

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

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

Lord who is not a giver—at least not a mere giver—and the fighters in the battle of life, on whose conduct the result depends :—Δείκνυσιν ὅτι οὔτε αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ πατρὸς ἀλλ' ἐτέρων τινῶν. . . . τίσι δὲ ἡτοίμασται ; τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων δυναμένοι γενέσθαι λαμπροῖς. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εἶπεν “Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι ἀλλὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου”, ἵνα μὴ ἀσθενεῖν μηδὲ ἀτονεῖν αὐτὸν φαίη τις πρὸς τὴν ἀντίδοσιν· ἀλλὰ πῶς ; “οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν ἀλλ' ἐκείνων οἷς ἡτοίμασται”. Theophylact's comment on the passage in St Matthew is οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι κατὰ χάριν τὸν στέφανον ἀλλ' ὧς ἡτοίμασται, τουτέστι τῷ δραμόντι καὶ νικῆσαντι. On St Mark, where the Latin version and the punctuation in Migne's edition indicate the editors' adoption of the reading preserved in R.V., the Greek is οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμοῦ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ τὸ δοῦναι ὑμῖν κατὰ χάριν τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην, οὐ γὰρ ἂν δίκαιος εἴην· ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀγωνισάμενοις, ἐκείνοις ἡτοίμασται ἡ τιμὴ αὕτη.

The true sense of the original is well put by Bishop Walsham How in the S. P. C. K. Commentary, and is admitted by Alford and by the Speaker's Commentary.

BLOMFIELD JACKSON.

THE ORIGINAL HOME OF CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (D PAUL).

ON deciding to examine the character of the text used by Ambrosiaster as the basis of his commentaries on the Pauline epistles, I consulted Mr F. C. Burkitt about the best way to study it. On his advice, I collated first the text found in all the Pauline quotations in Lucifer of Cagliari and the text in Ambrosiaster with the Vulgate; second, the text used by Cyprian's *Testimonia ad Quirinum* (codex Laureshamensis) in all its quotations and that of Ambrosiaster with the Latin of Codex Claromontanus (d_2). Having, on the completion of my work, submitted the results to Mr Burkitt, I was advised to add ' d_2 ' to such variations from the Vulgate as appeared in the first apparatus, and ' vg ' to those differences from d_2 which were noted in the second. He kindly started this double work for me by noting several instances of agreement and called my attention to some agreements between Lucifer and d_2 . I have since noted that he refers to this kinship in his important article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

I make this personal explanation, because any truth there may be in the *theses* about to be propounded is ultimately due to Mr Burkitt's advice, while, if the theories should be decided to be erroneous, he may be entirely absolved from responsibility.

Briefly, then, I believe, as the result of my complete investigation that:—

(a) The Latin of Codex Claromontanus is, with the undernoted reservation, a copy of the same text as Lucifer of Cagliari employed, and that this bilingual MS belonged originally to Sardinia.

(b) The solitary MS of Lucifer is a good one.

(c) The text of d_2 can be emended from Lucifer.

(d) Lucifer's quotations can be emended from d_2 .

If I can prove the truth of (a), it will be unnecessary to prove the truth of the other three *theses*.

It is impossible in this place to print my entire collations. They are printed in full in the sixth chapter of my forthcoming *Study of Ambrosiaster* (Texts and Studies). There is no doubt that the Latin text of D^{Paul} has been contaminated with the Vulgate in the longer Pauline epistles. The other epistles, however, shew no such contamination. It looks as if the copy from which the Latin of Claromontanus was made had been so far corrected by the Vulgate, but that at a certain point the scribe's patience had fortunately become exhausted. Every experienced collator of manuscripts will have seen cases where an elaborate scheme of alteration has been begun, only to be dropped after two or three quaternions.

The fact that Corssen found close points of contact between d_2 and the text in Ambrosiaster, while he makes no mention of Lucifer, will shew how stringent a test I am employing. The texts in Lucifer and Ambrosiaster are contemporary texts, removed from one another by the short distance between Sardinia and Rome. Yet, the former constantly agrees with d_2 against the latter. Let me take two long passages out of a large number to prove the truth of my statement. The main text is in each case Vulgate.

