as the book’s “causa efficiens instrumentalis” (that is, its human author), simply because he was responsible for the “maior pars” – “greater part” of the text.

Of course, many psalms are indeed attributed to David in their superscriptions, but even in these cases Cossey finds reason to disagree with his fellow Hebraists. Following recent trends in scholastic literalism, he sometimes ties psalms to specific events in David’s life – such as Psalm 4, in which David is said to give thanks to God for his victory over Saul – but Cossey is generally more hesitant than Trevet or Lyre to read the biblical text so straightforwardly in terms of David’s biography. In part, this is simply because he often fails to find any mention of the events identified by his sources in these psalms, but his hesitancy also reflects Cossey’s understanding of when David would have been able to find the time necessary to compose in verse. As he suggests in his first prologue, this was surely only possible at the end of the ruler’s life, after his military campaigns had been successfully concluded, and so, though some psalms may have been composed spontaneously on the battlefield (as in the case of Psalm 4), Cossey typically sees David writing in considered retrospection, summing up his long experience of prayer and penitence.

70 E.g., on Psalm 91: “Secundum Hebraeos Moyses fecit hunc psalmum decantandum in die Sabbathi, quae celebris est apud Hebraeos, in memoriam beneficii creationis, secundum quod dicitur Gen. 2, Et benedixit Deus diei septimo et sanctificauit illum, etc.” – “According to the Hebrews, Moses made this psalm to be sung on the Sabbath, which is celebrated among the Hebrews, to commemorate the gift of creation, in accordance with what is said in Gen. 2: And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, etc.” (Biblia sacra, III, sig. O2ra). The reference is to Gen. 2.3.

71 Biblia sacra, III, sig. o2vaB.

72 “Iste ergo psalmus regnatiarius est pro uictoria, ... et specialiter pro illa quam Deus quasi miraculose fecit eum habere de Saul, sicut habemus 1 Reg. 23” – “Therefore, this psalm expresses thanks for victory ... and in particular for that [victory] which God caused him to have, as though miraculously, against Saul, as we find in 1 Reg. 23” (Kleinhans, “Cossey,” p. 250). On this interpretive habit in scholastic Psalter commentaries, see Kraebel, Biblical Commentary and Translation, ch. 1.

73 Prol. 1.132–137. On Psalm 4, he writes, “Et quamuis non scribatur quod orando tum, certum tamen est quod oravit instanter” – “And while it what he prayed for may not be what is written here, it is nevertheless certain that he prayed immediately” (ed. Kleinhans, “Cossey,” p. 251). For his dismissal of settings adduced by Lyre and Trevet, and his preference for more general readings, see his remarks on Psalm 6: “Et dicit Lira quod Dauid in hoc psalmo petit misericordiam super diuinum offensam, quia iactanter contra legem iussit populum numerari absque dacione argenti quod daretur in usum tabernaculi testimonii in tali numeracione, sicut precipitit Exod. 30, propter quod Gad prophet ex precepto Domini dixit ei: Trium tibi datur opicio etc., Reg. 24, et Dauid dixit: Coartor nimis etc., quia
Further, as part of this compositional process, Cossey insists that David inevitably included some of his prophetic knowledge in his psalms, and especially prophecy of the life and death of Christ. As Theresa Gross-Diaz has noted, though he praises David’s prophetic foresight in his prologue, Lyre generally distinguishes between the text’s literal sense and its Christological prophecy, the major exceptions being those verses cited as prophetic in the New Testament. Likewise, echoing Aquinas, Trevet begins his commentary by declaring that his interest in the “literal or historical” meaning of the text sets him apart from earlier exegetes, who have exclusively explored its “prophetic or spiritual understanding.”

uidebat sequi penam horribilem super se et super populum occasione sui. Alii autem Hebrei et Triuet exponunt de Absalone filio suo, cuius persecutionem ut euaderet rogart in hoc psalmo Dei misericordiam, penitendo de peccato Bersabee, pro quo Deus sibi per Nathan dixerat quod semen suum surgeret contra eum. Sed quia non apparebatur magis in hoc psalmo mentione penitentiae quam facit pro uno peccato istorum quam pro alio, et quia psalmos composuit quando altissima pace feriabatur et expeditus erat ab omnibus bellis, magis uidetur quod penitendo de omnibus peccatis suis et ad Deo petendo uniam ediderit hunc psalmum, ut hoc pro victoria generaliter omnium hostium impotentem euadenda uel de ipsis hostibus obtinenda si qui insurgerent” – “And Lyre says that in this psalm David asks for mercy for having offended God, for, arrogantly and contrary to the law, he ordered the people to be counted without giving the silver that was to be given for the use of the tabernacle of the testimony in such counting, as is commanded in Exod. 30.16, on account of which the prophet Gad, acting at the Lord’s command, said to him: The choice of three things is given to you, 2 Reg. 24.12, and David said, I am in great distress, etc., for he saw that horrible punishment would follow for him and his people because of him. But other Hebrews and Trevet expound it as concerning Absalom his son, and in this psalm he asks for God’s mercy in order to evade Absalom’s persecution, repenting for the sin of Bathsheba, for which God had said to him through Nathan that his seed would rise against him. But since no mention appears in this psalm of the pence which he did for one or the other of these sins, and since he composed the psalms when he rested in most profound peace and was free from all wars, it seems more likely that he composed this psalm repenting for all his sins and seeking pardon from God, and this for victory generally in evading all enemies henceforth or obtaining [victory] over those same enemies if they rise up” (Ch, fols. 21v–22r; cf. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 13ra–b and Biblia sacra, III, sig. q1va–b).

74 Prol. 1.50–55, including the quotation of 2 Reg. 23.1 invoked in the examples from Psalms 29 and 50 below; see too the lengthy discussion of Davidic prophecy, essentially analyzing a quaestio presented in Lyre’s prologue, in Prol. 3.173–257.


76 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 116b: “Quia uero omnes prisci temporis doctores circa allegoriarum mysteria profunda perscrutanda toto studiis occupati, aut neglexerunt aut perfunctorie tetigerunt uelut abiecta testa, nuclei dulcedinem consequentes, postuluit a me uestra paternitas, ut quo clarius pateret spiritualis prophetiae intellectus qui litterae uelud basi ininititur, Psalterium expositione litterali et historica illustrarem” – “Since all the doctors of former times devoted their efforts wholly to studying the profound mysteries of allegories and therefore either neglected or gave
this distinction, suggesting that, since the literal sense includes the whole of its human author’s intended meaning, and since this author was a prophet, there is therefore every reason to think that at least some Davidic psalms could contain literal prophecy of Christ. At Psalm 50.8, for example, glossing the “incerta et occulta sapientiae Dei” revealed to David before his present spiritual blindness, Cossey echoes the definition of prophecy offered in his prologue, claiming that these things are “incerta hominibus et secundum naturam et humanum ingenium” – “uncertain to human beings with respect to nature and human intelligence,” and he maintains that the knowledge described here is specifically Christological: “Sibi enim erat constitutum prophetare de Christo Deo Iacob, sicut patet Reg. 23” – “For to him it was appointed to prophesy of Christ, the God of Jacob, as is clear in 2 Reg. 23.” Lyre, in contrast, had suggested that this verse could refer either to Christological prophecy or to the succession of David’s royal line, and Trevet insisted that it could only have to do with succession, which was an especially urgent concern, since the king’s son and heir, Solomon, had not yet been born.78 The limited sense of literalistic prophecy seen in Trevet’s approach to this verse – restricting what is being predicted to events before the birth of Christ – recurs throughout his and Lyre’s commentaries, for example, in their interpretation of Psalm 29 as prophesying the construction of the temple under Solomon (according to Lyre) or its restoration after the Babylonian captivity (according to Trevet). For Cossey, again drawing on the apparent reference to David’s Christological insights in 2 Reg. 23.1, if this psalm is to be understood as prophetic, then it should be read, in its literal sense, as referring to Christ.79

only perfunctory treatment to it [i.e., the literal meaning] like a lowly covering, seeking instead the sweetness of the kernel, you, father, have asked me to elucidate the Psalter with a literal and historical exposition, thereby making clearer the spiritual and prophetic understanding which rests upon the letter as though on a foundation.”

77 Ch, fol. 89r; cf. Prol. 3.177–183 and 291–295. The reference is to 2 Reg. 23.1.
78 Biblia sacra, III, sig. C1rb; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 93va.
79 Ch, fol. 41v: “De materia psalmi dicit Triuet quod est regraciatorius pro redivu de captiuitate Babilonica, et cantabatur in templi dedicacione, et sic tractat totum psalmum, et quod infra dicitur, Domine eduxisti ab inferno, exponit de ergastulo Babiloniorum. Sed si iste psalmus sit propheticus, sicut oportet secundum istam expositionem, et prophecia Daudid fuit de Christo maxime, sicut testatur 2 Regum 23, multo melius uidetur de Christo exponere ad literam” – “Concerning the subject matter of this psalm, Trevet says that it is an expression of thanks for the return from the Babylonian captivity, and it was sung in the dedication of the temple, and he treats the whole psalm accordingly, and what is said below (Ps 29.4), Lord, you have brought from hell, he expounds as concerning the prison of the Babylonians. But if this psalm is prophetic, as it must be according to this exposition, and David’s prophecy chiefly concerned Christ, as witnessed in 2 Reg. 23, it seems much better to expound it literally as concerning Christ.” Cf. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 23va–b; Biblia sacra, III, sig. v8va–b.
In this regard, Cossey could appear to be advocating a return to a way of reading the psalms more commonly attested in early scholastic commentaries, including the \textit{Magna glosatura}, where Christological prophecy is identified as the apparent meaning of the book as a whole.\footnote{For example, PL 191:57D: “Ea quippe quae alii prophetae obscure et quasi per aenigmata dixerunt de passione et resurrectione Christi, et aeterna genitura et de caeteris mysteriis, David prophetarum excellentissimus ita evidentissime aperuit, ut magis videatur evangelizare quam prophetare” – “Those things which other prophets said obscurely or as it were by means of enigmas concerning the passion and resurrection of Christ, and the eternal begetting and other mysteries, David, the most excellent of prophets, disclosed so plainly that he appears to write gospel more than prophecy.”} While these earlier sources consider the Psalter as principally prophetic, however, Cossey is insistent that this is only a secondary feature of the text. As he says in his prologues, the psalmists sometimes include prophetic content in their hymns of praise, but this is crucially different from claiming that they praise God in the course of writing prophecy.\footnote{Prol. 3.258–260; cf. Prol. 1.38–41.} Further, in a move without precedent in his sources, Cossey argues that not all of the psalms that appear to be prophetic are in fact indicative of their author’s gift of prophecy. In many cases, these authors were likely repeating prophecies passed down in other sources, refashioning this received knowledge into verse. To support this point, he turns to the \textit{Testamenta duodecim patriarcharum}, a pseudepigraphic text purporting to give the deathbed pronouncements of the sons of Jacob. As translated from its Greek version by Grosseteste, the Latin \textit{Testamenta} enjoyed considerable popularity in the fourteenth century, but Cossey seems to be the first exegete to put it to substantial use in a biblical commentary.\footnote{For the Latin text, see PG 2:1025–1160; for the manuscripts, see S. Harrison Thomson, \textit{The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln 1235–1253} (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 43–44. The translation is discussed by Marinus de Jonge, “Robert Grosseteste and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” \textit{Journal of Theological Studies} 42 (1991), 115–25, and its influence is explored by Henk Jan de Jonge, “Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon bis Richard Simon,” in \textit{Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation}, ed. Marinus de Jonge (Leiden, 1975), pp. 3–42 (though unfortunately skipping from Bacon to the sixteenth century), and, more recently, Ruth Nisse, \textit{Jacob’s Shipwreck: Diaspora, Translation, and Jewish-Christian Relations in Medieval England} (Ithaca, 2017), pp. 127–47.} Perhaps reflecting his familiarity with Bacon’s similar discussion of the text, Cossey draws attention to the \textit{Testamenta’s} various Christological prophecies, suggesting that, in its original form, this material would have been available to the different authors of the psalms, and that it could be the source of their apparently prophetic knowledge.\footnote{Prol. 3.299–422; cf. Bacon, \textit{Opus Maius}, II.xiv, ed. John Henry Bridges, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1897), 1:58–59.} Indeed, he extends this line of thinking to explain the \textit{Testamenta} itself, indicating that where the patriarchs describe what they have read in the book of Enoch, they are themselves acting as reporters of prophecy rather than
actually prophesying. Cossey is careful, however, to specify that psalms attributed to David contain Christological details that cannot be explained with reference to the Testamenta, making it clear that at least those portions of the Psalter are indeed prophetic, and he is therefore able to maintain both the possibility of literalistic prophecy in some psalms and the book’s composition by many different writers.

Dwelling on the Psalter’s mixed authorship, the avenues by which prophetic content came to be expressed in its verses, and the different ends for which the Psalms were written, Cossey’s prologues articulate a set of literalistic hermeneutic priorities that, though clearly responding to recent trends in scholastic exegesis, are specific to this biblical book, understood as an ancient and inspired collection of hymns. In Cossey’s view, other Christian Hebraists have not sufficiently recognized the unusual demands that the Psalter’s status as a versified compilation places on its interpreter, and he clearly thinks that his contemporaries have been led astray, either through an insufficiently rigorous study of Hebrew or because they have adopted interpretive methods leading to conclusions not supported by the text itself. As he writes toward the beginning of his gloss on Psalm 5, the curiosity of commentators leads them to try to extract as much meaning as possible from Scripture, but it would seem that this interpretive eagerness has not always been properly directed. Cossey thus presents an alternative to the scholastic commentator’s typical pose, recently described by Gilbert Dahan, as a humble worker seeking to add to the interpretive edifice begun by his predecessors. For Cossey, many of the bricks laid by recent exegetes need to be pulled up and cast away for the building to conform to its proper plan, and the terms used in his critique of Trevet in particular are startlingly harsh (e.g., “Que nugacio!”). Conjectures about compositional settings, doctrinaire readings that push prophecy off to the spiritual senses, vestigial attributions of anonymous psalms to David – all of these can only get in the way of an interpretation based on ancient and authoritative sources, the biblical text itself and the various para-biblical and patristic writings that cast light on its interpretation.

Clearing away these misleading glosses, Cossey offers his commentary as a new standard reference work of scholastic exegesis, providing as many details as possible of the Psalter’s Latin translation history, its original language, and a basic account of its literal meaning. Indeed, in his frequent and lengthy definitions of significant Hebrew

84 Prol. 3.335–336.
85 Prol. 3.422–424.
86 Ch, fol. 20v: “Ad curiositatem tamen expositorum pertinet elicere quantum possunt de litera” – “It pertains to the curiosity of expositors to draw as much as they can from the letter.”
87 Gilbert Dahan, Lire la bible au moyen âge: Essais d’herméneutique médiévale (Geneva, 2009), pp. 27–33.
88 Prol. 3.434.
words, as in the introduction to Hebrew prepositions and articles appended as an epilogue to the commentary, Cossey apparently sought to enable further work with the original language of the Psalms. If his detailed discussions of the text and its translations sometimes dwarf his relatively brief and straightforward interpretive offerings, as several of the examples discussed above indicate, this could be because he hoped that subsequent commentators would draw on the resources he had provided and offer more elaborate readings in keeping with his general view of the text. His work, like Trevet’s, was one of the many early fourteenth-century biblical commentaries overshadowed by the rapid and widespread success of Lyre’s literal postils, and Lyre’s more straightforward reporting of the Hebrew text and its Jewish interpretation – in contrast to Cossey’s expectation that his readers learn some Hebrew for themselves – may have further discouraged the use of the English Franciscan’s commentary. By holding potential readers to a standard which most seemed disinclined to attain, Cossey follows in the steps of Roger Bacon, and his ambitious and painstaking work is no less impressive for its lack of willing followers.

**Edition and Translation**

The four texts edited below are preserved uniquely in Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11 [= Ch], fols. 1r–3v, 4v–5r, 5v–13v, and 252r, respectively. The first three are prologues, presenting Cossey’s discussion of the Psalter’s four Aristotelian causes, followed by a consideration of other issues germane to the book as a whole; his glosses on Jerome’s preface to the Hebraicum translation; and finally a much longer discussion of ten introductory topics: the Psalter’s translation history, its authors, their intention, the work’s utility, its proper student, its subject matter, the order and mode in which it should be read, the part of philosophy to which it pertains, and its division into parts. Jerome’s Hebraicum preface is copied on fols. 3v–4v, and his shorter Gallican preface on fol. 5r, but neither of these has been included here. Finally, by introducing the reader to different Hebrew prepositions and articles, the “epilogue” on fol. 252r supplements the discussions of Hebrew vocabulary and grammar found throughout the commentary.

