

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Bishop Wordsworth's Edition of the Vulgate *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*. Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi ad codicum Manuscriptorum fidem recensuit Johannes Wordsworth, S.T.P., episcopus Sarisburiensis, in operis societatem adsumto Henrico Iuliano White, A. M. Societatis S. Andreae, Collegii Theologici Sarisburiensis Uice-Principali. Partis Prioris Fasciculus Primus Euangelium secundum Matthaeum. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCLXXXIX. 12s. 6d.

T. K. Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 10 / December 1889, pp 452 - 454

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196192, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196192

How to cite this article:

T. K. Abbott (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 452-454 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196192

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is absolutely alien to the general style of the *Metamorphoses*.

It becomes exceedingly clear from an

examination of this codex how far from settled the text of Ovid's great work still remains.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

BISHOP WORDSWORTH'S EDITION OF THE VULGATE.

Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine. Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi ad codicum Manuscriptorum fidem recensuit JOHANNES WORDSWORTH, S.T.P., episcopus Sarisburiensis, in operis societatem adsumto HENRICO IULIANO WHITE, A.M. Societatis S. Andreae, Collegii Theologici Sarisburiensis Uice-Principali. Partis Prioris Fasciculus Primus Euangelium secundum Matthaeum. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCLXXXIX. 12s. 6d.

SCHOLARS will give a hearty welcome to this instalment of the important critical edition of the Hieronymian Version of the New Testament, undertaken by the Bishop of Salisbury eleven years ago. The series of Old Latin Biblical Texts noticed in these columns as they appeared have from time to time testified to the laborious and careful work that was being carried on, and raised our expectations of the promised edition. Needless to say that these expectations are not likely to be disappointed.

The present portion contains the Gospel of St. Matthew, with a short account of the plan of the work, the Prolegomena being naturally postponed.

Each page presents first the critically revised text, then the older version from the Codex Brixianus, selected as approximating most nearly to the text which Jerome may be supposed to have used, and, below, the conspectus of various readings.

The propriety of the selection of Codex Brixianus to represent Jerome's copy of the *Vetus Itala* may be illustrated by the fact that of the thirteen readings quoted by Professor Westcott in his article on the Vulgate (p. 1697a) to exemplify the difference between the older text and Jerome's, in no less than seven Brixianus agrees with the latter. On the other hand there are, as will be seen presently, a few cases in which the Vulgate agrees with the *Vetus* whilst the text as here revised departs from it.

Of course a complete collation of all codices would have been both impossible and

useless. Those have been selected which, as coming from different countries or different sources, embrace so wide an extent of space and time that we may expect to find the true reading in some or other of them. The editors have not sought to accumulate a multitude of witnesses for this or that reading, but rather to ascertain the readings supported by manuscripts which may be regarded as representative of schools or countries; for this I suppose they will have the assent of every one versed in criticism. The selected codices have been collated with the utmost care 'uel ad apices litterarum,' so that the philologist will find much to interest him in the diversities of spelling &c. recorded.

The codices constantly cited in this fasciculus number 28, but in addition to these there are several occasionally referred to, as well as many printed editions. The readings of MSS. of the older versions are also given. Of these MSS. there are in Matthew about 20, some fragmentary.

The causes of various readings in the Hieronymian Version are: first, in the Gospels the recollection of parallel passages, the scribes being above all unwilling to omit anything; secondly, the recollection of some one of the older versions, or of some rendering adopted by Jerome himself in his expositions; and thirdly, correction from Greek codices.

Some interesting examples of this last kind of correction are furnished by British-Irish codices. For example xiii. 35 'per prophetam,' the book called the Gospels of Mac-Regol adds 'esaiaim' with cod. Sin. and others. Jerome mentions the reading, but himself believed the true reading to be 'per asaph prophetam.' (This reading, I may remark, is ingeniously defended by Professor Rendel Harris in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. vi.) In xvi. 3. the same codex adds 'hyppochritae' but with many Old Latin codices. Again in xiv. 3, after 'fratres sui,' 'philippi' is added by several codd. with nearly all the Greek authorities. In xxvii. 55, after 'a longe,' the Book of Armagh and another MS. add 'vi-

dentes.' Some other codd. add 'aspicientes' (*θεωροῦσαι*).

