

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

In comparing these instances with those supplied by Mr C. D. Chambers, it is hardly necessary to say that we should not expect such casual documents to shew the same conformity to quasi-literary usage as is found even in the apocryphal Acts. Still the papyri from which these examples are taken are not the letters of illiterate peasants, but legal documents conforming to a more or less regular and formal phraseology.

Let us consider the five examples in relation to Mr Chambers's three canons quoted above.

First canon : In exx. (i) and (iv) the aorist part. is used after a verb of appointment ; in (ii) after a verb of motion ; in (iii) and (v) after a verb of knowing in the acc. and partic. construction.

Second canon : In every case the participle follows the verb.

Third canon : In every case the participle is active.

It is of interest to observe that in (iii) and (iv) the aorist participles are strictly parallel to future participles which have already been used in the same sentence.

By attributing the form *ἀπατήσαντα* to dialect, Mitteis seemed to give colour to the suggestion that this use of the aorist partic. might be due to a local usage in Egypt. Unhappily that eminent jurist and papyrologist is no longer with us, but a letter to his former colleague, the veteran scholar Dr Wilcken, has met with a courteous reply, saying that probably nothing more was meant than that this is a Koiné usage. The evidence seems to point to the probability that however the instinct of the narrative writer may have restricted its use within definite limits, there was in vernacular (but by no means illiterate) Greek of the Hellenistic age a strong tendency to use the aorist participle active as equivalent in meaning to the future.

W. F. HOWARD.

## THE TEXT OF THE VULGATE.

*Mémoire sur l'Établissement du Texte de la Vulgate*, par Dom HENRI QUENTIN (Collectanea Biblica Latina VI). (Rome, Desclée ; Paris, Gabalda, 1922.)

THE monograph of Dom Henri Quentin here reviewed may be regarded as the first constructional effort of the Papal Commission for the revision of the Latin Vulgate. The volume before us extends only to the Octateuch, but in many ways it serves as textual Prolegomena for the whole Bible, more especially in the part devoted to the

early printed editions, which no doubt maintain much the same textual characteristics all through the Canonical Books. It is a fine piece of work and worthy of the careful attention of all Biblical students. Perhaps the spirit in which it is written may be best illustrated by the fact that when Dom Quentin leaves the Clementine edition and comes to what has happened since 1592 the three works which, as he says (p. 203), he cannot omit to mention are Vercellone's *Variae Lectiones* (1860-4), Wordsworth and White's N.T. (1899- ), and Samuel Berger's *Histoire de la Vulgate* (1893).

Dom Quentin's monograph falls into two main divisions, that dealing with the printed editions (pp. 75-208), and that in which he makes an attempt to arrange and subordinate the MSS (pp. 209-520). His method is to take a selected chapter from each book—Gen. xviii, Exod. ii, Lev. v, Num. vi, Deut. ii, Josh. ii, Judg. ii, Ruth ii—collate it minutely for all his authorities, and then tabulate the results with a view to discover how the various texts group themselves. It must be remembered that except for Vercellone's collations it is mostly pioneer work. Berger relied chiefly upon selected readings of exceptional intrinsic interest: it is no doubt a safer method to take readings of little intrinsic interest as a first guide in grouping, as they are less likely to be changed except as part of the general revision of a whole text.

As regards the printed editions Dom Quentin's results can be stated in a very few words. He has collated 50 editions of the Latin Bible between the 42-line Bible of 1452 and the Clementine of 1592, and examined I don't know how many more. Of these only three are found to have any critical value: that printed at Vicenza in 1478, which was derived from or assimilated to the mediaeval Italian text; that of 'Cervicornus' (i. e. one Gobelinus Lavidius) at Cologne, 1530; and the Paris editions of Robert Estienne, valuable not for their text, but for the MS variations actually quoted by name.<sup>1</sup> Gobelinus Lavidius appears to have had access to some good Latin MSS and to have allowed their readings to have a real influence upon the text printed by him. All the other early editions, including the Sixtine and the Clementine, are little more than a reproduction of the *editio princeps* of 1452, itself an example of the mediocre text stereotyped by the University of Paris in the thirteenth century.