The present edition generally preserves the orthography of Ch, with the exception of the lower case “v” which is rendered as “u” throughout. All abbreviations are expanded silently, while punctuation, capitalization, and the division of the text into paragraphs are editorially imposed. The text has required relatively little emendation, with most corrections being obvious from context. Emended readings are included in the text, with the manuscript’s readings provided in the *apparatus criticus*; more conjectural emendations are explained in the notes to the edition. These are more

---

frequent in the epilogue than in the prologues, since the scribe seems to have been unfamiliar with the Hebrew characters encountered in his exemplar. Quotations of biblical *lemmata*, generally underlined in red ink in the manuscript, are given in italic, while other quotations are, where possible, set off in double quotation marks. However, Cossey’s habit of integrating phrases drawn from his major sources into his own sentences, shifting frequently between paraphrase and quotation, has made it seem unnecessarily cumbersome to indicate every verbatim borrowing in this way. The notes indicate Cossey’s sources, insofar as it has been possible to identify them, and they also preserve some marginalia that, as demonstrated above, are likely to be authorial. English translations of each text are given immediately after the Latin.
Prologue 1: On the Four Causes of the Psalms

Prophecie istius gradus aperte zampri in Hebreo dici potest, quod interpretatur “psalmus” uel “canticum meum.” Totum nempe quod Psalmista Deo inspirante concepit ut prophetando prediceret psallere uoluit et cum ympnis et canticis inspiratoris laudi tribuere, ut merito dici possit pro tocius libri continencia illud breue uerbum eiusdem libri, Nomini tuo psalmum dicam, in quibus uerbis quattuor genera causarum famosa istius prophecie uidentur expressa. Primum materialis cum dicitur psalmum. Vnde et “liber Psalmorum” uocatus est, nomen sortitus a materia, non ab efficiente causa sicut ceteri libri prophetarum, Ysaie, Ieremie, Danielis et ceterorum libri prophetarum ab ipsorum auctoribus nuncupati. Formalis vero causa eodem uocabulo uidetur expressa, id est psalmum. Modus enim tradendi istam propheciam non est simplici narracione, sed psalmodia et decantacione, ut duriora corda que uerbis non compunguntur modulacionis suauitate moueantur. Psalmus autem est ipsum canticum quod ad psalterium canitur. Psalmos igitur istos siue cantilenas litteraliter, id est secundum mentem ipsius cantoris Psalmiste, cuius mens litteralis est sensus meo iudicio, ut post patebit, cum Dei adiutorio uellem exponere. Conuenienter autem iste due cause, materialis et formalis, in eodem uocabulo designantur; nam et ipse simul uniri et coniunctim unum quiddam nate sunt facere.

Efficiens autem causa subdiuisio uocatur in uerbo diuidendi dicam, qui uel fuit solus Daudi, secundum Augustinum, 17 De ciuitate Dei capitulum 14, ubi dicit quod credibilibius existimant qui tribuunt operi ipsius Daudi omnes illos centum quinquaginta psalmos, uel fuit ipse Daudi una cum aliis auctoribus, secundum Ieronimum in prologo ad Suffronium. Qui istos doctores concor-

---

1 All citations of Psalms reflect the Gallican or LXX numbering, unless otherwise noted. According to Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, ed. Bonifatius Fischer et al., 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1975), 1:788, Cossey’s lemma is a variant of the verse, which more commonly appears as “Psalmum dicam nomini tuo.” (This edition will subsequently be cited as Vulgate, ed. Fischer et al. Significantly, then, Cossey’s lemma is favoured in the Hebrew-Latin Psalter manuscripts discussed above, e.g., Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.8.6, fol. 9va.)

2 Compare below, Prol. 3. 465–466.


4 Donatien de Bruyne, Préfaces de la bible latine (Namur, 1920), pp. 46–47; Vulgate, ed. Fischer et al., 1:768.
dare voluerit, dicit quod ipse David prophetando et instituendo ut canerentur auctor fuit omnium et singulorum. Cum enim psalmus dicatur quod in psalterio canitur, quamuis primo dicitur et eciam uoce cantetur, non adhuc psalmus uocatur. Auctor ergo omnium psalmorum dici potest, quia ipse causa extitit ut psalmi dicerentur et essent, sicut et Auicena dicitur canonis, cum tamen multa ibi aliorum operi tribuenda sint, et Aristoteles fatetur se ab aliis qui bene dixerunt accepiisse que [fol. 1v] tamen omnia eius operi tribuuntur. Si tamen aliquem istorum doctorum negare oporteat, senciendum est pocius cum Ieronimo in hiis que ad Hebraicam pertinent uritatem. Finalis uestro causa designatur cum premittitur nomini tuo, id est ad honorem nominis tui Deus. Vnde in Hebreo uocatur liber iste sephar talim, quod interpretatur secundum Ieronimum “uolumen ympnorum.” 5 Ympnus autem est carmen in laudem Dei editum. Vnde ympnus Grece “laus Dei” interpretatur. Hec est causa finalis, per quod patet quod totus iste liber non est propheticus, sed laudatorius (ut plurimi) et ympnidicus, sicut est ympnarium ecclesie iam catholice. Vnde mihi uidetur quod de omnibus istis centum quinquaginta psalmis quidam sunt simpliciter doctrinales, quidam prophetales, quidam querimoniales, quidam penitenciales, quidam deprecatorii et quidam increpatorii, quidam uero regraciatorii, quidam animatorii et quidam laudatorii. Quandoque enim in psalmo principaliter docere intendit et docet quid est humanum bonum, felicitas seu beatitudo, sicut psalmo primo describit beatum uirum et sibi oppositum, qui modus Scripture sacre uocatur a Junilio in suis Institutis simpliciter doctrinalis. 6 Sicut enim Christus in sermone quem dixit in monte describit uiros beatos pluraliter, hic Psalmista in primo psalmo describit in singulari beatum uirum, per quod patet ista beatitudo que ultimus finis dicitur a philosophis et bene actuum humanorum. Quandoque psalmus est principaliter prophetalis et hoc de Christo, sicut sunt multi. Quod enim aliqui psalmi ad litteram sint prophetici patet per uerba Dauid nouissima, Reg. 23: Dixit Dauid filius Ysai, dixit uir cui constitutum est de Christo Dei Iacob, egregius psaltes Israel, “Spiritus Domini locutus est per me et sermo eius per linguam meam.” 7 Quandoque enim de inimicis conqueritur dicens, Domine quid multiplicati sunt, etc. Quandoque de commissis conteritur: Domine ne in furore, Beati quorum, etc. Quandoque deprecatur pro se uel pro aliis, sicut pa-

---

5 Prol. ad Soph., in De Bruyne, Préfaces, p. 47; Vulgate, ed. Fischer et al., 1:768.
7 See the discussion above, pp. 312–13.
tet in diuersis psalmis. Quandoque imprecatur illis qui finaliter mali sunt penam et tormentum: *Deus laudem meam.*

Quandoque uero eos increpat et obiurgat: *Quid gloriaris in malicia.* Quandoque uero regraciatur et beneficia recitat: *Diligam te.* Quandoque uero semetipsum in periculis animat et [fol. 2r] confortat: *Dominus illuminacio.* Et quandoque, ymmo frequenter, eius magnificenciam extollit et laudat, sicut patebit. Ista decem in omnibus hiis principaliter continentur meo iudicio, quamuis multa istorum in psalmo eodem frequenter exprimantur et mixtim.

Habet iterum Psalmista in diuidendo hos psalmos decem loquendi modos, hinc inde permixtos. Modo enim loquitur Deo sed non de Deo, modo de Deo sed non Deo, modo Deo et de Deo. Item modo sibi ipsi loquitur, sed non de se, modo de se et non sibi, modo sibi et de se. Item quandoque loquitur homini alteri sed non de illo, modo de illo sed non illi, modo illi et de illo. Quandoque uero sic simpliciter loquitur et absolute, et in eodem psalmo hos modos hinc inde permiscet, sicut patet intuenti. Decem adhuc sunt nomina quibus apud Hebrewos nominatur Deus secundum Ieronimum ad Marcellam, scilicet *El, Eloyym, Eloie, Sabaoth, Elion, Eser eie, Adonay, Ya, Tetragramaton, Saday.*

Quibus nominibus decem et decem nominum istos psalmos Psalmista depromsit, et hoc in instrumento musicorum psalterio decem cordarum, in quo placuit ipsi Davide Deo psallere: *In psalterio,* inquit, *decem cordarum psallam tibi,* et hoc in memoriam decem preceptorum et ad internecionem decem bestiarum, sicut dicit Augustinus in libello de decem cordis. Et sunt ille decem bestie decem uicia seu decem demonis qui ipsis uiuis presunt, scilicet demon supersticionis, erroris, amoris seculi, impietatis, libidinis, crudelitatis, rapacitatis, falsitas, adulterine cogitationis, cupiditatis, que contraria sunt ipsis decem preceptis. Ad quarum bestiarum seu demonum necem et fugam

---

59 Ps. 108.2  ||  60 Ps. 51.3  ||  61 Ps. 17.2  ||  62 Ps. 26.1  ||  77–78 Cf. Ps. 143.9

59 *Deus laudem meam*] *add. Ch in marg.*  ||  60 *Quid ... malicia*] *add. Ch in marg.*  ||  61 *Diligam te*] *add. Ch in marg.*  ||  61 *et*] et *Ch*  ||  62 *Dominus illuminacio*] *add. Ch in marg.*

---

8 This and the following three illustrative examples are written by the main scribe in the margin and tied to the relevant point in the text with hairlines.


iste Psalmista psallebat. Sicut enim in antiquis fabulis poetarum legitur quod Orpheus uxorem suam Euridicem in talo a serpente vulneratam et mortuam et ad inferos iam deductam cum cithara est secutus ut eam ab inferis extraheret, et ibi ita dulciter citharizavit quod omnes dii infernales tanta dulcedine commoti ei Euridicem reddiderunt, ita [föl. 2v] fuit de isto citharedo animas a peccatorum infereris extrahente et psalmodie suavitatis fugante demonia. Item in isto libro sunt decem pentadecades psalmorum, id est decies quindecim; nam centum quinquaginta sunt decies quindecim. Pentadecas¹¹ uero propter mysterium ebdoaxis et ogdoaxis insinuat Novi Testamenti et Veteris continenciam. In quo tam Nouo quam Veteri Testamento mencio fit publica decem preceptorum, per quod patet quod quicquid in Scriptura sacra historialiter, doctrinaliter, prophetice et proerbialiter traditur, in hoc libro metrice et iyme nidice continetur. Adhuc cum quindecim sint conditiones caritatis quas numerat Apostolus, Cor. 13: *Caritas paciens est, benigna est*, etc.,¹² et in caritate tota lex pendat et prophete, constat quod decem psalmorum pentadecades ipsum decalogum in caritate diffusum et quicquid latet uel patet in diuinis sermonibus prefigurat.

Omnes siquidem psalmi metrice in Hebreo compositi et scripti sunt, secundum Ieronimum et Ysidorum, libro 6 Ethymologiarum,¹³ sed quo metro, utrum uidelicet iambico trimetro et tetrametro, sicut currunt committeri ymptni nostri, “Primo dierum omnium quo mundus extat conditus,”¹⁴ sicut pa-

---

¹¹ Note in margin: “De hoc in communi glosa” – “On this point, see the common gloss.” This could refer to the Glossa ordinaria, for which see Biblia sacra cum Glossa ordinaria nouisque additionibus, ed. François Feruardent (Venice, 1603), III, sig. o5vbe, but it more likely refers to the Lombard’s *Magna glosatura*, which offers a similar discussion (PL 191:55C–56C).

¹² In his prologue, Trevet cites the same verse to justify his division of the Psalter into, not ten groups of fifteen, but fifteen groups of ten (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fól. 2ra–b; Trevet may be following Aquinas, who divides each of the conventional quinquagenes into five groups of ten. On this structure, see Thomas Ryan, *Thomas Aquinas as Reader of the Psalms* (Notre Dame, 2000), pp. 20–28.


¹⁴ See *Analecta hymnica medii aevi* 51, ed. Clemens Blume (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 25–26, no. 23.
tet in commento Boecii, De consolatione, “O stelliferi conditor orbis,” dubitari posset, sed patet per Ieronimum, in prologo ad Paulinum, qui uocat ipsum Dauid Simonidem, Flaccum et Pindarum propter similia metra que in psalmis cecinit. Isti autem carmine lirico scripserunt. Liricum uocatur a uarietate secundum Papiam. Vnde non uno et eodem metro currunt omnes psalmi, sed sicut dicit Ysidorus, Ethimologiarum, libro 6, capitulo de scriptoribus et uocabulis sanctorum librorum, nunc alii iambico currunt, nunc alchaico personant, nunc saphico miscent trimetro uel tetrametro pede incedentes. Scito quod pedes uarii sunt, quod si a dissillabis usque ad exsasillabos conputentur centum uiginti quattuor, sed dissillabi tantum quattuor, trissillabi octo. Dissillabi ut pirichius qui ex duabus breuibus, cui contrarius est spondeus ex duabus longis, iambus ex breui et longa, cui contrarius est trocheus ex longa et breui. Iambicum ergo metrum est quod ex pedibus iambis constat dimetrum, trimetrum, [fol. 3r] uel tetrametrum, uel quia pes predominans in metro iambus est, exemplum in ympno illo “Primo dierum omnium,” ubi est metrum iambicum dimetrum continuum metrum. In hoc ergo metro ad minus duos habet pedes, dimetrum quattuor, trimetrum sex, tetrametrum octo. Alchaicum autem metrum uocatur quod Alcheus fecit et saphicum quod Sapho fecit. Saphicum autem metrum est quale est illud: “Vt queant laxis,” etc.

105 o stelliferi] constelliferi Ch

15 This is a citation of an unidentified gloss on Boethius, De consolatione, I m. 5. The comparison to the meter of “Primo dierum” does not appear in any of the Boethius commentaries I have investigated, which tend (correctly) to identify this metrum as an example of anapestic dimeter: see, e.g., Tretv’s influential gloss, ed. E.T. Silk, unpublished typescript, p. 199 (for which see my website: sites.trinity.edu/akraebel). Cossey’s anonymous citation may indicate that the work did not include an attribution. Though the major commentaries present discussions of meter, many ultimately deriving from Lupus of Ferrières, the use of a Latin hymn as an illustrative analogue is unusual, and it may reflect the unidentified commentary’s reliance on Bede, De arte metrica, I.21, ed. Calvin B. Kendall, CCSL 123A (Turnhout, 1975), pp. 135–36, who does adduce several hymns (though not “Primo dierum”) as examples of what Bede calls iambic tetrameter (more commonly, as later in this paragraph, called iambic dimeter), and the indirect dependence on Bede for this point could also explain Cossey’s apparent inconsistency in the labeling of this meter (dimeter vs. tetrameter).

16 See Hier., Ep. 53.8, ed. Hilberg, p. 461; used as a prologue to the Pentateuch; see De Bruyne, Préfaces, p. 6.

17 Papias, Elementarium, s.v. “lyrici poetae” (Venice: Andreas de Bonetis, 1485), sig. n8r.


19 See Analecta hymnica medii aevi 50, ed. Guido Maria Drexes (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 120–23, no. 96. The first line of this hymn, quoted further below, reads: “Vt queant laxis resonare fibris.”

Habuerunt autem psalmi decem auctores secundum Hebreos, scilicet Moysen, Dauid, Salomon, Asaph, Ethan, Idithun, Eman, filii Chore, Helcana, Abiathar. Sed Rabi Salomon numerat decem auctores, sed omittit Eman et Ethan et nominat Melchisedech et Abraham, quod “quia de Scripturis non habet auctoritatem,” etc. Conuenienter ergo cum decem essent in psalterio decem cordarum psallere potuerunt, et hoc denario nominum Domini. Omnia siquidem dicta decem nomina in Psalterio inueniuntur expressa, excepto scilicet Tetragramaton, Iehaue, quod cum frequenter modo quasi psalmo scri-

124 heroicum] cum Ch; heroici Ch || 126 pentametrum] pentat° Ch || 127 pentametrum] pentat° Ch || 143 Domini] dominorum Ch || 145 Tetragramaton Iehaue] Tetraiehaue Ch

---

21 See the discussion above, pp. 311–12.
23 Nicholas of Lyre offers the same contrast between Jerome’s list and Rashi’s (Biblia sacra, III, sig. o7ra), and it seems more likely that Cossey is responding to this intermediary (and affirming his support for Jerome’s position) than drawing on Rashi directly. Cf. Mayer Gruber, Rashi’s Commentary on Psalms (Leiden, 2004), p. 165.

