THE MONTE CASSINO PSALTER.[1]

DOM AMELLI is indeed to be congratulated upon his interesting discovery, which is nothing less than a hitherto unknown revision of the Latin Psalter from Hexaplaric sources. It is a surprising 'find'. Cod. 557 of the ancient library at Monte Cassino is a twelfth-century Vulgate Bible written almost certainly at Monte Cassino itself by a monk named Ferro, who also wrote Cod. 264 in the same library. There are dozens of such codices in all the principal libraries of Western Europe, and a cursory inspection would hardly suggest that *Cass.* 557 contained anything of outstanding value. On examination, however, the Psalter is found to be given four times over: no. 1 is Jerome's new version from the Hebrew, no. 2 is the ordinary 'Gallican' text, no. 4 is the 'Roman'. No. 3, occupying pp. 217–238, is the version edited by Amelli.

A text like this, embedded in a mediaeval Latin Vulgate, has first of all to prove its claim to be derived from ancient sources. I shall therefore give a few examples where the evidence happens to be particularly clear.[2]

(1) Renderings derived from **Aquila.**

Ps. liv 4 און

inutilia *Cass* = *ἀνωφελέσ* A'.

ἀνομίαν LXX Θ' (*iniquitatem, -tes,* Latt), *ἀσέβειαν* Σ'.

Ps. lxiv 2 לך דמיה תהלה

Tibi tacita laus *Cass* = [*σοὶ σιωπῶσα αἴνεσισ*] A'.

σοὶ πρέπει ὕμνοσ LXX (*Te decet hymnus, -num,* Latt). Note, that Jerome's Hebrew Psalter has *Tibi silens laus,* so that *Cass* is not derived from Jerome.

Ps. lxv 7 הסוררים

separantes se *Cass* = *ἀφιστάμενοι* A'.

παραπικραίνοντεσ LXX (*qui exacerbant, qui exasperant, qui in iram prouocant,* Latt).

[1] COLLECTANEA BIBLICA LATINA, *cura et studio Monachorum S. Benedicti,* vol. i. *Liber Psalmorum . . . nunc primum ex Casinensi Cod.* 557, *curante D.* AMBROSIO M. AMELLI, O.S.B., *in lucem profertur* (F. Pustet, Rome, 1912).

[2] The numeration of the Psalms here given is that of the Greek, as in Field's *Hexapla.* Field's Greek reconstructions of the Syro-Hexaplaric evidence are given in square brackets.

ἀπειθεῖσ Σ′ = *qui increduli sunt* Jerome.
ἐκκλίνοντεσ Θ′.

Ps. cxxxvi 6 על ראש שמחתי

Super caput gaudii mei *Cass* = ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν εὐφροσύνησ μου A LXX Σ′ Θ′ E′ all have ἐν ἀρχῇ . . ., the Latins have *in principio*.

This is all that is reported from Aquila in this verse by our Hexaplaric authorities, but as the words in *Cass* which immediately precede are *nisi non preordinauero cum hierusalem*, it is evident that Aquila is the source of this clause also. In this single Psalm there are actually five instances of Aquila's σύν=את, *cum sion* (v. 1), *cantemus cum cantico* (v. 4), *cum hierusalem* (v. 6), *cum diem* (v. 7), *cum paruulis tuis* (v. 9).

Ps. cxxxviii 20 עריך

Aemuli tui *Cass* = ἀντίζηλοί σου A′.
τὰσ πόλεισ σου LXX (Θ′ vid), *ciuitates tuas* (*suas*) Latt^{rell}
οἱ ἐναντίοι σου Σ′ = *aduersarii tui* Jerome.

(2) Renderings derived from **Symmachus**.

Ps. xxvi 11 הורני

Reuela michi *Cass* = ὑπόδειξόν μοι Σ′.
νομοθέτησόν με LXX Latt
φώτισόν με A′ Θ′
Jerome has *ostende mihi*.

Ps. lxvii 28^{b} רגמתם

ante pugnantes *Cass* = [προμαχοῦντεσ αὐτῶν] Σ′.
ἡγεμόνεσ αὐτῶν LXX Latt
in purpura sua Jerome.
(Note, that in 28^{a} *Cass* has *breuior obtinens eos* = A′.)

