

## UBERTINO DA CASALE AND A VARIANT READING.

UBERTINO DA CASALE is well known to all students of Franciscan history as one of the leaders of the 'Spirituali' or 'Zelanti', who held to the strict observance of St Francis's Rule of poverty and thereby found themselves in opposition to the majority of the Friars and to the Church authorities generally. His book, the *Arbor Vite Crucifixe*, was written in 1305: in 1311 he was the spokesman of the Spirituals at Avignon, replying to the various charges brought against them at the Papal Court.<sup>1</sup>

One of the accusations was that Friar Petrus Johannis Olivi, a leader of the Spirituals during the latter half of the thirteenth century, had taught heresy by asserting that our Lord was pierced by the lance of the soldier before He was dead. Ubertino replies that Petrus only considered the question by way of hypothesis, and quotes from what he takes to be a work of St Bernard to shew that he had done the same. He then goes on to say (*ALKG* ii 404):—

'Moreover St Jerome, who corrected the Gospels at the command of Pope Damasus, as appears from the Epistle which he writes to that Pope, and says that in Latin codices there were many things defective and superfluous, shews in that Epistle the marks and references (*signa et cotationes*) by which his correct edition (*correctio*) is recognized. And in a Gospel of Matthew containing his corrections and references set out according to the aforesaid Epistle this text is here given word for word in the xxviii chapter, as we extracted it from the very ancient book itself, though indeed it is found in a great many other copies: *Et circa horam nonam clamavit Ihesus uoce magna, helii helii la maza<sup>2</sup> batani, hoc est deus meus, deus meus ut quid dereliquisti me. Quidam autem illic stantes et audientes dicebant, Eliam uocat iste. Et continuo currens unus accepta spongia impleuit aceto et imponit arundini et dabat ei bibere. Alius autem accepta lancea pupugit latus eius et exiuit sanguis et aqua. Ihesus autem clamans uoce magna emisit spiritum. Et ecce uelum templi scissum est, etc.*

'And in the aforesaid book according to the notation (?)<sup>3</sup> of the whole book we saw with our own eyes (*oculata fide*) the figures of the numbers in black and red according to Ten Canons, which Jerome explains in the Epistle prefixed, and by these figures it clearly appears according to St Jerome, to whom more than to other Doctors credit is given about accuracy of the text, that this text quoted above ought to be in the Gospel of Matthew about the wound in Christ's side between

<sup>1</sup> All the documents are excellently edited by Dr Ehrle in *Archiv f. Literatur und Kirchengeschichte* (*ALKG*), vol. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Ehrle has 'maça', but Italian 'z' in the 14th cent. is exactly like 'ç'. *Lama sabatani* is the form commonly found in 13th-cent. MSS of the Vulgate.

<sup>3</sup> *iuxta signationem*. I do not quite understand what Ubertino means; possibly the Tables of Canons (see the last paragraph of *Nouum Opus*).

His two exclamations according to his (St Jerome's) own true copies, which he translated and corrected by the command of the aforesaid Pope; and this very thing is found also in many [corrected]<sup>1</sup> books. As for the cause why it is not contained in many books, he sufficiently explains that in the above-mentioned Epistle.'

It is much to be wished that other and earlier statements of ecclesiastical writers about readings found in MSS were as clear and instructive as this of Ubertino's. It is concerned, of course, with the famous interpolation in Matt. xxvii 49, which is found in  $\aleph$  and B and has actually been given a place in the text between double brackets by Westcott and Hort. The Latin attestation for the interpolation is what is called Hiberno-British: I give it here according to its geographical distribution.

IRELAND: D Q R  $r_2$  *Mulling Dimma Harl.* 1023 *Corp. ox.* 122

ENGLAND: L (S. Wales) B.M. Add. 9381 (St Petroc, Cornwall)

*Reg.* 1 E vi (Canterbury)

CONTINENTAL IRISH: *S. Gall* 51 *Berne* 671

CONTINENTAL ENGLISH: *Würzburg* 61 *Echternach margin* (F<sup>ms</sup>)

SCHOOL OF TOURS: *Gat* E

LATER FRENCH: B.N. 9386 (Chartres, ix<sup>o</sup>), B.N. 342 (xiii<sup>o</sup>), B.N. 16262 (xiii<sup>o</sup>).