\textsuperscript{153–154} Cf. Ps. 21.2 \textsuperscript{154–155} Cf. Ps. 7.12 \textsuperscript{155} Cf. Ps. 4.2 \textsuperscript{157} Ps. 23.10 \textsuperscript{158} Ps. 7.18 \textsuperscript{159} Ps. 1.1 \textsuperscript{160} Ps. 8.2 \textsuperscript{165–167} Ps. 90.1

\textsuperscript{148} perplexorum\textsuperscript{]} perplexcup Ch \textsuperscript{153 21} om. Ch \textsuperscript{154 meus\textsuperscript{2}} Domine Deus \textit{add. Ch} \textsuperscript{155} Eloe\textsuperscript{3} cum monhilche Ch \textsuperscript{156} interpretatur\textsuperscript{]} Dominus \textit{add. Ch a.c.}

\textbf{English Translation}

The degree of this prophecy can certainly be called \textit{zamiri} in Hebrew, which is translated “my psalm” or “my song,” for the divinely inspired Psalmist wished to sing whatever he thought to predict and prophesy, to offer it in hymns and songs to the praise of the inspirer. Rightly, then, can the contents of the whole book be conveyed

\textsuperscript{25} See Maimonides, \textit{Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum}, I.60 (Paris: Josse Bade, 1520), sig. c8v, corresponding to I.61 in modern editions.

\textsuperscript{26} This is an apparent confusion of \textit{beatus} (asher) with \textit{qui} (asher).
in this little phrase: *To your name will I say a psalm*. In these words, the well-known four categories of causes of this prophecy appear to be expressed. First, the material cause, when he says *psalm*. For this is called the “book of Psalms,” its name deriving from its subject matter rather than its efficient cause, as is the case with the other books of the prophets, those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and the books of the other prophets named after their authors. The formal cause appears to be expressed in the same word, i.e., *psalm*. For the mode in which this prophecy is conveyed is not by means of a simple narrative but rather by psalmody and singing, so that harder hearts which are not pricked by the words may be moved by the sweetness of the melody. A psalm is a song which is sung to the accompaniment of a psaltery. It is these psalms or songs, therefore, that I have sought to expound, with God’s help, after the intention of the singer or Psalmist, whose intention I judge to be their literal sense, as will later become clear. It is fitting for these two causes, the material and formal, to be denoted in the same word, for they themselves are likewise united and arise together to make a thing whole.

The efficient cause, however, may be picked out in the words *will I say*, and this was either David alone, according to Augustine, *City of God*, 17.14, where he says that the more credible opinion belongs to those who attribute all one hundred fifty psalms to the work of David himself, or it was David together with other authors, according to Jerome in the prologue to Sophronius. If someone wanted to reconcile these doctors, he could say that David was the author of each and every psalm insofar as he prophesied and commanded that they be sung. For since it is said that a psalm is what is sung on a psaltery, if it is first read aloud or even sung without accompaniment, it cannot be called a psalm. Therefore he can be called the author of all the psalms, since he caused the psalms to exist and be performed – just as Avicenna is called the author of the *Canon of Medicine*, even though many of the things in that text should be attributed to others, and Aristotle confesses that what, as a whole, is attributed to him was taken from others who had spoken well. Yet, if we must deny the claims of one of these doctors, we should come down on the side of Jerome in matters which pertain to the Hebrew language.

The final cause is denoted by the opening words, *to your name*, to the honour of your name, O God. So it is that in Hebrew this book is called *sefîr tehillîm*, which according to Jerome is translated “book of hymns.” A hymn is a song written in praise of God, and the Greek word *hymn* is translated “praise of God.” Insofar as this is the final cause, it is clear that this book as a whole is not prophetic but rather laudatory (as are many) and hymnidic, like the hymnal of the catholic Church. It seems to me, then, that of all of these one hundred and fifty psalms, some are straightforwardly didactic, some prophetic, some complaints, some penitential, some deprecatory and some reproving, some giving thanks, some rousing, and some laudatory. Sometimes in a psalm the primary intention is to teach, and it teaches human good, i.e., happiness or
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blessedness, just as the first psalm describes the blessed man and his opposite. In his Institutes, Junillus calls this mode of Scripture “straightforwardly didactic.” For just as Christ describes blessed men in the plural in the sermon he delivered on the mountain, here the Psalmist describes the blessed man in the singular in the first psalm, clearly expressing that beatitude which philosophers call the final end and the well-being of human actions. Sometimes a psalm is principally prophetic, and in particular about Christ, as are many of them. Indeed, the last words of David, 2 Reg. 23, make it clear that many psalms are literally prophetic: David the son of Jesse said, the man to whom it was appointed concerning the Christ of the God of Jacob, the preeminent Psalmist of Israel said, “The spirit of the Lord has spoken by me, and his word by my tongue.” Sometimes he complains about his enemies, saying, Lord, why are they multiplied, etc. Sometimes he expresses contrition for what he has done: Do not, O Lord, in your wrath, Blessed are they whose, etc. Sometimes he prays for himself or for others, as is apparent in various psalms. Sometimes he curses with punishment and torment those who are, finally, wicked: My praise, O God. Sometimes he rebukes and chides them: Why do you boast of wickedness. Sometimes he gives thanks and recalls what he has been given: I will love you. Sometimes he rouses and consoles himself amid dangers: The Lord is my light. Finally, sometimes – indeed, frequently – he extols and praises God’s magnificence, as will become clear. These ten may be found across the Psalter, in my opinion, though frequently several of them are mixed together and expressed in one and the same psalm.

Similarly, with regard to the classification of these psalms, the Psalmist had ten modes of speaking, often likewise intermixed. Sometimes he speaks to God but not about God, sometimes about God but not to God, sometimes to God and about God. Again, sometimes he speaks to himself but not about himself, sometimes about himself but not to himself, sometimes to himself and about himself. Again, sometimes he speaks to another person but not about that person, sometimes about him but not to him, sometimes to him and about him. Sometimes, finally, he speaks both simply and absolutely – and in one and the same psalm he mixes these modes together here and there, as is apparent to anyone paying attention. Furthermore, according to Jerome in his letter to Marcella, there are ten names for God among the Hebrews, i.e., El, Elohim, Eloah, Sabaoth, Elyon, Asher ehyeh, Adonai, Jah, the Tetragrammaton, and Shaddai. To these ten names and about these ten names the Psalmist uttered the psalms, and this on a psaltery, a musical instrument of ten cords, on which David himself took pleasure in singing psalms to God: On a psaltery of ten cords, he says, I will sing psalms to you – thereby memorializing the ten commandments and massacring the ten beasts, as Augustine says in his little book about the ten cords. Those ten beasts are the ten vices or the ten demons in control of those vices, i.e., the demon of superstition, of error, of love of the world, of impiety, of lust, of cruelty, of rapacity, of falseness, of impure thought, and of cupidity, and these are opposed to the ten
commandments. To kill these beasts or demons, or to put them to flight, the Psalmist sang his psalms. For in the ancient stories of the poets we read that, after Eurydice had been wounded on her ankle by a snake and died and already been led down to the underworld, Orpheus took up his harp and followed his wife to rescue her, and there in the underworld he played his harp so sweetly that all the infernal gods, moved by this uncommon sweetness, returned Eurydice to him. Likewise, by this harper, the Psalmist, souls were rescued from the underworld of their sins and demons were made to flee by the sweetness of his psalmody. Further, in this book there are ten “pentadecades” of psalms, i.e., ten groups of fifteen, for one hundred and fifty is ten times fifteen. A pentadecade, because of the mystery of the groupings of seven and eight, is suggestive of the contents of the New and Old Testament, and in both the New and Old Testament the ten commandments are openly proclaimed. And all of this makes it clear that whatever is conveyed in holy Scripture, whether historically, didactically, prophetically or proverbially, is also contained in this book, metrically and hymnidically. Furthermore, since the Apostle enumerates fifteen conditions of charity, 1 Cor. 13, Charity is patient, it is kind, etc., and since all the law and the prophets hang on charity, it follows that the ten pentadecades of the psalms prefigure the Decalogue diffused in charity, along with anything hidden or openly stated in the divine words.

All the psalms were composed and written metrically in Hebrew, according to Jerome and Isidore, Etymologies, Book 6, but it is unclear what that meter is, i.e., whether it could be iambic trimeter or tetrameter, the common meter of our hymns (e.g., “On this, the first of all the days, / When God the world’s foundation laid”), as is made clear in a commentary on Boethius, On the Consolation of Philosophy, “O founder of the star-filled heavens.” Still, in his prologue to Paulinus, Jerome makes it clear that they are indeed metrical, referring to David as Simonides, Horace, and Pindar on account of the similar meters which he sang in the psalms. All of these authors wrote lyric songs. According to Papias, “lyric” derives from a word meaning variety, and so it is that the psalms do not all run along in one and the same meter, but rather, as Isidore says, Etymologies, Book 6, in the chapter on the writers and names of holy books, now some of them run in iambic, now they resound in Alcaic, now they mix in a Sapphic, proceeding with a trimeter or tetrameter foot. Now, you should know that there are many different metrical feet – one hundred twenty four in total if you were to count from the disyllables to the hexasyllables – but there are only four disyllables and eight trisyllables. The disyllables include the pyrrhic (two short syllables) and its opposite the spondee (two long syllables), as well as the iamb (one short and one long syllable) and its opposite the trochee (one long and one short syllable). Iambic meter, therefore, whether dimeter, trimeter, or tetrameter, is either made up entirely of iambic feet or is a meter in which the iamb predominates, e.g., in the hymn “On this, the first of all the days,” where the meter is a continuous iambic
dimeter. In this meter, therefore, at the very least there are two feet, while dimeter has
four, trimeter six, and tetrameter eight. Alcaic meter takes its name from Alchaeus,
who made it, and Sapphic from its maker Sappho. An example of Sapphic meter is the
hymn “Now may with loosened,” which has a heroic period, i.e., the end of a heroic
(or hexameter) verse, as Jerome and Isidore say. A meter is Sapphic when the
preceding verses are concluded with this kind of ending and otherwise the meter is
dactylic pentameter: “pentameter” because each verse has five feet, the first a trochee
(“Now may”), the second a spondee, the third a dactyl, fourth a trochee, fifth another
trochee (“fibers”), and it is called “dactylic” from the preceding foot in the unequal
(i.e., third) position. From all this it is clear enough that the psalms do not run along
in Hebrew in the verse-forms which our versifiers call hexameters or pentameters, but
in various other meters and verse-forms. But is it not astonishing that the same David
who was chosen from the sheepfolds and afterwards, throughout his life, was kept
busy waging war, also knew how to compose in verse? Then again, even the laity know
how to versify in their mother tongue. Still, David was literate, for (as Isidore reports
in Book 6 of the Etymologies) the Hebrews say that David wrote the last part of the
book of Samuel, up to the end.

According to the Hebrews, the psalms had ten authors, i.e., Moses, David,
Solomon, Asaph, Ethan, Jeduthun, Heman, the sons of Korah, Elkanah, and Abiathar.
Rabbi Solomon also enumerates ten authors, but he omits Heman and Ethan and
instead names Melchizedek and Abraham, but “since this opinion does not have the
authority of the Scriptures,” etc. It is fitting, therefore, since there were ten of them,
that they were able to sing psalms on a ten-stringed psaltery, and this to the ten names
of the Lord. For all of the aforementioned ten names are found expressly stated in the
Psalter, except, that is, for the Tetragrammaton, Yahweh, which, although it is now
written frequently in almost every psalm, the Hebrews do not dare to say out loud,
except in the sanctuary in the priestly benediction and by the High Priest on the day
of fasting, as Rabbi Moses says in his Guide for the Doubting or Direction for the
Perplexed. But this practice was introduced by the Jews in error, for in truth that name
is not more worthy of silence than any other, and it does not appear to have been left
unsaid in the time of David, for the psalms could not be recited metrically if that name
were not pronounced where it is written. El, Elohim, Eloah: each one of these means
“God,” and they may be found throughout the psalms. El in Psalm 21, Eli, Eli, i.e., My
God, my God. Elohim, Psalm 7, near the middle, where it is written, Elohim saddiq, i.e.,
God is just. Eloah, Psalm 4, Elohe sidqi, i.e., O God of my justice. Sabaoth, which is
translated “of hosts,” appears clearly in Psalm 23, The Lord of hosts: he is the king of
glory. Elyon, translated “exalted,” Psalm 7, I will sing psalms to the name of the Lord most
high. At least one part of Asher ehyeh, translated “who is,” appears in the first psalm,
Blessed is the man. Adonai, translated “Lord,” Psalm 8, O Lord, our Lord. Jah, also
translated “Lord,” frequently appears in the titles and in the last psalms, in the word
Alleluia. The Tetragrammaton is not a name of God but rather a name for the name Yahweh, which appears more frequently than any other and is ineffable, and no one knows its meaning. Finally, Shaddai, translated “almighty” and “powerful,” Psalm 90, He who dwells in the aid of the most high, where we have will abide in the protection of the God of heaven, which in Hebrew is will remain in the shadow of Shaddai, dwelling in the hiding place of Elyon, i.e., of the most high. May he indeed grant that we dwell and remain there, who lives and reigns, etc. Amen.

Prologue 2: Glosses on Jerome’s Hebraicum Preface

Nota¹ quod Ieronimus binomius fuit: vocabatur Eusebius. Vnde Valerius Maximus, libro 10,² dicit quod mos Romanorum erat aliorum nomina suis preponere quandoque amoris uel honoris alia uel alia de causa, sed pueris non antequam uirem togam acciperent imponebantur, puellis non antequam nuberent, uocaturque illud quod sic preponitur “prenomen” et illud quod sequitur, Ieronimus, “nomen,” et tercium, si adhuc adderetur, diceretur “cognomen.”

Prima decisio per fiat fiat est psalmo 40, Beatus qui intelligit, secunda psalmo 71, Deus iudicium tuum, tercia psalmo 88, Misericordias Domini, quarta psalmo 105, Confitemini secundum, et durat usque ad finem, sed finis non est per fiat fiat, sed cal hanesama te halleluya, id est omnis anima laudet Dominum.³

¹ Note in margin: “Ieronimus binomius erat” – “Jerome had two names.”
² Valerius Maximus, De factis dictisque, 10.3 (i.e., the Julius Paris epitome), ed. Karl Kempf (Leipzig, 1888), p. 589.
³ There is a note in the lower margin, not tied to this point in the text but clearly related to the foregoing discussion: “Nota tamen quod Ieronimus in epistola sua ad Marcellam etc., 99, dicit sic: Septuaginta senocto [sic for “genoito”], id est fiat. Vnde et in fine librorum (in quinque siguqem volumina Psalterium apud Hebreos diuisum est) fiat fiat transtulerunt, quod in Hebreo legitur amen amen. Hic ibi. Item Ieronimus, epistola 119, et est ad Marcellam, dicit sic: Cum hora ferme tercia Hodierne diei, septuagesimum secundum psalmum, id est terci libri principium, legere cepissemus, et docere cogemerum tituli ipsius partem ad finem secundi libri partem ad principium terci libri pertinere, etc.” – “Note, however, that in his letter 99 [= 26] to Marcella, etc., Jerome says thus: ‘The Septuagint reads génoito, i.e., so be it. For this reason at the end of books – and indeed among the Hebrews the Psalter is divided into five volumes – they write out so be it, so be it, which in Hebrew is amen amen.’ This is what he says here. Likewise,
Potest autem prologus iste diuidi in nouem partes, in quarum prima
premittit consuetam salutacionis caritatem, Eusebius, etc., secundo ostendit
huius uoluminis unitatem, Scio quosdam, tercio eiusdem auctoritatem, Psalmos
quoque, quarto sue translacionis neccessitatem, Quia ergo, quinto ostendit sue
translacionis veritatem, Certe confidenter, sexto redarguit emulorum
peruersitatem, Nunc cum, septimo ostendit sui laboris utilitatem, Nec hoc dico,
ubi primo ostendit quod non facit hoc propter deprauacionem priorum, sed ad
satisfaciendum calumpnie Iudeorum et respondendum, octauo ostendit quod
in his sibi prestat solamen et iocunditatem, Quod si opusculum, ultimo
conclusiue recommendacionis congruitatem, Vale. Et nota hic, parte septima,
quod Ieronimus innuit quod nollet quod translacio sua in ecclesis
Christianorum cantaretur, nec hoc intendebat sed dare uiam respondendi
Iudeis.

Item nota secundum translacionem septuaginta interpretum, que facta fuit
de Hebroe in Grecum, quos Augustinus putat [fol. Sr] in diuersis cellis fuisse et
quasi miraculo in unum concordasse, sed Ieronimus uult, sicut patet in
prologo ad Desiderium, quod in una basilica congregati contulerunt
adiniucem et non prophetabant. Erant enim Iudei ex omni tribu sex electi et in
summa septuaginta duo, sed dicit Magister Historiarum quod de paruo
numero Scriptura non facit curam, et ideo illi duo cum septuaginta non
nominantur, uel forte illi duo aliis in percameno et incausto et in alii
necessariis seruiebant. Isti ad peticionem Philadelfi regis Egipti missi a summo
sacerdote Iudeorum Eleazaro transtulerunt, fuitque translacio eorum lecta et
approbata ab omnibus Iudeis qui Alexandrie erant utriusque lingue, Hebrew
scilicet et Grece, periti.

in his letter 119 [= 23], which is also to Marcella, Jerome says thus: “Today, at about the third
hour, when we were beginning to read Ps. 72, i.e., the first psalm of the third book, and when
we were compelled to teach how in part its title pertained to the end of the second book and in
part to the beginning of the third book,” etc.” The two quotations come from Hier., Ep. 36.4
and Ep. 23.1, ed. Hilberg, pp. 222 and 211.

