

possibly further helped by the commemorative associations of the verb.¹ Moreover, if such prayer was to be addressed to God in the imperative, *μνήσθητι* was more general than most possible alternatives such as *εὐλόγει*, and was applicable both to the living and to the dead.

PS.—p. 392, n. 3. This must not be pressed; for, as Dr Brightman has kindly indicated to me, we find in Theophilus *Ad Autolyicum* ii 27 *ἵνα, εἰ βέβη ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἀθανασίας τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μισθὸν κομίσηται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀθανασίαν καὶ γένηται θεός*. In Theophilus the words are essential, as the context is a discussion of the question, Was man made mortal by nature? As the feature cited from *C. Ap.* viii 12 does not appear in the parallel version, *C. Ap.* vii 34. 8, it may well here be a reminiscence of Theophilus, who is perhaps correctly identified with the Antiochene bishop of that name and whose writings may have exercised influence there: elsewhere we have but scanty indications of their continued use (Harnack-Preuschen *Gesch. altchr. Lit.* i 499). At the same time, in view of the lack of originality shown by Theophilus, the phrase may be due to a lost common source. Theophilus is not the source of the matter common to the two versions in *C. Ap.*: he lacks the characteristic element of God's promise to Adam.

A. D. Nock.

JEROME'S WORK ON THE PSALTER

PROFESSOR ALLGEIER'S fresh study of the Latin Psalters² is most welcome; it is a work as important for the critical study of the Psalms in Latin, as Dr A. V. Billens's work is for the Old Latin Pentateuch. It is divided into three parts: pp. 1-60 is a learned and well-documented history of the textual study of the Latin Psalter from 'Faber Stapulensis' to Lagarde and Dom Morin. Then follows on pp. 61-136 a full collation of the five chief types of Latin Psalter with the now dominant 'Gallican' Psalter (Hg), and on pp. 137-187 is a complete Concordance of the words in Hg and its rivals, the non-Hieronymian words being given in italics and the clearly Hieronymian corrections marked with an asterisk. This Concordance is no mere formal *Index uerborum*, but a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the evolution of the

¹ On gravestones occasionally, and commonly in the *graffiti* of tourists (J. Keil-A. von Premerstein *Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien, Wien. Denkschr.* liii ii p. 40 no. 78 with their note; Friedländer *Sittengeschichte Roms*¹⁰ i 443; Mouterde *Mélanges Beyrouth* viii 449).

² *Die altlateinischen Psalterien*: Prolegomena to a history of the text of St Jerome's translations of the Psalms, by A. Allgeier (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1928).

present text, and Prof. Allgeier is much to be congratulated on his achievement.

The five rivals of Hg are the Verona Psalter (R), the *Psalterium Romanum* (Hr), the Mozarabic Psalter (M), Sabatier's *Sangermanense* (G), and the Milan Psalter (Mi). Jerome's Hebrew Psalter (Hh) is naturally not included. A word or two about these authorities may not be out of place. Hg, now used everywhere in Roman Catholic worship except at Milan, Toledo, and St Peter's in Rome, is essentially the text of the *exemplar Parisiense*, the text approved by the University of Paris in the 13th century (Allgeier, p. 23). I venture to submit the conjecture that its wide diffusion is connected with the diffusion of the New Hymnary, which ousted the Old-Benedictine Hymnary not so very long after Charlemagne's time. R is almost identical with the text used by Augustine for his Commentary on the Psalms. Hr is said to be the text used by Gregory the Great: it is also very much like that of Niceta of Remesiana. St Benedict's Rule has a text almost half-way between Hr and M (the Mozarabic Psalter): so much so is this the case that I venture to think that the references to Pss xxxvii 7 and cxviii 107 on p. 40 of Abbot Butler's admirable edition of the Rule may be left out, for *Incurruatus sum et humiliatus sum usquequaque* is exactly Ps xxxvii 9 according to Hr and M.

It is possible now to make a guess at the extent and character of Jerome's work on the Psalter. It was distinguished by the same sort of discretion and conservatism as marked his revision of the Gospels, indeed by a considerably higher degree of conservatism. The words which he disliked, for one reason or another, are those printed in italic type in Prof. Allgeier's Index: specimens are *garrire* and *muscipula*. Besides these there are others, small in extent but clearly dependent on the Greek or even the Hebrew. Whose heart is coagulated like milk (Ps. cxviii 70)?¹ The Psalmist's, according to the ancient Latin Psalters and the *Tractatus Origenis* (p. 20). But Jerome corrected *cor meum* into *cor eorum* (= αἰρών). Again, how familiar to mediaeval and modern piety is the direct address to God in Ps. l 19 (li 17)—'The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, *Thou wilt* not despise'! But it was only familiar to mediaeval piety because some editor corrected the traditional *spernet* (or *spernit*) to the *despicies* of Jerome's Hebrew Psalter.

Prof. Allgeier calls his book Prolegomena to the Hieronymian translations of the Psalms. He is well aware that the true Old-Latin Psalter remains to be investigated, and it is good news that he is now actively engaged in this quest (p. 60). It is a curious and interesting subject,

¹ Ps. cxix 70 'Their heart is as fat as brawn (or grease)'.

very much concerned with the development of regulated Psalm-chanting during the 4th century. After all, Hg and Hr, and M and Mi, and even the ancient MSS called R and G, are all forms of the same translation. With a little goodwill any two of them might be chanted together antiphonally, though it might be disconcerting at times to get the wrong cues and when you were expecting *nimis* to hear your brother say *usquequaque*. But it would be quite impossible to chant the Verona text and Cyprian's Psalter together: words and rhythm are altogether different, both for Psalms and Canticles. How and when did the non-Cyprianic Psalter come into being? Did Augustine find the Cyprianic text still used when he came back to Africa as a Christian and an ecclesiastic? We hear of small differences exciting disputes, such as *florebit* for *floriet*, but nothing about the greater differences. We shall all look forward to what Prof. Allgeier has to say about these matters when he comes to them. Meanwhile we have to thank him for an admirable beginning, all the more admirable for his refusal to consider these earlier questions, interesting as they are, until he has methodically prepared the way for their discussion.

F. C. BURKITT.

A FURTHER NOTE ON ROMANS vi 17-18.

IT is a pleasure to find that Prof. Burkitt to an important extent agrees with what I wrote on these verses in the July number of the JOURNAL;¹ if I wish to offer some further remarks, this is chiefly with a view to making my own contention somewhat clearer and more cogent where it has failed to satisfy the Professor. It is difficult to foresee what points will seem most open to criticism; there are some which now seem to call for rather fuller treatment.

Perhaps I had better take as the basis of my remarks the new translation which I suggested for these verses:

'Thanks be to God that whereas ye were slaves to sin, and had given hearty obedience to that form of teaching whereunto ye had been delivered, yet ye were freed from sin, and enslaved to justness.'

The first point I should like to make clear is that St Paul could write *χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε . . . ὑπηκούσατε δὲ . . . ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ . . .*, even if *ἦτε* and *ὑπηκούσατε* both represented something highly undesirable, so that the real reason of the thanksgiving would begin with

¹ See *J. T. S.*, July 1928 (vol. xxix, pp. 381-4); Prof. Burkitt in *J. T. S.*, January 1929 (vol. xxx, pp. 190-1).