It is true, of course, that in the primitive Babylonian myth, *Anšar* and *Kišar*, *Laḫmu* and *Laḫamu*, and the gods who are subsequently produced, represent the forces of kosmos in conflict with primaeval chaos represented by *Tiâmat*. But, with the adoption of the mythology as a mere *symbolism* by writers to whom Yahwe was the only God, it is natural that the perspective should be altered, and that all that savours of polytheism should stand in opposition to the One who is supreme.

C. F. BURNEY.

SAINT AUGUSTINE'S BIBLE AND THE *ITALA*.

II

The Gospel Quotations in the De Consensu.

THE treatise of S. Augustine called *De Consensu Euangelistarum* is nothing less than a critical study of the Synoptic Problem, with the problem of the Fourth Gospel thrown in. Naturally it is full of extracts from all four Gospels, often quoted with particular stress laid upon a certain word or phrase. Augustine's contribution to historical criticism need not be examined here, but it is obvious how valuable a work like this may be to the textual critic, if only we can be sure of Augustine's own text. The work was admirably edited in 1904 by Weihrich (*CSEL.* vol. 43), who gives reasons for believing that the treatise was written at the end of the year 399.

The first thing that strikes the reader with regard to the Gospel quotations in the *De Consensu* is that they agree generally with the Vulgate. The Vulgate Gospels had been published in 384, fifteen years before; less than four years later, in 403, Augustine wrote to Jerome thus: 'Proinde non paruas Deo gratias agimus de opere tuo quod *Euangelium* ex Graeco interpretatus es, quia paene in omnibus nulla offensio est' (*Ep.* 104). It would therefore not be surprising that in a critical work Augustine should use the new and scientific revision, the execution of which he himself actually approved.

Dr Vogels of Munich, however, has brought forward the theory that the Vulgate element in the Gospel extracts in the *De Consensu* is intrusive.[1] Some editor has altered the text: 'Burkitt hat nicht ernstlich genug mit der Möglichkeit gerechnet, dass der Evangelientext auch gefälscht sein könne' (p. 270). Readers of the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1909 will see Dr Souter's opinion of Dr Vogels' thesis. But I feel that in the circumstances it will

[1] *Biblische Zeitschrift* for 1906, 267–295, repeated in *Biblische Studien* xiii 5, pp. 477–506 (1908).

not be out of place for me to give at some length the reasons why I adhere to the conclusions which I published in my book *The Old Latin and the Itala*. In opposition to Dr Vogels, I believe that the text of the *De Consensu*, as found in the MSS and edited by Weihrich, is the text put there by Augustine.

I do not propose to follow Dr Vogels point by point. Indeed, as to the textual facts we are to a great extent in agreement, and the illustrations of detail which Dr Vogels has brought forward are very often pertinent.[1] The Gospel quotations in the *De Consensu* are, as they stand, taken from the Vulgate, but there really is in the work an underlying strain derived from the Old Latin (i.e. a strain of text that agrees with Codex Bezae and the Old Latin codices), together with occasional readings which do not agree either with the Old Latin texts or with the Vulgate. The difference between me and Dr Vogels is just this: Dr Vogels thinks it easier to imagine an elaborate textual revision by an unknown later editor than to ascribe these inconsistencies to S. Augustine, while I think it easier to believe that the inconsistencies come from S. Augustine than to credit a theory of textual revision.

This really is one of the instances where Dr Sanday's remark about some modern schools of literary investigation applies: 'The complexity of a critical hypothesis very rarely stands in the way of its adoption; but a very little psychological complexity acts as a deterrent.'[2] I do not think Dr Vogels has quite realized to himself what his critical hypothesis involves. The case is quite different from that of the *Speculum*. The *Speculum* was compiled very shortly before Augustine's death, and we do not even know that it was published during his lifetime. The nature of the work was such that it would have been comparatively easy to alter the Biblical text in the body of the compilation. The *De Consensu*, on the other hand, was published thirty years before Augustine died, yet the 'revised' text is found in every one of the MSS, which range in date from the sixth century onwards. Does Dr Vogels think that all our knowledge of the works of Augustine has filtered down to us through Eugippius? Moreover, Dr Vogels' hypothetical revision has been carried out with extraordinary thoroughness, as he himself admits.[3] I feel it very difficult to believe

[1] As Dr Souter points out (*J. T. S.* for October 1909, p. 153), Dr Vogels has sometimes brought forward terribly irrelevant illustrations. But after all deductions have been made, there does remain a residuum of real Old Latin influence, and it is with that residuum that I wish to deal.

