

Emendations and Corrections.¹

BY REV. J. I. MOMBERT, D.D.

IT has been already intimated² that the Hieronymian Version displaced the old very slowly, and that its official adoption by the various churches was rather the result of ecclesiastical usage than of formal authorization.³ Various causes were at work to vitiate it. Jerome did not write out his own version, but dictated it to amanuenses, and employed transcribers to multiply copies for others; these bad copies, not having had the benefit of his own revision, of course contained inaccuracies; subsequent copies grew worse and worse, when transcribers began to interpolate the Hieronymian text by the Itala, and hardly a century after his death, *quot codices tot exemplaria* applied as well to the former as in Jerome's time it had been true of the latter. It is therefore not surprising that the Latin Bible, which passed as Jerome's, very speedily needed revision, and the first to engage in that work was Cassiodorus, one of the most imposing characters of the sixth century, who, in his old age, founded a monastery, and established in it a splendid library which contained, besides the Septuagint and the revised Itala, also the translation of Jerome; his work, *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*, an introduction to the profitable reading of the Holy Scriptures for the use of the monks, happily preserved,⁴ contains full particulars concerning the causes of the corruptions of the text of the Latin Bible, and the principles to be observed for the preservation of a pure text. With the assistance of some friends he undertook the revision of the Psalter, the Prophets, and the Epistles of the New Testament by old Mss. of Jerome's version, leaving it to his monks as a pattern according to which old copies were to be corrected, and new ones to be made. His principle was to avoid conjecture and a new version, and to restore the original text by collation with the best Mss.; only in cases where the collation failed to fix the original renderings of the Itala the monks were

¹ Read in June, 1885.

² In a former treatise, still in manuscript.

³ See my *Hieronymian Versions*, still in manuscript, and Hody, *De bibliorum textibus originalibus*, &c., pp. 441 sqq.

⁴ Migne, vol. LXX. pp. 1105 sqq.

instructed to consult the LXX., and in the case of similar renderings of the Hieronymian version to have recourse, if possible, to the Hebrew. Cassiodorus cautions the monks against the mischievous practice of modernizing the text, and insists upon its being fixed by documentary evidence; e.g. such renderings as the following he wants to remain unchanged:—

- Ps. VII. 9: Secundum innocentiam manuum mearum.
 “ XXVIII. 13: auribus percipe lacrymas meas.
 “ LXII. 9: effundite coram illo corda vestra.
 “ LXIII. 9: Adhaesit anima mea post te.
 “ LXVI. 6: multiplicasti locupletare eam. Ibi laetabimur in idipsum.
 “ LXXV. 9: et inclinavit ex hoc in hoc.
 “ CV. 26: Misit Moysen servum suum, Aaron, quem eligit ipsum.
 “ CXIX. 82: Defecerunt oculi mei in eloquium tuum.

Proper names, such as, Seth, Enoch, Lamech, Noe, Sem, Cham, Japhet, Aaron, David; Sion, Oreb, Geon, Hermon, are not to be declined. Ambiguous words, such as, mons, leo, cedrus, catulus leonis, clamor, homo, fructus, calix, vitulus, pastor, thesaurus, vermis, canis, etc., are not to be altered, nor are figurative expressions to be exchanged into literal ones; as, Satanus into “who swerves from the right way”; *semel* into *incommutabilis*, etc., the interpretation of such words being the province of a commentator, not that of a transcriber; even solecisms, provided they are proved on documentary evidence to be the original readings, must not be touched, such as,—

Ps. 44: 16, oblitus non sumus te; 55: 24, viri sanguinum et dolosi; 24: 1, terra in qua habitant in ea; 22: 21, de manu canis anima mea; 95: 12, tunc exsultabunt omnia ligna silvarum; 98: 8, flumina plaudent manibus in se, etc.

On the other hand, Cassiodorus provided his monks with a set of rules for the correction of errors, such as, the wrong case after a preposition, mistakes of declension and conjugation, and even those of orthography, provided that all changes introduced rest on the authority of the ancient Mss.; as to punctuation, they were to see that it be agreeably to the received rules in the Itala, but in the new version the colons and commas of Jerome were to be decisive. These judicious and scholarly directions, however, appear alas! to have remained a dead letter, for, in the seventh century, the Hieronymian text had become notoriously corrupt, and in the eighth so confused and utterly uncertain that a revision of it was indispensable. The impetus, curiously enough, was not given by the church, but by

Charlemagne, who, about 800, charged Alcuin, his chancellor and friend, to provide a reliable text of the Latin Bible. There is no evidence that Alcuin, who presented his revision to Charlemagne on Christmas day, 801,¹ consulted the Greek and Hebrew originals; the passages which Hody (*l. c.*, p. 409) adduces to show his knowledge of Hebrew are simply quotations from Jerome, and in one instance, Gen. xxv. 8, where the latter calls attention to its inadequate rendering,² Alcuin left the passage as it stood. His revision is just such a one as Cassiodorus had recommended, and seems to have consisted in the collation of Mss. of the Vulgate. Its success, doubtless promoted by the vast influence of Charlemagne, — whose main object was to establish a uniform text, especially in the church service, — was very marked, and the *Biblia Alcuini* or *Biblia Caroli Magni*, rapidly drove out of use all other editions of the Bible. Carefully prepared copies were distributed throughout the empire, and a relatively large number of such Mss. has been preserved. The Alcuinian revision was, on the whole, very creditable, and the text he furnished a vast improvement on its predecessors. An example will illustrate this: —

*Specimen Characterum Bibliorum Sacrorum Venerabilis Monasterii
S. Pauli extra muros Urbis Romae scriptorum tempore Karoli
Magni, Blanchini, Ev. Quad. II. p. dlxxvii.*

S C D

Lucae Cap. III Anno autem quinto decimo Imperii Tiberii caesaris procurante pontio pilato iudaeam Tetrarcha autē galileae herode philippo autem fratre eius tetrarcha itureae & traconitidis regionis & lysania abyline tetrarcha sub principibus sacerdotum anna & caipha Factum est uerbum dñi super iohannem zachariae filiū in deserto

Et uenit in omnem regionem iordanis praedicans baptismum paenitentiae in remissionem peccatorū sicut scriptum est in libro sermonum isaiae prophetae Vox clamantis in deserto parate uiam dñi rectas facite semitas eius Omnis uallis implebitur & omnis mons & collis humiliabitur & erunt praua in directa & aspera in uias planas Et uidebit omnis caro salutare dī

Dicebat ergo ad turbas quae exiebant ut baptizarentur ab ipso Genimina uiperarū quis ostendit uobis fugere a uentura ira? Facite ergo fructus dignos paenitentiae & ne coeperitis dicere patrem habemus abraham. Dico enī uobis quia potest d̄s de lapidibus istis suscitare filios abraham. Iam enim securis ad radicē arborum posita est Omnis ergo arbor non faciens fructum bonum excidetur & in ignem mittetur

¹ See Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, for excerpts from the epistles of Alcuin.

² Hieron. *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.*, Op. III., p. 344, ed. Vall.

Et interrogabant eū turbæ dicentes: Quid ergo faciemus? Respondens autē dicebat illis: Qui habet duas tunicas det non habenti: Et qui habet escas similiter faciat: Venerunt autem & publicani ut baptizarentur & dixerunt ad illum

Magister quid faciemus? At ille dixit ad eos: Nihil amplius quam quod constitutum est vobis faciatis: Interrogabant autē eū & milites dicentes: Quid faciemus & nos? Et ait illis: Neminem concutiat: neque calumniam faciatis: & contempti estote stipendiis uestris: Existimante autē populo & cogitantibus omnibus in cordibus suis de iohanne ne forte ipse esset xps? Respondit iohannes dicens omnibus: Ego quidem aqua baptizo vos: Veniet autem fortior me cuius non sum dignus soluere corrigiam calciamentorū eius ipse vos baptizabit in spū s̄to & igni

Cuius uentilabrium in manu eius & purgabit aream suam & congregabit triticū in horreum suum: paleas autē comburet igni inextinguibili: Multa quidem & alia exhortans euangelizabat populo:

The general arrangement of *capitula* and *versus*, etc., in the Alcuin Ms., called *Charlemagne's Bible* (Brit. Mus. Addit. 10, 516), taken from Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, III., p. 1704, brings out all the salient features of that class of Latin Bibles:—

Epistola ad Paulinum. Praefatio.

Bresit, i.e. *Genesis*

capp. LXXXII. habet versos III.DCC.

Ellesmoth, i.e. *Exodus*

capp. CXXXVIII. V. III.

Leuiticus, Hebraice *Vaieera*

capp. LXXXVIII. V. II.CCC.

Numeri

capp. LXXXVIII. hab. vers. numr. III.

Addabarim, Grece *Deuterionium*

capp. CLV. habet vers. II.DC.

Praefatio Jesu Naue et Judicum.

Josue Ben Nun.

capp. XXXIII. habet vers. I.DCCL.

Softim, i.e. *Judicum* (liber)

capp. XVIII. habet vers. numr.

I.DCCL.

Ruth

none. habet vers. numr. CCL.

Praefatio (Prologus galeatus).

Samuhel (Regum) lib. prim.

capp. XXVI. habet vers. II.CCC.

Samuhel (Regum) lib. sec.

capp. XVIII. habet versus, II.CC.

Malachim, i.e. *Regum* lib. tert.

capp. XVIII. (for XVIII.) habet

vers. II.D.

Malachim, i.e. *Regum* lib. quart.

capp. XVII. habet versus II.CCL.

Prologus.

Isaias

none. habet vers. III.DLXXX.

Prologus

Hieremias (with Lam. and Prayer)

none. habet versus III.CCCCL.

Prologus

Hiezeheel (-iel)

none. none.

Danihel

none. habet versus I.DCCCL.