This result is not new, but it has never been demonstrated before with so much detail, nor had we anywhere before such a conspectus of the extant MS variations as Dom Quentin has provided us in his eight selected chapters. We now know that in not a few cases (e. g. *viditque*

<sup>1</sup> More particularly Estienne gives the readings of B.N. Lat. 11553 (Quentin's *Gel*, Wordsworth's G, Tischendorf's g<sup>1</sup>), the first volume of which is now missing.

for *vidit*, Exod. ii 11) all the editions, or all the editions except Cologne 1530, agree against all the MSS. The readings are not perhaps of intrinsic importance, but they shew to how great an extent the fifteenth and sixteenth century editors, notwithstanding the big promises in their Prefaces, contented themselves with reprinting their immediate predecessors.

In classifying and grouping the MSS of the Octateuch Dom Quentin entered on an almost unworked field. Something indeed was known. The Alcuinian and Theodulfian recensions of the ninth century comprised the whole Bible. For the Gospels and Acts, Romans and 1 Corinthians, we know their text and that of the Amiatinus and the Cavensis and Toletanus in detail, and it is unlikely that the characteristics of these great branches of transmission will be entirely lost in the Octateuch. Dom Quentin's results are somewhat startling. They are, in outline, as follows:—The three oldest surviving MSS, Amiatinus, Ottobonianus,<sup>1</sup> Turonensis,<sup>2</sup> represent three independent families. All the other MSS belong fundamentally to *Am* or to *Ottob* or to *Tur*: the Spanish MSS go with *Tur*, the Alcuinians with *Am*, and the Theodulfians with *Ottob*. Of the Alcuinian MSS the best is not the Vallicellianus but the Bible of Count Rorigon (B.N. Lat. 3), and of the Theodulfian MSS the Bible of S. Hubert (Wordsworth's H) represents an earlier stage of the group than the Codex Memmianus (Wordsworth's Θ).

Those who are familiar with Berger's *Histoire de la Vulgate* will see at once that these are very contentious propositions. When Dom Quentin comes to his final chapters and to his essays in the reconstruction of the true text of the Vulgate he treats these critical results as assured. It is therefore necessary to examine some of these results rather closely, and the methods by which they have been obtained, before considering one or two of the more notable readings which he proposes to adopt.<sup>3</sup>

And first as to the Theodulfian group. This is composed of five MSS: Theo, Anic, Hub, Gep, and Bern. *Theo* is the Codex Memmianus, Wordsworth's Θ (B.N. Lat. 9380), a Bible formerly belonging to the Cathedral of Orleans: Berger and Delisle regard this magnificent codex as having been prepared under the eyes of Theodulf himself, who was Bishop of Orleans from 798–818. *Anic* is the Bible of Le Puy (*Anicium*), almost the twin brother to *Theo*. *Hub* is the Bible of

<sup>1</sup> Ottoboni 66, in the Vatican Library (*saec.* vii), Vercellone's E: it is famous, amongst other things, for containing a number of quite long passages (e. g. the whole of Genesis xlix and l) taken not from the Vulgate but from the Old Latin.

<sup>2</sup> B.N. Lat. Nouv. acq. 2334, known as the Pentateuch of Tours (*saec.* vii), formerly at St Gatien.

<sup>3</sup> In what follows *Cav* and *Tol* are Wordsworth's C and T. *Mar* is Tours 10 (see Berger, p. 204): *Mordr* is the Bible of Mordramnus from Corbie, now Amiens 6 and 7. Both are *saec.* viii.

St Hubert (B.M. Add. 24142), Wordsworth's H. *Gep* is B.N. Lat. 11937, formerly at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and cited by R. Estienne as '*Ge. p.*', i. e. S. Germani exemplar parvum. *Bern* is A. 9 in the Berne Library: it comes from Vienne in Dauphiné (Berger, p. 62); and is only partly Theodulfian in text.