[2] Sanday *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* p. 30.

[3] Es lässt sich nicht leugnen, dass die äusserst mühsame Arbeit der Textveränderung—man denke nur daran, dass die Kapitel- und Verseinteilung fehle—mit vielem Fleisse und grosser Aufmerksamkeit durchgeführt worden ist (p. 290, or 500).

that so thoroughgoing a textual revision of any literary work was ever undertaken in ancient times. And this care for the biblical text, be it observed, was entirely confined to the Gospels. The quotation of 2 Cor. iv 3 (p. 334) agrees, as we should expect, with the Freising MS (*r*) and not with the Vulgate; the quotation of 1 Pet. iv 18 (p. 89) agrees very nearly with Cod. Floriacensis (*h*) against the Vulgate; the quotations from the Acts are notoriously unlike the Vulgate. All this suits the state of things presupposed in the *Acta cum Felice* (A.D. 404), where Augustine reads out from one codex Lk. xxiv 36–49 in agreement with the Vulgate, followed by Acts i 1–ii 11 from another codex in agreement with the Old Latin text found in Cod. Floriacensis (*h*).[1] Of course I shall be told that the *Contra Felicem* has been revised also, but is it not odd that all Augustine's works published earlier than 399 should have escaped this strange revision, while all those later than 399 have undergone it? Why is it that the *De Sermone Domini in Monte* (394), the *De Agone Christiano* (396), and the *Contra Faustum*[2] have escaped, while the *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* (say, 400), the *De Consensu* (399), and the *Contra Felicem* (404) have been revised? Is it not more likely that something happened at Hippo about 398, which produced this marked difference in the text of Augustine's Gospel citations?

What, then, is the alternative to Dr Vogels' theory of textual revision? It is simply this, that at the time of the writing of the *De Consensu* Augustine had approved the Vulgate text of the Gospels and had, so far as in him lay, adopted it as the standard text for critical purposes and, apparently, for Church use also. But, as any English-speaking person knows who has attempted regularly to substitute the Revised Version of 1881 for the Authorized Version of 1611, the formal substitution of a new text for an old one does not entirely drive the old one out. For at least six years before the Vulgate text appears in Augustine's writings he had been actively engaged in Christian controversy and literary work: it was not to be expected that the new Revised text, however much it may have been theoretically approved, would be so familiar as that to which he had become accustomed.

Furthermore, I venture to think that S. Augustine is not a man in whom we should expect to find any extraordinary measure of verbal accuracy or consistency. He was very far indeed from being a pedant, and was much more concerned with the meanings of words than their sounds. I have already quoted his assertion that *amor* and *caritas* and *dilectio* mean the same thing (*De Civ.* xiv 7): elsewhere he asserts

[1] See the discussion in *The Old Latin and the Itala* pp. 66–71.

[2] The date of the *Contra Faustum* cannot be determined with accuracy. All that is certain is that it was written 'long before' *Ep.* 82, i.e. 'long before' 405.

that *glorificare*, *honorificare*, and *clarificare* are synonyms,[1] and in the *De Consensu* itself he equates *uilla*, *castellum*, and *municipium* (iii 71). Nor is there any reason to suppose that S. Augustine never made downright mistakes. He certainly put Barnabas instead of Silas into the prison at Philippi (*in Iohan.* 113), a reading for which neither the Vulgate nor the Old Latin of Acts xvi 25 is responsible, and it is difficult to believe that some of the peculiar readings of the *De Consensu* have any other origin than the fallible pen of a busy writer.[2] It is very hard to write a book upon textual subjects without making occasional mistakes.[3]

There is no absolute limit to human carelessness or forgetfulness, and, in the case of Augustine, we cannot tell *a priori* how largely reminiscences of the Old Latin text to which he had been accustomed would influence his quotations when he was not actually copying from a codex. But instances of marked agreement between Augustine and the Vulgate cannot be explained away as pieces of forgetfulness or carelessness. If we can find a series of passages in the *De Consensu*, where on the one hand we can be sure that the readings are Augustine's own, and on the other that they are definitely Vulgate readings and not Old Latin readings at all, then it will be very difficult to regard the Vulgate element as really intrusive in the rest of the work.