Osee, Jofel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas,

Michas, Naum, Abacuc,

Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias,

<i>Malachias,</i>	none.	none.	
Prologus			
<i>Job</i>	none.		V̄. I.DCC.
Origo Proph. David.	Praefatio		
Liber <i>Psalorum</i> (Gallican)	none.	habet vr.	V.
Epist. ad Chroni. et Heliod.			
Liber <i>Proverbiorum.</i>	capp.	LX. habet versus	I.DCCXL.
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	capp.	XXXI. none.	
<i>Cantica Canticorum</i>	none.	habet vers.	CCLXXX.
Liber <i>Sapientiae</i>	capp.	XLVIII. habet versus	I.DCC.
<i>Ecclesiasticus</i>	capp.	CXXXVII. habet versus	II.DCCC.
Praefatio			
<i>Dabreiamin</i> lib. prim.	none.	hab. (sic).	
<i>Paralyptominon</i> (lib. sec.)	none.	none.	
Praefatio			
Liber <i>Esrae</i>	—	—	
Prologus			
<i>Hester</i> (with addit.)	none.	habet versus	V̄.DCC.
Praefatio			
<i>Tobias</i>	none.	none.	
Prologus			
<i>Judith</i>	—	habet versus	I.C.
Liber <i>Machabr.</i> prim.	LXI.	none.	
<i>Machabr.</i> liber sec.	LV.	—	
Praef. ad Damasum.			
Argumentum.			
Canones.			
Prologus.			
<i>Mattheus</i>	capp.	LXXXI. habet vers.	II.DCC.
<i>Marcus</i>	capp.	XLVI. hab.	V̄. I.DCC.
<i>Lucas</i>	capp.	LXXIII. vers.	III.DCCC.
<i>Johannes</i>	capp.	XXXV. vers.	I. DCCC.
Lib. <i>Actuum Apost.</i>	capp.	LXXIII. habet vers.	III.DC.
Prologus septem Epistolarium Can.			
Epistl. <i>Sci. Jacobi</i>	capp.	XX. none.	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Petri prim.</i>	capp.	XX. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Petri sec.</i>	capp.	XI. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Joh. prim.</i>	capp.	XX. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Joh. sec.</i>	capp.	V. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Joh. tert.</i>	capp.	V. —	
Epistl. <i>Sci. Jud.</i>	capp.	VII. —	
Epla. <i>ad Romanos</i>	capp.	II. habet versus	DCCCCXI.
Epla. <i>ad Cor. prim.</i>	capp.	LXXII. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Cor. sec.</i>	capp.	XXVIII. hab. vers.	CCXCII.
Epla. <i>ad Galathas</i>	capp.	XXXVII. habet versus	CCXIII.
Epla. <i>ad Ephesios</i>	capp.	XXXI. habet versus	CCCXVII.
Epla. <i>ad Philippenses</i>	capp.	XVIII. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Thess. prim.</i>	capp.	XXV. habet versus	CCXIII.

Epla. <i>ad Thess. sec.</i>	capp.	VIII. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Colosenses</i>	capp.	XXXI. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Tim. prim.</i>	capp.	XXX. vers.	CCXXX.
Epla. <i>ad Tim. sec.</i>	capp.	XXV. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Tit.</i>	capp.	X. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Philem.</i>	capp.	III. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Hebr.</i>	capp.	XXXVIII. none.	
Epla. <i>ad Laodicenses.</i>	none.	none.	
<i>Apocalypsis.</i>	capp.	XXV. habet versus	̄DCCC.

Each book of the N. T., except the Cath. Epp. and the Ep. to the Laodiceans, is preceded by an *argumentum*, and the whole Ms. closes with sixty-eight Latin hexameter verses.

Such poetical additions are very common in Alcuinian Mss.; one at Amsterdam has the following:—

Quatuor hi rutilant uno de fonte fluentes
 Matthaei et Marci Lucae liber atque Johannis
 Sanctus Apostolus Lucas conscripserat Actus
 Bis septem doci per cartas dogmata Pauli
 Jacobi Petri Judæ et pia dicta Johannis
 Scribitur extremo Johannes in ordine tomus
 Jusserat hos omnes Christi deductus amore
 Alcuinus Ecclesie famulus conscribere libros.¹

The following six lists, exhibiting the *ordo librorum* in different Mss. at different periods, may be convenient for reference:—

I. Codex *Toletanus*: Genes. Exod. Lev. Num. Deuteron. Josue. Judicum. Ruth. Regum IV. Isaias. Jeremias. Ezechiel. Osee. Joel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michas. Nahum. Habacuc. Sophonias. Aggeus. Zacharias. Malachias. Job. Psalmorum. Proverbia. Ecclesiastes. Cant. Cantic. Daniel. Paralipom. II. Esdras II. Esther. Hic explicit canon hebraicæ veritatis. Sapientiae. Ecclesiasticus. Tobias. Judith. Machab. II. Evang. sec. Mattheum. Evang. sec. Marcum. Evang. sec. Lucam. Evang. sec. Johannem. Actus apostol. Pauli epistolae ad Rom. ad Corinth. II. ad Galat. ad Ephes. ad Philipp. ad Coloss. ad Laodic. ad Thessal. II. ad Timotheum II. ad Titum. ad Philemon. Ep. Jacobi. Ep. Petri II. Ep. Johannis III. Ep. Judae. Apocalypsis. — Blanchini, *Vindiciae*.

II. Codex *Amiatinus*: Genesis. Exod. Lev. Num. Deut. Josue. Judicum. Ruth. Samuhel [i.e. 1, 2 Reg.]. Malachim [i.e. 3, 4 Reg.]. Paralyomenon [i.e. libri 2]. Lib. Psalmorum. Proverbia. Ecclesiastes. Cant. Cantic. Sapientiae. Ecclesiasticus. Esaias. Hieremias. Hiezechiel. Danihel. Osee. Johel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michas. Naum. Habacuc. Soffonias. Aggeus. Zacharias. Malachias. Job. Thobias. Judith. Hester. Esdras [i.e. libri 2]. Machab. lib. II. Evang. sec.

¹ For an account of Alcuinian Mss., see Blanchini *Vindic.* passim; Vercellone, *Varr. Lect.* I. p. lxxxiv. sqq.; Kaulen, *l. c.* p. 236 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, III. p. 1704.

Mattheum. Evang. sec. Marcum. Evang. sec. Lucam. Evang. sec. Johannem. Actus Apostolorum. *Epist. Pauli apost.*: ad Romanos I. ad Corintheos II. ad Galatas I. ad Ephesios I. ad Philipp. I. ad Colosens. I. ad Thessalonic. II. ad Timotheum II. ad Titum I. ad Philimon I. ad Hebreos I. Epist. Jacobi I. Epist. Petri II. Epist. Johannis III. Epist. Judae I. Apocalypsis Johan. Amen. Bandini, *Dissert.* etc. Vercellone, *Varr. Lect.* I. p. lxxxiii. Tischend. *Cod. Amiat.* prolegg.

Order of the Books according to Cassiodorus, De instit. divinarum litterarum, Capp. xii-xiv.

III. Cap. xiv. *Septuagint.* V. T.: Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numeri. Deuteronomium. Jesu Nave. Judicum. Ruth. Regum libri IV. Paralipomenon libri II. Psalmorum *Salomonis libri V.*: Proverbiorum. Sapientiae. Ecclesiasticus. Ecclesiastes. Cant. Cantic. *Prophetas*: Isaia. Jeremia. Ezechiel. Daniel. Osee. Amos. Michas. Joel. Abdias. Jonas. Naum. Habacuc. Sophonias. Aggeus. Zacharias. Malachias. Job. Tobias. Esther. Judith. Esdrae libri II. Machab. libri. II. N. T.: Mattheus. Marcus. Lucas. Johannes. Actus Ap. Epist. Petri ad gentes II. Epist. Judae. Epist. Jacobi ad XII. tribus. Epist. Joannis ad Parthos. *Epist. Pauli* ad Romanos. ad Corinthios II. ad Galatas. ad Philippenses. ad Colossenses. ad Hebraeos. ad Thessaloniens. II. ad Timotheum II. ad Titum. ad Philemon. Apocalypsis.

IV. Cap. xii. *Jerome.* V. T. *Lex*: Gen. Ex. Levit. Num. Deut. *Prophetas*: Jesu Nave. Judicum. Ruth. Samuel. Isaias. Jeremias. Ezechiel. Daniel. Libri XII. prophetarum. *Hagiographa*: Job. David. *Salomon*: Proverbia. Ecclesiasticus. Cantic. Cantic. Verba dierum: i.e. Paralipomenon. Esdras. Esther. N. T. *Evangelist.*: Mattheus. Marcus. Lucas. Joannes. *Epistolae Apostolorum*: Petri II. Pauli XIV. Joannis III. Jacobi I. Judae I. Actuum apostolorum Lucae liber I. Apocalypsis Joannis lib. I.

V. Cap. xiii. *Augustine.* V. T. *Historia, libri XXII*: Moysi libri V. Jesu Nave lib. I. Judicum lib. I. Ruth lib. I. Regum lib. IV. Paralipom. lib. II. Job. lib. I. Tobiae lib. I. Esther lib. I. Judith lib. I. Esdrae lib. II. Machab. lib. II. *Prophetas, libri XXII*: David. Psalm. lib. I. Solomon. lib. IV. Jesu fil. Sir. lib. I. *Proph. majores* lib. IV. Isaias. Jeremias. Ezechiel. Daniel. *Proph. minores* lib. XII. Osee. Joel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michas. Nahum. Habacuc. Sophonias. Zacharias. Aggeus. Malachias. N. T. *Epistolae Apostol. XXI*: *Epistolae Pauli* ad Rom. lib. I. ad Corinth. lib. II. ad Galat. lib. I. ad Ephes. lib. I. ad Philipp. lib. I. ad Thessal. lib. II. ad Coloss. lib. I. ad Tim. lib. II. ad Tit. lib. I. ad Philem. lib. I. ad Hebr. lib. I. *Epist. Petri* lib. II. *Epist. Joannis*, lib. III. *Epist. Judae* lib. I. *Epist. Jacobi* lib. I. *Evangelia IV*: Evang. sec. Matth. lib. I. Evang. sec. Marc. lib. I. Evang. sec. Lucam lib. I. Evang. sec. Joannem lib. I. Actus Apostolorum lib. I. Apocalypsis lib. I.