4 Note in margin: “Diuisio istius prologi” – “This prologue’s division.”
5 Note in margin: “Ieronimus nollet quod sua translatio in ecclesia legeretur” – “Jerome would
not have wanted his translation to be read in church,” i.e., in the liturgy.
7 De Bruyne, Préfaces, p. 8; Vulgate, ed. Fischer et al., 1:3–4.
8 No such remark appears in Peter Comestor’s Historia scholastica, but compare below,
Profil.3.19–20.
English Translation

Jerome had two names, the other being Eusebius. Valerius Maximus, 10.3, says that it was Roman custom for the names of others to be added before one’s own, whether out of love or honour or some other cause, but they were not bestowed on boys before they received the toga of manhood or on girls before they were married, and this added name was called the “prename” and what followed, Jerome, the “name,” and, if a third was added, it was called the “surname.”

The first break caused by so be it, so be it occurs at the end of Psalm 40, Blessed is he who understands, the second Psalm 71, Your judgment, O God, the third Psalm 88, The mercies of the Lord, the fourth Psalm 105, the second psalm beginning, Acknowledge, and this section persists to the end, but the whole text does not end with so be it, so be it, but rather with kol hannesamah te hallelujah, i.e., let every soul praise the Lord.

This prologue can be divided into nine parts, the first of which begins with the customary expression of charity in the salutation, Eusebius, etc., secondly he demonstrates the unity of this volume, I know some, thirdly its authority, The Psalms likewise, fourthly the necessity of its translation, Since therefore, fifthly he demonstrates the trustworthiness of his translation, Truly, confidently, sixthly he refutes the perversity of the envious, Now when, seventhly he demonstrates the utility of his undertaking, Neither do I say this, first demonstrating that he does not do this on account of the corruption of earlier translations but to satisfy and respond to the false accusations of the Jews, eighthly he demonstrates that these efforts bring him comfort and joy, But if this little work, and finally, in conclusion, the appropriate commendation, Farewell. And note that, in the seventh part, Jerome indicates that he would not have wanted his translation to be sung in Christian churches, and that this was not his intention, but rather to provide a way to respond to the Jews.

Further, with respect to the version made by the seventy translators, which was rendered from Hebrew into Greek, note that Augustine thinks they were in different cells and, as though miraculously, they all agreed on one text, but, as is clear in the prologue to Desiderius, Jerome prefers to think that they were gathered together in a single hall and collaborated in their work, and that they did not prophesy. Six Jews were chosen from each tribe, adding up to seventy-two in total. The Master of Histories says that Scripture does not bother with small numbers, and therefore two of them are not named along with the other seventy. Alternatively, perhaps those two served the others, providing parchment, ink, and other necessities. These men prepared their translation at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the King of Egypt, a petition he sent to Eleazar, High Priest of the Jews, and their translation was read and approved by all the Alexandrian Jews who were learned in both languages, i.e., Hebrew and Greek.
Prologue 3: Notes on the Psalter, Its Composition, and Interpretation

Beatus uir. Quia sanctus Franciscus in regula sua suis fratribus officium divinum in iungens secundum usum curie Romane exceptit Psalterium, per hoc manifeste preponens commune Psalterium, ideo circa eius expositionem insistam de capite meo nichil asserturus nisi quod sancti patres et catholice consonat veritate. Sunt autem in psalmis decem inquirendae, scilicet quod nomen interpretis, quod nomen auctoris, intencion auctoris, utilitas operis, titulus operis, conveniens discipulus, que materia, quis ordo legendi et modus, ad quam (si ad aliam) partem philosophie spectet, et tandem diuisio libri in partes, etc.

De primo uidendum est utrum translacio Septuaginta sit illa que “ulgata” uocatur, sicut Triuet dicit, et pro se allegat Augustinus, 18 De ciuitate Dei, quod ipse uelit translacionem Septuaginta ideo uocari “ulgatam,” quia “tam communis fuerit eius usus, ut multi an aliqua alia esset penitus ignorarent.”

Certum est quod, libro 16 capitulo 10.4, dicit uulgatam edicionem esse translacionem Septuaginta et eam sic exponit. Sed miror uel de ignorancia uel non aduertencia huius senis, ut enim auctoritatem Ysidori, Ethimologicarum, libro 6, capitulo de interpretibus, taceam, et libro 5 de etatibus, ubi breuiter signat quibus temporibus interpretes fuerunt – et proprie qui eadem uerba dicit – et Magistri Historiarum, cito post principium, qui omnes edicionem quinsum “ulgatam” dicunt appellari, quia auctor eius ignoratur. Probo per ipsummet Augustinum, qui cum hiis concordat et non contradicit, libro 18 capitulo 43, qui c. 42 dicit quod septuaginta duo erant interpretes, de singulis tribubus seni utriusque lingue, Hebreu scilicet et Grece, doctissimi, missi ab 8 philosophie] prophecie Ch | 19 Historiarum] Sentenciarum Ch | 21 Augustinum] Augustinus Ch | 22 43] 44 Ch; 42] 43 Ch; septuaginta duo] 72 72 Ch a.c. | 23 Grece] Latine Ch

6 Note in margin: “Quare dicitur edicio uulgata” – “Why it is called the common version.”
Eleazaro summo sacerdote Iudeorum ad Phtolomeum regem Egipti, quorum interpretacio, ut Septuaginta uocetur, iam optimuit consuetudo. Et post: “Nam cum fuerint alii interpretetes qui ex Hebrea lingua in Grecam sacra eloquia transtulerunt, sicut Aquila, Simachus, et Theodocion, sicut est eciam illa interpretacio cuius auctor non appareit et ob hoc sine nomine interpretis quarta uel quinta edicio” (quarta, inquam, post Christum, sed quinta post Septuaginta) “nuncupatur, hanc tamen que Septuaginta est tanquam sola est sic recipit Ecclesia, eaque utuntur [fol. 6r] Greci populi Christiani, quorum plurique utrum alia sit aliquam ignorant.”

Patet quod non uocat translacionem Septuaginta “uulgatam,” sed que dicatur “uulgata” non expressit. Sed alii omnes et ipse Ieronimus illam quintam edicionem, cuius auctor ignoratur, uocari “uulgatam” manifestant. Vlterius est aduertendum quod de Hebreo in Grecum sextam et septimam edicionem Origenes fecit et cum ceteris edicionibus comparauit. Octauam uero Ieronimus de Hebreo in Latinum, quam editionem Suffronius de Latino uertit in Grecum. Latinorum autem interpretum, qui de Greco in nostrum eloquium transtulerunt, nomina et numerus ignorantur, sicut dicit Augustinus, libro 2 De doctrina christiana. Quiscumque enim primis Ecclesie temporibus utriusque lingue, Grece scilicet et Latine, periciam habuit, ausus est transferre, propter quod nimia est littere confusio introducta. Verumptamen ipsius Psalterii Latinos interpretes enumerat beatus Ieronimus in epistola quadam ad beatum Augustinum, ubi sic dicit:


31 populi] et add. Ch  ||  42 est\(^2\) ] littera add. Ch a.c

---

9 Note in margin: “Et est epistola 24, sed nota quod ibi accipit interpretes, id est expositores, quod patet per antecedencia et illa que secuntur” – “And it is Letter 24 [= 112]: but note that he does not approve of these interpreters, i.e., expositors, which is clear enough from what comes before and what follows.”
10 Hier., Ep. 112.20, ed. Hilberg, p. 390.4–12.
Omnia ista dubitacionem augent que sit ista translacio super quam fuerit glosa, qua et singule fere Latinorum utuntur ecclesie, qua et sanctus Franciscus uti uoluit fratres suos et non Psalterio uso Romano.

Et dicit Triuet quod Ieronimus translacionem Septuaginta, ut pura erat, de Greco uertit in Latinum, sed postea, cum hec translacio esset uiciata, interpellantibus Paula et Eustochio iterum Psalterium de Greco transtulit in Latinum, sed Origenis imitatus est studium, scilicet asteriscos et obelos. Et circa litteram istarum duarum [fol. 6v] translacionum tota antiquorum desudauit intencio, inter quos Septuaginta simplicem translacionem, que prior erat, Senator Cassiodorus exponit, commixtam uero, que secunda erat, beatus Augustinus edisserit.\(^{11}\) Sed miror quod iste “translacionem” uocat quam ipse Ieronimus non “translacionem,” sed “correccionem” appellat. Ait enim in prefacione super Psalterium, a qua iste accepit:

Psalterium Rome dudum positus emendaueram et iuxta Septuaginta interpretes magna illud ex parte correxeram, quod quia rursum uidetis, O Paula et Eustochium, scriptorum uicio deprauatum plusque antiquum errorem quam nouam emendacionem ualere, cogitis, etc.

Et post:

Notet igitur unusquisque uel iacentem lineam uel signa radiancia, id est obelos uel asteriscos, et ubicumque uiderit uirgulam precedentem ab ea usque ad duo puncta que impressimus sciat in Septuaginta translatoribus plus haberi. Vbi autem similitudinem stelle perspexerit de Hebreis uoluminibus additum nouerit.\(^{12}\)

Patet igitur quod non fuerunt nisi due emendaciones secundum eum, non translaciones. Et dicit Triuet (et Lira) quod Psalterium prime translacionis est in usu ecclesie Romane usque in presens, secunde uero translacionis Psalterium Damasus Papa in ecclesiis Gallicanis decantari instituit.\(^{13}\) Sed hec secunda, ex quo continebat talia signa (quorum uno, obelis, superflua iugulabantur, et asteriscis que superflua ibidem scribebantur), non potuit

\(^{55}\) uso \[ su\] Ch \[ || \] \(^{59}\) Origenis \[ ] Origenes Ch; scilicet \[ ] om. Ch; \(^{60}\) \[ asteriscos \] astericos Ch \[ || \] \(^{68}\) antiquum \[ ] antiquum Ch \[ || \] \(^{72}\) asteriscos \[ ] astericos Ch \[ || \] \(^{81}\) et asteriscis \[ ] ut asserit Ch

\(^{11}\) Trevet, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. ep. (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 1rb), omitting some material.


\(^{13}\) Trevet, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. ep. (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 1rb); Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3aC).
conuenierter nec debuit decantari, quin oporteret illa superflua decantare, nec fiebat illa emendacio nisi ad differentiam duarum translationum Septuaginta et Origenis cognoscendam.


15 Apparently referring to the “et” between “tua” and “laudabimus” in the Hebraicum.
constat de Greca translacione Septuaginta in Latinam linguam esse translatum et a Ieronimo emendatum.

Beatus Ieronimus, ut dicit Nicholaus de Lira, ter transtulit Psalterium, primo secundum Septuaginta interpretes, quod dicitur Psalterium Romanum eo quod ecclesia beati Petri illo utitur. Secundo fecit aliam translacionem non multum differentem a prima, sed plus appropinquantem Hebraico, et uocatitur Psalterium Gallicanum eo quod Damasus Papa precepit in Gallia cantari, quo et Fratres Minores utuntur. Tercio ad preces Suffronii, etc.\(^\text{16}\) Iste concordat cum Triuet, et contra eum sunt eadem argumenta, et scito quod isto Psalterio Gallicano, quod est pure secundum translacionem Septuaginta, utitur quasi totum residuum Ecclesie, excepta curia Romana et quibusdam abbathii. Et istum errorem acceperunt a cronica Martini, qui de Damaso Papa dicit quod Romanum Psalterium est secundum translacionem Septuaginta, quod Ieronimus primo emendauit.\(^\text{17}\)

Quid autem sit nomen auctoris uel auctorum Psalmorum? Quamuis secundum Ieronimum teneamus quod illi fuerunt auctores qui nominantur in titulis, sunt tamen psalmi uel carentes titulis uel saltem ubi nullius nomen exprimitur. Dubium est qui auctores eorum sunt. Et dicitur in quadam prefacione super Psalterium (nescio cuius sit) quod nouem psalmos fecit ipse Daud, et triginta duo non sunt suprascripti, septuaginta duo in Daud et in Asaph uiginti duo et duo in Ydithun, nouem filiiis Chore, unus Moysi, duo in Salomonem, duo in Aggeum et Zachariam. Fuerunt itaque omnes Psalmi Daud numero centum quinquaginta. Cui et ego dico quod hic mala sit calculatio. Nouem enim et triginta duo et septuaginta duo et uiginti duo et duo, [fol. 7v] nouem, unus, duo et duo faciunt centum quinquaginta unus. Item unde habet quod “nouem fecit ipse Daud,” cum multo plures sibi ascribantur in titulis hoc modo, psalmus seu cantus uel canticum Daud, sicut patebit et patet intuenti? Item cum Ieronimus in epistola sua ad Suffronium dicat et nominet Eman unum de auctoribus,\(^\text{18}\) da aliquem psalmum sibi et tunc plures erunt quam centum quinquaginta unus, uel aliquem de istis quem alii dedisti auferes et sic sibi

\(^{118}\) appropinquantem \(\mid\) apropinquantem Ch \(\mid\) 119 eo] om. Ch

\(^{16}\) Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3vaC).

\(^{17}\) Martin of Opava, \textit{Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum}, ed. Ludwig Weiland, MGH SS 22 (Hanover, 1877), p. 417,7–10. This paragraph (lines 115–126) is found after line 172 in Ch; for the rationale for moving it here, see above, pp. 306–7.

\(^{18}\) De Bruyne, \textit{Préfaces}, p. 46; Vulgate, ed. Fischer et al., 1:768.

Quare ergo ipsi Ethan nullum psalmum ascribitur? Illa autem prefacio talis est:


143 Ps. 87.2, Ps. 87.1  ||  144 Ps. 88.1

143 Psalmus | Psalmum Ch  ||  144 intellectus | ipsi Ch  ||  148 percuciebat | percuciebant Ch  ||  154 subclamantes | suos clamantes Ch  ||  158 uitulis | uituli Ch  ||  160 surprascripti | scripti Ch  ||  161 in Asaph duo | om. Ch  ||  163 dia-psalmata | diaplasmo Ch

19 De Bruyne, *Préfaces*, pp. 43a–44a. On this preface, and Cossey’s decision to gloss and quote it, see above, pp. 293 and 297–299.
Et quia Dauid expressissime de Christo prophetat, dubitari potest utrum ipse fuerit maior et eximius omnium prophetarum, sicut uocatur in glosa Cassiodori.\textsuperscript{20} Et quid sit prophecia declarat Iunilius dicens: “Prophecia est rerum latencium preteritarum, presentium, et futurarum ex diuina inspiracione manifestacio,”\textsuperscript{21} et uide ibi septem genera propheticarum. Intelligenda est autemlatencia ista illi cui fit revelatio quantum ad humanam investigacionem, sicut inferius est dictum.\textsuperscript{22} Cogitacio enim Simonis Magi bene erat sibi ipsi nota per naturalem experienciam, sed Petro per revelacionem, Act. 8, \textit{In felle amaritudinis uideo te esse}. Similiter quod Giezi puer Elisei accepit munera, Reg. 4 c. 5, notum erat sensibiliter ipsis Naaman et alii qui circumstabant, sed ipsi Elizeo per inspiracionem. Prophecia autem de preterito sicut Moyses prophetauit creacionem mundi, sicut dicit Gregorius super Ezechielem.\textsuperscript{23}

Est eciam scindendum quod proprae non est prophecia nisi intelligat illud quod propheteando dicit.\textsuperscript{24} Vnde qui modo prophete dicuntur olim “uidentes” uocabantur, quia uidebant intelligendo ea que prophetabant. Verumtamen in Scriptura quandoque quamuis non inteligat prophetare dicitur dummodo ad instinctum Spiritus sancti uerba proferat, quorum alium intellectum habet quam Spiritus sanctus habeat, sicut Caiphas, Ioh. 11, \textit{Expedit uobis}, etc. Intellexit enim quod expediens erat quod Christus quamuis innocens moreretur, ne occasione ipsius [fol. 8v] uenirent Romani, etc.\textsuperscript{25} Ille igitur gradus prophecie est excellencior, cuius ceteris paribus est intelligencia clarior, dum tamen prophecie limites non excedat, sicut dicit Lira, quia semper prophecia debet esse enigmatica. Vnde uisio diuine essencie excludit actum.