How are we to identify definitely Vulgate readings? S. Jerome described his work on the Vulgate Gospels as a *Nouum opus*: was that altogether a vain boast? If the Vulgate really did contain new features, introduced into the Latin Gospels for the first time by S. Jerome, it ought to be possible to recognize some of them. The whole array of extant Old Latin MSS of the Gospels is

a b c d e f ff g h i k l m n p q r s t v z.

[1] *C. serm. Arrianorum* 35.

[2] See *Retr.* ii 4, where Augustine's excuse for synchronizing Plato and Jeremiah is *me fefellit memoria.*

[3] Here are two recent curiosities:

(1) In Dr Ernst Hautsch's *Evangelienzitate des Origenes* (Leipzig, 1909), a careful study of Origen's text in the light of modern editions of his works, I find on p. 117 B and D expressly cited for omitting ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν in Lk. xxiv 32, as well as the preceding ἐν ἡμῖν. If a learned and capable scholar can fall into this kind of error in the twentieth century, surely Augustine may sometimes have done as badly 1500 years ago.

(2) Lord Halifax in defending the Athanasian Creed at Cambridge (*Church Times Report*, Nov. 12, 1909) quoted as a saying of Christ 'Unless ye also believe, ye shall all likewise perish'. This is exactly parallel to some of Augustine's slips: I do not suppose that Lord Halifax's words imply either knowledge or approval of the text of Cod. Veronensis in Lk. xiii 5. It would be different if a whole series of agreements with a particular text could be produced.

Of these *n p s t v* and *z*[1] are mere fragments, and *m* is a series of extracts. *c* (Colbertinus) was written in the twelfth century, and though it assuredly contains very ancient elements, it has frequently been interpolated from the mediaeval Vulgate. *h* (Claromontanus) is 'Old Latin' only for Matthew, *l* (Rehdigeranus) only 'Old Latin' for Luke and parts of John. There is a Vulgate element in *g* (Sangermanensis, ninth century), and perhaps in the fragments of *i* (Vindobonensis) and in the Irish MS called *r* (Usserianus), both of the seventh century. We are thus left with

a b d e ff[2] *f k q*

as the leading representatives of the Old Latin. It would be perhaps too much to say that the whole range of Old Latin variants is contained in these eight MSS, but there is certainly a strong presumption that a Vulgate reading which is not found in either of them is one due to Jerome himself.

It should be added that *e* and *k*, the two representatives of the 'African' text, are very rarely extant together. *d* is the Latin of Codex Bezae (fifth century), and though free from contamination from the Vulgate it is often so accommodated to the Greek on the opposite page as to lose its genuine Old Latin character. Finally, *f* (Brixianus, sixth century), which I have felt bound to include, while it certainly has in it an element derived from the Gothic version, does not escape the suspicion of having also been adapted here and there to the Vulgate text.

In the passages of the *De Consensu* which follow I venture to think that the reading of the text is for one reason or another clear from the context. The pages are those of Weihrich's edition (*CSEL.* vol. xxxiii).

1. *De Cons.* ii 2 (p. 82, line 11), cf. Matt. i 16:

exsequitur ergo humanam generationem Christi Mattheus ab Abraham generatores commemorans, quos perducit ad Ioseph uirum Mariae de qua natus est Iesus.

The last eight words are so much a part of Augustine's own sentence that Weihrich does not seem to have noticed that they agree word for word with the second half of Matt. i 16.[2] The extant renderings are:

Ios. uirum M. de qua natus est Iesus vg *f*
Ios. cui desponsata uirgo M. genuit Iesum *a k* (*q*)[3]
Ios. cui desp. erat uirgo M. uirgo autem M. genuit Iesum *b*
Ios. cui desponsata uirgo M. peperit Christum Iesum *d*.