In some cases Jerome himself gives express testimony as to the rendering he adopted. Critically these are of considerable interest. For example in Matthew vii. 11 he expressly tells us that he renders ἐπιούσιον 'supersubstantialem.' Yet six of the codices here selected have 'cotidianum,' the reading of the Old Latin, and one combines both readings.

In the same chapter, ver. 16, of the hypocrites who 'disfigure' their faces, the Old Latin had 'exterminant facies suas,' on which Jerome very properly remarks 'exterminantur exules qui mittuntur extra terminos.' He therefore substituted 'demoluntur.' Yet 'exterminant' is read by three-fourths of the MSS. and in others it is added as a correction.

It is remarkable that a few verses later, where the same Greek word (*ἀφανίζεν*) was rendered by the same Latin in the old versions, nearly all the codices read correctly. This is an instance of a phenomenon which recurs elsewhere also: viz. that where the same word occurs more than once in a paragraph, the true reading, which at first is found in a few copies only, is later on found in most or all.

A good example is vii. 22 where 'in tuo nomine' occurs three times. Only three codices (of those here selected) have the words in this, the correct, order all three times. These three by the way belong to the British-Irish family. Nearly all are right the second time, and only two are wrong every time.

Again xxii. 37, 'in toto corde tuo et in tota anima tua et in tota mente tua,' sixteen have 'ex tuo corde'; six of these have also 'ex tua anima,' while two only have 'ex tua mente.' The Greek here has ἐν, but in the parallel in St. Mark the preposition is ἐξ.

Such facts as these help to show that in questions of reading the numerical preponderance of testimony ought not to be regarded as decisive. This is further illustrated by instances of readings which may be regarded as morally certain although not supported by any codex. One such instance is Matth. xvii. 9, where the Greek has μονόφθαλμον. Many codd. have 'cum uno oculo' with the Old Latin; but besides this reading we have 'uno oculum' 'unum oculum,' 'cum unum oculum,' etc. Doubtless the right reading is that conjectured by Bentley and adopted by the present editors, 'unoculum'—a word which is found in Accius and elsewhere, but which was un-

known to the scribes. Sometimes where itacism has disguised or altered the original reading, it is the Greek text that enables us to detect the error. For instance 'procedens' is read for 'procidens' in Matth. xviii. 26, 29 by many codd. In Matth. vi. 26 'plures estis' is read by most codd. instead of 'pluris estis' (*διαφέρετε*). On the other hand what appears to be itacism may perhaps be the mistaken correction of what the scribe supposed to be itacism. To this class may belong the futures in Matth. vii. 19 'excidetur,' 'mittetur,' xxiii. 38 'relinquetur,' xxvi. 24 'tradetur,' 28 'effundetur,' 46 'qui me tradet.' In all these cases the great majority of MSS. have the future. But this may have been either an intentional correction or at least a deliberate choice. To a reader ignorant of Greek the future, especially in xxvi. 24, 28, would appear the most suitable or perhaps the only suitable tense. Compare 'tradetur' 1 Cor. xi. 24.

Like itacism the confusion of *b* and *v* has sometimes given rise to a various reading, apparently through the too ingenious correction of a scribe. For example in Matth. xxiii. 34 we have the following: occiditis... crucifigetis, ... flagellabitis; then occiditis... crucifigitis... flagellauitis; lastly, occidistis... crucifigistis... flagellastis (Cod. Mac-Regol.) Here the erroneous form 'crucifigistis' seems to betray the origin of the perfects.

The following readings have some interest. Matth. xxvi. 50, 'amice, ad quod uenisti.' To this is added in two MSS. (both British-Irish) 'fac,' thus giving the sense adopted by the English Revisers who also supply 'do,' 'Friend, do that for which thou art come.' The Vulgate reads 'ad quid uenisti?'

