

FREIBURG FRAGMENTS OF A MS OF THE PELAGIAN COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

EARLY in the present year I received photographs of two conjugate leaves of a Latin manuscript, by the kindness of Professor J. M. Heer of the University of Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Baden, known to the readers of the JOURNAL¹ as the learned editor of the Latin version of the Epistle of Barnabas, and of the Latin codex *gat* of the Gospels, as well as the author of other works. The leaves, which had been in use for many years as the cover of the accounts of a professors' 'goose club'² at Freiburg, are now preserved in the Stadtarchiv there. Dr Heer or some one else has rightly labelled them Pelagius's Commentary on the Epistles of St Paul.

The leaves are the two outer conjugate leaves of quaternion CC.² The writing may be safely assigned to the first half of the ninth century, and to a South German *scriptorium*. Certain of its palaeographical characteristics may be mentioned. Open *a* is invariable. The form of the uncial C used in signing the quaternion is so peculiar that in itself it may be decisive for one *scriptorium* against all others; at the lower left-hand corner it is provided with an appendage, somewhat like the lower part of a German capital J. The diphthong *ae* is never so written: generally it is represented by *e* merely, once or twice by *æ*.³ In the last lines the following letters are sometimes provided with long tails, reminiscent of legal documents: *f*, *p*, *q*, *r*, and *s*. The short stroke is sometimes used both for *m* and for *n*, both in the middle and at the end of a word or line. The letter *r* is sometimes highbacked, and a low *f* is characteristic. The *y* is of rather peculiar shape and is dotted; the *z* is short, and stretches half below the line. The following ligatures occur: *ec*, *et*, *ex*, *nt*, and *ri*. Punctuation is rare, and is of three kinds: the simplest is that of the dot placed half-way up above the line, the most emphatic is that of two dots in a line and a comma midway between them underneath, while the medium strength is represented by the semicolon. The interrogative sign is entirely absent, though there is at least one place where the sense is interrogative: the absence of the interrogative sign is unfortunate, as its presence would

¹ See vol. xi (1909-10) pp. 137-140 (Souter), 607-611 (Burkitt).

² See *Postscript*, p. 519.

³ Always given in the text below, where it occurs in the MS.

greatly facilitate an answer to the question of the provenance of the MS. The presence of scripture quotations in the text is sometimes indicated in the margin in the usual way. The MS is carefully and neatly written; there is no attempt to save space. The separation of words is fairly advanced. The number XVI, indicating a *capitulum*, appears at 1 Cor. x 25. This is a matter of some importance, as 1 Cor. x 25 is regularly the beginning of Capitulum L or LI: the question what system of capitulation is here used must be left to experts. The scribe was somewhat addicted to the omission of syllables—*euan*(*gē*)*lizauero*, *ce*(*tē*)*ris*, *idol*(*i*)*o*, *immola*(*ti*)*cium*, and he was not always sure of his vowels:—*potet* for *putet*, and *parte cipo* for *participo*.

The following are all the abbreviations and contractions that occur:—*au*, *dm*, *dñi*, *ē*, *ēē*, *f̄rs*, *n̄*, *ꝑ*, *ꝑ̄*, *p̄pter*, *q*; (= quae), *q̄d*, *s̄ca*, *χ̄p̄*. The following syllabic suspensions occur:—*b̄*; (= bus), *ṛ* (= ter), *ṝ* (= tur, at end of line).

The contents of the MS correspond to the following places in Migne *Patrologia Latina* tom. xxx (later issue); col. 775 A 2-B 2, B 9-C 9, 779 B 1-C 3, C 13-D 14, that is 1 Cor. ix 15-17, 18-20, x 24-27, 27-31. A calculation shews that six lines of writing have been clipped from the upper part of the leaves, and that each page originally contained twenty-three lines. The signature CC may be taken to indicate that what we have left to us belongs to the twenty-sixth quaternion of the MS. This calculation fits the Pseudo-Jerome fairly well. As quaternion twenty-six represents five columns and two lines of the Pseudo-Jerome in Migne, the previous twenty-five quaternions,—if we ignore the conditions of the printing on the one hand,¹ and the absence of prefatory matter from the printed edition on the other, as well as the fact that there may have been a change of scribe, and even one scribe will not always maintain the same size of lettering throughout—ought to be represented by about 126 columns of printing. As a matter of fact, in Migne this portion takes only 105. If we test by the contents of three old MSS of Pseudo-Jerome, which I have completely collated, we find that, in the case of one peculiar MS, the matter of the first twenty-five quaternions of the Freiburg MS would take ninety-four leaves, whereas almost 98½ are actually occupied by the corresponding material. This result is found to be delusive when we turn to the two other MSS, belonging to opposite recensions, and find that in the one case the MS would require 106½ leaves for what is contained in about 96, and in the other case the MS would require 72 leaves for what is

¹ In MSS text and comment run right on, one following immediately on the other. In Migne a fresh line is begun with each extract from the Epistles. Consequently when the notes are long, a page contains much more than it does when the notes are short. This fact disturbs calculations.