[1] Amelli's *Sarezzanensis.*

[2] Note that on p. 83, line 21, Joseph is spoken of as *uirum Mariae.*

[3] *q* omits *uirgo.*

2. *De Cons.* ii 3 (p. 83, line 17) = Lk. ii 33:

ipse item Lucas superius dixit *et erat pater eius et mater mirantes* . . . unde eum patrem eius appellat.

Augustine's text of Lk. ii 33 therefore called Joseph 'father' of Jesus. This is true of the Vulgate and of *d* (following its Greek), but *a b e ff f q* have *Ioseph et mater eius*, together with some of the inferior Old Latin MSS and two of Wordsworth and White's.

3. *De Cons.* ii 12 (pp. 123, 124) = Lk. xxiv 46:

oportebat, inquit, *Christum pati et resurgere tertio die*, non ait 'oportebat me pati'.

Augustine quotes this phrase with some others merely to shew that our Lord sometimes spoke in the third person. No weight need therefore be attached to the fact that he omits *a mortuis* after *resurgere*, or that he makes *dies* masculine (as he also does in *contra Felicem*).[1] But it is evident that his text contained the verb *oportebat*. Now in Lk. xxiv 46 we find:

sic scriptum est et sic oportebat vg
sic scriptum est et sic oportuit *f q*
sic scriptum est *a b d ff*
scriptum est *e*.

This example appears to me particularly cogent, inasmuch as it exhibits the Vulgate and Augustine in agreement with the Greek text supported by *f* and *q*, but differing from them in Latinity. In other words this reading, which is attested as Augustine's own by the turn of his phrase, has come to him by way of the Vulgate, not by way of *f* or *q*.

4. *De Cons.* ii 57 (p. 159, line 14), cf. Lk. v 20:

quod ergo Mattheus dicit Dominum dixisse *Confide, fili, dimittuntur tibi peccata tua* (Matt. ix 2), Lucas autem non dixit *fili*, sed *homo* . . .

Thus Augustine expressly attests the vocative *homo* for Lk. v 20, where we find

dixit: Homo vg *ff*
dixit paralytico: Homo *d f*
dixit homini *a b e q*.

This instance, of course, is not absolutely decisive, because *ff* here agrees with the Vulgate.

5. *De Cons.* ii 59 (p. 162, line 13) = Mk. ii 14:

uidit Leuin Alphei . . . nihil hic repugnat; ipse est enim Mattheus qui et Leui.

It would be rash to assert too confidently that we know how Augustine spelt 'Alphaeus' or 'Matthew', or how he declined 'Levi', but it is evident that he read *Leui* or *Leuin* in Mk. ii 14, and not 'James'. Here we find *Leui* or *Leuin* in vg *f q*, but *Iacobum* in *a b d e ff*.

[1] *Dies* is also masculine here in Cod. Amiatinus.

6. *De Cons.* ii 86 (p. 189, line 7) = Lk. xi 37:

et cum loqueretur, rogauit eum quidam Pharisaeus ut pranderet aput se. non autem ait 'cum haec loqueretur', sed *cum loqueretur.* nam si dixisset 'cum haec loqueretur', necessario cogeret intellegere hoc ordine non tantum a se fuisse narrata, uerum et a Domino gesta.

Whatever be thought of Augustine's exegesis, there can be little doubt that his text had *et cum loqueretur* for the introductory clause. The extant readings are:

et cum loqueretur vg
et cum haec loqueretur *f*
et cum loqueretur haec *eff*
in eo autem cum loqueretur *b q*
loquente autem eo *a*
om. *d.*

Thus Augustine's text is that of the Vulgate and of the Vulgate only.

7. *De Cons.* ii 100 (p. 208, line 10) = Joh. vi 15:

Mattheus dixit *ascendit,* Iohannes autem *fugit,* quod esset contrarium, si fugiens non ascenderet.

