

REVIEWS

OLD-LATIN BIBLICAL TEXTS.

Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. V. The Four Gospels from the Codex Corbiensis (*ff*) . . . together with fragments of the Catholic Epistles, of the Acts and of the Apocalypse from the Fleury Palimpsest (*h*) . . . by E. S. Buchanan, M.A., B.Sc., Oxford, 1907.

MR BUCHANAN'S edition of the two very important Old Latin MSS, best known respectively as *ff* and *h* (Acts), will be welcomed by all students. The work has been a labour of love to the editor, and he has spared no pains in the work of decipherment. Readers of the *Journal of Theological Studies* will remember that he has elaborately discussed the text of *ff* in these pages (*J. T. S.* vii 99-121, 236-267); in fact, these articles must be regarded as his Prolegomena to his edition of the text of *ff* in the series of Oxford Old-Latin Biblical Texts. He also published his reading of two pages from *h* in the same volume (p. 454). Those who are curious in such matters will discover some notable improvements in the Oxford edition, mostly in the direction of a return to Samuel Berger's decipherments.

It would have been well if Mr Buchanan had considered Berger's demonstration of the primitive contents of *h* (Berger, p. 12). Had he done so, he would not have printed the Catholic Epistles in front of the Apocalypse and the Acts. The page containing Ac. xviii 8-19 (reproduced by Berger in facsimile) has the signature G, i.e. Quire 7. Ac. xviii 19 therefore ends the seventh quire, and any one who will take the trouble of counting can verify Berger's calculation for himself, whereby he proves that *h* contained first the Apocalypse (Quires A-C), then the Acts (Quires C-L), and finally the Catholic Epistles.¹ The point is of importance, because *h* is an example of the Third Volume of the New Testament in the *late African* text, in which the Catholic Epistles were the latest stratum (Berger, p. 18); it is therefore proper to point out that they are added on at the end of the volume.²

In the case of a palimpsest like *h*, which in many places is very difficult to read, we have practically to depend upon the testimony of

¹ The only point in which Berger's reconstruction needs to be corrected is that Quire E appears to have had only six leaves instead of eight.

² In *J. T. S.* ix p. 98, Mr Buchanan makes the strange statement that the text of *h* in the Catholic Epistles appears older than that of the Acts or Apocalypse. So far as I know this is quite unfounded.

decipherers, and those who have worked much at such MSS know well how often the eye is deceived ; we see, again and again, what we think is there, but other decipherers approaching the MS with somewhat different prepossessions will see differently. M. Berger was an admirable palaeographer with great experience, and Mr Buchanan amply acknowledges his debt to his great predecessor. With very few exceptions it may be taken for granted that where Berger's and Mr Buchanan's text agree the reading of *h* has been correctly made out. Not indeed everywhere, for if we turn again to the page published in facsimile we find that in Ac. xviii 14 Mr Buchanan has repeated Berger's *facinus*, an impossible division for a Latin word. A glance at the facsimile will shew that the MS has 'fa' only at the end of the line, leaving *-inus* to be supplied at the mutilated beginning of the next line.

The elimination from *h* of the barbarous *fac-inus* emboldens me to maintain that Mr Buchanan has wrongly followed Berger in Ac. xxvi 27 by beginning a line with *ppa*. Here it is the ends of the lines that have lost six or seven letters. Mr Buchanan prints *eredis rex agrippa profetis scio quia cr[edis] agri] ppa ad eum ait modico suades mihi paule xpian[um fieri]*. Possibly *fieri* may be right : it fills the space rather better than Berger's *facere*. But *agri-ppa* is impossible, and some years ago, when I had an opportunity of examining *h*, I read *ita* instead of *ppa*. I conjecture therefore that the true text of *h* is ²⁸[*qui*] *ita ad eum ait*. For *ita* we may compare the beginning of the very next verse in *h* which has *ad quem sic ait*, where the Greek is ὁ δὲ Παῦλος.¹

Of perhaps more general interest is Ac. ix 18, where Mr Buchanan reprints Berger's *untus est* (=εβαντίσθη), where the MS clearly has *tintus est*, the characteristic 'African' term. Naturally, therefore, we must supply *tinti* in Ac. xviii 8, not *unti*.² We should also supply *Sileas* in Ac. xviii 5 (not *Silas*), on the analogy of Cyprian 127 and other Old-Latin evidence.

Where Mr Buchanan supplements or differs from Berger's text it is difficult to speak with confidence, and in many cases he must be prepared to wait until his report is confirmed by the evidence of another pair of eyes. Thus it is quite possible that he has read *h* correctly in Ac. xiv 6, where he prints

⁶ *intellexerunt [et fugerunt
IN LYCAONIAE CIUITATES sicut ihs dixerat eis lx[xii in lys
TRA et dERBEN*

¹ Similarly in Ac. xxvii 9 we must read *trans|sisset* not *trans|isset* : cf. Ac. ix 19 *h*. In Ac. xxvii 7 I read *aliquod* not *aliquos*, so that *tempus* not *dies* must be supplied at the beginning of the next line. In Apoc. i 13 read *mam*[*mas*] not *mam*[*illas*].

