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 ἀγγέλων 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 ἀέρα 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*[1] had been disposed to agree, but afterwards in a notable article in the first number of the JOURNAL,[2] 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.[3]

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 (*b*) which was so employed. Whether the fresh readings of *b* 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 *b*, 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

[1] p. 55 ff (Cambridge 1896), (*Texts and Studies* &c. vol. iv no. 3).
[2] Vol. i (1899–1900) p. 129 ff.   [3] 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,[1] 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.

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

[1] Vallarsi dates the letter about the beginning of 383.

a (Lc. xv 11–32)	Hier. *epist.* xxi § 4 seq.
(15) Et abiit	et abiit
et **con***iunxit se*	et **con***iunxit se*
uni de MUNI**cipibus**	uni de *PRIN***cipibus**
regionis illius	regionis illius.
qui misit illum	**Qui** misit illum
in *agro suo*	in *agro suo*
ut pasceret porcos	ut pasceret porcos
(16) Et cupiebat **saturare**	Et cupiebat **saturare**
uentrem suum	uentrem suum
de siliquis	de siliquis
quas porci *EDEBANT*	*PORCORUM*
NEC QUISQUAM DABAT ILLI	ET NEMO ILLI DABAT
(17) In se autem *con*uersus	In se autem *con*uersus
dixit	dixit
Quanti mercenarii	quanti mercennarii
patris mei	patris mei
abundant *pane*	abundant *pane*
ego autem	ego autem
hic fame pereo	hic fame pereo
(18) *Surgens* ibo	*Surgens* ibo
ad patrem meum	ad patrem meum
et dicam illi	Et dicam illi
pater	pater
peccaui in caelum	peccaui in caelum
et coram te	et coram te
(19) iam non sum dignus	iam non sum dignus
uocari filius tuus	uocari filius tuus.
fac me sicut unum	Fac me sicut unum
ex mercenariis tuis	*ex* mercennariis tuis.
(20) Et SURGENS uenit	Et uenit
usque ad patrem suum	**usque** ad patrem suum
Cum**que** adhuc longe esset	Cum**que** adhuc longe esset
uidit ILLUM pater IPSIUS	uidit *EUM* pater *EIUS*
et misericordia motus est	et misericordia motus est
et **pro**currens	Et **pro**currens
incubuit	*incubuit*
super collum **ipsius**	*super* collum **ipsius**
et osculatus est *eum*	Et osculatus est *eum*
(21) Dixit *autem illi* filius	Dixit *autem illi* filius
pater	pater
peccaui in caelum	peccaui in caelum
et coram te	et coram te

a (Lc. xv 11–32)	Hier. *epist.* xxi § 4 seq.
iam non sum dignus	iam non sum dignus
uocari filius tuus	uocari filius tuus
(22) Dixit autem pater	Dixit autem pater
ad **pueros** suos	ad **pueros** suos
Celerius proferte	**celerius** proferte
stolam **priorem**	stolam **priorem**
et induite illum	
et date anulum	Et date anulum
in *manu* **illius**	in *manu* **illius**
et calciamenta	Et calciamenta
in *pedibus eius*	in *pedibus eius*
(23) et ADDUCITE	Et *ADFERTE*
uitulum *ILLUM* saginatum	uitulum saginatum
et occidite	et occidite
et manducemus	et manducemus
et aepulemur	et epulemur
(24) **quóniam** hic filius meus	**quoniam** hic filius meus
mortuus *fuerat*	mortuus *fuerat*
et reuixit	et reuixit
perierat	perierat
et inuentus est	et inuentus est
Et coeperunt aepulare	Et coeperunt epulari
(25) Erat autem	Erat autem
filius **illius** senior	filius **illius** senior
in agro	in agro
et cum ueniret	Et cum ueniret
adpropinquauit domui	**adpropinquauit** domui
et audiit	*et* audiuit
symphonia*s* et chorum	symphoniaм et chorum
(26) et uocauit	Et uocauit
unum de *pueris*	unum de *pueris*
et interrogauit	et interrogauit
quidnam essent haec	*quidnam essent haeс*
(27) **Qui ait** illi	**Qui ait** illi
quoniam frater tuus uenit	*quoniam* frater tuus uenit
et occidit	et occidit
pater tuus	pater tuus
uitulum *ILLUM* saginatum	uitulum saginatum
quoniam	**quoniam**
incolume	**incolumem**
illum recepit	illum recepit
(28) *Iratus* est autem	*Iratus* autem