A Latin Ms., beautifully written, assigned to the 14th century, in the Astor Library, New York, is a good Vulgate with the Gallican version of the Psalter and the *capitulatio* very nearly agreeing with that of modern editions of the Bible. The *ordo*, however, differs

materially. The metrical *ordo*, partly in old French and Latin, is curious, and points, like the Gallican Psalter, to French origin.

Jeroime qui riens noublia.
 Ordinavit in bibliā.
 Libros sacros in huc modū.
 Genesin et post exodu.
 Leviticus est tertius.
 Numeri. deuteronomius.
 Apres Josue. Judicum.
 Ruth. quatuor libri regu.
 De paralipomenū *deulx.*
Le premier d'esdras apres eulx.
Le second est apres heremie (sic)
 Judith hester *sont soutz* tobie.
 Job. david. salmon. ysaie.
Et le prophete Jeremye,
Ezechiel laygle volant,
Et daniel le sage enfant.
 Duodena prophetia,
 Machabea milicia.
Du nouveau q̄tre euangelistes.
Et de saint paul xiiii epistres,
Actus Jacques la canonique,
Pierre ·ii· Jehan ·iii· Jude unique.
Puys saint Jehan en apocalipse,
Fait du tout la fin bien propice.

Then follows : —

Ordo et numerus librorū et capitulor. biblie.

Genesis, cap. LI. Exodi XL. Levitici XXVII. Numeri XXXVI. Deuteronomii XXXIII. Josue XXIII. Judicum XXI. Ruth III. Primus regum XXXI. Secundus regum XXIII. Tertius regum XXII. Quartus regum XX. Primus paralipomenū XXVIII. Secundus paralipomenū XXXVIII. Primus esdre XI. Neemie XIII. Secundus esdre IX. Thobie XIII. Judith XVI. Hester XVI. Job XLII. Psalmorum CL. Prouerbiorum XXXI. Ecclesiastes XII. Canticorum VIII. Sapiencie XIX. Ecclesiastici LI. *Libri prophetarū* : Ysaie LXVI. Jeremie LIII. Treni seu trenorū. III. Baruch VI. Ezechielis XLVIII. Danielis XII. Osee XIII. Joelis III. Amos IX. Abdie I. Jone III. Michee VIII. Naum III. Abacuch III. Sophonie III. Agei II. Zacharie XIII. Malachie III. Primus Machabeor. XV. Secundus Machabeor. XV. *Libri euangelistarū* : Mathei XXVIII. Marci XVIII. Luce XXIII. Johannis XXI. *Epistole pauli et alior.* Ad romanos XVI. Prima ad chorinthios XVI. Secuda ad corinthios (sic) XIII. Ad galathas VI. Ad ephesios VI. Ad Philipenses III. Ad colocenses III. Prima ad thessalonicen. V. Secuda ad thessalonicen. III. Prima ad tymotheu VI. Secuda ad tymotheu III. Ad titum III. Ad philemonem I. Ad hebreos XIII. Actus apostolorū XXVIII. Epistola iacobi V. Prima petri V. Secuda

petri III. Prima Johannis V. Secūda Johannis I. Tertia Johannis I. Epistola iude I. Apocalipsis XXII.

Contents :

No title. 1. Metrical ordo. 2. Ordo et numerus. 3. Prol. ep. S. Jeromini etc. ad paulinum. 4. Prologus in Pentat. 5. Genesis — 2 Machabeorum, in the given order with the usual Prologues to Jos. 1 Reg. 1 Paralip. 1 Esdr. Tob. Judith. Hester. Job. Salom. (Prov.) Eccles. Sap. Is. Jer. Baruch (præfatio). Ezech. Dan. Osee (two, viz. *Non idem ordo est*, etc., and *Temporibus ozie*, etc.), Joel. Amos. Abdias. Jonas. Michæas. Naum. Aggeus. Zach. Mal. 1 Machab.

Then follows, without a break in the body of the page, —

6. The New Testament, with prologues to Math. Marc. Luc. Joh. Rom. 1 Corinth. 2 Corinth. Gal. Eph. Philip. Colos. 1 Thess. 2 Thess. 1 Tim. 2 Tim. Tit. Philem. Hebr. Act. — Epistol. Canonicas (general); 7. Interpretationes. and 8. Supplemental Prologues to 2 Paralip. Ecclus. Joel. Amos (two additional). Abdias. Jonas. Mich. Naum (two additional). Abacuc (two). Sophon. (two). Aggias (two additional). Zachar. Matth. and Apocalyps.

The whole codex is written in Gothic letter, and, according to No. 1 (*q.v.*), by a French transcriber, who wrote 1 and 2, but neither the remainder of the Ms. from 3 to end of 7, nor 8. The body of the Ms. (Nos. 3–7 incl.) is written by one hand, corrections by another, and interlineary matter in carmine by a third. The omission of *h* in *hortus* and similar words shows that the writer was a Frenchman.

The writing is quite ornate, and the numerous illuminations and miniatures are of great artistic merit. The latter, examined under a magnifying glass are remarkable for drawing, coloring and expression. The Psalms are numbered, and display in scutcheons of various shapes the titles, e.g. Ps. XXI. *in finem. psalmus david. pro susceptione vel assumptione matutina seu pro cerva matutina*. The text of the Psalter is the Gallican, and throughout the remainder of the Ms. a good Vulgate. A picture of the text may be had from the collation in PRINTED TEXT, p. 2, here supplied:—

Ms. at Bonn, 13th century, de- Ms. in Astor Library, New York,
scribed by Kaulen, *Vulgata*, 14th century:
pp. 276, 7:

Baruch.

I. 7 ioachim. helchiar. salomi.	ioachim. helchie. salon.
8 siban. Zedechias. yosie.	siban. sedechias. iosie.
9 et victos et potentes. duxit eos in babil.	et victos potentes. duxit eos in babil.
10 holocaustomata.	holocaustomata.
11 regis babiloniae. dies ipsorum	regis babilonie. dies ipsorum

35 in multitudinem	in multitudinem
V. 1 decorem et honorem	decore et honore
2 circumdato te dipl. deo iustitiae:	circumdabit te dip. deus iusticie :
capiti tuo: honoris	capiti tuo: honoris
3 in te: qui	in te qui. <i>om.</i> omni
8 autem silvae: israel mandato	autem silve: israel mandato
9 ab ipso <i>Ep. Jerem.</i>	ex ipso
VI. 1 adducemini	adducemini
2 babiloniam: eritis illic.	babiloniam: eritis illuc. in tempus
et tempus longum. adducam	longum. adducam
6 Angelus autem	angelus autem
8 fabricata	fabricata
9 habent aureas. ab illis.	habent aureas. ab eis.
semetipsis	semetipsis
14 gladium in manu	gladium in manu
15 veneremini eos	
17 tutant	ita obturant
19 dicuntur. vest. eorum	dicunt. vest. eorum
20 nigrae sunt	nigrae facies eorum
22 scietis	sciatis
24 non est in ipsis	non est in ipsis
26 non surgent	non consurgent
27 sacerd. ipsorum vend.	sacerd. ipsorum vend.
34 div. dare. nec hoc	divit. dare. necque hoc
36 restituent	restituent
38 dii eorum. lapidei aurei.	dii eorum. lapidei et aurei. colunt
colunt illa	illos.
40 illum	illum
42 circumdatis. succedentes	circumdantes. succedentes
43 abstracta dormierit. prox.	abstracta. dormierit proxime
45 et aurificibus	ab aurificibus
46 aurifices. possunt. que	aurifices. possunt. q̄ ab ipsis fabr.
ab ipsis fabr. sunt	sunt.
48 sacerdotes ubi	sacerdotes ubi
50 lignea et inaurata. opus dei in	lignea et inaurata. nullum opus dei
illis est	ē in illis
52 suscitant: pluviam hom. non	suscitant. neque pluv. hom.
dabunt	dabunt
54 cum ceciderit. aureorum et	cum ceciderit. aureorum et
argenteorum	argenteorum
55 aut dicendum	aut recipiendum
57 ferunt	<i>uncertain</i> : fert̄
58 illud. quam falsi dii: vel	illud: vel ostium — quam falsi
ostium	dii
59 et sidera	et sidera
63 esse illos deos. neque facere	illos deos esse
71 quoque. et marmore. super	purpura quoque et a marmore. super
illud. et erit oppr.	illud. et erit in oppr.

The abstract of *Cantica Cantic.*, with an allegorical interpretation written in carmine over the respective words in italics, is interesting.

The Ms. is not paginated, but has signatures of unequal length, the last being numbered XXXVIII. ; at the end of each signature a catchword is in the extreme right-hand corner of the lower margin, which has been reduced by cutting. I have discovered that one leaf is missing ; it contains *Sap.* XIV. 15 (con)stituit — spiritu sancto, *Ecclus.* I. 9. It may be bound up in the volume in the wrong place, but it certainly is not in the right place.

Cantica Cantic. : —

Cap. I.	3.	<i>Trahe me</i> —	vox ecclesiae ad christum.
		<i>Introduxit me</i> —	“ sponsæ ad adolescentulos.
	4.	<i>Nigra sum</i> —	“ synagogæ.
	6.	<i>Indica mihi</i> —	“ ecclesiae ad christum.
	7.	<i>Si ignoras te</i> —	“ christi ad ecclesiam.
	10.	<i>Murenulas aur.</i> —	“ amicorum.
	11.	<i>Dum esset</i> —	“ ecclesiae.
	14.	<i>Ecce tu pulc.</i> —	“ christi.
	15.	<i>Ecce tu pulc.</i> —	“ ecclesiae.
Cap. II.	1.	<i>Ego flos</i> —	“ christi.
	3.	<i>Sicut malus</i> —	“ ecclesiae.
	7.	<i>Adjuro vos</i> —	“ christi.
	8.	<i>Vox dilecti</i> —	“ ecclesiae.
	10.	<i>surge</i> —	“ christi.
	15.	<i>Capite nobis vulp.</i> —	“ adversus haereses.
	16.	<i>Dilect. meus</i> —	“ ecclesiae.
Cap. III.	1.	<i>In lectulo</i> —	“ eccl. electæ de gentibus.
	3.	<i>num quem</i> —	ecclesia de christo dixit.
	5.	<i>Adjuro</i> —	vox christi.
	6.	<i>Quae est ista</i> —	synagoga de ecclesia.
	7.	<i>En lectulum</i> —	vox ecclesiae.
	11.	<i>Egredimini</i> —	“ ecclesiae de chr. dicit.
Cap. IV.	1.	<i>Quam pulc.</i> —	vox christi ad ecclesiam.
	6.	<i>vadam ad</i> —	sponsus de sponsa dicit.
	7.	<i>Tota pulc.</i> —	sponsus ad sponsam.
	16.	<i>Surge aq.</i> —	christus gentes convocat.
Cap. V.	1.	<i>Veniat dil.</i> —	ecclesia de christo dicit.
		<i>Comedite am.</i> —	christus ad apostol. dicit.
	3.	<i>Exspoliaui me tunica</i> —	sponsa ad semetipsam.
	4.	<i>Dilectus meus</i> —	vox ecclesiae de christo.
	9.	<i>Qualis est dil.</i> —	“ synagogæ.
	10.	<i>Dil. meus cand.</i> —	“ ecclesiae de christo.
	17.	<i>Quo abiit</i> —	“ synagogæ ad ecclesiam.
Cap. VI.	1.	<i>Dilectus meus</i> —	“ ecclesiae.
	3.	<i>Pulcra es</i> —	“ christi ad ecclesiam.
	10.	<i>Descendi ad ortum</i> —	“ ecclesiae ad synagogam.