In the next line Augustine speaks of the 'causa fugiendi', so that it is clear that in Joh. vi 15 he read *fugit* with the Vulgate and *aff,* while *b d e f q* have *secessit.* No doubt the evidence of *aff* proves that *fugit* was a genuine Old Latin reading, and very likely its appearance in the Vulgate is only due to what Wordsworth and White (p. 484) call the 'ignauia Hieronymiana', but the distribution of the evidence suggests that the presence of *fugit* in the *De Consensu* is due rather to Vulgate than Old Latin influence.

8. *De Cons.* ii 133 (p. 236, line 22) = Matt. xxi 44:

Sequitur Mattheus (xxi 28 ff), . . . et cetera usque ad illud ubi ait *et qui ceciderit super lapidem istum confringetur, super quem uero ceciderit conteret eum.*

The verse quoted is the Vulgate text of Matt. xxi 44. If Dr Vogels' theory be correct, that the Gospel quotations in the *De Consensu* have been assimilated to the Vulgate, the agreement of text may, of course, be due to the corrector and not to Augustine. I only quote it here as presumptive evidence that the verse, in whatever form, was quoted by Augustine. Matt. xxi 44 is found in the Vulgate, and in *f* and *q*.[1] But it is omitted altogether in *a b d e ff.*

9. *De Cons.* iii 83 (p. 389, line 18) = Lk. xxiv 51:

ita narrans: [50] *eduxit autem illos foras in Bethaniam et eleuatis manibus suis benedixit eis.* [51] *et factum est, cum benediceret eis, recessit ab eis et ferebatur in caelum.* uiderunt ergo eum praeter quod in terra uiderant, etiam cum ferretur in caelum.

[1] Both *f* and *q* read *conminuet* for *conteret,* and *q* reads *hunc* for *istum.*

The last clause makes it quite clear that *et ferebatur in caelum* was part of the quotation as Augustine made it. The texts have:

et ferebatur in caelum vg
et eleuabatur in caelum *f q*
om. *a b d e ff*

10 and 11. *De Cons.* iii 75 (pp. 378, 379), cf. Lk. xxiv 36 and Joh. xx 19:

sed erant ibi utique non credentes, unde uerum est quod Marcus dicit[a]: *nec illis crediderunt.* his ergo iam, sicut Marcus dicit[b], discumbentibus et adhuc inde, sicut Lucas dicit, loquentibus stetit in medio eorum Dominus et ait illis: *pax uobiscum*, sicut Lucas et Iohannes[c]. fores autem clausae erant, cum ad eos intrauit, quod solus Iohannes commemorat.

For [a] Weihrich gives Mk. xvi 13, for [b] Mk. xvi 14, for [c] Lk. xxiv 36; Joh. xx 26. I venture to think it very hard to believe that a passage of this kind has been textually worked over. Not only are the Scripture references very closely mixed up with Augustine's own words; they present also verbal differences from the actual wording of the Vulgate. In Mk. xvi 14 *q* has *conquirentibus*, while the Vulgate has *recumbentibus* with *ff* and the seventh-century 'supply' of *n*. Neither *a b d e* nor *f* is extant and *k* has a different ending. In Lk. xxiv 36 and in Joh. xx 19, 21, 26 the vast majority of Vulgate MSS have *pax uobis*, not *pax uobiscum*, though the ordinary ecclesiastical salutation has found its way into several Old Latin texts, notably the 'African' *e* (in John). In these points it is quite open to Dr Vogels, or any one else, to maintain that Augustine shews himself to be under the influence of the Old Latin versions, though it seems to me quite likely that the variations may have arisen from his writing *currente calamo*, without verifying his references in small things.

However that may be, the biblical allusions in this paragraph also most distinctly shew the influence of the Vulgate. Unless the sentence quoted above has been altogether rewritten, Augustine attests the presence of 'Peace be unto you' in Luke. But the salutation is altogether absent from Lk. xxiv 36 in *a b d e ff*, i. e. it is absent from the whole phalanx of the unrevised Old Latin texts.