² I leave this as I had written it, because of the importance of the phrase, but I am glad to see that Mr Buchanan has already recognized his error (*J. T. S.* ix 99).

(Berger only read the letters printed in capitals). But this startling reference to Lc. x 17 (or rather Matt. x 23) is not legible in the photograph, and I think still needs verification before any argument can be built upon it. In the case of a Palimpsest the old rule holds good, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word must be established.

It is pleasant to be able to establish Mr Buchanan's curious new reading in Apoc. i 8, where *h* really has

ego · d · et · w ·

Of course this is a mere miswriting of the Greek uncials, but the same confusion of Δ and Λ is also found in *ff*, e.g. Matt. xiv 2 where we find *iōdnis*, corresponding to *IΩΛNHC* in the Greek. This has been corrected by a superscript *a*, whereby we arrive at the same form that is found in some of the headlines to the Gospel of John in *ff*, viz. SEC *ΙΟΑDNEM* and SEC *ΙΟADHEM*. The ultimate cause of all these scribal corruptions is the attempt to write Greek letters with a Latin pen.¹

The reservations and hesitations with which Mr Buchanan's text of *h* must be accepted do not apply to *ff*, a MS of the Gospels which has been long known to scholars in a rather slipshod fashion. It has been now edited in full with commendable care, and will for the future rank with the Vercellensis (*a*) and the Veronensis (*b*) as a primary authority for that interesting intermediate state of the Gospels in Latin that we know as 'the European text'. Hitherto *ff* lay under some suspicion of occasional assimilation to the Vulgate; Mr Buchanan's careful discrimination of the various correctors of *ff* has finally removed this suspicion.² The Vulgate does not appear to be a constituent element in *ff*: in this it is unlike *c*, and perhaps *r* and *f*.

The side of Mr Buchanan's work upon *ff* where I venture to think he has laid himself open to criticism is his estimate of the value of this text of the Gospels. That *ff* is one of our leading Old-Latin MSS is certain, that it was written not later than the middle of the fifth century is highly probable. Like most other Old-Latin MSS it retains here and there very ancient elements, and these sometimes shew themselves in the form of coincidences with Cyprian. But it is lost labour to try to exhibit *ff* as having any near relation to the true African authorities. What African readings it retains are generally found in other MSS also at the same point. Thus Mr Buchanan quotes (*J. T. S.* vii 242) from

¹ In Apoc. i 8 the pronunciation intended, both in Greek and Latin, is, of course, that indicated by Prudentius's line *Alfa et O cognominatus, ipse fons et clausula*.

² In Joh. iv 19 an examination of the photograph has convinced me that *ff** wrote *video quia propheta es* (in agreement with *D a b e l r*), and that *tu* was added by a late corrector. Mr Buchanan reads *est* for the first hand, reserving the *u* for the corrector. But the genuine *t's* of *ff* do not prolong the horizontal stroke to the right as this *t* does.

ff k and Cyprian the passage Mc. xii 29–31, and remarks: ‘Here *ff* together with *d* has alone of Latin MSS preserved the second *d̄nis* which is found in St Cyprian. Also *ff* Cyprian support *praecepta* as opposed to *mandatum*. *ff* (*k*) read *diligis* for *diliges*, and *totis viribus tuis* for *tota mente* (=vg). Finally *ff* combines with *k* Cyp. in reading *huic* for *illi*.’

The impression given by a detailed statement like this is very strong. One thinks of *ff* as a sort of Abdiel, faithful without other support to the Africans. But what are the facts? Let us supplement Mr Buchanan’s statements one by one. The extant Old-Latin MSS for this passage are *a b c d ff i k q r*: I do not count *l*, for it has a Vulgate text in Matt. and Mc. Well, the second *d̄ns* is found in *c q* as well as in *d ff*. Also *c* supports *praecepta* as opposed to *mandatum*, and *q* has *preceptum*. The misspelling *diligis* for *diliges* is indeed found in *ff* where *k* has *diligit*, but *diligis* also is found in a whole row of Vulgate MSS and in *d*: such confusions of vowels prove very little. On the other hand *totis viribus tuis* for *tota mente* is found in *a b* and *i*, as well as *ff* and *k*. It is not found in *c*, which has the three words *corde . . . anima . . . virtute* in agreement with *d* and with Cyprian. Finally *ff* combines with *k* Cyprian, but also with *c i q*, in reading *huic* for *illi*. Thus in not one single instance out of all the five is *ff* combined alone with an ‘African’ authority.