	11. <i>Nescivi</i> —	“ synagogæ.
	12. <i>Revertere</i> —	“ consolatoris ecclesiæ.
Cap. VII.	1. <i>Quid videbis</i> —	“ synagogæ.
	<i>Quam puleri</i> —	“ christi ad ecclesiam.
	8. <i>Dixi : ascendam</i> —	sponsus de sancta cruce dicit.
	<i>et erunt</i> —	sponsus de sponsa.
	9. <i>dignum dil. meo</i> —	ecclesia de christo dicit.
	10. <i>Ego dilecto meo</i> —	sponsa de sponso.
	11. <i>Veni dilecte mi</i> —	ecclesia ad christum.
Cap. VIII.	1. <i>Quis mihi det</i> —	vox patriarch. de christo.
	4. <i>Adjuro vos</i> —	“ christi.
	5. <i>Quæ est ista</i> —	“ synagogæ de ecclesia.
	<i>Sub arbore malo</i> —	“ sponsi de sponsa.
	6. <i>Pone me ut</i> —	ecclesia ad christum dicit.
	8. <i>Soror nostra parva</i> —	christus ad synagogam.
	9. <i>Si murus est</i> —	christus sibi respondet.
	10. <i>Ego murus</i> —	respondit ecclesia.
	11. <i>Vinea fuit</i> —	synagoga de christo dicit.
	12. <i>Vinea mea</i> —	christus dicit.
	13. <i>Quæ habitas in ortis</i> —	christus ad ecclesiam dicit.
	14. <i>Fuge dilecte mi</i> —	vox ecclesiæ ad christum.

Literal transcript : ¹

I.	3. Trahe me	vox ecclesiæ ad xtm.
	Introduxit me	“ sponsæ ad adolescentulos.
	4. nigra sum	“ synagogæ.
	6. indica mihi	“ ecclæ ad xtm.
	7. Si ignoras te	“ xti ad ecclm.
	10. Murenulas aur.	“ amicorum.
	11. Dum esset	“ ecclæ.
	14. Ecce tu pulc.	“ xti.
	15. Ecce tu pulc.	“ ecclē.
II.	1. Ego flos	“ xti.
	3. Sicut malus	“ ecclē
	7. Adiuro vos	“ xti.
	8. Vox dilecti	“ ecclē.
	10. surge	“ xti.
	15. Capite nobis vulp.	“ adversus hereses.
	16. Dilectus meus	“ ecclē.
III.	1. In lectulo	“ eccl. electæ de gentibus
	3. num quem	“ ecclesia de xto dixit.
	5. Adiuro	“ xti.
	6. Quæ est ista	“ synagoga de eccl ^a
	7. En lectulum	“ ecclē.
	11. Egredimini	“ ecclē de xto dicit.

¹ I had prepared two copies of this interpretation, the one spelt out, the other *literal*, intending to use the former only; both copies were sent to the printer, whose neat and accurate reproduction of the latter induces me to retain both.

IV. 1.	Quam pulch.	vox xti ad eccl ^m .
	6. vadam ad m.	sponsus de sponsa dicit.
	7. Tota pulc.	sponsus ad sponsam.
16.	Surge aquilo	xtus gentes convocat.
V. 1.	Veniat dilectus	ecclē de xto dicit.
	Comedite amici	xts ad apost ⁹ dicit.
	3. Exspoliaui me tunica	sponsa ad semetipsam.
	4. Dilectus meus	vox ecclē de xto.
	9. Qualis est dilect. t.— o pulcherr.	“ synagogæ.
10.	Dileus meus cand.	“ ecclæ de xto.
	17. Quo abiit	“ syn. ad ecclm.
VI. 1.	Dilectus meus	“ ecclæ.
	3. Pulcra es	“ xti ad eccl ^m .
	30. Descendi ad ortum	“ eccæ ad syn ^m .
	11. Nescivi	“ synagogæ.
	12. Revertere	“ consolatoris eccæ.
VII. 1.	Quid videbis	“ synagogæ.
	11. Quam pulcri	“ xti ad eccl ^m .
	8. Dixi: ascendam	Sponsus de sancta cruce dicit.
	11. et erunt	Sponsus de sponsa.
	9. dignum dil. meo	ecclæ de xto dicit.
	10. Ego dil ^o meo	Sponsa de sponso.
	11. Veni dil. mi	eccl ^a ad xtum.
VIII. 1.	Quis mihi det	Vox patriarchū de xto.
	4. Adiuro vos filiæ	Vox xti.
	5. Quæ est ista	“ synagogæ de ecclæ.
	Sub arbore malo	“ sponsi de sponsa.
	6. Pone me ut sign.	eccl. ad xtum dicit.
	8. Soror nostra parva	xto ad synagogam.
	9. Si murus est	xtus sibi respondit.
	10. Ego murus	Respondit ecclæ.
	11. Vineâ fuit	Synagogæ christo docit.
	12. Vineâ mea	xtus dicit.
	13. Quæ habitas in ortis	xtus ad eccl ^m dicit.
	14. Fuge dilecti mi	vox ecclæ ad xtum.

The history of the division of the Latin Bible into chapters and verses contains much curious and interesting information. Concerning Jerome, little is known beyond his mentioning *capitula*, which were not made by himself, but existed in the Mss. he used, and must have been conspicuous to the eye; these *capitula*, moreover, were different in the Hebrew, Greek and Latin Ms.¹ The division *he*

¹ Mic. vi. 9: In hebraicis alterius hoc capituli exordium est, apud LXX. vero finis superioris.—Sophon. III. 14: Non videatur mirum, aliter hebraica capitula et aliter LXX. graeca videlicet latinaque finiri. Ubi enim in sensu diversa translatio est, ibi necesse est diversa esse vel principia vel fines.

introduced relates only to lines (*versus*) marked off by means of *kola* and *kommata* for the special help of ignorant ministers to bring out the meaning in reading the lessons.¹

The divisions in Latin Mss. are not uniform, but generally agree with the summary of contents given at the head of the several books; the terms *capitula*, *breves* and *tituli* are used to designate such divisions; Martianay (*Bibliotheca*, Prolegg. IV.), e.g. shows that Genesis contains XXXVIII *tituli*, XLVI *breves*, and LXXXII (or CLIV) *capitula*. The abstract of Charlemagne's Bible (p. 95) gives the *capitula*, the tables (p. 97 sq.) the *ordo*, and the account (p. 98 sqq.) *ordo*, *numerus*, and *capp*. Numerous examples are collected in Thomasius, *Opera omnia*. T. I. *continens sacror. biblior. veteres titulos, sectiones, etc.*, ed. Vezzosi, Romæ 1747. Our modern division into chapters is ascribed to Stephen Langton, abp. of Canterbury (died 1227),² and Hugh de St. Cher (died 1263).³ The only further subdivision in Latin Bibles was the breaking up of the page into four parts, marked A, B, C, D. The verse-division was introduced by Stephanus in his edition of the Vulgate in 1555.

About the same time a critical examination of the text of the Latin Bible was undertaken at the instance of Theodulph, bp. of Orleans (A.D. 787-821).⁴

It seems an established fact that Charlemagne spent the closing years of his eventful life in the correction of the scriptures,⁵ an occupation which was then regarded as a work of piety, as is evident from the similar practice of Dunstan⁶ and Peter Damiani.⁷

But neither Alcuin's revision, nor the pious labors of Charlemagne, Dunstan, or Peter Damiani were of avail to stem the tide of corruption as long as Mss. had to be multiplied by the dangerous process of copying, which seems necessarily to entail errors of orthography, and arbitrary corrections, to say nothing of omissions and involuntary changes where the written copy reads one way and the memory suggests another, which is thoughtlessly put down. An illustration

¹ . . . propter simplicitatem fratrum colibus et commatibus ordinasse, ut qui distinctiones saecularium litterarum comprehendere minime potuerunt, hoc remedio suffulti, inculpabiliter pronuntiarent sacratissimas lectiones. — Cassiod. *de inst. div. litt.* cap. XII. ed. Migne.

² Triveti, *Annal.* p. 182, ed. Oxon.; Balæus. *II. Eccles.* Cent. XIII., cc. 7, 10.

³ Gilb. Genebrard, *Chronol.* IV. p. 644.

⁴ Leopold Delisle, *Les Bibles de Théodulfe*, Paris, 1879.

⁵ Van Ess. p. 159, quoting Theganus, *Script. Hist. Franc.* II. p. 177.

⁶ Migne, *l. c.* vol. CXXXVII., p. 443.