\textbf{181} Act. 8.23 \textbf{||} \textbf{191} Ioh. 11.50

\begin{itemize}
\item[175] Iunilius] Papa Damasus Ch \textbf{||} \textbf{179} inferius est] superius fuit Ch
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{20} Peter Lombard, \textit{Magna glosatura}, prol., PL 191:55A.
\textsuperscript{22} See below, Prol.3.291–295.
\textsuperscript{24} A similar point is made by Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3raA). Much of this discussion draws on and responds to the \textit{quaestio} on prophecy that concludes Lyre’s prologue.
\textsuperscript{25} Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3raA), who goes on to conclude that Caiphas therefore “non fuit propheta proprie loquendo.”
propheciae.\textsuperscript{26} Contra: tunc Christus non fuisset uerus propheta, cuius oppositum tota Scriptura testatur. Item, Num. 12, Deus ipse uolens preferre propheciam Moysi dicit: \textit{Si quis fuerit propheta in uisione apparebo ei uel per sompnum, at non talis seruus meus Moyses. Ore enim ad os loquir et palam non per enigmata et figuras Dominum uidet.}

Sunt autem quattuor gradus propheciae. Primus quando cum uisione alicuius signi datur uisionis intelligencia, sicut Jeremias uidit \textit{ollam succensam a facie aquilonis}, per quod lexiit exercitum regis Babilonis uenturum ad conburendum ciuitatem. Secundus gradus est per auditum alicuius uocis absque figura, Reg. 3, de Samuele, et iste est excellencior quam primus secundum Liram.\textsuperscript{27} Contra: uoces magis sunt faciles ad exprimendum ueritates quam alia signa, sed si per alia signa et uisiones reueletur sibi sine uoce ita clare uel clarius sicut per uoces, maioris excellencie uidetur esse. Quod enim prophete fallantur per uoces auditas in Iona et Niniue. Visus eciam nobilior est sensus et magis cognoscituus quam auditus, id est metafisice. Tercius gradus quando cum uoce apparat aliqua persona loquens, ut aliquis homo sanctus, Mach. 15, uel angelus, sicut frequenter in Scriptura, aut effigies representans ipsum Deum, sicut Ysa. 6. Et hoc uel in sompnis uel in uigiliis, et tunc est excellencior gradus illo qui fit in sompnis uel in raptu uel extasi, ubi protunc non est usus sensuum exteriorum.\textsuperscript{28} Contra: tunc excellencior esset uisio Moysi quam uidit in rubo uisione Pauli quam habuit in raptu. Quartus gradus est, quando sine apparicione alicuius figure uel signi sensibilis capitur uritas intelligibils de occultis per diuinam reuelacionem, quo modo reuelacio facta est ipsi Dauid, sicut dicitur in principio glose communis.\textsuperscript{29} Et iste ergo gradus est excellencior predictis, sicut ille diceretur melioris ingenii qui caperet scienciam conclusionum geometricalium sine descripcione figurarum quam ille qui sine talibus capere non posset.\textsuperscript{30} [fol. 9r] Contra: illa anima magis perficitur cognicione que perficitur quoad intellectum equali cogitacione et quoad

\textsuperscript{26} Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3rbF).

\textsuperscript{27} Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3raB).

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3raC–o3rbD).

\textsuperscript{29} Possibly \textit{Glossa ordinaria in Pss.}, prol. (\textit{Biblia Sacra}, III, sig. o5vaC), but more likely Peter Lombard, \textit{Magna glosatura}, prol., PL 191:58CD.

\textsuperscript{30} Nicholas of Lyre, \textit{In Pss.}, praef. (\textit{Biblia sacra}, III, sig. o3rbD).
sensum et ymaginem suis propris cogitacionibus, qua non perficitur alia anima. Hinc enim maius gaudium habebit anima in celo resumpto corpore quam modo habeat, quia tunc corporaliter sensibus corporalibus perficietur. Si ergo Moyses ostensio sibi rubo ardente cognosceret reuolutione Spiritus sancti Virginem parituram ita clare sicut unus alius sine tali ostensione, non propter hoc esset gradu cognicionis eius imperfeccior, sed perfeccior pocius, quia cognosceret rem et figuram eius, alius autem cognosceret rem tantum.

Vnde ualde difficile est homini cognoscere quis prophecie gradus perfeccior sit, et ualde difficilius quis prophetarum habuerit illum gradum post Christum. Et dicit Lira quod Dauid non fuit perfeccior propheta quam apostoli, quia ipsi plenius acceperunt graciam Spiritus sancti. 31 Sanctus Thomas de Alquino, secunda secunde, dicit quod Moyzes eciam propheta fuit perfeccior, eo quod uidit diuinam essenciam in presenti uita, secundum quod dicit Augustinus, De uidento Deum. 32 Maiora eciam signa et mirabilia fecit Moyses, et prophetauit communi populo Iudeorum. Sed si racio sua ualeret, sequitur quod Moyzes fuit perfeccior propheta quam apostolus qui uiderat diuinam essenciam, quod tamen ipse negat ibidem. 33 Similiter Iohannes Baptistai non fecit multa signa, sicut patet Ioh. 10, et tamen ipse concedit quod fuit maior propheta quam Moyses. 34 Item quamuis apostoli fuerunt uiri perfecciores, quia et uiderunt corporaliter Messiam et alia de quibus Dauid prophetauerat, non propter hoc sequitur quod fuerunt perfectiores prophete, nec quod habuerunt perfecciorem gradum prophecie, ymmo raro leguntur prophetasse, nisi Iohannes in Apocalipsis.

Dico ergo quod propheta excellit prophetam uel propter maiorem certitudinem et euidenciam rerum sibi reuelatarum, uel propter maiorem dignitatem rerum ipsarum, uel maiorem multitudinem reuelatorum, uel propter

---

31 Nicholas of Lyre, In Pss., praef. (Biblia sacra, III, sig. o3rBf).
33 Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae 2a2ae, 174, 6, arg. 3, quoted by way of Nicholas of Lyre, In Pss., praef. (Biblia sacra, III, o3vA).
34 Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae 2a2a, 174, 4, ad 3, quoted by way of Nicholas of Lyre, In Pss., praef. (Biblia sacra, III, o3vA).
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concursum omnium istorum, et iste est perfectissimus gradus, qui excellit in omnibus istis. Sed quando unus propheta excellit in uno et alius in alio, quis est perfectissimus gradus difficile est dicere, nisi Deus reuelet, et quia omnes prophete in celo sunt unanesme de eorum excellenciis, non disputemus in terris. Tamen Dauid potest dici “prophetarum eximius” qui suo tempore prophetabant secum, uel eciam quia rex erat, uel quia suam propheciam metrice et ympnidice concinabat, uel alis de causis quas Deus nouit. [fol. 9v]

De intencione istorum auctorum michi uidetur quod principaliter intendunt laudare Deum, et ubi quidem ex intencione prophetant, finaliter magis intendunt prophetando laudare quam prophetare, quod et ipsum nomen ostendit, secundum Ieronimum de musicis instrumentis ad Dardanum: “Psalterium quoque nabulum Hebraice, Grece autem psalterium, Latine dicitur laudatorium, de quo in 54 psalmo dicitur, Consurge psalterium et cithara.” Ista autem intencio magis declarabitur in processu.

Vtilitas uero huius operis quanta sit difficile est explicare. Habet enim utilitatem euangelice doctrine et uere ac manifeste de Christo prophecie, contricionis et penitencie, deuote oracionis et divinae laudis. Quam bonum quantus fructus est istorum operacionum.


Sed quid est prophecia? Dicit Cassiodorus quod est inspiracio uel reuelacio diuina rerum euentus immobili ueritate denuncians. Vnde prophecia “uisio,”

263 Ps. 56.9

262 quoque] quod Ch || 277 antonomastice] antonomatice Ch

35 Peter Lombard, Magna glosatura, PL 191:55A.
36 Ps.-Jerome, Ep. 23.8, PL 30:215A, following the letter’s citation of Ps. 56.9 as Ps. 54.
37 Peter Lombard, Magna glosatura, PL 191:58B.
38 Cf. the use of “alloqui” in the passage discussed above, p. 303.
39 Cf. Peter Lombard, Magna glosatura, PL 191:58A.
prophecta “uidens” interpretatur. Sed tunc si inspirare uel reuelare proprie esset prophetare, non homini competeret, sed soli Deo inspiranti. Nec ipsa uisio proprie prophecia est, quamuis qui modo “prophete” olim dicerentur “uidentes,” aliquin mutus et qui nec uerbis nec signis loqui potest, si uideret prophetaret, quod non conceditur. Et dicit Brito quod dicitur a profor, -aris, quod est “procul ab intencione exfari,” scilicet aliud uerbo proferre aliud in corde habere. Sed hec est mala nominis exposicio, cum secundum eam mentitores proprie prophete dicerentur, quia hoc modo procul ab intencione fantur. Plana eciam denunciacio alicuius futuri, quals est illa Danielis, Post ebdomades sexaginta duas occidetur Christus, non esset prophecia, quia quod mente intellexit non procul a mente, sed planis uerbis expressit. Melius est ergo ut dicamus secundum Ysidorem, Ethimologiarum, libro 7, prophetas quasi “prefatores.” Videtur itaque prophecia esse denunciacio alicuius ueritatis a Deo ipsi prophete reuelate et non per humanam inuestigacionem cognite. Hinc enim prefatores eclipsium non prophetant, quamuis futura predicant.

Item oportet quod sit reuelacio [fol. 10r] facta sibi. Si enim reuelacionem Danieli factam ego denunciauero, numquid propheta ero? Absit. Vnde ulde dubium esse potest utrum Dauid et ali prophetauerint uel ab aliis prophetis prioribus acceperint que dixerunt. Non enim latuit ipsum Dauid prophecia patriarche Iacob et filiorum eius duodecim, de quibus habetur in illo libello qui dicitur Testamenta duodecim patriarcharum, quorum quilibet prophetauit de Christo. Nam Ruben cum preciperet filiis honorare et audire Leui adiecit:

Quoniam ipse noscit legem Domini et diuidet in iudicium et sacrificia pro omni
Israel, usque ad consummacionem temporum principis sacerdotis Christi,
quem dixit Dominus.43

Et Symeon:

Tunc, inquit, requiescet omnis terra a turbacione et omnis qui sub celo est a bello.

289–290 Dan. 9.26

290 ebdomades sexaginta duas] quinquaginta ebdomades etc. Ch  || 298 alii] lii Ch a.c.
Sem glorificabitur, quoniam Dominus Deus magnus Israel apparebit in terra ut homo et saluabit in ipso Adam. Tunc dabuntur omnes spiritus erroris in conculacionem, et homines regnabunt super perniciosos spiritus. Tunc resurgam in leticia et benedicam Altissimum in mirabilibus ipsius, quoniam Deus corpus assumens et comedens cum hominibus saluabit homines. Et nunc, filioli mei, obedite Leui et in Iuda liberabimini, et non offeretis super duas tribus haec, quoniam ex ipsis orietur salutare Dei. Suscitabit enim Dominus ex Leui ut principem sacerdotem et ex Iuda ut regem, Deum et hominem. Iste saluabit omnes gentes et genus Israel. Propter hunc omnia mando uobis, ut et uos mandetis filiis uestris, ut custodiant hec in generationes eorum.44

Leui autem sic dicit:

Rex ex Iuda exsurget et faciet sacerdotem nouum secundum tipum gencium in omnes gentes. Aduentus autem ipsius ineffabilis, ut prophete Altissimi ex semine Abraham patris nostri.45

Et post:

Innocens sum ab omni impietate uestra et transgressione quam facietis in consummacione seculorum, in Saluatorem mundi impie facientes et errare facientes Israel et suscitantes ei mala magna a Domino, et inique facientes cum Israel, ut non portet Jerusalem a facie malicie uestre, sed scindatur uulum templi, ut non uel deformitatem uestram. Et dispergemin captiui in gentibus et eritis in opprobrium et maledictionem et conculacionem.46

Et post:

Et pater noster Israel mundus erit ab impietate principum sacerdotum qui inponent manus suas in Saluatorem mundi. Et nunc, filii, cognoui Enoch, quoniam in fine [fol. 10v] impie agetis, in Dominum manus inponentes in omni malicia.47

Hoc quod Leui sic accepit ab Enoch, sibi non fuit prophetare, sed alterius referre propheticam. Post:

Quid facient omnes gentes, si uos tenebrescatis in impietate, inducentes maledictionem super genus uestrum, pro quibus lumen mundi datum est uobis

309 omnes] omes Ch

44 Testamenta, 2.6–7, PG 2:1050C–1051B.
45 Testamenta, 3.8, PG 2:1058D–1059A.
46 Testamenta, 3.10, PG 2:1059CD.
47 Testamenta, 3.14, PG 2:1063B.
ad illuminaconem omnis hominis, hunc volentes occidere, contraria mandata
docentes Dei iustificacionibus? 48

Post:
Et nisi propter Abraham, Ysaac et Iacob, patres nostros, unus ex semine meo
non relinqueretur in terra. Et nunc cognoui in libro Enoch quoniam
septuaginta ebdemades errabitis et sacerdocium inquinabitis et sacrificia
polluetis et legem exterminabitis et sermones prophetarum contemptetis. In
peruersitate persequemini uiros iustos et pios odio habebitis. Veracium
sermones abominabimini et uirum renouantem legem in uirtute Altissimi
erroneum appellabitis, et in fine, ut estimabitis, occidetis eum, nescientes
ipsius resurrectionem, innocentem sanguinem in malicia super capita uestra
receptur, et eritis in dispersionem, donec rursus ipse uisitabit et miserens
recipiet uos in fide et aqua. 49

Post:
Et suscitabit Dominus sacerdotem nouum qui faciet ueritatem in terra. Et
orietur astrum ipsius in celo et ipse resplendebit sicut sol, etc. Celi aperientur
et ex templo glorie ueniet super ipsum sanctificationum cum uoce paterna, sicut ab
Abraham patre Ysaac. Et gloria Altissimi super ipsum dictetur et spiritus
intellectus et sanctificationis requiescat super ipsum in aqua, etc. Et ipse
aperiet portas paradisi et stare faciet minantem gladium aduersus Adam, et
Belial ligabitur ab ipso, et dabat potestatem filiis suis ad calcandum super
perniciosos spiritus. Tunc exultabit Abraham, Ysaac et Iacob, et ego gaudebo
et omnes sancti induentur leticia. 50

Et in testamento Iude sic:
Et nunc diligite Leui et non efferamini super ipsum, ut non dispereatis. Michi
enim dedit Dominus regnum et illi sacerdocium, et subiecit regnum sacer-
docio. Michi dedit que in terra, illi que sunt in celis, et ut supereminet
celum terre, ita supereminet Dei sacerdocium regno quod est in terra. 51

Et post prophetat de Christo:
Ipse inquit custodiet potestatem regni mei usque in seculum. [fol. 11r]
Iuramento enim iurauit michi Dominus non deficere regnum meum et seminis
mei omnibus diebus usque in seculum. 52

355 ab] ad Ch  |  356 patre] ipse Ch  |  363 efferamini] effraini Ch

48 Testamenta, 3.14, PG 2:1063C.
49 Testamenta, 3.15–16, PG 2:1066AB.
50 Testamenta, 3.18, with omissions, PG 2:1067AB.
51 Testamenta, 4.21, PG 2:1082AB.
52 Testamenta, 4.22, PG 2:1082C.
et alia similia que dixit Leui. Ysachar uero non multum prophetauit. Zabulon uero plane prophetat sicut Leui et cetera:

Videbitis, inquit, Deum in forma hominis, Ierusalem nomen ei, et rursus in malicia sermonum uestrorum ad iracundiam prouocabis eum, et abiecti eritis usque ad tempus consummacionis.\(^{53}\)

Et Dan:

Et ducet uos Dominus in sanctificacionem clamans uobis pacem. Et orietur uobis ex tribu Iuda et Leui salutare Domini, et ipse faciet aduersus Belial prelium et uincet, etc. Et Dominus erit in medio Israel, cum hominibus conversatus in humilitate et paupertate. Et est mediator Dei et hominum, et nouit quod in qua die credet Israel, consummabitur regnum inimici, etc.\(^{54}\)

Neptalim et Gad similia de Christo dixerunt filii. Et Aser dixit filiis:

Eritis in dispersione dispersi usquequo Altissimus uisitabit terram, ipse ueniens ut homo cum hominibus manducans et bibens, et in silencio conterens caput draconis. Per aquam hic saluabit Israel et omnes gentes, Deus in uirum absconditus. Dicite igitur hec filii uestrus, ut non discredant ei. Legi enim in tabulis celorum quoniam discredentes discredetis ei et impie agetis in eum, non attendentes legem Dei, sed mandata hominum, etc.\(^{55}\)

Et Ioseph:

Audite, filii mei, que uidi sompnia, uidelicet quoniam ex Iuda nata est uirgo habens stolam m bissinam, et ex ipsa prodiit agnus immaculatus et a sinistris eius ut leo. Et omnes bestie impetum fecerunt aduersus eum, et uicit eas agnus et perdidit in conculcacionem. Et gaudebant in eo angeli et homines et omnis terra. Hec autem fient tempore suo ultimis diebus. Vos igitur, filii mei, honorate Iudam et Leui, quoniam ex ipsis orietur uobis agnus Dei, gentes omnes et Israel gracia saluans. Regnum enim Israel eternum: uero meum in uobis consummatur ut pomorum custodia, quoniam post messem non apparebit.\(^{56}\)

Et Beniamin filiis suis:

Fornicabimini, inquit, fornicacione Sodomorum et renouabitis in mulieribus motus inordinatos, et regnum Dei non erit in uobis, etc., [fol. 11v] usquequo

---

\(^{53}\) \textit{Testamenta}, 6.9, PG 2: 1098B.