Ps. cxli 8 יכתרו צדיקים

coronabuntur iusti *Cass* = στεφανώσονται δίκαιοί Σ′ (and Jerome).
ὑπομένουσι δίκαιοι LXX, περιμενοῦσι δ. A′.

(3) Renderings derived from **Theodotion**.

Ps. xxiv 14 סוד

Arcanum *Cass* = μυστήριον Θ′ E′, *secretum* Jerome
κραταίωμα LXX Latt
ἀπόρρητον A′
ὁμιλία Σ′.

Ps. xliii 13 ולא רבית במחיריהם

et non erat incrementum in commutatione eorum *Cass* = καὶ οὐκ ἦν πλεόνασμα ἐν τῷ ἀλαλάγματι ἡμῶν (leg. αὐτῶν) Θ′.

καὶ οὐκ ἦν πλῆθοσ ἐν τοῖσ ἀλαλάγμασιν αὐτῶν LXX Latt (*et non fuit multitudo*)

καὶ οὐ πολλὴν ἐποίησασ τὴν τιμὴν αὐτῶν Σ′ Jerome.

Ps. lxiii 7 קרב איש

sensus uiri *Cass* = διάνοια ἀνδρὸσ Θ′.

προσελεύσεται ἄνθρωποσ LXX Latt

ἔγκατον ἀνδρὸσ A′

ἐξ ἐγκάτων [αὐτοῦ] ἕκαστοσ Σ′ Jerome.

Ps. lxxiii 8 שרפו

comburemus *Cass* = ἐμπυρίσωμεν Θ′ (*sic* ap. Hieron).

καταπαύσωμεν LXX Latt

ἐνέπρησαν A′

ἐνεπύρισαν Σ′.[1]

Ps. lxxv 5 נאור אתה

Timendus es tu *Cass* = φοβερὸσ εἶ Θ′.

φωτίζεισ σὺ LXX Latt (*illuminans tu*)

φωτισμὸσ σὺ A′ Jerome

ἐπιφανὴσ εἶ Σ′.

(Note that *Cass* retains the LXX 'eternal mountains' for הרי טרף at the end of the clause, where Θ′ has ὀρέων καρπίμων.)

Ps. cxviii 118 סלית כל שוגים

Nullificasti omnes errantes *Cass* = ἐξουδένωσασ πάντασ τοὺσ πλανωμένουσ Θ′ E′.

ἐξουδένωσασ πάντασ τοὺσ ἀποστατοῦντασ LXX Latt (*spreuisti . . .*)

ἀπεσκολόπισασ π. τ. ἀποστρεφομένουσ A′ Jerome

ἀπήλεγξασ π. τ. ῥεμβομένουσ Σ′.

The above series of examples are surely enough to shew that the compiler of the Monte Cassino Psalter made use of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in turn, and that his work is quite independent of Jerome's 'Hebrew' version of the Psalms. A couple of peculiar renderings of another kind now claim attention. It frequently happens that the rendering of *Cass*, while differing from that of the Latin Psalters, yet implies no difference in the underlying Greek. The first explanation that presents itself is that we have here an untouched reading of an 'Old Latin' Psalter, perhaps of an African text, as Amelli seems to suggest. But as a matter of fact, these readings do not agree to any marked extent with Cyprian's or Tertullian's quotations; indeed the cast of language strikes me as distinctly unbiblical, e.g. *egregius*

[1] At the end of Field's Note to Ps. lxxiii 8 'Σ' is a slip for 'S', i.e. *Sexta*. Jerome's words are *Sexta κατακαύσωμεν, id est* comburamus, *quod et LXX iuxta Hexaplorum ueritatem transtulisse perspicuum est.*

for κράτιστοσ (xv 6, xxii 6), and *amaricare* for *exacerbare* (civ 28). We must therefore refer them to the compiler rather than to the Old Latin base which he was revising. This is clearly the case in the following:

Ps. xxxi 4 ('my moisture is like the drought in summer')

conuersasti in miseria in punctione spinarum *Cass*

ἐστράφην εἰσ ταλαιπωρίαν ἐν τῷ ἐμπαγῆναι ἄκανθαν LXX

conuersus sum in aerumna [*mea*] *dum configitur spina* Latt (some Latin texts omit *mea*, others have *confringitur*, *configeretur*, *infigitur*, *infixa est*, but all have *aerumna* and the construction with *dum*)

Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Quinta, and Sexta are all extant and all differ entirely from LXX, interpreting קַיִץ 'summer' or 'harvest'. Jerome's Hebrew Psalter is *uersatus sum in miseria mea cum exardesceret messis.*

Other instances are Ps. lxxvi 5 *anteuenerunt custodiam oculi mei*, and Ps. cxviii 100 *inuestigaui* (= ἐξεζήτησα LXX), where the other Latins have *intellexi*. In Ps. lxxiii 15^{b}, lxxix 16^{b}, clauses absent from the true Old Latin have been added in *Cass*, though of course it would be possible in these cases to put down the addition to the use of Theodotion.

But in any case the example from Ps. xxxi 4 shews that the Greek Bible itself was occasionally used by the compiler of the Monte Cassino text as well as Aquila and his companions. The discoveries of the last twenty years let us see that this was not quite so difficult a work as it might once have seemed, for fragments of two copies of Origen's Hexapla Psalter have come to light, one among the Genizah Fragments at Cambridge,[1] the other in a palimpsest at Milan.[2] In both these MSS the texts were arranged in six narrow parallel columns, as in the original Hexapla itself: any one with a knowledge of Greek, with such a codex before him, could make an eclectic revision of a Latin Psalter with the utmost ease, and the result would be just such a mixture as that of the Monte Cassino Psalter. As a specimen of the actual texts before the eyes of such a reviser I give the actual words of the Milan Palimpsest (O. 39 *sup.* ff. 68. 75, 74. 69) for Psalm xlv 2–4: in the original the texts are arranged in five narrow columns, making a synoptic comparison still more easy.

(*a*) HEBREW TEXT IN GREEK LETTERS:

[2] ἐλωὶμ λανου | μασε· ουοζ | εζρ βσαρὼθ | νεμσα· μωδ | [3] αλ·χεν | λω·νιρα | βααμιρ | ααρσ | οὐβαμωτ | αριμ | βλεβ | ιαμιμ | [4] ισεμου (*sic*) [3] | ιέμρου | μημαν | ιεράσουι | αριμ | βγηοναθω | σελ

[1] C. Taylor *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests*, Camb. 1900.

[2] Ceriani (and G. Mercati) in *Rendiconti del r. Ist. Lomb. di sc. e lett.*, Serie ii, vol. xxix, 1896.

[3] Read ιεεμου.

(*b*) AQUILA:

[2] [ὁ θ̄σ̄ ἡμῖν] ἐλπὶσ καὶ κράτοσ βοήθεια ἐν θλίψεσιν ευρέθη[σ] σφόδρα [3] ἐπι τούτωι οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα ἐν τῶι ἀνταλλάσσεσθαι γῆν καὶ ἐν τῶ σφάλλεσθαι ὄρη ἐν καρδία θαλασσῶν [4] ὀχλάσουσιν ἀντικρ[ουσ]θήσονται ὕδατα αυτου σεισθήσεται ὄρη ἐν τῆ υπερηφανία αὐτοῦ ἀ[σμα][1]

(*c*) SYMMACHUS:

[2] ὁ θ̄σ̄ ἡμῖν πεποίθησισ καὶ ἰσχὺσ βοήθεια ἐν θλίψεσιν εὑρισκόμενοσ σφόδρα [3] διὰ τοῦτο οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα ἐν ταῖσ (*sic*) συγχεῖσθαι γῆν καὶ κλίνεσθαι ὄρη ἐν καρδία θαλασσῶν [4] ἠχούντων καὶ θολουμένων τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ σειομένων ὀρέων ἐν τῶι ἐνδοξασμῶ αὐτοῦ διάψαλμα

(*d*) LXX:

[2] ὁ θ̄σ̄ ἡμῶν καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμισ βοηθὸσ ἐν θλίψεσι ταῖσ εὑρούσαισ ἡμᾶσ
εὑρεθήσεται ἡμῖν
σφόδρα [3] διὰ τοῦτο οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα ἐν τῶ ταράσσεσθαι τὴν γῆν καὶ μετατίθεσθαι ὄρη ἐν καρδία θαλασσῶν [4] ἤχησαν καὶ ἐταράχθησαν τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῶν ἐταράχθησαν τὰ ὄρη ἐν τῆ κραταιότητι αὐτοῦ διάψαλμα

(*e*) THEODOTION:[2]

[2] ὁ θ̄σ̄ ἡμῶν καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμισ· βοηθὸσ ἐν θλίψεσιν εὑρέθη σφόδρα
ταῖσ εὑρούσαισ ἡμᾶσ
[3] διὰ τοῦτο οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα ἐν τῶ ταράσσεσθαι τὴν γῆν καὶ σαλεύεσθαι
μετατίθεσθαι
ὄρη ἐν καρδίαι θαλασσῶν [4] ἠχήσουσι καὶ ταραχθήσονται τὰ ὕδατα αὐτοῦ
ἐταράχθησαν αὐτῶν
σεισθήσονται ὄρη ἐν τῆ ὑπερηφανία αὐτοῦ ἀει
ἐταράχθησαν κραταιότητι αὐτοῦ

(*f*) MONTE CASSINO PSALTER:

[2] Deus noster nobis refugium et uirtus adiutor in angustiis quae inuenerunt nos. [3] Propterea non[3] timebimus in turbatione terrae et commotione montium in cordibus maris. [4] Sonabunt et turbabuntur aquae eorum moueantur montes in soliditate eius [*Blank, for* 'Selah']

(*g*) GALLICAN PSALTER:

[2] Deus noster refugium et uirtus; adiutor in tribulationibus quae inuenerunt nos nimis. [3] Propterea non timebimus dum turbabitur terra, et transferentur montes in cor maris. [4] Sonuerunt et turbatae sunt aquae eorum; conturbati sunt montes in fortitudine eius.

I have quoted this passage in full, because it is the only one in the whole Psalter where the continuous parallel texts of Aquila, Symmachus

[1] For ἆσμα, see Field on Ps. xxxviii 12: Mercati here gives ἀε(ί).

[2] I give Theodotion in full, according to the MS. It is usually the fate of Theodotion's Psalm-text to be passed over in silence, or with the phrase ὁμοίωσ τοῖσ O', a phrase which may not be always quite trustworthy. The principle on which the alternative readings are given in the MS is not clear.

[3] *ea non* is written twice over.

and Theodotion are all extant for three verses together. It may be fortuitous, but the feature that emerges most strongly is the preponderating influence of Theodotion upon the Monte Cassino text. Unfortunately the readings of Theodotion are very imperfectly represented in our Hexaplar authorities, but with the example of Ps. xlv 2–4 before us we may well infer that many of the unique readings of the Monte Cassino text, many of them blundering renderings of the Hebrew which Eusebius and Jerome might well think not worth mention, are directly taken from Theodotion.

In Ps. xlv 2–4 the future tenses in *v.* 4, also *moueantur* for σεισθήσονται, come from Θ′. In *v.* 3 *in . . . commotione montium* is a rendering of ἐν τῷ . . . σαλεύεσθαι ὄρη (Θ′): cp. *sine commotione* Ps. xcv 10. To these must be added the places where *Cass* alters the Latin in cases where Θ′ and LXX agree, i. e. *in angustiis*[1] = ἐν θλίψεσι, *in . . . -atione* = ἐν τῷ w. inf., *soliditas* = κραταιότησ (as in Ps. lxxix 16 *quem solidasti tibimetipso*). Naturally the revision of a Latin Psalter from a MS of the Hexapla would include cases where the reviser would prefer a fresh Latin rendering of the LXX itself: a clear example has been given above from Ps. xxxi 4. But here, and in most other similar cases, it is likely that the reviser was following the Greek as given in Theodotion's column.

