

the saints as 'your righteous brethren', and Peter asks where the rest of the righteous are, stood, in *A. P.*, in a different form.

Again, *Akh.* 17-19 and 21 are not represented in *Eth.*, and 21 at least is incompatible with the order adopted therein. A phrase of 17 has an echo in 21: 17 has ἐνδεδυμένοι ἦσαν ἔνδυμα ἁγγέλων φωτεινῶν, καὶ ὅμοιον ἦν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτῶν τῇ χώρᾳ αὐτῶν: cp. 21 οἱ κολαζόμενοι ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ κολάζοντες ἄγγελοι σκοτεινὸν εἶχον τὸ ἔνδυμα κατὰ τὸν αἶρα τοῦ τόπου. In these lines, therefore, there has been adaptation on the part of one of our texts. *Akh.* 20, where our Lord says 'This is the place of your leaders (?), the righteous men', has an equivalent in *Eth.*, 'Hast thou seen the company of the Fathers? This is their rest'.

A question akin to the last treated is, whether the whole of the matter which I suggest was contained in the *A. P.* could have been compressed within the 300 στίχοι (each presumably of 34-36 letters) which is recorded as having been the compass of the book in Greek (the Latin numeration of the Codex Claromontanus gives 270). I think an affirmative answer is reasonable. The Akhmim text gives us something to go upon. In it the prediction (vv. 1-3) makes about 7 στίχοι: the next paragraph (not all of which was in *A. P.*, as I think) another 7. The section on Paradise (6-20), 39 στίχοι. The description of Hell, 81: in all, 134. We know that in *A. P.* the description of Hell, even in the portion parallel to *Akh.*, was somewhat longer: say that it contained 100 στίχοι. I believe that the prophecy of Judgement, and the remainder of the description of Hell, could be got into 150 στίχοι; and 50 would remain for the introduction and conclusion. This is largely guesswork, but it seems worth while to record the fact that no insuperable obstacle to the identification of *Eth.* with the *A. P.* arises on the score of the known length of the latter.

M. R. JAMES.

## THE TYPE OR TYPES OF GOSPEL TEXT USED BY ST JEROME AS THE BASIS OF HIS REVISION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ST LUKE'S GOSPEL AND CODEX VERCELLENSIS (a).

In the investigation of the Old-Latin authorities for the text of the Gospels it is of the utmost importance that we should secure as a starting-point a text of the Vulgate as it left the hands of St Jerome, and there can be little doubt that the edition of Wordsworth and White has practically conferred this upon us. In individual passages it is, of course,

possible to disagree with their verdict, but even in these cases it is they who provide us with the very evidence which leads some critics to another conclusion. The service they have rendered to the study of the Vulgate, however, is by no means confined to the construction of a text and the compilation of an apparatus, and amongst the further interesting features of their edition is the text of *f* (Codex Brixianus, of the sixth century), which they print below their text of the Vulgate as in their opinion (and that of Westcott and Hort) the type of text which St Jerome used as the basis of his revision.

This view has not been allowed to pass unchallenged. Professor Burkitt in his *The Old Latin and the Itala*<sup>1</sup> had been disposed to agree, but afterwards in a notable article in the first number of the JOURNAL,<sup>2</sup> while admitting that for about ninety per cent. of their texts *f* and the Vulgate agree, he shewed that there were a number of cases where *f* stood in solitary agreement with the sole MS of the Gothic version among all extant authorities for the text of the Gospels. He explained *f* as representing a fundamentally Old-Latin text, which had been partly corrected to the Vulgate, before it was altered to suit the readings and renderings of the Gothic. Both his conjecture that *f* represents the Latin side of a Gothico-Latin codex, and his other conjecture that the discovery of another MS of the Gothic might reveal yet further coincidences with *f* have been signally verified by a discovery made in Egypt of a fragment of just such a *codex*, to which he himself has referred in the JOURNAL for July last.<sup>3</sup>