\(^{54}\) \textit{Testamenta}, 7.5–6, with omissions, PG 2:1102D–1103B.

\(^{55}\) \textit{Testamenta}, 10.7, PG 2:1123C–1126A.

\(^{56}\) \textit{Testamenta}, 11.19, PG 2:1139AB.
Altissimus mittat salutare suum in usitacione unigeniti, et ingredietur templum et illic Dominus injuriam pacietur et contemptetur, in ligno ex-altabitur. Et erit uelum templi scissum et descendet spiritus Dei super gentes ut ignis effusus. Et ascendens ex inferno erit ascendens a terra in celum, etc.\textsuperscript{57}

Et tunc omnes resurgent, hii quidem in gloriam, hii uero in ignominiam, et iudicabit Dominus inprimis Israel de eis que in ipsum inusticia fecerunt, quoniam aduenientem Deum in carne liberatorem non crediderunt, et tunc iudicabit omnes gentes.

\textbf{Post:}

Et congregabitur omnis Israel, et non amplius uocabor lupus rapax propter rapinas uestras, sed operator Domini, tribuens cibum operantibus bonum. Et suscitabitur ex semine meo in extremis temporibus dilectus Domini, audiens in terra uocem eius, cognicione noua illuminans omnes gentes, lux cognicionis ascendens Israeli in salute, et rapiens ut lupus ab ipsis et dans Sinagoge gencium, et usque ad consummacionem seculorum erit in sinagogis gencium et in principibus eorum sicut musicum melos in ore omnium, et in libris sanctis et in scripturis erit opus et sermo eius. Et de ipso instruxit me Iacob pater meus.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{itemize}
  \item – et dormiuit sompnum secularem.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{itemize}

Cum igitur multa que ab aliis prophetis dicta sunt hic predicta fuerunt, non oportet eos dicere in omnibus prophetasse. Magis tamen in speciali prophetauit Dauid de Christo et ad eum pertinentibus, propheciaque sua in Scriptura sancta posita est, quomodo non fuit de istis duodecim patriarchis. Ideo antomastice propheta dici potest.

Sed mirum est quare iste psalmus primus titulum non habet. Et dicit Triuet quod, cum secundum Ieronimum titulus libri sit “uolumen ymnporum,” superuacuum esset addere “ympnus Dauid.” Titulum autem istum non uident in Hebreo, sed supletur ubi dicit psalmus 39, \textit{In uolumine libri scriptum est de me},

\begin{center}
\textit{Ps. 39.8 (Hebraicum)}
\end{center}

\textit{Ps. 39.8 (Hebraicum)}

\textsuperscript{57} Testamenta, 12.9, PG 2:1146C–1147A, followed by a paraphrase of Testamenta, 12.10, PG 2:1147AC.

\textsuperscript{58} Testamenta, 12.10–11, PG 2:1150AB.

\textsuperscript{59} Not part of the foregoing quotation, but apparently adapting some of the phrasing commonly used to end chapters in the Testamenta, e.g., 11.20, PG 2:1139B: “dormivit somnum perpetuum.”
quod autem de primo psalmo intelligat patet per aliam translacionem: *In capite libri scriptum est de me ut facerem placitum tibi*, etc., sed noluit hic titulum premittere, ne uideretur a laude propria incepsisse.\(^60\) Sed quomodo superuacuum foret exprimere cuius ymnpnus sit iste uel psalmus, sicut in aliis fit? Non enim est superuacuum genus sic specificare, “Incipit uolumen ymnporum,” et postea diceretur “ymnpnus Davuid.” Que nugacio! Item quo-modo nosti [fol. 12r] quod ille psalmus erat caput libri credendum, uel ipse Davuid dictum titulum gratis omiserit, cum dicatur quod Esdras sic psalmos disposuisse et in unum redegisse uolumen et titulos prescripsisse?\(^61\) Et iterum, si de se ipso loquitur quasi in tercia persona,\(^62\) manifestum est eum a laude propria incepsisse, et uideri posset quod mendaciter se diceret in consilio impiorum et in uia peccatorum non abisse. Illud autem quod dicitur infra, *In capite libri scriptum est de me ut facerem placitum tibi*, melius est referri ad librum legis Domini, scilicet ad Pentateuchum totum uel ad librum Exodi, qui specialiter liber legis dici potest. Et si ad caput tocius Pentateuci referatur, id est ad librum Genesis, manifesto patet ex peccato primorum parentum per inobedienciam et eorum iusta puncione scriptum super se, et de se Psalmista cognouit ut obediret diuine voluntati et faceret placitum sibi. Si uero ad librum Exodi referatur, qui libri caput dici potest, quia antequam legem daret in monte Syna, dum erant filii Israel in Marath transito mari Rubro, Ex. 15, constituit Dominus populo populo precepta atque iudicia dicens: *Si audieris uocem Domini Dei tui et quod rectum est coram eo feceris et mandatis eius obedieris, cunctum languorem quem posui in Egipto non inducam super te*, ubi obedientia iniungitur quasi in capite libri. Verumptamen multo melius est sicut in Hebreo habetur, *In uolumine libri*, quam *In capite libri*, pro eo quod ubique per totam Scripturam docetur obedientia ut faciamus que Deo placent. Si autem primus psalmus fuerit ipsius Davuid et ad illum referatur quod dicit, *In capite libri*, oportet quod ipse Davuid librum Psalmorum instituisset et illum tanquam principium et caput libri posuisset, et tunc ipse se ipsum auctorem allegare uideretur, quod non conuenit.

---

\(^{429–430}\) Ps. 39.8–9 (Gallican) || \(^{440}\) in uia peccatorum non abisse] Cf. Ps. 1.1 || \(^{440–441}\) Ps. 39.8–9 (Gallican) || \(^{449–451}\) Ex. 15.26

---

\(^{60}\) Trevet, *In Pss.*, in Ps. 1 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, folvs. 4vb–5ra), quoting the reference to the “uolumen hymnorum” from Jerome’s Hebraicum prologue; see De Bruyne, *Préfaces*, p. 47; *Vulgate*, ed. Fischer et al., 1:768.


\(^{62}\) As claimed by Trevet, *In Pss.*, in Ps. 1 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 738, fol. 5ra).
Quis autem sit huius libri conueniens discipulus? Certe quanto senior et sapiencior et Deo deuocior tanto conueniencior.

Materia enim libri deissima est et [fol. 12v] tocius theologie finem continere uidetur, qui in diuinis laudibus et contemplacione diuinorum existit. Hec est felicitas que est ultimum bonum actuum humanorum.

Ordo autem legendi esse debet, pro nunc, quo psalmi ipsi sunt scripti. Modus autem legendi erit ad mentem auctorum quantum possibile est declarandum, que sensus litteralis dicitur. Intelligi potest scilicet uel apparens et non existens, secundum quod dicit Apostolus, Littera occidit, et hic sensus recitandus est quandoque et reprobandus. Alius autem litteralis est sensus eorum qui scripserunt, et iste sensus meo iudicio quadrifarie est in Scriptura.

Quandoque enim sensus litteralis historicus est, sicut cum docetur quid gestum sit uel non gestum. Quandoque est ethimologicus, id est originis et cause interpretantis, sicut est illud Moyses preceptum dari libellum repudii et recedendi licenciam. Hoc ethimologicice intelligendum est, sicut Christus ostendit in Euangelio: Hoc, inquit, Moyses fecit propter duriciam cordis uestri, quasi dicet: Modo non est illud obseruandum, et ita de multis, que tempore Christi aduentus cessauerunt, consideranda est causa quare pro tempore concessa erant. Quidam autem sensus litteralis uestus est anologicus, id est irracionalis nec contradictorius sermo, quo ostenditur non sibi aduersari duo testamenta, Vetus et Nouum, sicut et ostendit Apostolus: Lex igitur aduersus promissa Dei? Absit, etc. Aliquis autem sensus litteralis est allegoricus, id est tropologicus et figuratiuus, sicut in Euangelio: Sicut fuit Ionas in uentre ceti, sic erit filius hominis, etc., et Apostolus, Cor.: Nolo uos ignorare fratres quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt, etc. Hec autem in figura contingebant illis. Et alibi: Quoniam Abraham duo filios habuit, etc. Itaque non sumus ancille filii, etc. Sensus litteralis uerborum istorum Christi et Apostoli allegoricus est et figuratiuus. Istos quattuor sensus quere in Augustino, De utilitate credendi, in
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63 In Augustine’s text, cited below, this sense is called “aetiology,” though “etymology” seems to have been substituted frequently in scholastic discussions; see Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, ed. Minnis and Scott, pp. 241–43 (Thomas Aquinas) and 256–66 (Henry of Ghent), at p. 257.

Sensus autem allegoricus continet sub se tam illum quem uocant anagogicum siue tropologicum, nisi quia tropologia et allegoria idem sonant, si tropologia dicatur a tropus, -pi, sed si a tropos, “conuersio,” tunc continetur sub sensu allegorico. Quod enim anagogicus sensus continetur sub allegorico, ostendit Apostolus, Gal. 4, ubi dicit: Qui de ancilla secundum carnem natus est: qui autem de libera, etc., que sunt per allegoriam dicta. Et declarat hoc dicens de libera: Illa autem que sursum est Ierusalem libera est, etc. Vult igitur Apostolus quod Ierusalem signat allegorice Ecclesiam triumphantem, que sursum est, mater nostra. Ille autem est sensus anagogicus secundum modernos, quod eciam tropologicus sensus, id est conuersius ad nos instruens in moribus. Tropologicus sub allegoria continetur patet per Apostolum qui dictam allegoriam convertit ad nos ad nostram instruccionem. Ita ergo patet quod nullo sensu exponenda est Scriptura, nisi aliquo illorum quos Augustinus expressit. Illa enim pars Scripture que nos mores instruit quandoque figurativae loquitur et ad allegoriam pertinet, quandoque uero simpliciter docet quid faciendum uel non, quid gerendum uel non, et hoc ad historiam pertinet. Historia enim non solum gestorum, sed gerendorum est: historia, id est gesticulacio. Patet eciam quod non omne uerbum Scripture potest et debet sic quadriformiter exponi: Diligite iusticiam, In principio erat uerbum. Nam etsi quattuor sensus
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65 Cf. Thomas Docking, OFM, In Epp. Pauli, on Gal. 6, quoted in Little, Franciscan Papers, p. 108.
uersos quis inuenerit, ad hos quattuor sensus uix concordia traheretur, ita sic in proposito sensui litterali est insistendum.

515 Ad moralem autem philosophiam, sicut et tota theologia, meo iudicio spectat, sicut alibi est probatum. Nec enim ad aliam poterit pertinere, nec aliquam sanam doctrinam ad nullam partem philosophie pertinentem possibile est reperire.

520 Diuiditur autem liber [fol. 13v] iste in centum quinquaginta partes secundum numerum tot psalmorum, nec est alia diuisio immediacior ista secundum rem, nisi quis uoluerit diuidere secundum quinque distinciones que fiunt per fiat fiat in fine psalmi. Secundum quas glosa beati Ieronimi inponit quod librum Psalmorum in quinque libros distinxerit, cuius oppositum uult ipsemet Ieronimus in epistola ad Sophronium. Dicta eciam distinctio tantum uerbalis est. Non enim est aliquis ordo psalmorum racione subtilis materie, nisi forsitan aliqui eorum, “in prima Sabbati,” etc., cantari instituti sunt uel secundum aliquem alium ordinem festiuitatum succeedencium in Sinagoga temporis illius, sicut modo est in ympnario ecclesie.

530 Accedamus ergo singillatim ad psalmorum expositionem singulorum.

English Translation

Blessed is the man. In his rule, St. Francis enjoined his brothers to perform the divine Office according to the use of the Roman curia, but he made an exception for the Psalter, thus clearly preferring its common version. I will therefore undertake the interpretation of this version, asserting nothing of my own devising, except insofar as it is consistent with the holy Fathers and catholic truth. Ten things about the psalms need to be investigated: the name of the translator, the name of the author, the au-

66 Perhaps a reference to Cossey’s lectures on the Sentences, which are lost. Little, Franciscan Papers, p. 141, records a reference to these lectures in the Sentences commentary of Adam Wodeham, OFM; see too Sharpe, Handlist, p. 166.

67 This claim should indicate that Cossey’s earlier discussion, dividing the Psalter into ten groups of fifteen, was focused on the possible spiritual or mystical meaning of the text’s structure, and, indeed, he does not there suggest that the ten parts have any internal coherence based on their contents or any other criteria (see above, Prol.1.89–100).

68 Note in margin: “Ieronimus, epistola 98 ad Marcellam de uerbis Hebreis, dicit quod aput Hebreos Psalterium in quinque volumina diuisum est per fiat fiat” – “In letter 98 [=26] to Marcella concerning Hebrew words, Jerome says that according to the Hebrews the Psalter is to be divided into five volumes by the words so be it, so be it.” This refers to Hier., Ep. 26.4, ed. Hilberg, p. 222, also marginally cited above, in Prol. 2, as “epistola 99.” The reference in the text to a glosa may indicate that Cossey is working from the Magna glosatura, the prologue to which includes a discussion of Jerome on this point (PL 191:57D–58A), and the marginal reference could have been supplied belatedly.

69 De Bruyne, Préfaces, p. 46; Vulgate, ed. Fischer et al., 1:768.
thor’s intention, the utility of the work, the work’s title, the appropriate student, the subject matter, the order and mode of reading, the part of philosophy (if any) to which it pertains, and finally the division of the book into parts, etc.

On the first point, we need to see whether the Septuagint translation is the one which is called the common version, as Trevet says, on this point citing Augustine, *City of God* 18, who (he says) prefers to call the Septuagint translation the common version because “its use was so widespread that many people were wholly unaware that there was any other.” Now it is certainly true that at 16.10 Augustine says that the common version is the Septuagint translation, and he expounds it accordingly – but I am astonished by my elder’s ignorance or carelessness, and so I will not say anything about the authority of Isidore, *Etymologies* 6, in the chapter on translators (where he quotes Augustine verbatim), and 5, on periodization, where he briefly indicates the times in which the translators lived, or, indeed, the authority of the Master of Histories, a little after the beginning, that everyone says the fifth version should be called the common one because they do not know who its author was. Instead, I base my argument on Augustine himself, who agrees with these men and does not contradict them, 18.43, and who in chapter 42 says that there were seventy-two translators – six from each of the tribes – who were learned in both languages (i.e., Hebrew and Greek), and they were sent by Eleazar the High Priest of the Jews to Ptolemy, King of Egypt. Their translation was called the Septuagint and was then in common use. Further: “For there were other translators who translated Holy Writ from Hebrew into Greek, including Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and there is also that translation whose author is unknown and therefore, lacking the translator’s name, is called the fourth or fifth translation” – fourth, that is, after Christ and fifth after the Septuagint. “But it is the Septuagint that is, almost exclusively, received by the Church, and the Greek-speaking Christian people use it, many of them being unaware that there is any other.” It is clear that he does not call the Septuagint translation the common version, and he does not expressly say which one is called common. But all the other authorities, even Jerome himself, are clear that the fifth version, whose author is unknown, is called the common translation. Further, it should be noted that Origen made the sixth and seventh translations, working from Hebrew to Greek, and he compared it to the other versions. The eighth was made by Jerome, working from Hebrew to Latin, and this translation was in turn translated by Sophronius from Latin into Greek. We do not know the names and numbers of the Latin translators who worked from Greek into our language, as Augustine says in *On Christian Teaching* 2. For, in the first age of the Church, whoever had knowledge of both languages, i.e., Greek and Latin, presumed to translate for themselves, and this led to considerable confusion concerning the text. Nevertheless, blessed Jerome enumerates the Latin interpreters of the Psalter in a letter to blessed Augustine, where he says:
The Greek text of the Psalms has been interpreted in many different books, first by Origen, then Eusebius, third Theodorus of Heraclea, fourth Asterius of Scythopolis, fifth Apollinaris of Laodicea, sixth Didimus of Alexandria. Additionally, there are treatises on a few psalms by many different writers, but at present I am just speaking of the complete corpus of the Psalms. Among the Latins, Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, and Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli, translated Origen and Eusebius, and the first of them was followed in some respects by our Ambrose.

All of these things cast more doubt on the identity of the translation interpreted in the Gloss, used by almost all churches in the Latin world, and which St. Francis wished his brothers to use instead of the Roman Psalter.