It remains now to point out that the use of a MS of the Hexapla, such as the Milan fragment is, explains the most curious feature of *Cass*, viz. the presence of some Hebrew words embedded in the Latin text and of some renderings which appear to be taken direct from the Hebrew. It should be clearly stated at the outset that the evidence which demonstrates a use of the Hebrew text also demonstrates the extreme incompetence of the compiler, whoever he may have been. When in Ps. lxxxvi 4[b] we find *ipsi facti sunt nomen* for *hi fuerunt illic*, where the LXX has οὗτοι ἐγεννήθησαν ἐκεῖ, it is evident that there has been a confusion between *shēm* 'a name' and *shām* 'there'. In this instance it is possible that Theodotion may have been the original blunderer, for his rendering of this verse is not extant.[2] But in Ps. xxxi 5[b] this explanation will not hold. Here LXX, Aquila and Theodotion have καὶ σὺ . . ., Symmachus ἵνα σὺ . . ., the Hebrew being ואתה. But *Cass* has *et nunc*, i. e. ועתה. Obviously our compiler saw ογαθθα in the column of the Hexapla containing the Hebrew text in Greek letters and ventured on an original translation. It suggests that

[1] *Angustia* for θλῖψισ is a favourite word in the Monte Cassino text: it is rare in the Latin Bible, where it is used for στενοχωρία.

[2] How little regularity existed in the use of *a* and ε in transliterations may be seen from Isa. xlvii 2, where for צַמָּתֵךְ Aquila has σεμμαθέχ, but Theodotion σαμθέχ.

he did not know even the letters of the Hebrew Alphabet.[1] Further it is noteworthy that the lists of 'readings derived from the Hebrew text', which Amelli has collected in his Appendix viii (pp. 138–141), do not contain a single instance of confusion between ד and ר[2]: this is inconceiveable if the compiler were working from a Hebrew MS. I therefore suggest that he only used the Greek transliteration found in MSS of the Hexapla.

Some of these schoolboy attempts at Hebrew are very odd. For instance, in Ps. xxi 6 and lv 4 אליך, i. e. 'unto thee', is rendered 'thy Deity'. From the latter verse it appears that our compiler got this queer blunder neither from Aquila, nor from Symmachus, nor from Theodotion, so that it must have been his own rendering of HΛΑΙΧ.[3] Possibly also it was he, rather than Theodotion, who is responsible for rendering PAAB (i. e. רהב) by *famem* (i. e. רעב) in lxxxvi 4. In any case it was doubtless the same person who emended the traditional *spatiosum* of ciii 25 into *auidum manibus* (i. e. רעב for רחב). Naturally all gutturals are interchangeable when they are not represented at all in writing!

To sum up, the Monte Cassino Psalter contains an eclectic text which seems to have been produced by emending an ordinary fourth-century Latin Psalter by readings taken indiscriminately from Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, together with a few new renderings of the Greek LXX and a few renderings taken from the Hebrew. This can best be explained by the use of a single MS of the Hexapla itself, a MS such as the fragments now at Milan and at Cambridge once formed part of. The chief value of the new text, therefore, is as an addition to our Hexaplar authorities: where the Monte Cassino text differs from the Latin Psalters in diction, we may be reasonably certain that we have before us a direct translation into Latin of the text of Aquila, or of Symmachus, or of Theodotion, or (in a few cases) of the LXX, the Hebrew or the 'Quinta'. It is unfortunate that the parentage of the readings should so often remain indeterminate; it might be worth while to furnish the Psalter with a full Commentary and see what can be done to identify the passages one by one.

In any case we lie under a debt of gratitude to Dom Amelli for the admirable manner in which he has set this new text before scholars. He has given us the text as it stands in the MS, and accompanied it with a dozen Appendices in which the various peculiarities of the text

[1] See Amelli, p. vii, for the proof that the barbarously executed Hebrew Alphabet at the end of the MS came from another source than the body of the book.

[2] Ps. lxxxiii 11 *a generatione* only attests מְדוֹר in place of the ordinary *magis quam habitare* which corresponds to מָדוּר: either of these words might be transliterated ΜΙΔΔΟΥΡ or ΜΙΔΔΩΡ.