Having thus destroyed the claim that *f* represents the type of text used by St Jerome as the basis of his Vulgate, he suggests that in reality it was a MS more like *cod. Veronensis* (*δ*) which was so employed. Whether the fresh readings of *δ* which Mr Buchanan has discovered and published in his recent edition (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts* vi) will cause him to modify his view in any way I do not know; I do not fancy so. On the problem as a whole I have no right to speak. I merely wish to suggest that Latin Gospel codices in the fourth century may have been made up of assorted texts, or in other words that a version may not have been always 'einheitlich' throughout a particular MS of the four Gospels. I make this suggestion in view of the possibility that in one of the four Gospels St Jerome may have used a type different from *δ*, without prejudice to the possibility that in the other three Gospels he may really have employed the latter type. This view occurs to me as the result of a little research only recently made possible.

It does not seem to have occurred to any one to examine fully what type or types of Old-Latin text Jerome actually cites in his surviving

<sup>1</sup> p. 55 ff (Cambridge 1896), (*Texts and Studies* &c. vol. iv no. 3).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i (1899-1900) p. 129 ff.

<sup>3</sup> pp. 611-613.

works. This kind of detective work can be pursued even with Vallarsi's edition, which is perhaps for the most part worthy of the great esteem in which it is commonly held. But certainly a new era in the study of St Jerome has dawned with the publication of the first volume of the Vienna edition of his works, containing Epistles 1 to 70. In Epistle xxi, written to Pope Damasus himself, the 'onlie begetter' of the Vulgate, about the very time of its publication,<sup>1</sup> Jerome, in giving an extended comment on the section concerning the Prodigal Son, chooses not his new revision, but a text practically identical with that of cod. Vercellensis (*a*) traditionally said to have been written by Eusebius of Vercelli himself (*ob.* 371)!

In the left-hand column I give the text of *a*, and in the right that of St Jerome; the portions of both texts which agree with the Vulgate are printed in Roman type. The real differences between the text in *a* and that in Jerome are given in capitals, these capitals being Roman where the reading agrees with the Vulgate, and italic where it differs from the Vulgate. The ordinary italics represent readings differing from the Vulgate which are found in one or more Old-Latin MSS other than *a*. Readings in Clarendon type are unknown in any other MSS the texts of which are accessible to me.

<i>a</i> (Lc. xv 11-32)	Hier. <i>epist.</i> xxi § 4 seq.
Homo quidam	Homo quidam
<i>habebat</i> duos filios	<i>habebat</i> duos filios
(12) et dixit <i>illi</i> adolescentior	Et dixit <i>illi</i> adolescentior
pater	pater
da mihi portionem substantiae	da mihi portionem substantiae
quae me contingit	quae me contingit
ET diuisit <i>ILLIS</i> substantiam	<i>QUI</i> diuisit <i>EIS</i> substantiam
(13) Et non post multos dies	Et non post multos dies
<b>collectis</b> omnibus	<b>collectis</b> omnibus
adolescentior filius	adolescentior filius
peregre profectus est	peregre profectus est
in regionem longinquam	in regionem longinquam
et ibi dissipauit	Et ibi dissipauit
substantiam suam	substantiam suam
<i>uiuens</i> luxuriose	<i>uiuens</i> luxuriose
(14) <i>cumque consumpsisset</i> omnia	<b>Cumque consumpsisset</b> omnia
facta est famis ualida	facta est fames ualida
<i>per regionem illam</i>	<i>per regionem illam</i>
et ipse coepit egeri	Et ipse coepit egeri

<sup>1</sup> Vallarsi dates the letter about the beginning of 383.

a (Lc. xv 11-32)

