

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]

uicina desiderant.

v. 6 nam prudentia carnis mors estprudentia autem sps. uita et paxipse alibi dicit. prudentiam huma
nam esse malo uicem referretalis ergo prudentia mortem pa
rit. transgrediendo praeceptumsps. uero prudentiae et in praeseti pacem habet. et non reddendo
uicem et uitam in futuro perci
piet. prudentia uero a prouidedo est appellata.

v. 7 quoniam sapientia carnis inimica est dō legi enim dī non est subiecta non ipsa caro ut manichei dicuntsed sensus carnalis inimicus est dō omne enim non subiectum ini micum est et quicumque se uo

luerit

20

10. esse: 11. prudentia: 13. prudentiae: 15. uicem: et deleuit m. 222. subiectum:

G. MERCATI.

THE RELATION OF THE ROMAN FRAGMENTS TO THE COMMENTARY IN THE KARLSRUHE MS (AUGIENSIS CXIX).

In my lecture before the British Academy on December 12, 1906,1 I argued that the commentary contained in the Karlsruhe MS, Augiensis cxix (saec. ix), is the original, unaltered commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St Paul. I also contended from internal evidence that the MS is a copy of a fifth or sixth-century original. The Roman fragments which Dr Mercati has discovered are portions of another copy of the same commentary. Scholars, therefore, are free to dispute that this commentary is the original Pelagius; they cannot dispute that it already existed in the sixth century, the century after Pelagius wrote his commentary. By good fortune the fragments provide the severest possible test of the character of the Karlsruhe MS. For it is on the longer Epistles, especially on the Epistle to the Romans, that the Pseudo-Jerome form is so much longer than the Karlsruhe form. Pseudo-Jerome is characterized, in my view, by numerous explanations added to the original Pelagius, and generally introduced by the word Item. All the passages which Dr Mercati has noted above as absent from his Roman

¹ Published in vol. ii of the Proceedings of the Academy, under the title 'The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: the Problem of its Restoration'.

fragments are absent also from the Karlsruhe MS. The remainder of this note is devoted to a statement of the few and unimportant discrepancies in text between the two MSS.

Romans MS (I a)

Karlsruhe MS

l. 1	naturale <i>m</i>
l. 4	qui sci—
1. 7	in uita
	in m <i>orte</i>

naturalem et quia iam sci ad uitam

ad mortem (Then follows the part of Scripture which the Roman MS introduces after duxit ad mortem)

l. 12 me ll. 16–17 sca et bona l. 20 ueteri l. 22 marcionistas **** om. bona et sca uetere

marcionitas (very likely the reading of Roman MS) hic locus facit

(I b)

l. 5 super peccatum de*linq*uens

l. 6 legis

1. ro autem quoniam

1. 18 propositus
 1. 21 ipsum

(II a)

l. 1 quod hostem

uelit

supra

peccans peccatum

om.

enim quod

uenundatus quasi propositus

ipse

quo hominem posset

uellet

nobis (Then follows the part of Scripture which the Roman MS introduces after 'mortificauimus carnem')

(II b)

l. 5 singulael. 13 prudentiael. 14 et

l. 19 est subiecta

singulae substantiae

prudentia om.

subicitur

While it is premature to discuss the relative value of the texts of the two MSS in these passages, it may be meantime remarked that, while the Roman MS appears to give the better arrangement of text and commentary, the actual readings of the Karlsruhe seem generally preferable.

ALEX. SOUTER.