[3] For this transliteration, combine Isaiah ix 6 with Micah vi 8 Θ′.

are collected together and illustrated. Appendix vi (*Ambrosii testimonia*) and Appendix vii (*Hieronymi testimonia*) are especially interesting. Amelli himself (Introd. pp. xxviii–xxxi) is inclined to claim Rufinus as the compiler, but so far as I have noticed Rufinus's own quotations from the Psalter have no points of contact with the Monte Cassino text. One difficulty, however, which Amelli brings forward (p. xxxii), does not, I confess, weigh much with me. Jerome said to Rufinus *Et me trilinguem bilinguis ipse ridebis?* There is surely no difficulty here! I cannot think that any Hebrew scholar would concede the honourable title of *trilinguis* to the unknown compiler of the Monte Cassino Psalter.

F. C. BURKITT.

ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ OR ΙΩΑΝΝΑ?—A NOTE ON PAPIAS *ap.* EUSEB. *H.E.* iii 39.

CONJECTURAL emendation is excusable only when exegesis fails to remove all reasonable difficulty and when any previous conjectures have failed to win assent. These conditions hold in our fragment. The problems still remain: Why, if Papias desires to distinguish the Johns, does he expressly describe them in the same terms? Why, if he desires to refer again to the John already mentioned, does he not say so? Or why do we leap from Andrew and Peter to two apostles of the second four, postponing John to Philip, Thomas, and James? And who is this James? Papias seems to speak of an aftermath period of reminiscence and retrospect, ill fitting the turbulent years during which James the son of Zebedee still survived. Then why couple John with the wrong James, without a word of comment? For whether this be James the son of Alphaeus or James of Jerusalem the pairing (and Papias certainly is grouping his list in pairs) is very harsh, when we realize how stereotyped 'James and John', meaning the brothers, had become. Some inkling of a corrupted text is given (as Zahn notices) by the isolation of the final *τί*. I suggest that we should read (omitting *τί*)

. . . ἢ ἡ Ἰακώβου ἢ Ἰωάννα ἢ . . .

a natural and proper pair (Lk xxiv 10) to whom enquirers after authentic records would always resort.

The inclusive masculines give no difficulty (cf. *Pistis Sophia* p. 231, Schwartze-Petermann, Latin version p. 146 'Maria Magdalene et Iohannes

παρθένος erunt praestantissimi inter meos μαθητὰς omnes'; and see Acts vi 1, 2, 7 al.). πρεσβύτεροι in its non-technical sense is as applicable to women as to men.[1] The insertion of women in the list is capable of explanation. Papias was collecting authentic λόγοι τῶν πρεσβυτέρων with his eye on current Gnostic prolixities (τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν). We may suppose that Gnosticism had already selected its *dramatis personae*. In later Gnostic writings the women are prominent. In the *Pistis Sophia* their persistent interruptions are reproved (see also *Apostolic Church Order* § 26) by the Apostles, among whom Philip, Thomas, and Matthew are an inner triad (Lat. vers. Schwartze-Petermann pp. 47, 48, 'Tres testes sunt P. et T. et M.').[2] Papias writes, 'I vouch for the truth of *my* λόγοι. They come from the very sources—Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Mary the (mother) of James, Joanna, Matthew—to which my opponents attribute *their* prolixities. I investigated all I could collect from these sources, as well as the more recent statements of Aristion and John'.

It need not be pointed out how swift and easy corruption of the text would be in unskilled hands; and lame explanations, such as that of Eusebius, would become imperative.

E. Iliff Robson.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE ODES OF SOLOMON.

(i) Students of the Odes of Solomon should be grateful to Dom Connolly for calling attention in your last issue (p. 315) to an expression that appears to him to supply 'almost conclusive evidence that our present Syriac text is a translation from Greek'. In the other 'several cases' in which, he says, 'the Syriac seems obviously to be turning Greek expressions', the evidence appears to me futile (as I have endeavoured to shew)[3]; but there is no futility in his observations

[1] Perhaps even in the technical sense also, as βασιλεῖς (in later Greek, at least) includes king and queen.

[2] Joanna does not occur in *Pistis Sophia* itself, but I strongly suspect her presence, p. 202, Lat. vers. p. 129, in place of John. The apology and hesitation of the speaker, as if speaking for the first time, are alien to John, but especially natural in a woman and after the recent rebuke by St Peter. The context would be altered to fit the error once committed.

[3] See my *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet* pp. 189–190, 223–224.