Trevet says that, inasmuch as it was pure, Jerome rendered the Septuagint translation from Greek into Latin, but then, since this translation was corrupted, at the behest of Paula and Eustochium he again translated the Psalter from Greek into Latin, and he imitated Origen’s efforts, i.e., with regard to asterisks and obeli. And it was to the text of these two translations that all the efforts of the ancients were devoted, among whom the straightforward translation of the Septuagint, which was earlier, was expounded by Cassiodorus Senator and the mixed version, which was second, by blessed Augustine. But I am astounded that he calls a “translation” what Jerome himself terms not a “translation” but a “correction.” For in the preface to the Psalter, from which Trevet takes these points, Jerome says:

A little while ago, when I was in Rome, I emended and, in accordance with the seventy translators, in large part corrected that Psalter, and since you see, O Paula and Eustochium, that it has again been corrupted by scribal mistakes, and that the ancient error is being favoured over the new emendation, you urge, etc.

And further on:

Let everyone take heed, therefore, of either a horizontal line or a radiating sign, i.e., an obelus or an asterisk, and wherever the first of these marks is seen, from there until we have put a double point know that the Septuagint contains extra material. But where one sees the likeness of a star, know that there something has been added from the Hebrew volumes.

It is therefore clear that, according to Jerome, these were only two emendations, not translations. And Trevet (and Lyre too) says that the first translation of the Psalter is in use in the church of Rome up to the present, and that Pope Damasus established the singing of the second translation in the churches of Gaul. But this second version, insofar as it contained those symbols (the first, obeli, eliminating extra material and the second, asterisks, adding more material), could not suitably be sung (nor should it be), since then at those points it would be necessary to sing the extra material, and in any case Jerome only undertook that emendation so that the difference between the two translations – the Septuagint, that is, and Origen’s – would be known.
Likewise, it is the earlier translation that is in use in the church of France and elsewhere: for this purely follows the Septuagint translation, which is quite different from what is found in the Roman Psalter. For example, in his letter to Cyprian the priest, Jerome discusses Ps. 89 according to what is found in the Hebrew or in another ancient translation: *Fill us in the morning with your mercy, we will all praise and rejoice together in all our days*, and this is what is found in the Roman Psalter, except it adds an *and*. The Septuagint, however, as Jerome says, has the following: *We are filled in the morning with your mercy, and we have rejoiced and delighted in all our days.* (At almost all points, as here, the Septuagint has this habit, that it reports as having already happened what is given in the future tense according to the Hebrews.) Further on: *Make us rejoice for the days in which you afflicted us, the years in which we saw evil* – this is also in the Roman Psalter, and Jerome says the Septuagint is as follows: *We have rejoiced for the days in which you humbled us*, etc., just as is contained in our Psalter. *And may the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and make the work of our hands steadfast upon us, and confirm the work of our hands* – all of this is in the Roman Psalter, while the Septuagint reads thus: *And may the splendour of the Lord our God be upon us, and direct the work of our hands upon us, and direct the work of our hands*. Thus Jerome. It is therefore apparent that our Psalter is the one that follows the Septuagint translation, and which Jerome himself corrected in Rome. (I do not know whether or not we have it just as he corrected it.) The Roman Psalter appears to be the one that he translated directly from Hebrew into Latin, but since in some (though very few) respects it seems to differ from the Hebrew, as will be clear in the course of my glosses, it could also be thought to have been the second translation which was made from Greek into Latin, not following the Septuagint. For having omitted the material eliminated by the virgules and adding in the new material from the Hebrew, the resulting Psalter could have the appearance of having been translated from Hebrew into Latin. But regardless of whether the Roman Psalter is the one translated directly from Hebrew or (as I just said) it was the second one that Jerome prepared, a correction and in part a translation, let us keep our attention fixed on our Psalter, which, it is evident, was translated from the Greek Septuagint version into the Latin language and then emended by Jerome.

Nicholas of Lyre says that blessed Jerome translated the Psalter three times, first following the Septuagint version, producing what is called the Roman Psalter, since it is used in the Church of blessed Peter. Second, he made another translation that is not very different from the first but is closer to the Hebrew, and this is called the Gallican Psalter, since Pope Damasus ordered it to be sung in France, and the Friars Minor use this translation. Third, at the request of Sophronius, etc. Lyre thus agrees with Trevet, and he is contradicted by the same arguments. And you should know that this Gallican Psalter, which purely follows the Septuagint translation, is used by very
nearly the whole Church, with the exception of the Roman curia and certain abbeys. Tretvet and Lyre derive their error from the *Chronicle* of Martin, who, concerning Pope Damasus, says that the Roman Psalter follows the Septuagint translation, which Jerome emended first.

But what is the name of the author or authors of the Psalms? Following Jerome, we hold to the idea that the authors are those who are named in the superscriptions, but some psalms lack superscriptions or have ones that do not include anyone’s name, and it is therefore uncertain who their authors are. And in a certain preface, whose author is unknown to me, it is said that David composed nine psalms, thirty two lack a superscription, seventy two are said to be by David, twenty two by Asaph, two by Jedethun, nine by the sons of Korah, one by Moses, two by Solomon, and two by Haggai and Zachariah, and therefore all the Psalms of David total one hundred fifty. And to this I say: this is a faulty calculation. For nine and thirty two and seventy two and twenty two and two, nine, one, two and two make one hundred fifty one. Likewise, why does he think that “David made nine psalms,” when many more are ascribed to him in the superscriptions thus: *psalm* or *song* or *canticle of David*, as will become clear, and as should already be clear to anyone who considers it? Likewise, since in his letter to Sophronius Jerome identifies Heman as one of the authors, give him a psalm and then there would be more than one hundred fifty one, or perhaps you could take back one of the ones you attributed to another author and give it to him instead. Indeed, Ps. 87, *Lord, God of my salvation*, is entitled, *Of Heman the Ezrahite*, and Ps. 88 is entitled, *The understanding of Ethan the Ezrahite*, and in Hebrew, *Wise Ethan the Ezrahite*. Why, therefore, is no psalm ascribed to this Ethan? Here is the preface in question:

In the midst of his reign, David, son of Jesse, chose four people who made psalms, i.e., Asaph, Heman, Ethan, and Jedethun. They therefore recited eighty eight psalms, and two hundred played on psalteries while Abiud struck the harp. When he had recovered the ark from the Azotians after twenty years and led it back into Jerusalem, staying in the home of Aminidab, David set it on a new yoked animal and led it into Jerusalem with seventy men chosen from every lineage of the children of Israel. From the tribe of Levi two hundred eighty-eight men were chosen, four of whom were appointed as song-leaders, Asaph, Heman, Ethan, and Jedithun, each one of them allotted seventy-two men proclaiming praise to the Lord in songs. And one of these four played the cymbal, another the cinara, another the harp, and another the triumphant horned trumpet, and in their midst stood David, holding his psaltery. The ark went before the seven choirs and sacrificial calf, and all the people followed behind the ark. Altogether, then, there are one hundred fifty psalms of David, out of which David himself composed nine, thirty two are lacking superscriptions, seventy two are said to be by David, twenty two by Asaph, two by Jedethun, nine by the sons of Korah, one by Moses, two by Solomon, and two by Haggai and Zachariah. And so there were one hundred and fifty psalms of David in total, seventy-two diapsalms, fifteen gradual canticles. The first psalm is not assigned to anyone because it is everyone’s. No one but the firstborn could be understood in the first psalm, and so, appropriately, an inscription
was unnecessary, and since this psalm makes mention of Christ, describing a person “against your Christ,” it did not have any reason whatsoever [i.e., for adding a superscription]. We read the unchanged order of history in the psalms’ superscriptions, but the psalms themselves are read not according to history but according to prophecy. So the order of the superscriptions cannot disrupt the order of the psalms. All the psalms which, by their inscriptions, are attributed to David himself pertain to the mystery of Christ, for David was called “anointed.”

And since David prophesies very clearly about Christ, it can be doubted whether or not he was better, or indeed the best of the prophets, as he is called in Cassiodorus’s gloss. Junillus sets out what prophecy is, saying, “Prophecy is the manifestation, by means of divine inspiration, of hidden things, past, present, and future,” and see his work on the seven kinds of prophecy. These things are “hidden” from those to whom they are revealed with respect to their powers of human investigation, as is said below. For the thought of Simon Magus was of course well known to Simon himself by his natural experience, but it was made known to Peter by revelation, Acts 8, I see you are in the gall of bitterness. Similarly, Naaman and others who were standing around him knew by means of their senses that Elisha’s servant Gehazi accepted his gifts, 4 Reg. 5, but Elisha knew it by inspiration. Prophecy about things past is exemplified by Moses, who prophesied about the creation of the world, as Gregory says in his work on Ezekiel.

Moreover, know that it is not truly prophecy if the person does not understand what he says in his prophecy. So it is that those who we now call prophets were once called “seers,” since they saw and understood what they prophesied. Still, sometimes in Scripture someone is said to prophesy even though they do not understand, provided that they offer their words at the instigation of the Holy Spirit, though they have a different understanding of their words than the Holy Spirit has, e.g., Caiaphas, John 11, It is expedient for you, etc. For he thought it would be expedient for Christ to die even though he was innocent, so that he would not give the Romans a reason to come, etc. All things being equal, that degree of prophecy is more excellent when the prophet’s understanding is clearer, as long as it does not exceed the limits of prophecy, as Lyre says, for prophecy should always be enigmatic. That is why the vision of divine being excludes the act of prophecy. On the other hand, then Christ was not a true prophet, the opposite of which is attested by all of Scripture. Likewise, in Num. 12, wishing to promote the prophecy of Moses, God himself says: If anyone is a prophet, I will appear to him in a vision or in a dream, but it is not so with my servant Moses. For I speak to him face to face, and he sees the Lord plainly, not by means of enigmas and figures.

There are four degrees of prophecy. The first is when, along with the vision of some sign, the prophet is given understanding of his vision, just as Jeremiah saw the boiling cauldron from the face of the north, by which he understood that the army of
the King of Babylon would come to burn down the city. The second degree is when words are heard without a figure, e.g., in the case of Samuel, 1 Reg. 3, and Lyre maintains that this is more excellent than the first degree. On the other hand, it is much easier to express truths with words than with other signs, and if something is revealed to a person without words but by means of other signs and visions as clearly or more clearly than it would be by means of words, then it would seem to be of greater excellence. Prophets are deceived by words, as you hear in the case of Jonah and Nineveh, and, metaphysically, sight is a more noble sense than hearing, and more important to the cognitive faculties. The third degree is when, in addition to the prophet hearing words, a person appears and speaks to him, whether a holy man (e.g., 2 Mach. 15) or an angel (as frequently in Scripture) or an effigy representing God himself (e.g., Is. 6). This can take place when someone is asleep or awake, and the latter case is more excellent than if it happens to someone in their sleep or in a rapture or ecstasy, during which time they do not have the use of their exterior senses. On the other hand, then, the vision Moses saw in the bush would have been more excellent than what Paul saw in his rapture. The fourth degree is when, without the apparition of any figure or perceivable sign, the intelligible truth of hidden things is grasped by divine revelation, and this is the kind of revelation made to David, as is said at the start of the common Gloss. Therefore, this degree is more excellent than the others, just as someone who can understand a geometry problem without drawing the figures could be said to be of greater intelligence than someone who cannot understand without them. On the other hand, that soul is more perfect in its cognition which is perfect with respect to its understanding, being equal to another soul’s cogitation, and with respect to its sense and its idea, with its own particular cogitations, with which another soul is not perfected. And thus, a soul will have more joy in heaven when it is reunited with its body than it has now, for then it will be perfected bodily with its bodily senses. If, therefore, when he saw the burning bush, Moses by means of the Holy Spirit’s revelation understood as clearly as someone else might have understood without the sight of the bush that the Virgin would give birth, it does not follow that the degree of Moses’s cognition was less perfect, but rather, indeed, it was more perfect, since he understood both the thing and its figure, and this other person only understood the thing itself.

Consequently, it is quite difficult for a person to know which degree of prophecy is more perfect, and, after the Incarnation of Christ, it is much more difficult to know which of the prophets attained to which degree. Lyre says that David was not a more perfect prophet than the apostles, since they received the grace of the Holy Spirit more fully. St. Thomas Aquinas says in Summa Theologiae that Moses was more perfect, since he saw the divine being in the present life, according to what Augustine says in On Seeing God. Indeed, he performed greater signs and miracles, and he prophesied
to the whole population of the Jews, but following this reasoning it would seem that Moses was a more perfect prophet than the Apostle, who saw the divine being – and St. Thomas himself denies that this is so. Likewise, John the Baptist did not perform many signs, as is clear in John 10, and yet St. Thomas concedes that he was a better prophet than Moses. Likewise, though the apostles were more perfect men, since they saw the Messiah in the flesh, as well as other things about which David had prophesied, it does not therefore follow that they were more perfect prophets, nor that they enjoyed a more perfect degree of prophecy – no, indeed, with the exception of John in the Apocalypse, they are only rarely said to have prophesied.

Therefore, I maintain that one prophet excels another either because of the greater certainty and evidence of what is revealed to him, or because of the greater dignity of the matters so revealed, or because of the greater number of his revelations, or because of some concurrence of all of these things – and this last, which excels in all these ways, is the most perfect degree. But when one prophet excels in one respect and another in another, it is difficult to say which degree is the most perfect – unless God reveals it! – and since all the prophets in heaven are in accord about their excellence, let us not dispute about it on earth. Still, David can be called “the best of the prophets” who prophesied in his time with him, or indeed because he was a king, or because he sung his prophecy metrically and in the form of hymns, or for some other reasons which God alone knows.

As regards the intention of these authors, it seems to me that they principally intend to praise God, and even when they intentionally prophesy, it is, finally, more correct to say that they intend to praise in their prophesying than simply that they intend to prophesy. The name of their text itself demonstrates this point, following what Jerome says about musical instruments in his letter to Dardanus: “The Psalter, called nabulum in Hebrew and psalter in Greek, in Latin means ‘praise-maker,’ as expressed in Ps. 56, Arise, psaltery and harp.” This intention will be set out at greater length in the commentary that follows.

It is difficult to explain how great the utility of this work is. It has the utility of Gospel teaching and of true and open prophecy about Christ, of contrition and penitence, of devout prayer and divine praise. How good and all-encompassing is the fruit of these actions!

In Hebrew, the title of this work is sefer tehillim, which is translated “book of hymns.” A hymn is the praise of God with a song, and therefore this is the hymnal of the Synagogue, which is now used with great frequency in the Church. It has many other titles. It is called “Psalter,” with the name of the musical instrument transferred to the songs which are sung to its accompaniment, and among the Greeks it is also called the “Monologion” (i.e., soliloquy) “of David” or the “Book of Soliloquies.” But it is unclear why it should be called “monologion” rather than “proslogion” (i.e., ad-
dress), when David, like many other people, addresses his words to God. *Here begins the Prophet's book of soliloquies about Christ.* David is called “the Prophet” by antonomasia, just as “the Apostle” is understood to refer to Paul.

But what is prophecy? Cassiodorus says that it is the inspiration or divine revelation of things, declaring what will happen with immovable truth, and, for this reason, prophecy is translated “sight,” prophet “seer.” But, then, if to inspire or to reveal were properly to prophesy, the term would not be fittingly applied to any person, but only to God the inspirer. Neither is sight properly prophecy, though those who are now called “prophets” were once called “seers,” for then someone who is mute or who cannot speak with words or signs, as long as he can see, could prophesy, which I am unwilling to concede. William Brito says that “to prophesy” derives from “to speak out,” i.e., to speak at some remove from one’s intention, i.e., to proffer one thing with one’s words and to have something else in one’s heart. But this is a poor interpretation of the word, since it would suggest that liars should properly be called prophets, since they speak at a remove from their intentions. Indeed, then the plain declaration of something in the future – such as Daniel, *After sixty-two weeks, Christ will be slain* – would not be prophecy, since he did not say something far off from what he understood in his intention, but he expressed it with plain words. It is better, then, for us to follow Isidore, *Etymologies 7*, and say that prophets are, as it were, “foretellers.” It would seem, then, that prophecy is the declaration of a certain truth revealed to the prophet by God and not known by any human investigation. Those who foretell an eclipse do not prophesy, therefore, though they predict the future.

Likewise, it is necessary for the revelation to be made to the prophet himself. For if I were to declare the revelation made to Daniel, would I then be a prophet? Certainly not! It is therefore very doubtful whether David and the others prophesied or whether they took what they said from earlier prophets. For the prophecy of the patriarch Jacob and his twelve sons was not unknown to David. This material is now contained in the little book called *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, in which each of the patriarchs prophesied about Christ. For after Ruben had instructed his sons to honour and listen to Levi, he added:

> For he knows the law of the Lord, and he will allot judgment and offer sacrifices for all of Israel, until the completion of the ages of the chief priest Christ, whom he has called the Lord.