Eph. iv 7-18 (Lucif p. 200 ff von Hartel)

uni cuique autem nostrum data est gratia secundum mensuram donationis Christi. propter quod dicit ascendens in altum captivam duxit captivitatem dedit dona hominibus. quod autem ascendit quid est nisi quia et descendit primum in inferiores partes terrae? qui descendit ipse est et qui ascendit super omnes caelos ut impletet omnia. et ipse 5

1 dignationis *Lucif* 2 domini nostri (*om* nostri *codd*¹) Iesu *ante* Christi *Ambrst* ascendit *codd* 4 et] etiam *Ambrst* *om* primum *Lucif* (= d_2): prius *Ambrst* inferiora *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) et *ante* qui *Lucif* 5 et qui] qui et *Ambrst*: qui

¹ By *codd* is meant either one or both of the Bodleian MSS of Ambrosiaster's commentaries, Bodl. 756 (saec. xi), and Bodl. 689 (saec. xii). By a careful use of them one can elicit from them almost as good a text as the ninth-century MSS provide.

dedit quosdam quidem apostolos quosdam autem prophetas alios uero euangelistas alios autem pastores et doctores ad consummationem sanctorum in opus ministerii in aedificationem corporis Christi donec occurramus omnes in unitatem fidei et agnitionis filii dei in uirum perfectum
 10 in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi ut iam non simus paruuli fluctuantes et circumferamur omni uento doctrinae in nequitia hominum in astutia ad circumuentionem erroris ueritatem autem facientes in caritate crescamus in illo per omnia qui est caput Christus ex quo totum corpus compactum et conexum per omnem iuncturam submini-
 15 strationis secundum operationem in mensuram unius cuiusque membri augmentum corporis facit in aedificationem sui in caritate. hoc igitur dico et testificor in domino ut iam non ambuletis sicut et gentes ambulat in uanitate sensus sui tenebris obscuratum habentes intellectum alienati a uita dei per ignorantiam quae est in illis propter caecitatem
 20 cordis ipsorum.

Tit. I 5-14 (Lucif pp. 196, 277 von Hartel)

huius rei gratia reliqui te Cretae ut ea quae desunt corrigas et constituas per ciuitates presbyteros sicut et ego disposui tibi siquis sine crimine est unius uxoris uir filios habens fideles non in accusatione luxuriae aut non subditos oportet enim episcopum sine crimine esse sicut dei
 5 dispensatorem non superbum non iracundum non uinolentum non percussorem non turpis lucri cupidum sed hospitalem benignum sobrium iustum sanctum continentem amplectentem eum qui secundum doctrinam est fidelem sermonem ut potens sit exhortari in doctrina sana

codd adimpleret *Lucif* (= d_2) 6 quosdam *Lucif* (= d_2) autem d_2 quosdam *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) uero *Ambrst* 7 magistros *Ambrst* 9 unitate *Lucif* agnitione *Lucif*: agnitionem *Ambrst* om filii *Lucif* 10 non iam d_2 : ultra non *Ambrst* 11 fluctuantes] neque fl. *Ambrst* 12 remedium *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) 13 augeamur *Ambrst*: augeamus *codd* ipso *Ambrst*: ipsum *codd* per om d_2 *codd* 14 om omnem *Lucif* 15 om secundum operationem *Lucif* (= d_2) *codd* partis *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) 16 incrementum *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) ad *Ambrst* itaque *Lucif* (= d_2): ergo *Ambrst* 17 testor *Ambrst* non amplius *Lucif* om iam *Ambrst* 18 mentis suae *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) om tenebris *Lucif* *Ambrst* (= d_2) obscurati in intellectu (*alias* insensati) *Lucif* obscurati intellectu *Ambrst* (= d_2) 19 om a *codd* fide *Ambrst* propter *Ambrst* ign. q. e. i. i. propter om *Lucif* *alias* ipsis *Ambrst* propter] et *Ambrst* duritiam *codd* 20 illorum *Ambrst*