It does not seem very likely that Ubertino's MS was any of these. His MS evidently had an elaborate Table of Canons, like B.M. *Reg.* 1 E vi (the 'Canterbury Gospels', of the 8th cent.). It was probably at Paris that he saw it, in his student days, and the case of B.N. 9386, of the 9th cent., formerly at Chartres, shews that the existence of such a MS at Paris is not to us surprising.

The interest of the question does not, however, lie in the region of textual criticism, but in the support that the modern science of textual criticism gives to the good faith and intelligence of Ubertino da Casale. Ubertino elsewhere refers to lost and otherwise unknown MSS of the greatest interest, to 'rolls' written by Brother Leo the companion of St Francis, and to various traditions that he had heard from the mouth of other of the earliest Friars. It becomes therefore important to know with what degree of accuracy he speaks.<sup>2</sup>

For this reason it has seemed to me worth while to set out the Latin evidence for the aberrant text of Matt. xxvii 49 in full. Neither Ubertino nor his judges could have had any clear idea of the history of the text of the Latin Bible, or what were the limits of variation in mediaeval MSS. Modern scholars would be, I suppose, unanimous that the interpolation is as foreign to the true text as set forth by Jerome as it was to the text current in Ubertino's day. But MSS

<sup>1</sup> *coreptis*, read *correctis*.

<sup>2</sup> See e. g. the discussion in P. Sabatier's *Speculum Perfectionis*, pp. cxl ff.

containing it did exist, some of them very ancient and splendid copies. It says a great deal for Ubertino's intelligence that he noted this reading together with other peculiarities of the old codex, and that then he had a reference to it ready when he wanted it many years later. His statement about the old codex which he reports *oculata fide* is credible to the specialist now, more credible than it must have seemed to Papini about 1820 or to the Papal Court at Avignon in 1311, and therefore it seems reasonable to believe his statement about Brother Leo's *rotuli*, which he also claims to have seen.

As for the degree of accuracy to which Ubertino attains, we may note that his quotation from Matt. xxvii drops a certain number of words and clauses *per incuriam*. Thus the old codex no doubt had *dicens* before *helii*, and *ex eis* before *currens unus*, and it almost certainly did not omit after *bibere* the clause *Ceteri uero dicebant sine uideamus an ueniat Elias liberans eum*. Probably also it read *aqua et sanguis*, with all the authorities except *Gat*. But these things do not affect the main issue, which is that Ubertino is not romancing, but giving an intelligent and intelligible account of something that he had really seen. The only thing that remains with me as a permanent surprise is that this champion of the strictest poverty should have managed to remain so well provided with documentary evidence. He was surely a very well learned man.

F. C. BURKITT.

### ON A PLACE IN ST. AUGUSTINE'S *RULE*.

IN the *JOURNAL* vol. xx p. 355, the present writer pointed out that the editor of the Vienna text of St Augustine's *Epistulae*, the veteran scholar Dr Alois Goldbacher, who at the ripe age of over eighty-four is still active and productive, has altered the reading in one all-important sentence so that it can no longer be used, as it was by earlier critics, to fix the date at which the *Rule* was written. *Apud* Goldbacher, this sentence (*Ep.* 211. 4) now reads:—

cogitate, quid mali sit, ut, cum de deo natis in unitate gaudeamus, interna schismata in monasterio lugeamus.

*deo natis*] *Donatistis* m. [= Ed. Maur.].

That *Donatistis* is right and ought to be restored, it is the aim of this note to shew.

(1) The antithesis in the last two members of this sentence and the emphatic position of *interna* surely imply that the 'rejoicing in unity' is over those who, though external to the *monasterium*, were Christians before this time, though separate in communion. The rejoicing is caused, not by their conversion, but by their ceasing to be schismatics;