contained in about $66\frac{1}{2}$. It seems clear that the Freiburg MS was longer than Pseudo-Jerome. If we proceed to test our fragments by the contents of the only known MS of Pelagius's commentary in its original form, Augiensis cxix (saec. ix in.) at Karlsruhe, we shall find that the portion in our fragments occupies there $9\frac{1}{3}$ columns. Multiplying this by twenty-five, to get at the space required for the preceding part, we arrive at $233\frac{1}{2}$ columns, or about $58\frac{1}{3}$ leaves. Prefatory matter and all, this part occupies hardly 58 leaves in the Karlsruhe MS. The correspondence would appear to be perfect, and our fragments would seem to belong rather to a pure Pelagius than to a Pseudo-Jerome. But the results above arrived at, and the remembrance that Pelagius is considerably shorter than Pseudo-Jerome, will make us pause a little before accepting this conclusion. Yet a further test is open to us, namely, to try the connexion with the form of the Pelagius commentary represented by the anonymous Veronese MS, Paris *B. N.* 653 (saec. ix in.). This MS has been referred to in several earlier articles.¹ Here the portion represented by our fragments fills almost exactly nine pages. On this proportion, what preceded would require 225 pages. As a matter of fact, that part occupies $222\frac{1}{4}$ pages in the Veronese MS. Here again the correspondence would appear to be practically perfect. But how can the Freiburg MS represent two forms so different? The pure Pelagius form is of all known the shortest, the Pseudo-Jerome is of medium length, and the Veronese form is the longest of all. The explanation must be that the expansions of the Veronese form are in inverse proportion to the capacity of one of its pages, or to put it in proportional form:—

Total length of Aug. cxix : total length of Paris 653 :: a page of Paris 653 : a page of Aug. cxix.

In attempting to decide to which family our fragments belong, we shall be wise to remember that the first twenty-five quaternions were too long for Pseudo-Jerome, and to decide that the Freiburg leaves represent a portion of another MS of the Veronese or longest form of the Pelagius commentary.

Let us now briefly consider the textual quality of the fragments. The following five readings are correct, where all the oldest Pseudo-Jerome MSS have gone wrong; and in the first and second cases the Karlsruhe MS was the only authority previously known to me which had the right reading:—

potero immutare (*Aug.*) f. 201 r, ll. 15-16.

exemplo apostoli (*Aug.*) f. 208 r, l. 7.

prosunt (*Aug.*, Cassiod. as printed) f. 208 r, l. 11.

¹ *Proceedings of the British Academy* vol. ii pp. 429 f, 435-439, and the *JOURNAL* vol. xii (1910-11) pp. 32-35.

ad cenam *om.* (*Aug.*, Cassiod.), f. 208 r, l. 22.

infideli (*Aug. Sang.*), f. 208 v, l. 15.

But there are more than sufficient errors to set over against these. In addition to the instances of the scribe's carelessness already given, there are various cases of interpolation: *abstinere* (f. 201 r, l. 10), *nec adnuntiam* (f. 201 v, l. 8), *quod* (alt.) (f. 208 r, l. 7), *esse* (f. 208 r, l. 14). Instances of omission are: *in* of *illicita* (f. 201 r, l. 11) with some Pseudo-Jerome MSS, *enim* (f. 201 r, l. 12) with some Pseudo-Jerome MSS, *legem* (after *qui*) (f. 201 v, l. 22), *ut* (after *fratres*) (f. 208 r, l. 10). Examples of corruption are: *in* (for *me*) (f. 201 r, l. 10), *fecisse* (for *fecistis*) (f. 201 r, l. 20), *immolare* (for *immolate*) (f. 208 r, l. 16), *ergo* (for *ego*) (f. 208 v, l. 18), with some Pseudo-Jerome MSS and *Sangallensis*. One case of transposition is *amplius aliquid* (f. 201 r, l. 20).

If the manuscript had been complete, it would have ranked as equal in value to the Veronese MS Paris *B. N.* 653 (saec. ix in.); and, next to the Reichenau MS itself, Paris 653 is of all MSS the most valuable for the restoration of Pelagius's text. Dr Heer has earned the gratitude of students for bringing these interesting and valuable fragments to light.

ALEX. SOUTER.

fol. 201 recto

fol. 201 verso

.

factum non est . sed uobis . exemplum pre
 beo . tam proprii quam alieni causa
 discriminis saltim ab illicitis abstinere
 cum uideatis in aliorum causa salutis ab
 stinere debita non minus quam licita
 contempsisse ; Bonum est mihi magis mori
 quam ut gloriam meam quis euacuet ;
 Etiam si fame morerer propositum meum
 de quo ante deum glorior numquam potero
 immutare ; Nam si euangelizauero
 non est mihi gloria necessitas enim mihi
 incumbit ; Cum omnia feceritis precepta
 debita uos dicite persoluisse non enim
 amplius aliquid fecisse unde gloriari
 possitis ; Ue enim mihi est si non euanliza
 uero damnationem habeo ; Si enim uolens
 hoc ago mercedem habeo si autem inuitus

(775 A2—B2)
 (in I Cor. ix 15—17)

.

habere mercedem et ipse respondit si
 gratis adnuntiam nec adnuntiam nec
 acceptam exerceam potestatem ; Nam
 cum liber essem ex omnibus omnium me
 seruum . feci ut plures lucrifacerem ;
 Cum possim uti libertatem meam et de ce
 ris non ita curare omnibus tamen com
 passus sum ut eos facerem saluos ;
 Et factus sum iudeis tamquam iudeus
 ut iudeos lucrarer ; Quando se purifi
 cavit in templo quod tempore gratie
 sciebat esse superfluum ; His qui sub lege
 sunt quasi sub lege essem ; Ostendit
 quomodo fuerit cum ipsis et ipse iudeus
 potest et ita intellegi quod samarita
 nos dixerit esse sub lege qui tantum
 moysae uidentur accipere ; Cum ipse

(775 B9—C9)
 (in I Cor. ix 18—20)