

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

dicas : Aperui ego fratrueli meo, fratruelis meus pertransiuit." Quid enim necesse est, ut cordis tui ostia clausa sint sponso ?'

Even allowing that the resemblance between the two last passages may be due to the influence of the Vulgate text of the Song of Solomon, common to both, this will not explain the resemblance in the other passages where the pulsating beat of the rhythm, the short terse sentences, the alternating questions and answers, the linking up of sentence with sentence by the same substantive used as a connecting link—all features which come out strongly in an English translation—suggests, if not the same authorship, at least a writer steeped in the phraseology of Jerome. The rubric of the letter to the hermits assigns it to Berengar, but our examination of the rubric in the Aberdeen MS proves that the rubric of a medieval letter has no necessary connexion with its substance. The style and content of the letter to the hermits are quite unlike anything else written by Berengar. It does not appear to have been written by him. Was it written by Jerome?

A. J. MACDONALD.

#### NOTE ON MARK i 41 AND JOHN xi 33, 38

IT seems to be generally agreed that the strange reading *ὀργισθείς* in Mark i 41, and not the *σπλαγχνισθείς* of the traditional text is right. Jesus, when the leper besought him saying, 'If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean', *being moved with anger*, stretched out his hand and touched him saying, 'I will : be thou clean'. But while there is general agreement that anger is here attributed to Jesus, there is no agreement as to the explanation of anger in such a connexion. An 'Additional Note' to Dr A. E. J. Rawlinson's *Westminster Commentary on St Mark* (p. 256) gives a number of different suggestions which have been put forward to explain why Jesus was angry with the leper. C. H. Turner in the S.P.C.K. one-volume Commentary put forward quite a new one. I believe that the difficulty arises from our not realizing the mental background of those to whom St Mark's Gospel was originally addressed. Suppose we were to read in a life of Lord Shaftesbury that on some occasion when he was visiting a manufacturing town a child was brought to him in a state of extreme emaciation, and suppose the author went on to say : 'Lord Shaftesbury expressed the liveliest indignation, and took immediate steps to have the child removed from its present surroundings and placed under proper care', we should not be held up by a moment's perplexity : although the writer did not state against whom Lord Shaftesbury was indignant, we should understand at once that Lord Shaftesbury regarded the child's

condition as due to the evil will of those responsible for it or the evil will of industrialists bent on enriching themselves by child labour. In the case of a disease, such as leprosy, we do not think of any malignant will being behind the horrible disfigurement, and so indignation, in any one confronted with it, would seem to us quite inappropriate. *We* do not think that a malignant will is at work behind diseases, but the people for whom St Mark wrote did: that is the point. For them, therefore, the anger of Jesus against the evil power which had dealt so cruelly with a human creature would need no more explanation than Lord Shaftesbury's anger would need for us in the case imagined. The explanation of *ὀργισθείς* in this passage is to be got, I believe, by comparing the expression in St Luke iv 39, when Jesus 'rebukes' the fever: rebuke is near to anger. Or again, when St Luke represents Jesus as saying of the crooked woman (xiii 16), 'This woman, a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound lo these eighteen years', there is certainly here too a note of indignation against the evil power. If this is the true explanation of *ὀργισθείς* in Mark i 41, the scribe who substituted *σπλαγχνισθείς* did not appreciably alter the sense, for the same emotion which was on one side of it indignation against the disfiguring power was on the other side of it compassion for the man. Any construction of the passage which makes it to be *the leper* with whom Jesus is angry seems to me hopeless. One has only to look at the far-fetched and unnatural character of all the explanations hitherto offered us on that supposition.

In this connexion reference may be made to a passage in St John, where a somewhat similar difficulty occurs. On the occasion of the raising of Lazarus the emotion attributed to Jesus, when confronted with the outbreak of lamentation and again when he is proceeding to the sepulchre, is expressed by the word *ἐνεβριμήσατο* (xi 33), *ἐμβριμούμενος* (xi 38). Our Authorized Version by translating 'groaned in spirit', 'groaning in himself', represented the emotion as sympathetic grief, which fitted in with the ordinary understanding of the Lord's action in this story. But it has been pointed out that the verb *ἐμβριμούσθαι* properly connotes rather indignation than sorrow (it occurs, of course, in the very passage of Mark which we have just been considering, where it refers to the sternness with which Jesus gave his injunction to the leper after the cleansing), and so here too we find in some modern commentaries over-ingenious explanations why Jesus is represented as angry with the mourners. I would suggest that here too what lies behind the phrase is the idea that in the encounter of Jesus with Death, from whom he is going to rescue the prey, as Herakles rescued Alcestis, Jesus is about to close with the Satanic power. What is suggested is the hard, angry breathing of the man who is bracing

himself to meet and overthrow a tremendous enemy. The sight of human sorrow makes him indignant with the enemy of man.

EDWYN BEVAN.

## TRACES OF AN UNKNOWN<sup>1</sup> SYSTEM OF *CAPITULA* FOR ST MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

It is fairly clear from an examination I have made of eight of the oldest MSS of St Jerome's commentary on St Matthew's Gospel, which I am now collating with a view to a new edition, that Jerome himself made no record of any system of *capitula* in composing this work. This statement can safely be made in spite of the fact that one or two of these MSS do as a matter of fact shew signs, either here and there or systematically, of the use of a list of *capitula*. What these signs are will be stated in the introduction to my edition. Meantime I wish to call attention to an extraordinary system which emerges from one, and as yet only one, of the MSS I have examined.

Codex Augiensis cclxi (saec. ix in.) was written in North Italy somewhere, but was clearly copied from a Visigothic exemplar. It is a manuscript of rare fascination, both palaeographically and textually. The work of perhaps seventeen scribes, it almost certainly came into the possession of the Reichenau Abbey early in the ninth century, and was preserved there until the Reichenau collection was transported to Karlsruhe early in the nineteenth century.

By the kind intervention of H. M. Foreign Office, the Baden Minister of Public Instruction very courteously sent the manuscript to Aberdeen, where the work of collation was expedited by the voluntary co-operation of three of my assistants, all of whom have had a palaeographical training, Mr R. J. Getty, Mr C. J. S. Addison, and Mr D. J. Campbell.

The following table, I think, explains itself. I may add that the numbers of the *capitula* (both systems) are written by the scribes themselves, nearly always in the body of the text. The system of xxviii *capitula* needs no remark, as it has been adequately illustrated by Wordsworth and White. Also, it should be stated that the numbers alone are given in the MS, not the words of the summaries. The other system appears to be derived from the upper numbers in the Eusebian system, and to have been taken from a Vulgate MS.

<sup>1</sup> I use this word with some hesitation, but I can find no trace of the system either in Wordsworth and White's larger Vulgate (vol. i pp. xviii ff.) or in De Bruyne's article 'Notes sur la Bible de Tours au ix<sup>e</sup> Siècle' (*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1931 pp. 345 ff.), or in Berger's 'Histoire de la Vulgate', pp. 353 ff. I have to thank Dom de Bruyne for kindly sending me a copy of his important article.