⁷ *Ibid.* vol. CXLV., p. 334.

may be had from the double version of the Psalms in the Anglican communion, where, even in sermons and similar compositions, the familiar words of the Prayer Book are apt to displace the text of the Authorized Version. The attempts made by Lanfranc (A.D. 1089) and his disciples at correcting the Scriptures appear to have been of the same character as those of his immediate predecessors; for, though his biographer, writing in the 13th century, says that "hujus emendationis claritate omnis occidui orbis ecclesia, tam gallicana quam anglica gaudet se esse illuminatam,"¹ all traces of it appear to have been lost in subsequent obscurity. Cardinal-deacon Nicolaus (A.D. 1150) also tried his hand at the emendation of the Bible, but his success was not greater than that of the others, and of all of them it is more or less true that their efforts, though well-meant, were useless, and worse than useless, for every new correction increased the confusion.

It is proper to add here that the adoption of the Alcuinian revision seems to have been confined to the Frankish empire, since a number of Mss. belonging to the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries contain the Vulgate text of a different recension. The readings of this class of Mss. are preserved in the works of Peter Damiani, and seem to represent the text then current at Rome and in Italy. Such a Ms. exists in the college of the Barnabites at Rome, and another in the Vatican Library, n. 4216, marked *Biblia monasterii S. Crucis Fontis Avellanæ*; for more on this subject see Vercellone, *l. c.* I. xix. lxxxvii. xci.; II. xviii. Evangelistaries belonging to that period are often met with; they only contain the Gospels and a table of the pericopes; lectionaries are less frequent. From a sumptuous *Evangelistarium* preserved at Echternach near Trier, written in the tenth century, Kaulen (*l. c.* p. 241) has a specimen, of which the following is a sample:—

Matth. T. X. Attendite ne iusticiam ūram faciatis coram hominibus: ut videamini ab eis. Alioquin mercedem non habebitis apud patrem ūr̄m qui in caelis est. Cum ergo facis aelemosynam noli tuba canere ante te: sicut hypocritae faciunt in synagogis & in uicis: ut honorificentur ab hominibus. Amen dico uobis: receperunt mercedem suam.

From another in the cathedral at Trier, No. 139. ol. 20. not much more recent than the first, he gives (*l. c.*) this extract to illustrate the text and orthography:—

¹ *Ib.* CL., 55.

Matth. T. XIII. Cum autem introisset capharnaum accessit ad eum centurio rogans eum et dicens Dne puer meus iacet in domo paralyticus et male torquetur Et ait illi ihc Ego neniam et curabo eum Et respondens centurio ait Dne non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum sed tantum dic verbo et sanabitur puer meus Nam et ego homo sub potestate habens sub me milites Et dico huic uade et uadit Et alio veni & venit Et seruo meo fac hoc & facit Audiens autem ihc miratus est et frequentibus se dixit Amen dico vobis non inueni tantam fidem in israhel Dico autem uobis quod multi ab oriente et occidente uenient & recumbent cum abraham & isaac & iacob in regno caelorum Filii autem regni eicientur in tenebras exteriores ibi erit fletus & stridor dentium Et dixit ihc centurioni Vade & sicut credidisti fiat tibi Et sanatus est puer in illa hora.

2. The Cistercian abbot Stephanus II. (twelfth century), of Citeaux, struck with the variant readings of an old Ms. and the current copies, took notice that the old codex gave in many places much shorter renderings than the copies in the abbey. Instead of correcting the latter by the former, which seems to have been an early, and relatively pure form of Jerome's version, he conceived the idea of consulting the originals. There was not much difficulty in the case of the N. T., but, as a Christian man of letters acquainted with Hebrew was at that time *avis rarissimus*, he sought the aid of several Jews, familiar with the Bible, requiring them to give him in French the meaning of the Hebrew and Chaldee in all places where the Latin texts were divergent, and was amazed that their renderings almost invariably agreed with the readings of the older Ms. He is believed to have discovered a means of producing a trustworthy Latin text; he selected a good copy of the Latin Bible, consisting of four parchment folio volumes, and made his corrections partly by the old codex and partly by the oral renderings of the learned Jews; he observed, moreover, the plan of erasing all words not found in the Hebrew, and designedly left the gaps vacant to remind the transcribers that the respective passages must be omitted. The copy thus corrected he declared to be the standard, which, according to the obedience of the order, must not be departed from, and by which all copies of the Bible in the whole congregation were thereafter to be made.¹

The plan of Stephanus marks the transition from the period of extravagant or unlicensed correction, or, what often means the same thing, corruption, to that of a more orderly revision, especially in two respects; the whole work was removed from the arbitrary attempts of

¹ Martianay, *Prol. in Div. Bibl. S. Hieron.* Vall. IX. p. lxxi.

individuals to the care of corporate bodies, and the original Scriptures were appealed to for fixing the Latin text. The principle, however, on which this was done, was peculiar. It was taken for granted that Jerome's version was perfect, and the object was not to produce a new version, but to restore the current text to the Hieronymian; the inquiry in dealing with different readings in the Mss. used was very simple; the reading which agreed with the original was adopted as true, for the correctors seem to have felt that it must be Jerome's. For the preservation of the text thus ascertained, the various readings were collected and critically discussed, while transcribers were required to copy out the authentic reading only. Such collections were called *Epanorthotes* or *Correctories*, and existed in two forms; at first, a copy of the Bible with ample margins was selected, and the corrections and necessary notes were set down in the margin or between the lines; copies of the Bible already made were corrected by them, and new ones made by the standard thus provided; afterwards, it was found convenient to limit the reproduction to the various readings and the notes in the shape of manuals, so that any one by the use of such a manual might correct his own copy of the Bible. But the copies of such correctories were not uniform; few were in literal agreement with the original copy, each transcriber used his own judgment, or want of judgment, in condensing or expanding the subject-matter. The Hebrew and Greek originals furnished far less material than old Mss. of the Itala and other versions, the Commentaries of Jerome, the Fathers, the *glossa interlinearia* of Rhabanus Maurus, the explanations of Walafrid Strabo and others, and the corrections covered more or less deviations in the words and syntax, as well as orthography, punctuation, and the division of sentences and verses. In difficult places the true reading was expressly attested. The following example is taken from an *epanorthotes* without text, published in *Literarisches Museum* Vol. I. Altdorf 1778, p. 30:—

Gen. I. a. In principio Aquila transtulit *in capitulo*. Item et tenebre super faciem abissi et spiritus Dei ferebatur hebr. habet vayruca heloym¹ i.e. spiritus Dei. Si esset in textu spiritus Domini hebr. haberet rucha adonai historiae autem dicunt et hebraei quod quousque homo creatus est. Deus non est appellatus DOMINUS SED DEUS et hoc habent antiqui [sc. codices] Ambrosius in hexaameron spiritus Dei ferebatur cet. Syrus habet et spiritus Dei fovebat aquas i.e. vivificabat. — Matth. XVIII. d. in montibus glossa: in excelsis. Alias

¹ French pronunciation of the Hebrew; note *patach furtiv.* after the consonant.

tioned, but not by name, by Roger Baco¹; whose eminent linguistic attainments and more than forty years' study of the Scriptures made him the fittest person to undertake the revision of the text of the Latin Bible. Copies of the collected various readings are preserved in the Arsenal Library, Paris, St. Mark's Library, Venice, the Imperial Library, Vienna, the University Library, Turin, in the Vatican Library, and the College *di San Carlo a Catinari* at Rome. Vercellone's account is extremely interesting: "The author compares the text of his copy of the Latin Bible with three classes of Mss., *modern*, *ancient*, and *most ancient*, understanding by *ancient* codices, those of the Alcuinian recension, which he occasionally cites also as *Biblia Caroli Magni*, and by *most ancient*, codices older than that recension (*exemplaria ante tempora Caroli scripta*), among which he names *Biblia Gregorii M.*² As distinguished from many of his contemporaries, he clearly identifies Jerome as author of our modern Vulgate, and his rare familiarity with the subject enables him not only to identify the Latinity of Jerome, but also to avoid their error, who in correcting the Vulgate had followed the text of the Itala, or the Greek, and in that way introduced not a little confusion into that text. For the same reason he disregards the citations of the Latin Fathers taken from the Itala, as well as those portions of the Itala version which in his time continued in the liturgy, censuring those who had pursued a different course. Having collated the best and the most ancient Mss. of the Vulgate extant, *i.e.*, the Cod. *Amiatinus*, the Cod. *Valllicellianus*, and that in St. Paul *extra muros*, I can assure that the most ancient and accurate of our Mss. agree with the readings adopted in this Correctorium. Where the Latin Mss. left room for doubt, the author has consulted copies of the Hebrew and Greek originals, distinguishing the former of these not only into ancient and modern ones, but referring to them also as French or Spanish copies, nor has he omitted the use of the Chaldee Version. . . . I do not speak of his citations from rabbinical writings, or of his citations of words from St. Matthew's gospel, which he had read in Hebrew, nor of those from many Latin authors from the age of Jerome to his own, which are often not without importance, and uniformly bear witness

sicut est *le vel al* in gallico, quod non solum dativo sed etiam genitivo inseruit, sicut diceremus *la chape, le mestre, sive al mestre*. Vercell. *l. c.*

¹ Hody, *l. c.* 430.

² Vercellone thinks that this refers to the Bibles sent to Great Britain by Gregory, while Kaulen suggests the Cod. *Amiatinus* which, according to an unsupported legend, is said to have been written by Gregory himself.

of the incredible erudition at his command, and of the correct judgment with which he applied it."¹

After this high eulogium of so competent an author, the following examples, taken from the two volumes of his *Variae Lectiones*, in which *LXX. in Græco* designates the Septuagint, *LXX. in Latino* the Itala, *notula* an older correctorium, and *littera*, a lection or reading.

The specimens have been selected from Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones*, who has embodied in his work the readings of three correctories, designated M, N, O; of these N, no. 3466 of the Vatican, belongs to the thirteenth century, M (ottobonianovaticanus no. 293) and O (vaticanus no. 4240) to the fourteenth century. For full particulars concerning these Mss. see Vercellone in *Giornale arcadico*, vol. cxlviii, and *Atti della Pontificia academia romana d'Archeologia*, vol. xiv. He bestows special praise on the critical value of Cod. N, which he doubts not was used by the Roman correctors of the Vulgate, it having belonged to cardinal Ant. Carafa. The extracts here given fully sustain his opinion.