Still more convincing to one who is accustomed to work at the details of Old Latin biblical texts is the word *fores*. Of course if Dr Vogels is prepared to believe that the paragraph quoted above has been revised into conformity with the Vulgate he may put down *fores* to the reviser. Whether that is likely or not, I leave to the judgement of scholars. In any case its source is the Vulgate text of Joh. xx 19. Of *fores*, as of *porro* and Herr Denk's *caerimoniae*, it may almost be said 'quod nomen non est in usu sanctarum litterarum'

so far as the pre-Vulgate texts are concerned.[1] As a matter of fact, Joh. xx 19 is the only instance where *fores* is used in the Vulgate N. T.; and of the Old Latin texts, *a b d q* have *ostia*, while *c e f ff* have *ianuae*. In Joh. xx 26, the Greek being the same, the Vulgate has *ianuae* with *b c e f*, while *a d q* have *ostia*. When therefore we find Augustine referring to Joh. xx and using the word *fores*, it is difficult to avoid the inference that he got it from the exclusively Vulgate rendering of verse 19.

Out of these eleven passages, where the reading of the *De Consensu* is practically free from the suspicion of having been revised, the attested text agrees in all eleven with the Vulgate, in one with *a*, in one with *d*, in two with *ff*, in three with *q*, in four with *f*. In four cases (Lk. xi 37, xxiv 46, xxiv 51, Joh. xx 19) the *De Consensu* agrees with the Vulgate in renderings which there is every reason to believe originated with Jerome himself. But if the Vulgate be once admitted as having influenced Augustine's quotations in the *De Consensu*, what valid reason is there for disbelieving the evidence of the MSS, according to which the long formal quotations all agree with the Vulgate? Why should we go out of our way to accept Dr Vogels' hypothesis of textual revision? Is it not easier to suppose that the scanty traces of the influence of the Old Latin that Dr Vogels has detected in the *De Consensu* are due to Augustine's own reminiscences of the pre-Vulgate Bible?

As I have said already, it is no part of my case to deny the occasional influence of the Old Latin upon the Gospel references in the *De Consensu*. Only I think they are best regarded psychologically, as reminiscences of the text once familiar to Augustine.

I venture to consider that I have shewn that the use of the Vulgate in the *De Consensu* cannot satisfactorily be explained away, and consequently that the hypothesis of a wholesale alteration of the Gospel quotations in that work is to be rejected. The length of the investigation may be excused on the ground of the real importance of this conclusion for the textual criticism of the Vulgate. If we can trust the text of the *De Consensu*—and since Weihrich's edition has been published we are very well able to do so—we have in Augustine's elaborate quotations a witness to the form in which the Vulgate reached Africa only fifteen years later than its first publication. The acceptance of the Vulgate Gospels by S. Augustine is, in fact, the first event we know in the long and varied history of S. Jerome's great achievement.

[1] The only exceptions are Mk. i 33 *b* (ad fores), and Mk. xiii 29 *k* (in foreibus, *sic*). 'Ostium' and 'ianua' are used almost interchangeably to render θύρα, e.g. in Joh. x 9 'Ego sum ostium' is in *d c f* vg and Cyprian $^2/_3$, but *a b e ff q r* and Lucifer have 'Ego sum ianua'. Notice *in limine* for ἐπὶ θύραις, Matt. xxiv 33 *q*.

A couple of observations may be added here. When an ancient ecclesiastical work is badly preserved in MSS and there is reason to think the text may have been systematically tampered with by scribes or editors, then no doubt we may most safely recover the biblical text used by the original writer from the shorter quotations and allusions. But the case is entirely altered whenever the real text of the writer himself is ascertained. Long biblical quotations may be more exposed to subsequent corruption; but in the form in which they were originally written down by the author, or his amanuensis, they represent more nearly the text he used than the shorter allusions to the same passage in the course of his argument. It is worth while to copy out five, six, or a dozen verses,—or to give directions that they shall be copied out,—but in quoting part of the verses a second time a writer would not always take the trouble to verify his language. Certainly S. Augustine did not always do so: unless I am very much mistaken, he was given to the very human habit of quoting his own quotations.[1]