According to Berger *Theo* represents the revision of Theodulf, while *Hub* is a less pure representative of it; *Bern* exhibits the influence of the Theodulfian revision in parts, but not everywhere or to the exclusion of other elements. According to Dom Quentin, on the other hand, *Hub* is an earlier stage in a process of revision and correction that ended with *Theo*; while *Bern* has been influenced by the earlier stage, not by the later, in other words by *Hub* not by *Theo*.<sup>1</sup>

Dom Quentin bases his deductions on 91 numbered various readings taken from his selected chapters, but the 16 variants from Genesis do not count, as *Hub* is not extant for Gen. xviii. This leaves 75. In 35 cases (I make it 39) *Bern* goes with the group; *Bern* is therefore to be reckoned a Theodulfian. *Bern* agrees with all but one of the group six times, and five times *Hub* is the dissident. I make eight occurrences, *Hub* the dissident six times (for 87 has to be added), and *Theo* twice (54 and 69, not 74). *Bern* disagrees with almost all the group five times and in these cases the MSS with which it continues to agree are *Hub* (four times) and *Anic* (once). *Bern* disagrees with all the group nine times: I make it ten, for we must add No. 62. Dom Quentin continues (p. 253): 'On voit par les chiffres qui précèdent que l'appartenance de Bern au groupe théodulfien est manifeste. Ce qui n'est pas moins évident c'est le rapport spécial avec *Hub*. S'accorde-t-il avec tous les autres manuscrits du groupe? *Bern* est alors en désaccord avec *Hub*. Est-il au contraire en désaccord avec tous les autres, c'est avec *Hub* qu'il s'accorde. Nous avons vu plus haut la signification de ce fait: il veut dire que *Bern* est intermédiaire entre *Hub* et le reste du groupe.'

This is a quite definite conclusion. It is evident that the decisive element in the demonstration is the alleged agreement between *Bern* and *Hub* when they both leave the rest of the Theodulfian MSS (i. e. *Theo Anic* and *Gep*). Dom Quentin's list of these agreements (p. 250) is: 32. *Hub*\*, 33. *Hub*, 41. *Hub*, 62. *Hub*; 89. *Anic*. The solitary agreement with *Anic* is in Ruth ii 20, where *Cav Tol* and a few other MSS agree with *Anic* and *Bern* in reading 'ait propinquus noster est' instead of 'propinquus ait noster est': Dom Quentin lays no stress on this, nor need we. The other four are what his deduction rests on. Of

<sup>1</sup> It should be explained that 'influenced by *Hub*' is to be understood as meaning 'influenced by the special branch of transmission to which *Hub* belongs'. Dom Quentin's genealogical tables all seem to be drawn up in this looser sense.

these we must take away (62), as will be clear if we refer to his p. 58, for on p. 244 *Hub* is put on both sides by an uncorrected printer's error, of which there are too many in the book; on the other hand we should add (37), which has apparently fallen out by accident.<sup>1</sup>

Out of the 75 variants, then, *Hub* and *Bern* leave the Theodulfian group together in four places, viz. nos. 32, 33, 37, and 41. What sort of variants are they? First of all it should be noted that this special agreement is only met with in two out of the seven books: nos. 32 and 33 both come from Exod. ii 25,<sup>2</sup> no. 37 is from Lev. v 11 and no. 41 from Lev. v 19. It seems a narrow basis.

The actual variants in which *Hub* and *Bern* agree are:

- 32. *om.* Dominus,
- 33. *cognouit* (*not liberauit*),
- 37. *offeret* (*not offerat*),
- 41. *in Domino* (*not in Dominum*).

In each case *Hub* and *Bern* agree in company with a very large number of MSS of almost every age. The only serious variant is no. 33: *liberauit* is a gloss on *cognouit* (*not* from the Old Latin or the Hebrew!) intended to bring out the sense. The list of those who support *liberauit* is headed by *Mar* and *Mordr*, but besides this *cognouit* is actually retained in the margins of *Theo* and *Anic*. Any one correcting a MS by the aid of *Theo* or *Anic* would be quite as likely to take the marginal reading as the text.