1. Cod. N. Gen. XVIII, 28. — Certissime hebr. et antiqui habent *quinque* non XLV., quæ littera est LXX. in græco. Si enim esset ibi XLV., nil esset interrogari utrum *propter XLV. deleret*; cum potius dicendum fuerat nonne propter XLV *parces*? Est ergo sensus: Cum de L. concessois parcendum, nunc si quinque minus fuerint, ita ut inveniantur XLV. Si non his parcis, iam videris delere totam urbem propter quinque. Et enim piissima et efficacissima pro peccatoribus allegatio.

2. Cod. N. Gen. XLIV, 32. — Antiqua iuxta hebræum *Ego proprie servus tuus, qui in meam hunc recepi fidem*. Sensus est: ego, *servus tuus*; hoc solum dicit causa honoris; ego, inquam, sum ille *que in meam* etc. et sic est ex parte suppositi: unde qui ponunt ibi *sim*, faciunt istud q. d. *servus tuus* esse ex parte appositi, et se iam promittit esse servum vicarium, quod ibi primo ait cum dicit *manebo itaque*.

3. Cod. O. Exod. XIV. 9. *Phihairoth*. Alii habent *Airoth*, sed videtur hoc factum vitio scriptorum, cum hebr. sit *Phiairoth* sicut supra (v. 2).

Cod. N. *Hairoth*. Sic variant antiqui: *Hiroth* est nomen vel alpium, vel vallium, vel fluminum, vel huius modi; et sunt duo vel tria nomina: *Phi* idem est quod *os*; *Hiroth* est ille locus: *Ha*, articulus, qui Gallice dicitur *le*: unde modo ponitur *Phiaroth*, modo tantum *Ahiroth*, quod dicitur *le Hiroth* sicut dicimus *Le Rone* et *Bonde le Rone*.

4. Cod. O. Num. XXIX. 35, *non facietis*. — *Die octavo*, seu decima quinta

¹ Vercellone, *Diss. Acad.* p. 53. — The only printed correctorium is a very rare work, entitled: *Correctorium biblie cum difficilium quarundam dictionum luculenta interpretatione per Magdalium Jacobum, Gaudensem, ord. Predicatorii, studiosissime congestum*. Colon. Quentell, 1508, 4°. Compare J. H. a Seelen, *Meditationes exeget.* I, p. 605, sq. Lübeck, 1730-37, 3 vv. 8°.

dies mensis, *omne opus servile non facietis in ea*. Hic non debere esse servile, sicut nec Lev. XXIII, ubi agitur de eadem die (v. 28): *Omne opus non facietis in tempore diei huius*; et infra (v. 31): nihil ergo operis facietis in eo.

5. Cod. M. Num. XXXIII. 3. *altera die (fecerunt) Phase*. *Altera die Paschæ*, id est in crastino Paschæ, ut dixit Glossa; unde non est ibi *fecerunt*, nec hebræus habet; sic enim construitur: Profecti altera die Paschæ castrametati sunt.

Cod. N. Non video bene quomodo sit ibi *fecerunt*; antiqui non (Brugensis legit *vero* pro *non*) interponunt quod dicitur *fecerunt*; sed et ipse Strabus habet *altera die post Phase profecti sunt de Ramesse*.

Cod. O. *Profecti igitur de Ramesse mense primo XV die mensis primi, altera die Phase*; suspensiva est constructio usque ibi (v. 5) *castra metati sunt*: sic enim debet construi: Profecti altera die Phase, id est in crastino Paschæ, castra metati sunt. Et hoc consonat græco qui habet *crastina Paschæ*, supple die. Per hoc patet vitium quorundam qui habent *fecerunt* altera die Phase; nam ante profectionem de Ægypto, XIII. die fecerunt. Phase, et in crastino, scilicet XV. die profecti sunt.

Cod. O. 2 Reg. I, 18.—*Et præcepit, ut docerent filios Juda arcum, etc.* Antiqui legunt: *et præcepit ut docerent filios iudæorum, sicut scriptum est in libro iustorum: Inclyti Israel etc.* Hic incipit threnus; huic autem litteræ, quæ non habet nec *arcum*, nec *planctum*, attestatur multum hebræo adhærere consuetus græcus, qui nihil habet de iis. Sed tamen dicit sic: *ut docerent filios Israel et Juda*,¹ *sicut scriptum est in libro iustorum: et dixit: Inclyti Israel etc.*² Unde secundum litteram tam græcorum, quam latinorum antiquorum supplendum est resumendo *planctum* de superioribus; *planctum*, inquam, *docerent filios Israel et Juda*, sive, *filios iudæorum*. Hieronymus³ habere dicit hebræum hanc litteram: *Et dixit ut doceret filios Juda arcum*, quod exponens ait: *Et dixit ut doceret, subaudi Deus, arcum*, id est, fortitudinem esse in timore Dei, quod patet in casu Saul quondam electi Domini et optimi. Putarem quod antiqui habent *filios iudæorum*, quoniam esset error scriptorum, ab eo quod fuit *filios Juda arcum*, sed video alias et diversas litteras. Communis enim habet *præcepit*, hæc habet *dixit*; communis habet *docerent*, hæc habet *doceret*, quia utrumque potest significare hebræus, quod est *ad docendum*. Dicunt tamen quia isti ceciderant ictibus sagittarum, David præcipere filios Judæ docere de arte sagittandi. Quænam videtur ista consequentia, ut exordio threni, postquam dixerat: *Planxit autem David planctum huiusmodi*, subiungatur *sicut scriptum est, ut docerent filios Juda artem sagittandi*, et statim inchoet threnum sic: *Inclyti, Israel*. Quod si aliquando erat illa doctrina determinanda, consequentius videbatur, quod sicut docti pæne ante tempora nostra quasi glossando apposuerunt *planctum*, ibi dimitteretur potius quam litteram hebræorum ante tempora translationis Hieronymi in textum interserere librorum, qui per septingentos annos ita cucurrerant. Quod si cap. XXX libri I Regum dicebas Hieronymum dicere quod hebræus habet *qui iussi remanserant*, nec tamen propter hoc veram litteram, quæ est, *qui lassi substiterant* mutavisti, quare hic similiter non fecisti? Sed Hieronymus exponit, inquit. Exponit quidem, sed ut litteram hebræorum. Nonne etiam

¹ So Aquila and several Mss. in Holmes and Parsons. ² Probably the Itala—so Kaulen. ³ *i.e.* the author of *Quæst. hebr. in Lib. Regum*.—Kaulen.

ubi dicit Hieronymus non bene habere latinos codices, illam tamen litteram, immo multas tales, nullus ausus est immutare? Require Gen. XXIII (16) et in 1 Reg. XXV (3), et 2 Reg. XIV (26). Sed dices, quod Rabanus exponit. Sed non recolis, quod Rabanus nulli litteræ hebrææ, quam exponit, vult præstare auctoritatem, ut ipse in exordio testatur? Septuaginta autem etiam in latino nec de *arcu*, nec de planctu habent aliquid, sed sic: *Et docuit Israel et dixit: curare Israel*. Quod autem ante threnum, hoc est, ante hoc verbum *Inclyti*, interponitur sic: *Et ait: Considera, Israel, pro his, qui mortui sunt super excelsa tua vulnerati*, nec hebræus nec antiqui habent, nec græcus. Quod si Rabanus glossavit, non præstitit auctoritatem ut textus esset; multo magis si postillator.

6. Cod. N. Deut. XXX, 7. Antiqui iuxta hebræum super *inimicos tuos, et eos, qui oderunt te et persequentur*. Resume *super*, iuxta hebræum sic *et super eos, qui oderunt te*. Unde oportet interponi quod dicitur *et* ante hoc verbum *persequentur*, quod quidam male abstulerunt, quasi illud verbum regeret quod dicitur *eos*. Hebræus autem, etiam hispanus habet *qui persequentur te*; unde, qui abstulerunt coniunctionem, totam sententiam mutaverunt. Sed et *persequuntur* pro *persequentur* posuerunt.

7. Cod. M. Deut. XXXII, 8. Septuaginta legunt *statuit terminos nationum iuxta numerum angelorum Dei*. Super hoc dicit Gregorius in homilia de X dragmis quas mulier habuit (I, 1606), quod tanta creditur ascensura in cælum multitudo hominum, quanta illic remansit multitudo angelorum.

While the correctories were doubtless important aids to the study of the Bible at the time of their origin, their use and value, however, at the present, are very great, for they contain numerous readings of very ancient Mss. which have long since perished. Of course we are less interested in the Latin text than in the Greek, and the Hebrew; many such readings of the Greek slumber as yet in these monuments of medieval erudition, and the Correctorium of the Sorbonne, at least, is a vast treasury of various readings for the Hebrew text, for its author must have consulted Hebrew Mss. much older than any that have come down to us.