Hier. *epist.* xxi § 4 seq.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (15) Et abiit<br>et <b>coniunxit</b> se<br>uni de <b>Municipibus</b><br>regionis illius<br><b>qui</b> misit illum<br>in <i>agro suo</i><br>ut pasceret porcos   | et abiit<br>et <b>coniunxit</b> se<br>uni de <b>PRINCIPIBUS</b><br>regionis illius.<br><b>Qui</b> misit illum<br>in <i>agro suo</i><br>ut pasceret porcos   |
| (16) Et cupiebat <b>saturare</b><br>uentrem suum<br>de siliquis<br>quas porci <i>EDEBANT</i><br><i>NEC QUISQUAM DABAT ILLI</i>  | Et cupiebat <b>saturare</b><br>uentrem suum<br>de siliquis<br><i>PORCORUM</i><br>ET NEMO ILLI DABAT   |
| (17) In se autem <i>conuersus</i><br>dixit<br>Quanti mercenarii<br>patris mei<br>abundant <i>pane</i><br>ego autem<br>hic fame pereo  | In se autem <i>conuersus</i><br>dixit<br>quanti mercennarii<br>patris mei<br>abundant <i>pane</i><br>ego autem<br>hic fame pereo  |
| (18) <i>Surgens</i> ibo<br>ad patrem meum<br>et dicam illi<br>pater<br>peccaui in caelum<br>et coram te   | <i>Surgens</i> ibo<br>ad patrem meum<br>Et dicam illi<br>pater<br>peccaui in caelum<br>et coram te  |
| (19) iam non sum dignus<br>uocari filius tuus<br>fac me sicut unum<br><i>ex</i> mercenariis tuis  | iam non sum dignus<br>uocari filius tuus.<br>Fac me sicut unum<br><i>ex</i> mercennariis tuis.  |
| (20) Et <b>SURGENS</b> uenit<br><b>usque</b> ad patrem suum<br>Cum <b>que</b> adhuc longe esset<br>uidit <i>ILLUM</i> pater <i>IPSIUS</i><br>et misericordia motus est<br>et <b>procurrens</b><br><i>incubuit</i><br><i>super</i> collum <b>ipsius</b><br>et osculatus est <i>eum</i> | Et uenit<br><b>usque</b> ad patrem suum<br>Cum <b>que</b> adhuc longe esset<br>uidit <i>EUM</i> pater <i>EIUS</i><br>et misericordia motus est<br>Et <b>procurrens</b><br><i>incubuit</i><br><i>super</i> collum <b>ipsius</b><br>Et osculatus est <i>eum</i> |
| (21) Dixit <i>autem illi</i> filius<br>pater<br>peccaui in caelum<br>et coram te  | Dixit <i>autem illi</i> filius<br>pater<br>peccaui in caelum<br>et coram te   |

a (Lc. xv 11-32)

- iam non sum dignus  
uocari filius tuus  
(22) Dixit autem pater  
ad **pueros** suos  
**Celerius** proferte  
stolam **priorem**  
et induite illum  
et date anulum  
in *manu* **illius**  
et calciamenta  
in *pedibus eius*  
(23) et **ADDUCITE**  
uitulum *ILLUM* saginatum  
et occidite  
et manducemus  
et epulemur  
(24) **quoniam** hic filius meus  
mortuus *fuera*t  
et reuixit  
perierat  
et inuentus est  
Et coeperunt epulare  
(25) Erat autem  
filius **illius** senior  
in agro  
et cum ueniret  
**adpropinquauit** domui  
*et* audiit  
symphonias et chorum  
(26) et uocauit  
unum de *pueris*  
et interrogauit  
*quidnam essent haec*  
(27) **Qui** ait illi  
*quoniam* frater tuus uenit  
et occidit  
pater tuus  
uitulum *ILLUM* saginatum  
**quoniam**  
**incolume**  
illum recepit  
(28) **Iratus** est autem

Hier. *epist.* xxi § 4 seq.

- iam non sum dignus  
uocari filius tuus  
Dixit autem pater  
ad **pueros** suos  
**celerius** proferte  
stolam **priorem**  
  
Et date anulum  
in *manu* **illius**  
Et calciamenta  
in *pedibus eius*  
Et *ADFERTE*  
uitulum saginatum  
et occidite  
et manducemus  
et epulemur  
**quoniam** hic filius meus  
mortuus *fuera*t  
et reuixit  
perierat  
et inuentus est  
Et coeperunt epulari  
Erat autem  
filius **illius** senior  
in agro  
Et cum ueniret  
**adpropinquauit** domui  
*et* audiuit  
symphoniam et chorum  
Et uocauit  
unum de *pueris*  
et interrogauit  
*quidnam essent haec*  
**Qui** ait illi  
*quoniam* frater tuus uenit  
et occidit  
pater tuus  
uitulum saginatum  
**quoniam**  
**incolumem**  
illum recepit  
*Iratus* autem

a (Lc. xv 11-32)