I conclude therefore that the textual evidence does not even point towards Dom Quentin's conclusions about the Theodulfian group. I prefer to abide by Berger's opinion that *Bern* has been partly conformed to the Theodulfian revision, the standard of which is *Theo*, the Codex Memmianus, and that it has nothing to do with the special type represented by *Hub*.

*Bern* is after all not a very important MS; it has only come into prominence through the inferences of Dom Quentin. But *Hub* or H is a codex of considerable interest, both in the Old and New Testaments, and it will be worth while to consider what we can make of it. Where H differs from Θ (to revert to Wordsworth's notation) it generally agrees with the Amiatinus, sometimes with the Cavensis, but quite a large proportion of these differences have been corrected to agree with Θ, so that the combinations AH\* on the one hand and H<sup>c</sup>Θ on the other are quite frequent in the pages of Wordsworth and White.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. ii 25 runs in the Clementine text *Et respexit Dominus filios Israel, et cognouit eos*.

<sup>3</sup> Examples: ACH\* against H<sup>c</sup>Θ, Matt. xxi 31, xxvii 20, 32, 46; AH\* against CH<sup>c</sup>Θ, Matt. ix 38, xxvii 13, 58; CH\* against AH<sup>c</sup>Θ, Matt. xxvii 35. It should be noticed that H is often corrected to agree with Θ, even where Θ differs from almost all other MSS, e.g. Matt. xxvi 32.

What does this mean? H is very like ©, it is universally acknowledged to be a product of the same school, and it has been corrected to agree still more closely with the Theodulfian standard. Surely it means that H was copied from an older MS which had been corrected to agree with © but not perfectly or quite clearly, so that in a good number of cases the copy (our H) agreed with the original reading of its exemplar, not with the corrected reading, and then most of these exemplar-readings were corrected to the corrected reading by a reviser. We may therefore take all the readings where H differs from ©, and especially the H\* readings, as giving us pre-Theodulfian readings of the MS from which our H was copied. This text seems to me a very noteworthy one. It agrees almost always with AC, in other words it represents a text akin to the Amiatinus but free from the 'insular' elements in A.

To return to Dom Quentin, I do not propose to follow his theories in detail with regard to the Alcuinian and Spanish MSS,<sup>1</sup> but I have the feeling that his views on the Alcuinian group are somewhat hazardous. He puts *Rorig* before *Vall*: this is because *Rorig* now and then agrees with more ancient readings than *Vall*, and he does not seem to me to have sufficiently considered the possibility that the more ancient readings survive through imperfect correction to the Alcuinian standard. Yet after all there is a sense in which a correct *stemma codicum* is a matter of secondary moment. In a remarkable List (p. 350 f) he shews that almost all the variants, good and bad, are represented in the divergences between the Alcuinian, Theodulfian, and the extreme type of the Spanish texts (i.e. *Tol*): could we therefore have some method of divination by which to pick and choose in each case we could almost reconstruct the true text of Jerome's translation from these alone. The trouble is that these three groups are not wholly independent, so that we should often go wrong if we merely took the evidence of two of these groups against the other. But Dom Quentin believes that in the three oldest MSS, viz. *Am Tur* and *Ottob*, we have three independent lines of transmission. *Am* represents the peculiar element of Alcuin's recension, *Ottob* represents the peculiar element of Theodulf's, *Tur* represents the peculiar element of the Spanish MSS. The task of the future editor therefore is quite simple. All he has to do is to collect

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that Dom Quentin dates the Codex Toletanus (*Tol*, Wordsworth's T) about 988 A. D., that being the date of a Note recording the gift of *Tol* to the see of Seville. Berger, p. 13, treats this Note as being by a later hand. E. A. Loew (*Studia Palaeographica*, p. 57) dates *Tol* about the end of the eighth century, especially because *Tol* makes no distinction between the hard and the soft sounds of *h*, as almost all tenth century Visigothic hands do. On the other hand the handwriting of the Note (Quentin, pp. 318, 319, 323) is very like that of the ornamental and uncial letters in the body of the codex. Is it possible that the 'era' intended is not the Spanish era, but that 'of the Greeks' (i. e. 715 A. D.)?

the readings of *Am Tur* and *Ottob*, and to accept the agreement of either two of them against the other. The only real use of all the other MSS seems to be to supply evidence for reconstructing the text of these three in places where they happen not to be extant.