It may perhaps surprise some persons to see how well *c* comes out of a careful examination of this sort. Every one knows that the Codex Colbertinus (*c*) is comparatively modern, and as is natural in a MS written in the twelfth century it contains a number of corruptions and interpolations from the mediaeval Vulgate scattered over all four Gospels. These can be detected, however, without great difficulty. What remains, the Old-Latin text itself, is also of mixed quality, predominantly European in St Matthew, and comparatively uninteresting in St John. But in parts of St Luke and St Mark it has a large ‘African’ element, as is proved not only by the diction, but also by actual coincidences with Cyprian: by a fortunate chance this element is predominant in Lc. xxiii, where our leading African MS *e* practically deserts its fundamental base for a commonplace European type. In the present instance the African elements in *c* come out strongly; in vv. 29–31^a it agrees with Cyprian in almost everything except the commonplace *ex* for the African *de*, no doubt through mere assimilation to the Vulgate, and in ver. 31^b (where Cyprian goes off to Matt. xxii 40) *c* has, in agreement with *k* alone among Latin MSS, the ablative of comparison after *maius*.

To come back to *ff*, I cannot leave Mr Buchanan’s remarks in *J. T. S.* vii 249–252 without a protest against the uncritical way in which he

speaks of Codex Palatinus (*e*). It is not critical to set up an arbitrary standard—in this case apparently the *Textus Receptus*—and then to appraise MSS by their faithfulness to that standard. It is, of course, flattering to be named as an authority side by side with Lachmann and St Augustine and Tischendorf, but in these regions opinion matters nothing at all. It is not a question of my views or of Lachmann's, but of the textual facts. ‘Lachmann expressed his belief that the Old-Latin Version originated in Africa, probably at Carthage’ (p. 250), and on the ground of the singular readings in *k* he classed it among the ‘emended copies’. Very well: so the matter rested, until Hort shewed, not by arguments but by stating the ascertainable fact, that the quotations of St Cyprian agree with the singular codex *k* and to a smaller extent with the almost as singular codex *e*. This worked a revolution. Either Cyprian's text, the most African text we have, representing the official text in use at Carthage about 250 A.D., was to be classed ‘with the Italic or emended copies’, or else—and this is the alternative universally adopted—the features in *k* and *e* that by Lachmann and Tischendorf were put down to later revision are to be regarded as primitive, and if the text of *k* and *e* is generally speaking primitive, then that of the others, *a b ff* and the rest, is not primitive, but represents a later series of revisions both of the Latinity and of the underlying Greek text. As a result of revision, *a b ff* are on the whole more literal and more commonplace. So far as they are revised they do not represent the primitive Latin version, the main value of which to us resides not in its ‘faithfulness’ but in its age.

In many ways *e* is an unsatisfactory MS. It is far less true to the Cyprianic standard than *k*. But the black list that Mr Buchanan has drawn out on p. 250 only shews its independence and general freedom from revision. Far more serious are the instances where it agrees with certain European MSS or with the Vulgate itself in commonplace readings, for such passages suggest the influence of other exemplars. For instance, in Lc. iii. 22 it has ‘with Thee I am well pleased’, where D *a b c ff l r* and Tyconius have ‘this day have I begotten Thee’.

But after all such lapses are rare, and in very many cases the apparent inaccuracy of *e* receives confirmation elsewhere. Thus the opening words of the Benedictus in most Latin MSS are

Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel quia uisitauit et fecit redemptionem plebi sua, et erexit cornu salutis nobis in domo Dauid pueri sui. ‘Dominus’ is omitted by *a b ff l r* and Ambrose, *b ff r* Ambrose have ‘plebis sua’ and *a* has ‘populo suo’. Thus there is a very general consensus with regard to these familiar words. Now *e* has

Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel qui prospexit redemptionem populo suo, et excituauit cornum salutis nobis in domo Dauid pueri sui. Do

not *excitauit* for *ηγειρεν* and *qui prospexit* for *οἱ ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησαν* look like what Mr Buchanan calls 'wilful alterations'? There is no recorded Greek variant to Lc.i 68; any Greek MS that a fourth-century Latin reviser might be likely to use would agree with our printed editions. Yet it is quite certain that the scribe of *e* was here faithful to his exemplar, for the very same renderings are found in Cyprian 72. Cyprian, like so many other Latins, omits 'Dominus', and he puts 'nobis' immediately after 'excitauit': otherwise he agrees word for word with *e*. Whether the African text in this verse be ultimately the product of wilfulness or of carelessness I do not know; at any rate *e* is here faithfully repeating words which must have stood unchanged in its ancestry for at least 200 years. It is because instances like this can be taken out of almost every chapter for which *e* is extant that its readings are regarded by sober critics with respect. I do not agree with Mr Buchanan's estimate that *e* was written in the latter half of the sixth century (*J. T. S.* vii. 121): the first half of the fifth century is in my opinion more likely. But the value of the text of *e* is quite independent of the date of the MS, and, let me repeat, its value was proved not by its occasional agreement with readings approved by critical editors, but by its continual agreement with the quotations of St Cyprian. When any MS of the European Latin as a whole receives third-century Patristic attestation, then critics will regard its text with the same respect that they give to *k* and *e*. The nearest instance I can think of is the general agreement between *a* and Novatian in S. John, and, as we all know, *a* has a larger 'African' element than most of the European group.

These remarks are made in the belief that the best way I can shew my gratitude for Mr Buchanan's work is a somewhat detailed exposition of reasons why I cannot everywhere follow his too enthusiastic championship of *ff*.

F. C. BURKITT.