ET noluit intrare

Egressus autem

pater illius

coepit rogare eum

(29) *Ipse autem*

respondens ait

patri suo

Ecce tot annis

seruio tibi

et numquam

mandatum tuum

praeteribi

et numquam

dedisti mihi

haedum

ut cum amicis meis

aepularer

(30) *Cum autem*

filius tuus hic

qui comedit

omnem facultatem suam

uiuens cum FORNICARIIS

uenit

et occidisti

uitulum ILLUM saginatum

(31) *Ipse autem*

dixit illi

tu MECUM FUISTI SEMPER ET  
ES

et omnia mea

tua sunt

(32) *aepulari autem nos OPORTEBAT*

et gaudere

quoniam hic frater tuus

mortuus fuerat

et reuixit

perierat

et inuentus est

Hier. *epist.* xxi § 4 seq.

noluit intrare

Egressus autem

pater illius

coepit rogare eum

*Ipse autem*

respondens ait

patri suo

ecce tot annis

seruio tibi

et numquam

mandatum tuum

praeteriui

Et numquam

dedisti mihi

haedum

ut cum amicis meis

epularer

*Cum autem*

filius tuus hic

qui comedit

omnem facultatem suam

uiuens cum MERETRICIBUS

uenit

et occidisti ET

uitulum saginatum

*Ipse autem*

dixit illi

FILI

tu MECUM ES SEMPER

et omnia mea

tua sunt

*Epulari nos OPORTET*

et gaudere

quoniam hic frater tuus

mortuus fuerat

et reuixit

perierat

et inuentus est

Let us first note the differences between the two texts :—

(A) Differences of underlying Greek :—

- (v. 12) (a) et (καί), with **N<sup>\*</sup>DWL**,<sup>1</sup> &c.  
(Hier.) qui (ὅς), unparalleled, perhaps a mere stylistic improvement of Jerome's.
- (v. 15) (a) municipibus (πολιτῶν, universal).  
(Hier.) principibus, if not due ultimately to a πρώτων, a scribe's error for πολιτῶν, may be an error in the archetype of Jerome.
- (v. 16) (a) quas porci edebant (ὧν ἡσθιον οἱ χοῖροι, universal).  
(Hier.) porcorum, perhaps a simplification of Jerome's, in the interests of brevity.
- (v. 20) (a) surgens (ἀναστάς, universal).  
(Hier.) om. probably an error in the archetype of Jerome's letter.
- (v. 22) (a) et induite illum (καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν, universal).  
(Hier.) om. perhaps like the last (some MSS of Hier. insert the words).<sup>2</sup>
- (v. 25) (a) symphonias (συνφωνίας, almost universal).  
(Hier.) symphoniam, probably a stylistic alteration to harmonize with the singular *chorum*, but *gat* agrees.
- (v. 28) (a) et (καί, universal).  
(Hier.) recasts the sentence in the interests of style.
- (v. 30) (a) ei om. with **DL** (vt.<sup>o</sup>).  
(Hier.) αὐτῷ with all other authorities.
- (v. 31) (a) fili om. with **D**.  
(Hier.) fili (τέκνον), with all other authorities.  
(a) mecum fuisti semper et es (exactly thus only in *g*, but other Old-Latins have a similar expansion ; there is no known Greek authority for it).  
(Hier.) mecum es semper (this precise order appears to be unparalleled, but the *reading* is the common one).
- (v. 32) (a) oportebat (ἔδει) with the great majority of authorities.  
(Hier.) oportet (δεῖ) with **H L** and a number of Old-Latin MSS, &c.

(B) Differences of rendering :—

- (v. 12) (a) illis (with *e b ff vg*).  
(Hier.) eis. It would be generally admitted that Jerome frequently alters the Old-Latin *ille*.