I fear this is too good to be true. I fear that what Dom Quentin says very well on p. 210, about the perpetual correction of Biblical texts by more ancient or more approved codices, has introduced so much cross-breeding in all our authorities that no mechanical rule will lead us out of the labyrinth. And if in the end we are searching for texts derived by peculiar lines of transmission from very early days I wonder he has not tried to make use of the evidence of S. Augustine's *Speculum*.<sup>1</sup> It is a pity that none of his specimen chapters cover paragraphs quoted by Augustine in that work: it would be particularly interesting to see how far the *Speculum* would tend to support the Spanish group.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of the book, on pp. 466-487, Dom Quentin brings together eighty readings, mostly taken from Genesis, to shew that the agreement of two out of AM TUR and OTTOB against the other almost always produces the true reading. Most of the eighty deal with points of the very smallest intrinsic interest; some, however, are interesting in themselves or raise questions about Jerome's style and methods. Thus in Gen. iv 6 he proposes to read *Quare mestus es?* with AM and TUR against all the others which have *Quare iratus es?* It is true that in the preceding verse we read that Cain was 'angry', *iratus est*, and that both in the Hebrew and the Greek the same word is used in both verses. Dom Quentin urges on the other hand that the correction was obvious, whether from the Old Latin or from the context, and that Jerome may very well have varied the expression to avoid repetition, just as he calls Cain's countenance *uultus* in ver. 5 but *facies* in ver. 6. This is a reasonable plea: several other anomalous renderings are defended, no doubt rightly, 'par l'habitude qu'a saint Jérôme de varier ses expressions' (p. 472, on Gen. ix 23 *uerecunda*), but if we bear it in mind it is scarcely cogent when comparing *uenationem tuam* (AM TUR) with *de uenatione tua* (OTTOB) in Gen. xxvii 7 to argue for the former because the accusative is the form in the Hebrew and the Greek and the Old Latin.

An interesting example of Jerome's stylistic freedom even in familiar texts is to be found in Gen. vi 2, where he seems to have written *filiis eorum* (OTTOB TUR *Mar\* Cav Tol Theodulf*) not *filiis hominum* (AM *Mordr Alcuin*).

<sup>1</sup> I mean the work which begins *Quis ignorat*. On its text see *J. T. S.* xi 263 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See *J. T. S.* xi 458, where I pointed out a certain affinity between the text of Augustine in the *De Consensu* and that of Cod. Cavensis.

On Gen. iii 15 Dom Quentin decides for *ipsa* not *ipse*. This of course he has a right to do, but his note on the passage raises a very serious question. He says:—'[Gen.] iii 15 ipsa conteret AM TUR *Mar Mordr Rorig Zur Anic Theo Cav Co Tol Osc*; ipse conteret OTTOB *Geo*\*. C'est ici un passage qui a donné lieu à bien des discussions, mais la leçon de nos manuscrits n'est pas douteuse: elle l'est d'autant moins que *Ottob*, qui avec *Geo* est le seul témoin de *ipse*, est, comme nous l'avons vu, un manuscrit très affecté de l'ancien latin. Il est à noter, en outre, que saint Jérôme n'aurait pas rapproché *semen tuum* et *ipse*.'

I do not propose to discuss this famous reading on its merits; the question I must raise is one of fact. Are the Ottobonianus and *Geo* (i. e. B.N. 11504) the only witnesses for *ipse*? Which is correct, Berger or Dom Quentin and his collaborators? Berger's list for *ipse* (*Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 93, note 2), in addition to *Geo*, is

*ottob tol\* vall\* Tours 10\* Monza G. 1 and L<sub>2</sub><sup>g</sup>.*

The Bible of Monza (G. 1) and its satellite (L<sub>2</sub><sup>g</sup>) may be left out of account, for Dom Quentin has not made use of them. But 'Tours 10' is Dom Quentin's *Mar*, and he quotes both *Mar* and *Tol* for *ipsa*. On p. 204 Berger quotes *Mar* again for *ipse* and notes that it is the reading of the first hand. Then again *Vall* is an important and famous codex: Dom Quentin, it is true, does not regard it as the best Alcuinian MS, as Berger does, but when it attests a rare reading it seems ungracious not to notice the fact.