a (Lc. xv 11–32)	Hier. *epist.* xxi § 4 seq.
ET *noluit intrare*	*noluit intrare*
Egressus autem	*Egressus autem*
pater illius	*pater illius*
coepit rogare **eum**	coepit rogare **eum**
(29) *Ipse* **autem**	*Ipse* **autem**
respondens **ait**	respondens **ait**
patri suo	patri suo
Ecce tot annis	ecce tot annis
seruio tibi	seruio tibi
et numquam	et humquam
mandatum tuum	mandatum tuum
praeteribi	praeteriui
et numquam	Et numquam
dedisti mihi	dedisti mihi
haedum	haedum
ut cum amicis meis	ut cum amicis meis
aepularer	epularer
(30) **Cum** *autem*	**Cum** *autem*
filius tuus hic	filius tuus hic
qui *comedit*	qui *comedit*
omnem facultatem suam	**omnem facultatem** suam
uiuens cum *FORNICARIIS*	**uiuens** cum MERETRICIBUS
uenit	uenit
et occidisti	*et* occidisti *EI*
uitulum *ILLUM* saginatum	uitulum saginatum
(31) *Ipse autem*	*Ipse autem*
dixit illi	dixit illi
	FILI
tu *MECUM FUISTI SEMPER ET ES*	tu *MECUM ES SEMPER*
et omnia mea	et omnia mea
tua sunt	tua sunt
(32) aepulari autem *nos OPORTEBAT*	Epulari *nos OPORTET*
et gaudere	*et gaudere*
quonium **hic frater tuus**	*quoniam* **hic frater tuus**
mortuus *fuerat*	mortuus *fuerat*
et reuixit	et reuixit
perierat	perierat
et inuentus est	et inuentus est

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

(A) Differences of underlying Greek :—

(v. 12) (a) et (καί), with אּ*DωL,[1] &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 ἤσθιον 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).[2]

(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.ᵉ).

(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 *q*, 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*.

---

[1] ω = the great majority of Greek MSS, L = Latin authorities.

[2] I omit vv. 23, 27, 30, as, though the *illum* represents the second τόν 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.-Cypr. Hier. Aug.), which, though it is found in the Cyprianic Bible[1]
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[2]
(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) (= ταχύ), where all others have *cito, priorem* (*v.* 22) (= πρώτην),
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,[3] with a wealth of illustrative matter, I found that he

---

[1] Von Soden *Das lateinische Neue Testament* u.s.w. (Leipzig 1909) p. 73.

[2] Cf. Von Soden *op. cit.* p. 142, &c.

[3] 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 (⅔) with *a* alone of Old-Latin authorities (p. xxvii).

xv 1 *accedentes* 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 א 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 ἐπί of D).

vg : *cecidit super* (= ἐπέπεσεν [ἔπεσεν] ἐπί of all others).

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

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

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

vg : *nolebat* (= οὐκ ἤθελεν א 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* : *oporte*(*ba*)*t et gaudere* (= (ἔ)δει καὶ χαρῆναι (ἀγαλλιαθῆναι) D K Π).

vg : *et gaudere oportebat* (= καὶ χαρῆναι ἔδει ℵ A B ω).

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*[1] would have been ; *panibus* (*v.* 17) to correspond better with the plural ἄρτων ; 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 πρός, 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* (ἦν). In *v.* 25 the error of taking ὡς 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.

[1] 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 *municeps* rather than *ciuis* (cf. Professor H. F. Pelham in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* No. ii p. 137 f).

A. SOUTER.