<sup>1</sup> **(W)** = the great majority of Greek MSS, **L** = Latin authorities.

<sup>2</sup> I omit *vv.* 23, 27, 30, as, though the *illum* represents the second τὸν in the Greek, there is no reason to suppose that it was omitted for any other reason in Latin than because it was unnecessary.

(v. 16) (a) nec quisquam (following the classical idiom, spoilt by the later literalness).

(Hier.) et nemo (with *e b ff q vg*).

(v. 20) (a) illum (with *e b ff q vg*).

(Hier.) eum (cf. v. 12).

(a) ipsius (with *b ff vg*).

(Hier.) eius.

(v. 23) (a) adducite (with *e b ff q vg*).

(Hier.) adferte.

(v. 30) (a) fornicariis.

(Hier.) meretricibus.

This last difference is interesting. *Fornicaria* is a vulgar word (Tert. Ps.-Cyp. Hier. Aug.), which, though it is found in the Cyprianic Bible<sup>1</sup> and has survived in *e* at this place, is never found in the Vulgate, πόρνη being always rendered by *meretrix* (except in Apoc. xvii 16, where even Tyconius has *meretrix*).

The two texts are clearly the same, and the identity is even closer than might be suggested by the clarendon type, for I have refrained from using it in some cases where its use would have been perfectly legitimate. For instance, though every element of the following phrase is to be found in some Old-Latin MS or other, the exact combination *egressus autem pater illius* (v. 28) is confined to these two texts, and might very well have been so marked. The force of such identity of rendering as *collectis* (v. 13), which is an 'African' rendering of συνάγειν<sup>2</sup> (for the usual European *congregare*), as *coniunxit se* (v. 15) = ἐκολλήθη, represented by a bewildering variety of words in other texts, as *celerius* (v. 22) (= ταχὺ), where all others have *cito*, *priorem* (v. 22) (= πρῶτην), where all others have *primam*, the penchant for *ille* (vv. 22, 25), and *quoniam* (vv. 24, 27, &c.), the occurrence of the good old word *incolumem* (v. 27) (= ὑγιαίνοντα), instead of the more exact *saluum* of the others, will be admitted by all who have studied Latin texts.

Thus far it had been possible to proceed in May 1910, and the discovery seemed striking enough to deserve immediate publication, which it received in the *British Congregationalist*. But in reading through the sumptuous volume in which Mr H. C. Hoskier has published (Feb. 1911) a collation of *The Hamilton Gospels* (saec. vii-viii, written in the North of England), now in the possession of Mr J. Pierpont Morgan,<sup>3</sup> with a wealth of illustrative matter, I found that he

<sup>1</sup> Von Soden *Das lateinische Neue Testament* u.s.w. (Leipzig 1909) p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Von Soden *op. cit.* p. 142, &c.

<sup>3</sup> With splendid munificence copies of this wonderful book (of which only 200 have been privately printed) have been given not only to various public institutions but also to some private persons in this country.



had independently observed Jerome's use of the *a* type of text. Mr Hoskier gives the following instances :—

Luke vii 32 *planxistis* Jerome (J) with *a* alone of Old-Latin authorities (p. xxvii).

xv 1 *accidentes* Jerome with *a* alone of Old-Latin authorities (p. xxix).

15 *coniunxit se* Jerome with *a* alone of Old-Latin authorities (p. xxix).

xvi 7 *cautionem* Jerome with *a* alone of Old-Latin authorities (p. xxix).

xix 12 *paterfamilias* Jerome with *a* alone of Old-Latin authorities (p. xxix).

He remarks (p. xxix): 'We find that *St Jerome* was using the *a* text at the time he addressed Damasus'; 'it remains noteworthy that *St Jerome* was well acquainted with and used *a*.' On p. cxiv he speaks of *a* as *St Jerome's* 'friend'.

I venture to think, then, it may be taken as established that for *St Luke's Gospel* *St Jerome* habitually used an Old-Latin text practically identical with *a*. It has been noted that in the Fourth Gospel the text of *a* is closely related to the copies employed by Novatian and Lucifer. It will be necessary to ask later whether *Jerome* has special points of context with the text of *a* in other Gospels also.