The other remark is to draw attention to the necessity of studying the extant Old Latin MSS as wholes, and not merely referring to their evidence where S. Augustine, or some other writer, happens to differ from a standard text of the Vulgate. It looks mightily impressive to see in Weihrich's apparatus (Matt. xxvi 52–54, p. 287): 'milia legiones *B R E*[1] (*ueron. colb. clar. sgm. pal. brix. Big. Foroiul. al* . . .), legiones *cet., edd., v.*' The textual critic may wonder what '*pal.*', i. e. Codex Palatinus (*e*), is doing in this company, seeing that it is not extant for Matt. xxv–xxvii, but the long list of witnesses is very impressive for all that. One gets the feeling that *B*, the sixth-century Lyons codex of the *De Consensu*, supports the Old Latin and is supported by it. True '*Big.*' and '*Foroiul.*', i. e. Wordsworth's B and J, are not Old Latin at all, but Vulgate codices which have retained or admitted a certain number of widely-spread readings derived from the Old Latin. When we turn to Wordsworth and White's own note we find the clue. They say '+milia B J O X Z *cum b e f ff*$_2$ *g*$_1$ *h r*', i. e. by a misprint *e* has been put for *c*. Dr Weihrich suppressed *ff*$_2$ (which omits *legiones*) and added *colb.* from Sabatier, but the tell-tale '*pal.*' remains.[2]

Of course Dr Weihrich is quite right to take Old Latin readings

[1] In that way I explain the occurrence of the 'African' *sarcina* in the reference to Matt. xi 30 in the Capitula of the *De Consensu* (II xxxiii, p. 67), where the text (p. 183) has *onus* in agreement with the Vulgate. Dr Vogels regards these Capitula as having been made before the text had been tampered with. It should be noted therefore that in II xli (p. 69) the Net in Matt. xiii 47 is called *sagena*, as in the Vulgate. Here *a b c e f g h* have 'retia', *ff* and *q* have 'rete', and *k* has 'retiaculum'. Only *d* has 'sagina', corresponding to CAΓHNH on the opposite page.

[2] Part of Wordsworth and White's note to Mk. xiv 43 is quoted by Weihrich on p. 286, instead of the note to Matt. xxvi 47.

from 'Wordsworth and White', as long as he and his readers realize that the Oxford editors only give a selection of the innumerable differences of *a b d e ff k* and *q* from the Vulgate. Nothing but Dr Vogels' wholesale revision can turn the *De Consensu* quotations into an Old Latin text, and it seems to me that if that hypothesis be rejected, the only alternative is to treat the quotations as if they were fragments of the oldest Vulgate MS that we possess.

This does not mean that they are invariably to be preferred to the line of transmission preserved in Cod. Amiatinus and adopted by Wordsworth and White. We have to allow not only for Augustine's errors and reminiscences, but also for the possibility of uncorrected errors in the first Vulgate codex that came to Hippo. We know from *Retr.* ii 12 that the codex Augustine was using when he wrote the *Quaestiones Euangeliorum* had, by an error, '2' for '12' in Matt. xx 17. This work of Augustine's is made up of detached Notes, some of which are certainly based upon the Vulgate, as may be seen from *Qu. Euang.* ii 29, where Lk. xii 29 is given with the characteristically Vulgate reading.[1] Augustine's first knowledge of the Vulgate, therefore, was derived from a codex that sometimes dropped words and syllables, a state of things very well illustrated by the well-known crux in *De Consensu* ii 26 (pp. 126, 127), where Augustine declares Luke to omit *sancto* in iii 16, against the evidence both of the Old Latin and the Vulgate. But if his codex read *duo* for *duodecim* (or ii for xii) in Matt. xx 17, it may very well have accidentally omitted *sancto* in Lk. iii 16. If the omission had been really characteristic of the Vulgate or of the Old Latin, it would have left more trace elsewhere. The same may be said of *gloria sua* (for *gloria patris sui*) in *De Consensu* ii 111 (p. 218), which no doubt is a mere slip of S. Augustine's pen.[2]

On the other hand, when the variants in the *De Consensu* quotations are supported by two or three of the better Vulgate codices, then they deserve great attention, because they cannot be put down to mere mistakes. I add a list, partly for the intrinsic interest of the readings, partly to shew the very small extent of their range. The standard adopted is the text approved by Wordsworth and White.