The matter is all the more important because of the numerous slips and errors that have escaped correction scattered through the volume.<sup>1</sup> We are dependent not only for textual theory but also for the actual readings of most of the Vulgate O.T. MSS upon the care and accuracy of the great Benedictine Commission, and it is a matter of the first importance to ascertain the standard of accuracy and completeness that has been attained. Corrections in some Western MSS are very skilfully carried out, and it is easy to overlook them altogether. But in the case of a variation so well-known and so contentious as Gen. iii 15 I do not think Berger (if he be wrong) ought to have been merely contradicted *ex silentio*. The collation of *Tol* was made by the Dames Bénédictines de Maredret, Dom Adrien Coughlin and Dom Gaetano Fornari (p. 299), that of *Mar* by Dom Henri Cottineau (p. 268): if the first hands of *Mar* and *Tol* really read *ipse*, how can we trust the rest of the collations

<sup>1</sup> Some of these are quite disconcerting. Instances of inaccurate tabulation have been given above in discussing the Theodulfian recension. On p. 479 *Melchisedech* should be *Abimelech*. On p. 336 (description of plate) *repos* should be *repas*: *Habacuc* we know was 'capable de tout', but what he brought to Daniel was a dinner, not a sleeping-draught!

in detail? If Berger was misinformed it is well that we should know it, but if he be right in Gen. iii 15, in how many other cases may not important variants have been overlooked?

F. C. BURKITT.

### NOTE ON THE PICTURES IN 'THE PENTATEUCH OF TOURS'.

DOM QUENTIN'S *Turonensis*, now Nouv. Acquisitions Lat. 2334 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, formerly belonged to the Cathedral of St Gatiens at Tours: it was stolen by the notorious Libri about 1842, by whom it was sold in 1847 to Lord Ashburnham. It came back to France in 1888. While it was still at Ashburnham Place the nineteen surviving full-page illustrations were reproduced in photograph and edited by Oscar v. Gebhardt (*The Miniatures of the Ashburnham Pentateuch*, London, 1883) with full Prolegomena, which are not out of date even after Dom Quentin's description on pp. 414-432.

In particular I venture to think that v. Gebhardt's account of the descriptive lettering found on the pictures is more satisfactory than that of Dom Quentin. This lettering is painted on the various objects, and is light or dark according to the suitability of the surface on which it is painted, dark on a light ground, light on a dark ground. It was therefore done *after* the pictures had been painted. On *fol.* 56r there is a picture representing the Children of Israel building cities for Pharaoh: in this picture a good deal of the colour has come off, and underneath it is partly legible a similar series of legends, written with a pen, and done *before* the pictures were painted. The two series of inscriptions do not agree verbally: in the main they are based on the Old Latin, but Dom Quentin points out (p. 425 f) that the later, painted, series sometimes deserts the older wording to follow the Vulgate. Thus the under writing makes Moses hide the slain Egyptian *in arena* (Exod. ii 12), while the painting has *sub sabulo*. On the other hand both sets agree in calling the father-in-law of Moses *Iotor* (= Ἰοθόρ), while the Vulgate has *Iethro* (or *Raguel*).

The most obvious deduction to be made is that the pictures are a copy of a set of pictures made for an Old Latin Bible, but that the painter himself was more familiar with the Vulgate. A good many scenes are represented on the same page: before the painting was begun the painter himself, or his master, wrote with a pen the subjects to be represented: these inscriptions were no doubt copied verbatim from the exemplar. After the paintings were done the painter put on the inscriptions but now they were painted there was no further need