If, then, *St Jerome* regularly used this type of text, and chose it to comment on in a letter to Pope Damasus at the very time when the preparation of the revision we know as the Vulgate was in hand, may it not be, is it not in fact probable, that this was the type of text he used, in *St Luke's Gospel* at least, as the basis of his revision? Let us assume for the moment that it was, and see whether we can explain the alterations made by *St Jerome*. And the first question to ask is whether there are any differences between *a* and *vg* in the underlying Greek text in this section. Leaving doubtful cases out of account, we ought perhaps to conjecture a difference in the underlying Greek in the following cases :—

(v. 19) *a*: *iam non* (= οὐκέτι of N A B D *al.*).

*vg*: *et iam non* (= καὶ οὐκέτι of G M P X *al.*) (cf. Wordsworth-White, p. 665).

(v. 20) *a*: *incubuit super* (= ἐνέπεσεν ἐπὶ of D).

*vg*: *cecidit super* (= ἐπέπεσεν [ἐπεσεν] ἐπὶ of all others).

(v. 22) *a*: *pedibus eius* (= τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ D G P X *al.*).

*vg*: *pedes* (= τοὺς πόδας N A B L M *ω*).

(v. 28) *a*: *noluit* (= οὐκ ᾔθέλησεν A L P X *al. pauc.*).

*vg*: *nolebat* (= οὐκ ᾔθελεν N B D *ω*).

(v. 30) *a* : *omnem* (traces of this in the πάντα of D and e).

vg : *om.* (with all others).

(v. 32) *a* : *oportet*(ba)t *et gaudere* (= (ἐ)δει καὶ χαρῆναι (ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι) D K II).

vg : *et gaudere oportebat* (= καὶ χαρῆναι εἶδει N A B W).

St Jerome had a Greek text before him of the type we should have expected. But there has been still more alteration in the matter of rendering. The wording of this priceless parable, if it was to be altered at all, must be delicately altered in the interests of accuracy. The coarseness of *a* is avoided by the substitution of *implere* for *saturare* (v. 16). *Uiuens* (v. 13) is altered to *uiuendo*, because the latter better expresses the means than the coincident participle does. *Conuersus* (v. 17) may have been altered to *reuersus*, to avoid the ambiguity of the technical sense of the former. *Surgens ibo* (v. 18) is loose Latin, seeing that the rising is really prior to, and not coincident with, the going : the knot is cut by *surgam et ibo*. In v. 20 *accurrens* gives better point than *procurrens*. In v. 26 *haec essent* is a more dignified, if a less pointed, ending than *essent haec*. In v. 30 *substantiam* is certainly purer Latin than *facultatem* (sing.). The Vulgate, too, is full of more exact renderings of the Greek : *adhaesit* (v. 15) ; *ciuium* (v. 15) a wider word than *municipum*<sup>1</sup> would have been ; *panibus* (v. 17) to correspond better with the plural ἄρων ; in verse 19 *de* is distinctly better than *ex*, as the Greek has only a possessive genitive (and no ἐκ) ; in verse 20 *usque* is rejected as redundant, the Greek having simply πρὸς, and in v. 22 the comparative *celerius* is changed to the positive to represent ταχύ, point being gained, while a nice Latin idiom is rejected ; in the same verse note the superior accuracy of *primam* and *manum*. The pluperfect *fuerat* (vv. 24, 32), characteristic of the earlier translators, is rejected for the more exact *erat* (ἐν). In v. 25 the error of taking ὥς closely and only with the ἐρχόμενος is corrected by St Jerome. In v. 30 the *uiuens* (without Greek equivalent) introduced by the translator to help out the sense is summarily ejected in the interests of literalness.

<sup>1</sup> It is not impossible that some inference as to the locality in which the translator of the *a* type worked should be drawn from his use of *municipes* rather than *ciuis* (cf. Professor H. F. Pelham in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* No. ii p. 137 f).

A. SOUTER.