Matth. xxi. 31, after the parable of the two sons one of whom refused to go but afterwards went, the other promised to go and went not: 'quis ex duobus fecit uoluntatem patris? Dicunt ei primus.' The authorities cited are pretty evenly divided between 'primus' and 'nouissimus.' Jerome has the latter but states that the true copies have 'primus,' adding that if 'nouissimus' is read the interpretation is that the Jews were unwilling to say what they really thought. Two Irish codd. reading 'nouissimus' transpose the preceding verses, thus agreeing with the Greek MSS. B and some others (so Westcott and Hort).

Matth. xiii. 55. Some Irish MSS. (with some Greek authorities) have 'iohannes' instead of 'ioseph' amongst the brethren of

the Lord, and one has both names. No doubt the reading was due to the frequent association of the names James and John.

It should be mentioned that the Preface

includes a conspectus of Bentley's readings in the Gospels taken from a volume in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

T. K. ABBOTT.

RESCH'S AGRAPHA.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur. V. Band. Heft 4. *Agrapha Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente in möglichster Vollständigkeit zusammengestellt und quellenkritisch untersucht* von P. prim. ALFRED RESCH. Anhang: *Das Evangelienfragment von Faiyum* von ADOLPH HARNACK. Leipzig, 1889. pp. xii. 520. 17 Mk.

THIS is probably the most complete collection and most thorough discussion of the 'Agrapha' that has yet been published. The author notices his predecessors in the same field—Cotelierius, Grabe, Fabricius, Lardner, Körner, Routh, Hofmann, Anger, Westcott, and Hilgenfeld—and then points out that the subject has by no means been exhausted. The collections in these authors are not as complete as they might be: the sources in each case have not been critically determined; and there has been very little material for a satisfactory exposition of the 'Agrapha.'

By 'Agrapha' are meant sayings of Jesus Christ which have been preserved independently of the canonical or the apocryphal gospels. They are 'unwritten' only in the sense that they are not contained in the recognized text of the written gospels which have come down to us. In no other sense are they unwritten; for of course they have been preserved in writing, either in the works of the Fathers, or in eccentric texts of the canonical gospels, such as the Cambridge Codex (D), or imbedded in books of the N.T. other than the gospels. Indeed the object of the work before us, as its title indicates, is to show that all these reputed sayings of our Lord are fragments of a gospel or gospels which preceded those which are now extant, whether such as St. Luke mentions in his preface or otherwise.

The positive tone which the author adopts on this and other points is somewhat unfortunate. Where from the nature of the case nothing but probability is attainable, and where to some minds the amount of probability would not seem to be very great, such

expressions as 'unquestionable,' 'indubitable,' 'must,' and the like, seem to be out of place. To take one example. We are told that the relationship between 1 Pet. iv. 8 and James v. 20 (where both speak of 'covering a multitude of sins') is to be explained by their common use of a saying of Christ's preserved in some gospel prior to the Synoptics. There is *no doubt* of this (*Es ist also zweifellos dass*). Yet one would suppose that it was at least possible that S. Peter may have been influenced by the words of S. James, or *vice versa*, or that either or both may have been influenced by similar expressions in the Psalms (lxxxv. 2; xxxii. 1) or Proverbs (x. 12). And we are assured that the hypothesis that S. Peter makes use of this primary source becomes an absolute certainty (*zur exacten Gewissheit*) when we consider the saying that 'love covers a multitude of sins.' That S. Peter uses the source of that which is common to the first three Gospels is probable enough, especially as that source was almost certainly his own teaching; but the saying about love covering a multitude of sins cannot prove this, nor can any number of patristic quotations of these words prove that they were uttered by Christ (pp. 248, 249).

With regard to a considerable number of the seventy-four 'unwritten words' which Resch has arranged and illustrated with admirable clearness and research, a variety of hypotheses are still open, other than that which he puts forward so confidently—that they are surviving fragments of a primary gospel. (1) They may be conscious or unconscious adaptations of passages in the canonical books of the N.T. They may be the result of bad memory, and that in two ways: (2) either distorted quotations of the words of Scripture, or (3) sayings erroneously believed to be Scripture by the person who quotes them. Such things still occur. 'Train up a child, *and away he do go*' has been substituted in good faith for 'Train up a child in the way that he should go'; and it would probably not be difficult to find persons who believe that 'cleanliness is