And Simeon says:

> Then will all the earth rest from trouble, and all that is beneath heaven from war. Then will Shem be glorified, for the Lord, the great God of Israel, will appear on the earth as a man, and in himself he will save Adam. Then all the spirits of error will be trampled underfoot, and human beings will rule over the pernicious spirits. Then I will arise in joy and bless the Most High in his wonders, for God will take on a body and eat among
the people, and thus he will save them. And now, my little sons, obey Levi and in Judah you will be free: do not rise up against these two tribes, for from them the salvation of God will arise. For the Lord will raise up a chief priest from Levi and from Judah a king, God and man. He will save all the nations and the people of Israel. Therefore, I entrust you with all of these things, so that you also entrust your sons with them, to keep them in all their generations.

Levi speaks thus:

A king will arise from Judah and establish a new priest after the model of the nations in all the nations. His advent will be ineffable, as that of a prophet of the Most High from the seed of Abraham our father.

And further on:

I am innocent of all your impiety and the transgression which you will carry out in the completion of the ages, acting impiously toward the Saviour of the world and making Israel go astray and raising up great evils from the Lord against it, behaving wickedly with Israel so that it cannot save Jerusalem from the face of your wickedness, but the veil of the temple will be split so that it does not cover your deformity. And you will be scattered as captives among the nations, and you will be disgraced and accursed and tread underfoot.

And further on:

And our father Israel will be clean from the impiety of the chief priests who lay their hands on the Saviour of the world. And now, my sons, I have learned from Enoch that in the end you will act impiously, laying your hands on the Lord in all wickedness.

What Levi took from Enoch was not prophesied by him, but rather it was his report of someone else’s prophecy. Further on:

What will all the nations do if you are darkened in impiety, bringing wickedness upon your people, for whose sake the light of the world has been given to you, to enlighten every human being, and you wish to kill this man, teaching commandments contrary to God’s justice?

Further on:

But for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, your fathers, not one of my descendants would be left on the earth. And now I have learned in the book of Enoch that for seventy weeks you will go astray, staining the priesthood and polluting the sacrifices and dishonoring the law and despising the words of the prophets. In your perversity you will persecute just men and hate the pious. You will abhor the words of the truthful and you will label as erroneous the man renewing the law in the strength of the Most High, and, in the end, you will think that you have killed him, not knowing of his resurrection. In wickedness you will take his innocent blood upon your heads, and you will be dispersed until he visits a second time and mercifully receives you in faith and water.

Further on:
And the Lord will raise up a new priest who will enact truth on the earth, and his star will rise in heaven and he himself will shine forth like the sun, etc. The heavens will be opened and from the temple of glory sanctification will come upon him with the voice of the Father, as from Abraham, father of Isaac, and the glory of the Most High will be spoken over him and the spirit of understanding and sanctification will rest upon him on the water, etc. And he himself will open the gates of paradise and make the sword stand threatening against Adam, and Belial will be bound by him, and he will give power to his sons to trample upon the pernicious spirits. Then will Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob rejoice, and I will be joyful, and all the saints will be clothed in joy.

And in the testament of Judah:

And now, love Levi and do not rise up against him, lest you perish. For the Lord has given the royal power to me and the priesthood to him, and he has made the royal power subject to the priesthood. He gave me what is on the earth, and he gave him what is in the heavens, and just as heaven is above the earth, so too is the priesthood of God above royal power on the earth.

And further on, he prophesies concerning Christ:

He will guard the power of my kingdom forever. For the Lord has sworn an oath to me, that my kingdom and that of my descendants will not fail for all days and forever.

– as well as other things, similar to what Levi said. Issachar did not prophesy very much, but Zebulun clearly prophesies like Levi and the rest, saying:

You will see God in the form of a human being, and the name “Jerusalem” will be given to him, and a second time the wickedness of your words will provoke his wrath, and you will be cast down until the end of time.

And Dan:

And the Lord will lead you to sanctification, proclaiming peace to you. And the salvation of the Lord will rise for you from the tribe of Judah and Levi, and he will wage war against Belial and be triumphant, etc. And the Lord will be in the midst of Israel, dwelling with men in humility and poverty. And he is a mediator between God and men, and he knows that on the day on which Israel will believe, the kingdom of the enemy will come to an end, etc.

Naphtali and Gad said similar things about Christ to their sons. And to his sons Asher said:

In the dispersion, you will be dispersed until the Most High visits the earth, coming as a man and eating and drinking with men, and in silence crushing the dragon’s head. Through water will this one, God hidden in man, save Israel and all the nations. Tell your sons these things, so that they do not fail to believe in him. For I have read in the tablets of the heavens that, unbelieving, you will not believe him, and you will act impiously toward him, not heeding the law of God but rather the commands of men, etc.

And Joseph:
My sons, hear what I saw in a dream: from Judah a virgin wearing a linen stole was born, and from her the immaculate lamb came forth, and one as a lion on his left. And all the beasts attacked him, and the lamb conquered them and destroyed them underfoot. And angels and men and the whole earth rejoiced in him. These things will take place at their appointed time, on the last days. Therefore, my sons, honour Judah and Levi, for from them the Lamb of God will arise for you, by grace saving all the nations and Israel. For the kingdom of Israel is eternal, but mine among you will come to an end like a place to keep fruit, for after the harvest it will not appear.

And Benjamin said to his sons:

You will fornicate in the fornication of Sodom, and you will revive disordered stirrings in women, and the kingdom of God will not be among you, etc., until the Most High sends his salvation in the visitation of the only begotten. He will enter the temple, and there the Lord will suffer injury and be despised, and he will be lifted up on a tree, and the veil of the temple will be split, and the spirit of God will descend upon the nations like a fire poured out. And ascending from hell he will ascend from earth to heaven, etc. And then all will arise, some to glory, some to disgrace, and the Lord will first pass judgment on Israel for the injustices they carried out against him, for they did not believe in God, coming in the flesh as a liberator, and then he will judge all the nations.

Further on:

And all Israel will be gathered together, and I will no longer be called a rapacious wolf on account of your rapacity, but instead a worker of the Lord, allotting food to those who do good work. And the beloved of the Lord will be raised up from among my descendants in the last days, hearing his voice on the earth, enlightening all the nations with new understanding, the light of understanding ascending for the salvation of Israel, and taking it away from them like a wolf and granting it to the Synagogue of the nations, and until the end of the age it will be among the synagogues of the nations and among their princes like a tuneful melody on all their mouths, and his work and his word will be in their holy books and writings. My father Jacob has instructed me about him.

– and he slept the long sleep. Since, therefore, many things said by other prophets were predicted here, it is not necessary to say in every case that those others were prophesying. Still, David prophesied more about Christ and things pertaining to him, and his prophecy is included in sacred Scripture, while that was not the case with these twelve patriarchs. Therefore, he can rightly be called “the Prophet” by antonomasia.

But it is remarkable that this first psalm does not have a title. Trevet says that this is because the title of this book is, according to Jerome, “book of hymns,” and so it would be redundant to add “a hymn of David.” Trevet did not see this title in the Hebrew, but he says it is supplied in Ps. 39, where the Hebrew says: In the volume of the book it is written of me, which in the other translation is clearly meant to be understood (according to Trevet) as referring to the first psalm: In the head of the book it is written
of me, that I should do your will, etc., and he says that David did not wish for this title to be put at the opening of the text, lest he appear to begin by praising himself. In reply, I ask: In what way would it be redundant to provide an attribution for this hymn or psalm, as is done with the others? Indeed, it would not at all be redundant to specify the genre, thus: "Here begins the book of hymns," and then to say "a hymn of David." What a joke! Likewise, how can we believe that you knew that this psalm was the head of the book, or that David deliberately omitted the aforementioned title himself, when Ezra is said to have arranged the psalms, reassembled them into a single volume, and affixed the titles? Further, if David speaks of himself as though in the third person in this psalm, it is apparent that he began it by praising himself, and he could seem to be lying when he claimed that he had not dwelt in the counsel of the wicked or in the way of sinners. What is said further on, In the head of the book it is written of me, that I should do your will, is better understood as referring to the book of the law of the Lord, i.e., to the whole Pentateuch or the book of Exodus, which in particular can be said to be the book of the law. If it refers to "the head" of the whole Pentateuch, i.e., to the book of Genesis, then based on the sin of our first parents by their disobedience and their just punishment, it is clearly demonstrated that this is written about him, and, in regard to himself, the Psalmist recognized that he should obey the divine will and do as he pleased. But if it refers to the book of Exodus, this can be called "the head of the book" because before the Lord gave the law on Mount Sinai, when the children of Israel were in Mara after crossing the Red Sea, he established precepts and judgments for the people, saying, Ex. 15: If you will hear the voice of the Lord your God and do what is right before him and obey his commandments, I will not bring upon you all the sorrow which I imposed upon Egypt, and here obedience is enjoined as though at the head of the book. Still, it is much better as the Hebrew has it, In the volume of the book, than In the head of the book, since obedience is taught throughout all of Scripture, so that we might do what is pleasing to God. If, however, the first psalm was in fact by David himself and what he later says, In the head of the book, refers to this psalm, it would be necessary for David himself to have established the book of Psalms and to have positioned that psalm at the beginning and head of the book, and then he would have appeared to allege that he was himself the author, which is not consistent with what we have said.

Who is the appropriate student of this book? Certainly, the older and wiser and more devoted he is to God, the better suited he is to study it.

The subject matter of this book is very godly, and it would appear to contain the ends of all theology, consisting in divine praise and contemplation. This is the happiness which is the greatest good of human actions.
The order of reading should be, at present, the order in which the psalms are now written. The mode of reading will be set forth, as much as is possible, according to the intention of the authors, which is called the literal sense. This can be understood as being only apparent and not existent, following what the Apostle says, *The letter kills* – and this meaning must sometimes be recited and rejected. But another “literal” is the meaning of those who wrote the text, and, in my opinion, this sense is fourfold in Scripture. Sometimes the literal sense is historical, when it teaches what did or did not happen. Sometimes it is etymological, i.e., dealing with the interpretation of origins and causes, as when Moses ordered that a libel of repudiation and license of divorce be given, which is to be understood etymologically, as Christ demonstrates in the Gospel: *Moses did this on account of the hardness of your hearts*, as though he said: Nowadays this should not be observed. We should thus consider the reasons why many things which ceased in the time of Christ were formerly permitted. Sometimes the literal sense is analogical, i.e., an irrational but not contradictory saying, demonstrating that the two testaments, the Old and the New, are not incompatible, as the Apostle illustrates: *Was the law, then, contrary to the promises of God? Hardly*, etc. Sometimes the literal sense is allegorical, i.e., it contains tropes and figures, as in the Gospel: *Just as Jonah was in the belly of the whale, so too will be the son of man*, etc., and the Apostle, 1 Cor.: *I would not have you ignorant, brothers, that all your fathers were under a cloud*, etc. These things are said to have happened to them figuratively. And elsewhere: *For Abraham had two sons*, etc. *And so, brothers, we are not sons of the handmaid*, etc. The literal sense of these words of Christ and the Apostle is allegorical and figurative. You will find more about these four senses in Augustine, *On the Utility of Belief*, toward the beginning. All of these senses can be found at various points in Scripture, but it is appropriate to locate authority as pertaining in particular to history. Indeed, when the literal sense of a phrase is historical, and the same phrase, located elsewhere in Scripture, can be expounded etymologically, analogically, or allegorically, then the literal sense of that second instance is etymological or allegorical, etc., but its authority rests on the prior instance, the literal sense of which is only historical. The literal sense is therefore not identical to the historical sense.

The allegorical sense contains under itself what is called the anagogical or tropological, though, if “tropology” derives from the word *tropus*, meaning a rhetorical trope, then tropology and allegory would seem to denote the same thing. If, however, it derives from *tropos*, meaning “turn,” then it is contained distinctly under the allegorical sense. The Apostle demonstrates that the anagogical sense is contained under the allegorical when he says, Gal. 4: *He who was born of the handmaid after the flesh, but he who was of the freewoman*, etc., *which are said by allegory*. And he makes this clear, saying of the freewoman: *But that Jerusalem which is above is free*, etc. The Apostle therefore wishes Jerusalem to signify, allegorically, the Church triumphant, our mother,
which is above. According to modern usage, this is the anagogical sense, which is also a tropological sense, i.e., turned so as to instruct us in behaviour. The positioning of tropology under allegory is made clear by the Apostle, who turns the aforementioned allegory to us for our instruction. It is therefore clear that Scripture should only be expounded according to those senses set forth by Augustine. For that part of Scripture which instructs us in behaviour sometimes speaks figuratively and pertains to allegory, sometimes it simply teaches us what should or should not be done, how we should or should not behave, and this pertains to history. Indeed, history does not only have to do with things that were done but also with what should be done: “history,” i.e., gesture. It is also apparent that not every word of Scripture can or should be expounded in four ways, e.g., Love justice, In the beginning was the word. For even if someone finds four true senses, only rarely will there be harmony among them, and thus it is my intention to focus on the literal sense.

Like all theology, in my opinion, this book pertains to moral philosophy, as is proven elsewhere. For it cannot pertain to any other, nor it is possible to find any sound teaching pertaining to another part of philosophy.

This book is divided into one hundred fifty parts, following the number of as many psalms, and there is not any intermediate division according to its content, unless one were to want to divide it according to the five breaks which are made by the use of so be it, so be it at the end of a psalm. The gloss of St. Jerome indicates that the book of Psalms should be divided into five books following these breaks, but Jerome himself argues to the contrary in his letter to Sophronius, and, indeed, this division is really only nominal. Likewise, there is not any order to the psalms by reason of their detailed subject matter, unless perhaps some of them – the ones beginning “on the first day of the week,” etc. – were instituted to be sung in their present order or in some other order on successive feast days in the Synagogue in the time of David, just as now is the case with the hymnal of the Church.

Let us turn, therefore, to the interpretation of individual psalms, one by one.
Epilogue: Hebrew Prepositions


4 מ Ch | 5 מנהב Ch | 6 *hec* Ch | 13 מ Ch | 14 preposizione] preposicio Ch; מנהב Ch | 16 *rafa*] rosa Ch

English Translation

Note that *mem* with two points underneath, which we call tzere, thus מ, always signifies the preposition *of*. Likewise, in Hebrew *shin* with the same points signifies the conjunction *that*, thus ו. Likewise, with a line underneath, which they call *patach*, this letter, ה, signifies the article in the vernacular, just as *le* in French, e.g., מנהב signifies *l’homme* in French, *the man* in English. But this kind of article is not used in Latin. Further, note that these three letters, *mem*, *shin*, *he*, constitute the name “Moshe,” i.e., Moses. Further, note that the three letters making up the name Caleb in Hebrew, i.e., *kafe*, *lamed*, *beth*, signify three other things that are in common use. For *kafe* with *patach* and two points to the right, thus מ, signifies the conjunction *like* and *as*, etc., and the same holds true if upright points which they call *shva* are used without

1 Here the scribe seems to have written nonsense across the line break and my emendation is conjectural, though the prose makes clear that the word must begin with an article.
patach, thus כ. Likewise, lamed with the same two points, thus ל, signifies the preposition to. Likewise, beth, written thus ב or with the same points signifies the preposition in, ב. And without a preposition, an article is always put before a word, thus: הרשׁעים. Further, the same letters with points in the middle make an aspirated sound, but without such a point and with a line above, which is called rafe, they make a soft sound, e.g., the b in the word Caleb is liquid. For if a word is written with a beth in the end and with rafe above, thus בֿלֶ, it is liquid. If there is not a line above, provided that there is not a point, it is still soft, but with a point it is aspirated.

ABSTRACT

This article presents the first edition and English translation of substantial selections from the Psalter commentary of Henry Cossey, OFM (d. ca. 1336). Though largely absent from recent discussions of medieval Christian Hebraism, Cossey evidently learned some Hebrew, and he used this knowledge to critique other recent literalistic exegetes, most prominently Nicholas Trevet and Nicholas of Lyre. An introductory essay places Cossey’s work at Oxford ca. 1330, discusses the complex program of marginal notes in the single surviving manuscript (Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11), and explores some of his critical disagreements with Trevet and Lyre. The edition and translation include his prologues and an epilogue on Hebrew prepositions.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article présente la première édition et traduction anglaise de sélections majeures du commentaire du Psautier d’Henri Cossey, OFM (mort vers 1336). Bien qu’il soit largement absent des récentes discussions autour de l’hébraïsme chrétien médiéval, il semble clair que Cossey ait acquis quelques connaissances de l’hébreu et qu’il s’en servit pour critiquer d’autres exégètes littéralistes contemporains, en particulier Nicolas Trevet et Nicolas de Lyre. Un essai introductif situe les activités de Cossey à Oxford vers 1330, aborde le programme complexe d’annotations marginales qu’on retrouve dans le seul manuscrit nous étant parvenu (Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 11) et se penche sur certains des désaccords critiques de Cossey avec Trevet et Lyre. L’édition et la traduction comportent les prologues de Cossey et son épilogue qui traite des prépositions en hébreu.
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