Matt. ix 38 eiciat] p. 173 = AƤH*JKMM'O^{c}QVX^{c}YZ *d reh*, mittat BCD(E)H^{mg} ΘLO*RTX*W *vg.*

xiv 14 eius] p. 199 = AC Ƥ^{1}FHΘKLM'OT^{c}VWX^{c}Y*Z, eis BDEƤ*JMQRX* *vg. f corb*, illis *a b c ff g h*, de eis *d*, pro illis *q*, super eos *e k.*

xv 28 filia illius] p. 212 *CP M HAEL* = ACFHΘLMO^{mg}QRY, filia eius p. 212 *BRTD V ONQ* = BƤJKM'O*TVWXZ *vg.*

[1] *Nolite in sublime tolli* (= vg, only).

[2] Other peculiarities of a similar nature in the *De Consensu* are, e.g. *in*quisiuit, p. 109_{5}, dicitur 112_{11}, mulier 172_{9}, ex 210_{19}, nisi 218_{15}, abs 234_{27}, illi 236_{18}.

*xvii 14 genibus prouolutus] EHJKLMRVWZ *vg.*, genibus prouolutis p. 220 = ABCPFΘMOQTXY.

*xvii 15 filio meo] *vg.*, filii mei p. 220 = AEPJO*X^{c}YZ*.

xxiv 16 ad montes] p. 253 *C rel.* = ABCDEPHΘOQTVY, in montes p. 253 *BRTD* = FKLMRWX*Z.

xxvi 47 turba . . . missi] *vg.*, *om.* missi p. 286 = FM *d g.*

xxvi 71 alia] p. 293 = ACDPH*JLMRTX*, alia ancilla BEFH^{c}ΘKMOQVWX^{c}Z *vg.*

xxvi 75 plorauit] p. 299 = ABCHΘX^{c}Y *b c* (*ff*) (*h*) *q reh*, fleuit *vg. rel.*

xxvii 9 a filiis israhel] *vg.*, filii israhel pp. 304, 308 = CDP^{mg}LQT^{c} *f g h.*

xxvii 35 sortem mittentes] p. 323 = CDP*H*IJLMO^{c}RTV *d ff g corb reh*, + ut impleretur &c. ABEP^{mg}H^{c}ΘKMO*QWXYZ *vg.*

*xxvii 44 crucifixi erant] *vg.*, fixi erant p. 339 = A*CH*T*XYZ* *g*, crucifixi sunt P.

The list might be indefinitely prolonged for the other Gospels. In the three passages marked with * it seems to me that the evidence of the *De Consensu* turns the scale against the reading preferred by the Oxford editors; elsewhere it either supports their text, or has adopted an easily explained misreading. The readings in Matt. xv 28 and xxiv 16 I have quoted here, as illustrating the impression I formed in going through the *De Consensu*, that Weihrich's *B* and its followers *R T D* are not always free from sporadic corruption, and that Augustine's text is sometimes better preserved in Weihrich's *C*—but this may be prejudice! In any case the marked affinity between the *De Consensu* and the text of Cod. Cavensis (Wordsworth's C) is worth notice. It is a 'Spanish symptom', which I leave for others to explain.

This investigation should be followed by a study of the character and affinities of the pre-Vulgate Gospel quotations in Augustine's earlier works. Perhaps, however, it is better to wait until the appearance in the Vienna Corpus of the *De Sermone Domini in Monte*. The general impression that I have gained from a fairly extensive, though not systematic, study of these earlier quotations is that they have an 'African' base, but that here and there Augustine has introduced renderings taken from Jerome's version, even in works published before 398. This is notably the case in the *Contra Adimantum*, the Gospel quotations from which are appreciably nearer to the Vulgate than those from the first 'Volumen' of the *Contra Faustum* (i. e. *c. Faustum* i–xxi). But whatever explanation we may give, the fact remains that in these earlier works of S. Augustine the non-Vulgate element in the quotations from the Gospel is very large, while in the works published by him after 398 the non-Vulgate element is very small.

F. C. BURKITT.