As to the object for which they were made, viz., the establishment of a fixed standard of text of the Latin Bible, the correctories proved lamentable failures, and instead of purifying it from the gathered corruptions of so many centuries, were a fruitful source in augmenting it. Indeed it could hardly be otherwise; for given a learned apparatus of critical notes on the authenticity of certain readings and renderings on all the books of the Scriptures, and a vast army of ignorant transcribers, of whom the most ignorant were the safest, and the least ignorant the most dangerous, the result was inevitable: the mechanical transcriber produced a faithful copy, but he, possessed of a modicum of scholarship sufficient to render him conceited — and such was the typical transcriber — deemed it incumbent upon him to

indicate his preference for such readings as he thought correct, either by suppressing those he did not favor, or by smuggling into his new transcript as part of the text some unattested reading from some other source, perhaps an old Bible. Nor was this the worst case, for the practice of covering the margins of old Bibles with notes, excerpted from the correctories, opened the door to the introduction of arbitrary and unlearned corrections, which variant readings speedily found their way from the margin into the text of new copies made from those which had been annotated. In other words the correctories in the hands of the rank and file of the medieval ecclesiastic who looked upon his labors as meritorious, and mistook bigoted ignorance for piety and scholarship, were what critical commentaries are in the third quarter of the nineteenth century in the hands of uneducated preachers of whose hebdomadal deliverances some of the readers of these chapters may have had personal experience. The correctories and the critical commentaries are admirable helps in the hands of those fitted to use them, but they are most dangerous things in the hands of those of limited capacity, and still more limited culture. A graphic picture of the sad fortunes of the text of the Latin Bible in the three centuries ending with the thirteenth, may be seen in the letter of Roger Baco to Clement IV. accompanying a presentation copy of his *Opus majus*, A.D. 1267. He says: "The great mass of theologians do not know that Jerome is the author of the common translation; many flatly deny it; others again do not know which version they ought to take, and consequently each uses that which he prefers, substituting one for the other, the improper for the proper, the false for the true. But as there is only one translation in all the books of the Latin Church, to wit, that made by Jerome (the second he made in his exposition of the sacred original), the version received by the Church is greatly corrupted. For some, dealing with the writings of the holy Fathers, take no notice of the version they used. But they used the version of the Seventy; now when the Fathers cite the Scriptures in that version, these persons confound it with that contained in our present Latin Bibles, which is absolutely false. They accordingly correct and corrupt the text in this way, as is evident from the example of the raven in Genesis, which I have cited in the work accompanying this letter.¹ For the text is for the most part horribly corrupt

¹ The passage reads: "A horrible and unpardonable instance of superfluous additions occurs in Genesis VIII, where they say that the raven did *not* return to the ark, while all the Hebrew texts and ancient versions say that it *did* return." Roger Baco, *Opus maius*, ed. Lond. p. 50. This is confirmed by a correctory,

in the common copy (*exemplari vulgato*), that is, the Parisian, — and where it is not corrupt, it is uncertain; . . . and this uncertainty is due to the contention of the correctors, for there are as many correctors, or rather corrupters, as there are readers in the world . . . any one changes what he likes . . . changes according to his own caprice (*secundum caput suum*), as is evident from what I have said in the work I send along. But I will give an instance. The rendering of Mark v. (i.e. viii. 38) *Qui me confessus fuerit*, is wrong and a reading in modern homilies founded on ignorance of the propriety of ancient grammar. It ought to be *Qui me fuerit confusus*, a deponent verb with the signification of the verb *confundo*; for as *zelo-zelor* had the same signification, so *confundo-confundor* had of old the same meaning. But the modern use being different, they erased *Qui me confusus fuerit* from the sacred text, and put *qui confessus fuerit me*, the utter falsity whereof I will prove without the possibility of contradiction. For the ancient un glossed copies of the Bible throughout the church of God have Mark v. (viii. 38), *Qui me confusus fuerit*, the same as *qui me confundet*, which is the contrary of *confiteri*. And Augustine says *contra Faustum*, that when the Latin Mss. differ, recourse should be had to the most ancient Mss. and the majority (*ad antiquos et plures*). For as he there says, 'the ancient Mss. have greater authority than the new, and a plurality of them more than a few. The Parisian copy however is only one, but the copies in the different provinces are without number; the Parisian copy therefore must yield the place to the ancient copies both on account of its novelty and of its singularity, for in truth such singularity corrupts the truth of the whole Scriptures, etc.'" (Hody, *l. c.* pp. 420, 21.) The Parisian copy referred to is the Correctory; the reading *confusus* is attested by Codd. Vercell. Veron. Brix. Vet. Vulg. and the Sixt. Clementina, while I have found *confessus* in Bryling's Latin Bible of 1557, and the Lugdunum edition of 1562. "To this might be added innumerable instances. But the corruption springs from the fact that for the reason which follows they spend the whole day in tampering with the text. The holy fathers, and more especially Jerome, give different versions of the same passage in order to bring out the meaning. But many, not noting the difference of the renderings, regard them as different readings of the same revision, and adopt that reading which they understand best; and thus they introduce countless

which says: "Hoc antiqui latini non habent. Modo a translatione, qua utitur Augustinus, inolevit ut dicatur corvus ad arcam non redisse." Vercell. *Varr. Lect.* I. 28, b.

blemishes.¹ The compilers of such a text, moreover, mix it as they see fit, alleging that it is customary to construct it from different versions; thus they write what they please, mixing and changing what they do not understand.² Or they adopt *ad libitum* renderings interspersed in the works of the Fathers, or even the Antiquities of Josephus, which latter only explains the Scriptures, gives the substance of the Sacred History, and accommodates the expression to suit his pleasure. Hence many of the emendations and changes introduced by modern writers are taken from Josephus, although alterations not based on ancient Mss. are simply inadmissible.³ They also take much from the church offices and introduce it into the text. But the framers of the offices introduced many changes necessitated by the requirements of the service to fix the meaning and promote edification. And the Church of Rome has the right so to do, and through her the same right belongs to other churches.⁴ On these grounds all allege the text to contain different readings, for they constantly say that another reading reads thus and thus, and these readings they multiply at every word, pretending by way of excuse that the same subject-matter might be represented in different forms. They will not own that these alleged readings are different renderings, but aver that in one case the expression is literal and in the other paraphrase, for they would give great offense, (if it became known) that the same text in the same copy consisted of different versions; hence they say that (the variants) are different readings of the same text, utterly unmindful that they might be wrong. And yet it never occurs that the same translator uses several expressions for the same subject in the same text of his version. Such a method is not allowed in philosophical and other writings; there can only be one expression of any given rendering, but different renderings have a different

¹ The Correctorium of the Dominic. has a case in point: "Job V. 26: sicut infertur acervus tritici in tempore suo. Hebr. et antiqui non habent tritici, tamen Gregor. habet: sed per expositionem magis quam per literam." Kaulen, *l. c.* p. 268.

² The Paris Correct. has this note on Apoc. VI, 11: "donec impleatur numerus conservorum eorum et fratrum eorum: anti(qui) hnt: donec compleantur conservi eorum et fratres eorum."

³ Hugo's Correct. on 2 Kings VIII, 8: "de quo fecit Salomo omnia vasa aurea in templo et mare acneum et columnas et altare: hoc hebr. et antiqui non habent, sed sumtum est de Josepho."

⁴ Hugo, Correct. II. I. 1, 2: "Ideo adolescentulae diligunt te. non est hic nimis, quamvis cantetur in ecclesia."

These four examples are due to the researches of Kaulen, *l. c.*

expression. Their so-called different readings are accordingly different renderings, used by the Fathers in their works relating to the Scriptures, or found in Josephus, or adapted by the church to (liturgical) uses. This gives rise to endless corruption, fraught with unspeakable evil for the studies. Jerome also has explained the version of the LXX in Genesis, the Psalter and many other passages, and he calls it 'ours,' because at that time all the churches used it. For at that time he had not yet made his version from the Hebrew, which, moreover, had not yet been generally received during his life. Hence men of great reputation, and high, if not the highest, position, claim that certain places expounded by Jerome in the said works are readings of our Bible; they accordingly receive it into the text, disfiguring thereby the first version of Jerome which alone is found in our Bibles, by his second version found only in his commentaries; for they believe it to be one and the same translation. Thus they entirely change the form of the text."¹

It is evident that Hugo's knowledge of the labors of Jerome and the history of the Latin text was far from perfect, and the reader may readily correct his views by turning to the preceding chapter.²

Although the correctories, for the reasons given, did not result in the production of an absolutely uniform text, they appear to have been instrumental in furnishing one that was relatively so, as is evident from Mss. written in the 14th and 15th centuries, which, though they exhibit innumerable differences in minor points, present a much greater agreement in essentials than in Mss. written before that period. The differences, moreover, are of a national character, and warrant the division of the Mss. into certain classes of families, of which those of German and Italian origin at least disclose a Latinity colored by the idiom of Germany and Italy; how far this observation of Vercellone (*Diss. Acad.* p. 111) applies to Mss. of that period written in other countries, remains to be seen. Kaulen (*l. c.* p. 272), whose opinion deserves to be respected, assigns the origin of the term *textus vulgatus* in the modern sense, to this period, although he admits that the comparative stability of a text, so dissimilar to its original, is critically useless. It is curious in this connection to notice the phenomenon that versions into the vernacular, made in the same centuries, are based on a text much older than that found in contemporary Mss., but it is explained by the correctories which show that perfect copies of the Itala were still in use in

¹ The Latin text is given by Hody, *l. c.* p. 427.

² Still in manuscript.

the thirteenth century, and contributed not a little to the confused and composite nature of the Latin text.

The Mss. of that age are characterized by two features, the increase of vulgar expressions and spelling, and the Gothic or Black Letter in which they are written.

I. Example. From a Ms. in the University Library of Bonn (Kaulen, p. 275) : —

Prologus in librum baruch. Liber iste qui baruch nomine praenotatur. in hebraeo canone non habetur : sed tamen in vulgata edicione. Similiter et epistola iheremie prophete. Propter noticiam autem legencium hic scripta sunt : quia multa de cristo novissimis temporibus indicant. Explicit prologus. Incipit baruch. I cap. Et hec verba libri quem scripsit baruch filius nerie filij maasie filij sedechie filij sedi filij helchie in babilonia. in anno quinto in septima die mensis : in tempore quo ceperunt chaldei iherusalem et succenderunt eam igni. Et legit baruch verba libri huius ad aures ieonie filij iochim regis iuda. et ad aures universi populi venientis ad librum : et ad aures potencium filiorum regum. et ad aures presbiterorum. et ad aures populi a minimo usque ad maximum eorum habitantium in babilonia. et ad flumen sudi. Qui audientes plorabant etc.

For different readings contained in this Ms. see collation I in chapter IV on Printed Text.¹

II. From a Lectionary, not earlier than Cent. XIV, in the same library (Kaulen, p. 278) : —

In die Sco Ascens dni Secdm Marcum In illo t Recumbentibus undecim discipulis apparuit illis ihc & exprobrauit incredulitatem illorum et duriciam cordis quia his qui uiderant eum resurrexisse non crediderunt Et dixit eis Euntes in mundum universum praedicate euangelium omni creaturae Qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit saluus erit Qui uero non crediderit condempnabitur Signa autem eos qui crediderunt haec sequentur In nomine meo daemonia eicient linguis loquentur nouis serpentes tollent Et si mortiferum quid biberint non eos nocebit Super egros manus imponent & bene habebunt Et dns quidem ihc postquam locutus est eis assumptus est in celum & sedit adextris di Illi autem perfecti praedicaerunt ubiq; Dno cooperante & sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis.