1 deerant *Lucif* (= d_2) 2 presbyterium *Lucif* (= d_2) om et *Lucif* (= d_2) tibi disposui *Lucif* (= d_2) *Ambrst* est sine crimine *Lucif* (= d_2) *Ambrst* 3 mulieris *Ambrst* accusationem *Lucif* (= d_2) 4 non subiectum *Lucif*: non subiectos d_2 : inobsequentes *Ambrst* 5 dispensatorem dei *Lucif* proteruum *Lucif* (= d_2) *Ambrst* uino deditum *Ambrst* 6 turpis lucri cupidum] turpilucrum *Lucif* (= d_2): turpia luca adpetentem *Ambrst* prudentem *Ambrst* 7 tenacem *Ambrst* eum] id *Lucif* (= d_2) eius sermonis *Ambrst* qui] quod *Lucif* (= d_2) 8 est fidem uerbi *Lucif*: est fidelis uerbi d_2 : fidelis est

et eos qui contradicunt arguere sunt enim multi etiam inoboedientes uaniloqui et seductores maxime qui de circumcissione sunt quos oportet 10 redargui qui uniuersas domos subuertunt docentes quae non oportet turpis lucri gratia [dixit quidam ex illis proprius ipsorum propheta] Cretenses semper mendaces malae bestiae uentres pigri [testimonium hoc uerum est] quam ob causam increpa illos dure ut sani sint in fide non intendentes Iudaicis fabulis et mandatis hominum auersantium 15 se a ueritate ¹.

Ambrst sana *om Lucif* 9 eos qui contradicunt] contradicentes *Lucif* (= d_2)
Ambrst. reuincere *Lucif* (= d_2) *Ambrst*: se uincere *codd* etiam] *om Ambrst*:
 et *codd d_2* non subditi *Lucif* (= d_2): non oboedientes *Ambrst* 10 deceptores
Lucif ii (hi) (hii) *codd* qui *Ambrst* ex circumcissione sunt *Lucif* (= d_2): sunt ex
 circumcissione *Ambrst* 11 euertunt *Lucif* (= d_2) 14 causam] rem *Lucif*
 argue *Ambrst* acriter *Lucif* (= d_2) sunt *codd*

These passages were chosen as long as possible and from the shorter epistles, so that the test might be severe. An examination of the texts and variants shews that there is a connexion between the texts used by *Lucifer* and *Ambrosiaster*, whatever the nature of that connexion may be. Yet we find that d_2 hardly ever agrees with *Ambrosiaster* against *Lucifer*. The texts used by *Lucifer* and d_2 are the same text.

Sardinia had been taken by the Romans from the Carthaginians in 238 B. C.; so that in *Lucifer's* time the country had been in the occupation of the Romans for six centuries. The island must have been thoroughly Romanized, and even after the fall of the Western Empire the speech of the people continued Latin. Sardinia has never played a large part in the history of Europe, and has been more or less isolated from the Continent. The version used by *Lucifer* probably continued in use in Cagliari long after *Lucifer's* death.

But in the sixth century, actually 533, Sardinia came into the possession of the Eastern Byzantine empire, the language of which was Greek. Hence the necessity for a Greek version of the Bible in the island. The inhabitants spoke Latin, the invaders Greek. A bilingual bible was a necessity for Church services. Such a codex I believe *Claromontanus* to have been. It is remarkable that our three great bilingual codices, *Claromontanus* of the Pauline Epistles, *Codex Bezae* of the Gospels and Acts, and *Laudianus* of the Acts, are all attributed to the sixth century. *Laudianus* is known to be a Sardinian book. May not all these have been prepared in Sardinia to meet the historical situation to which I have referred?

ALEX. SOUTER.

¹ The parts within square brackets are not quoted by *Lucifer*, and therefore no variants from *Ambrst* or d_2 are given in the notes.