3. Roger Bacon, who has been called the Jerome of the 13th century, was unquestionably the leading thinker of that age, whose acknowledged mastery of almost every branch of learning made him the fittest, as he was the ablest, advocate of a revision of the Latin Bible. We have already noticed that in some respects at least his ideas rested on wrong premises, but on the whole they display a singularly clear understanding of the entire question as it was, and,

¹ Still in manuscript.

to a considerable extent, is yet regarded in the Latin Church. He thought the collation of ancient Mss., written in the time of Alcuin and earlier, might lead to the consummation he desired, for orthographical errors, etc., excepted, the said ancient Mss. exhibited a uniform agreement; in that he was as surely mistaken as he was in ascribing most of the discrepancies to the ignorance of transcribers, not only as to Greek and Hebrew, but also as to Latin, and in stipulating that the revisers of the Bible, besides possessing a fair knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, and a thorough acquaintance with Latin, should be well versed in rules of sound criticism, and that the revision should be made not by private effort but under papal authority.¹ His recommendations were disregarded, partly because the Church did not yet see the necessity for such revision, partly because, from the nature of the case, the production of an authoritative standard text was next to impossible, and last, not least, because duly qualified revisers were conspicuous by their absence. But towards the close of that century, which witnessed the revival of humanistic studies, attention was given to the study of Hebrew, and the biblical scholars of the period began to think that the best way of fixing the Latin text was by consulting the sacred originals, either by revising it with reference to them, or by the production of a new version. Raymond Martini, a Spanish author, wrote towards the close of the 13th century a polemical work against the Jews and Mohammedans, called *Pugio Fidei*, in which he distinctly states that he had frequently cited Scripture, neither from the Septuagint, the Vetus, nor Jerome, but from the Hebrew, because the last sustained the Christian verity far better than the Vulgate.² The commentaries of Nicolaus de Lyra, belonging to this period, doubtless contain numerous references to the Hebrew, and the views of the author are clearly set forth in the note.³

¹ See R. Baco, *Op. Maius*, ed. Jebb. pp. 44-56.

² . . . in plurimis valde S. Scripturæ locis veritatum multo planius atque perfectius haberi pro fide christiana in litera hebraica, quam in translatione nostra. Raym. Martini, *l. c.* ed. Carpzov. 1687, pp. 4, 5.

³ Postil. in Ez. I, 4: quasi species electri: dicit hic R. Sam: quod ipse nescit proprie quid significat chasmal. et ideo nescio quare Hieronym. transtulit electrum, non enim multum videtur probabile quod melius intellexerit hebraicum, quam doctor ille. — IV, 12: operies illud. in hebr. habetur coques illud. dictio enim hebr. quæ hic ponitur, æquivoca est ad operire et coquere. *hebræi tamen videntur hic melius dicere.* — XL, 31: et vestibulum eius. in heb. habetur et porticus eius ad atriam exterius. *et ideo litera nostra videtur esse corrupta per scriptores vel ignaros correctores.* — Introd. to the Commentary: Sensus literalis, a quo est incipiendum, videtur multum obfuscatus diebus modernis, partim scriptorum vitio,

A number of similar testimonies may be read in Hody, *l. c.* pp. 433, 438. Entirely *new* Latin versions of the Bible direct from the originals were made by Cardinal Adam Easton (died 1397), who translated the whole O. T. except the Psalter, and by Manetti (died 1549), who translated the N. T. and the Psalms, but the first of these works appears to have been lost, and very little is known of the second. The translation of the N. T. into Hebrew and Latin by Simon Jacumæus, at the end of the thirteenth century, has also been lost.¹ Independent versions of the Psalter were made in 1480 by Joh. Creston at Pavia, and Rud. Agricola (died 1485), at Gröningen,² but I have not been able to see them.

But the radical expedient for displacing the ancient, composite and corrupt text of the Latin Bible by a new version did not commend itself to the church in the Middle Age any more than at later periods. Revision was the aim, and in the beginning of the 15th century, it was thought that the language of the Vulgate should be conformed to classical models; of this view Laurentius Valla (died 1457) is the most conspicuous advocate in his celebrated work *De Collatione Novi Testamenti* (ed. Joh. Revius, Amstelod. 1638); specimens of his proposed improvements are given in the note.³ They remained, however, a dead letter. There is a radical difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians on the subject of translations, which must not be ignored. The former hold, if Kaulen e.g. may be regarded as their spokesman, that any version that has received ecclesiastical approbation is on that account to be regarded as true, whereas the latter have ever been reluctant to admit so dangerous a

. . . partim imperitia aliquorum correctorum . . . pro veritate literae habenda in scriptura V. T. qui de deitate christi ac de consequentibus ad hoc loquuntur. quorum aliquos Judæi corruperunt ad defensionem sui errores . . . in illis autem in quibus non est verisimile quod aliquid immutaverint . . . nullum videtur periculum, sed magis securum, secundum dictum b. Hieronymi, in dubiis recurrere ad textum hebraeum tanquam ad originale pro veritate textus declaranda. — These citations are taken from Kaulen, *l. c.* p. 289.

¹ Cave, *Scriptt. Eccles. hist. liter.* Col. 1720, *Saec. Wicklev.* p. 58.

² Trithemii, *Opera*, ed. Francof. 1601. I, p. 377.

³ Heb. XII, 3: ut non fatigemini animis vestris deficientes. — Melius foret *defatigamini*, h. e. labore deficiatis. *Animis* etiam pro *animabus* dixit; haud dubie elegantius κἀνητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς. — Matth. XXVI, 8: utquid perditio haec? — Eadem sunt in Marco verba quod adverbium ita compositum non memini ubi apud eruditos invenerim, quod apud Græcos nunc non, legitur, sed *in quid* sive *ad quid* εἰς τί; — v. 10: quid molesti estis mulieri? — verba graeca proprie et eleganter et ad eruditorum consuetudinem transferuntur: *quid negotii exhibetis mulieri?* h. e. quid mulierem accusatis etc.

tenet ; history, and especially that of the Vulgate, plainly shows that ecclesiastical bodies are not necessarily good translators, and that the sense of the Church ascertained from the Fathers and tradition, is not free from error. The views of Richard of Armagh (died 1359) doubtless express those of the Roman Catholic Church, but not those of Protestant divines, who consider that scholarship of the highest order, especially in the field of language and textual criticism, is the safest and truest way for ascertaining the meaning of the Sacred Originals, and for its expression in idiomatic phrase. It is difficult to understand by what other means a Church Council is able to declare a version to be Holy Scripture ; the concurrent testimony of the most competent scholars must always be the basis of such declaration, and scholarship in this respect requires to be established not by canon, but by proof. Take e.g. two or three passages from Richard of Armagh : “ Concerning the discrepancies or inaccuracies of any of the three versions approved by the Church [i.e. the Itala, Jerome’s version and the Vulgate] I observe . . . that the approbation of the Church respects the original meaning as expressed by the translators, and not your Ms. or mine, since both may have suffered violence from ignorant or careless transcribers. As you believe the original Scriptures to contain the truth, so you must believe it to be in every translation which, after common consultation of the Latin, Greek, Hebrew and other church-authorities, and upon careful examination and collation with copies of every other language, in which our original Scriptures did exist, the Church has received, declared canonical and recommended for use ; and you must not doubt the respective councils to have had sufficient guarantee of the person of the translators, or at least of the accuracy of the translation and its clear agreement with the original. For you are short-sighted in charging with inaccuracy or discrepancy versions that have been so carefully and diligently examined ; believe rather that the copy you may have seen has been vitiated by the ignorance of its maker. In such a case, as I have already said, you may have recourse to other ancient and corrected Mss., and if necessary, to the texts in the other tongues, and thus will doubtless discover the original meaning. The authority of Scripture renders it superfluous to take into account the names of the authors of such versions, who cannot increase its authority ; it is enough that the version contains truth and agrees with the text from which it is made. But if you meet with divergences in the original texts of the versions, it is better for you to ascribe the discovery to your want of judgment or familiarity with the different

expressions of the Scriptures, or to account for the divergence by the linguistic difference of the originals, or by the ambiguity of expressions in different languages, or by their tropical use, which is more current in one tongue than in another, than to the meaning intended by the translator, for that has upon careful examination been approved by the whole Church." And again, "Close examination of the different texts of Scripture will convince you that the different translations approved by the Church do not contradict each other in these and similar cases; although it may be proved that one of them contains less than the others, for though the version should not be a literal transfer of the original, even that cannot hurt you, if it sets forth a truth approved as aforesaid, and contains nothing in conflict with the other version or the original text. For it is not every translator's aim to render literally word for word in the order of the original, because it is not always possible to reproduce in another tongue the meaning by a strictly literal rendering, so that the translator is occasionally obliged to give the sense rather than the words."¹

Views like these may have satisfied the scruples of scholars of the 14th century, but they can only entertain those of the nineteenth, who require proof that black is white, and not a congeries of ingenious fictions, some of which struck even Kaulen as odd,² who mentions by way of apology quite a number of curious medieval notions, e.g. that Jerome's text was only found in his commentaries; that the author of the Vulgate was unknown, and that the Venerable Bede had translated the Book of Proverbs.³

NOTE. — The foregoing paper is part of a Treatise on the Latin Versions, still in manuscript, which discusses: 1. The Pre-Hieronymian Latin Texts; 2. The Hieronymian Texts; 3. The Emendations and Corrections of the Hieronymian Text; 4. The Printed Text.

The texts treated of under 1 are of the highest importance to Biblical criticism, for some of those of the New Testament doubtless belong to the sub-apostolic age, while some of those of the Old Testament probably antedate the Christian era, and furnish very ancient readings of the old *κοινή*. The recovery of some of these fragments is of singular interest, and reads more like romance than history, but history is often more romantic than fiction. The works of Rösensch and Ziegler deserve to be more widely known.

¹ See the passage in Hody, *l. c.* ² *l. c.* p. 299 sq. ³ Hody, *l. c.* pp. 267, 587.