

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]

Benedictines against the Jesuits in the Benedictine edition of St Augustine. When we read the history of that great controversy, or chuckle over the trouncing of Archdeacon Travis by Porson, let us not forget the lonely Oxford Friar who struck the first blow against the authority of received texts.

Before taking leave of Dr Glunz's interesting study, special note should be made, not only of the many collations in the text, but also of the six extensive Appendices. The first of these are Notes on the well-known codices X and O of the Vulgate, including a revised collation of X* and X^c. On p. 17 Dr Glunz gives his present opinion upon the Origin of X, which is at least more favourable to an Italian origin than his former determined rejection. In the foot-note, I do not know the difference between a 'gospel-book' and *Textus Evangeliorum*; for a book containing only the Liturgical Gospels hardly existed in the time of Gregory the Great. O, according to Glunz (p. xiii), was written in England.

There are many other things touched upon in this book, notably the conquest and subjection of the Church in England by Lanfranc, following upon the political conquest of England at Hastings. But the main thing is the identification of the Gloss as the work of the Master of the Sentences, and of his responsibility for the notorious *Exemplar Parisiense*. And, finally, the originality of Roger Bacon has found in Dr Glunz its most persuasive advocate.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE ANONYMOUS LATIN TRANSLATION OF ORIGEN ON ST MATTHEW (xxii 34 to the end), AND OLD-LATIN MS *q* OF THE GOSPELS

THE publication of Klostermann's admirable edition of the above (see *infra*, p. 105) provides an opportunity for some remarks which may not be devoid of interest, especially as, to the best of my knowledge, few persons have made a close study of the commentary.

It seems probable that the translator turned the whole work into Latin, though only a portion of it has been preserved.¹ It is not so probable that he was in possession only of part of Origen's work, and translated what he had. We do not know who he was, nor where nor when he worked. That he was neither Jerome nor Rufinus is quite certain. That he was identical with the author of the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum* has been argued by Dom Morin.² Earlier I had

¹ The earlier part, from tome xii to xvii, where the Greek also is preserved (De la Rue, vol. iii (Paris 1720) pp. 521-829) has not yet been edited by Klostermann, if indeed it will fall within the scope of his edition.

² *Revue Bénédictine*, t. xxxvii (1925) pp. 239-262.

ventured to suggest that 'the coincidences' of the Latin Irenaeus 'with the translation of Origen on Matthew are best explained by supposing that the two translations came from the same pen'.¹ The coincidences remain, and in fact I have since the time of writing found others, but as I assigned the Latin Irenaeus to Africa,² and am unable to assign the Latin Origen, who is now better known to me, to the same region, I would not now press my earlier view. The translator was, in any case, a cultured man, who employs an excellent Latin style for his purpose.

The first point I wish to call attention to is this: the biblical lemmata, which are almost complete for the part of the Gospel covered, show the most striking resemblances with the text of the old Latin MS called *q*.³ This MS passed from the Freising library in Bavaria to Munich in 1802, and has, of course, been admirably edited by the present Dean of Christ Church in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*: no. III (Oxford 1888). Since that date a good deal of study has been given to the MS.⁴ It seems now certain that it is an Italian (even a North-Italian) product of the seventh century, and it appears highly probable that its archetype also belongs to the same region. In the comparatively rare cases where the Latin Origen and *q* go different ways, agreements are found with *a* or *b* or *ff*², two of which at least are North-Italian.

That the translator of Origen did, as a matter of fact, copy the Gospel lemmata from a Latin copy of the Gospel, to save himself trouble, is clear from a remark which he interpolates at the beginning of § 71 (p. 167, ed. Klostermann); *Accipite regnum quod vobis praeparatum est a constitutione mundi*. [quod in Latino habet *a constitutione mundi* in Graeco sic habet *a depositione mundi*, et secundum Graecum sermonem exponit quae secundum Latinum non conveniebat exponere]. quare autem nomine depositionis de mundo frequenter utuntur scripturae, etc. The reader has only to look at Matt. xxiv 23-28 and right on to the end of the Gospel (e.g. xxvi 67-68, xxvii 28) to see how close these lemmata are to *q*. A detailed comparison of the two texts may

¹ *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei* (Oxford 1923) pp. xc v f.

² So did Ed. von Wölfflin (*Archiv f. lat. Lexikogr.* Bd. vii p. 126), a fact I had overlooked at the time of writing.

³ Dom Morin (see note 2) pp. 246, 261, refers to *q* among other MSS.

⁴ See Morin *Revue Bénédictine* t. x (1893) pp. 246-256; Chroust's *Monumenta Palaeographica* (I Ser. vi Lief. Taf. 1) (Munich 1902); Traube *Nomina Sacra* (Munich 1907), *passim*; De Bruyne *Revue Bénédictine* t. xxviii (1911) pp. 75-80; Lindsay *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915) *passim*; Leidinger 'Das sogenannte Evangelium des heiligen Korbinian' in J. Schlecht *Wissenschaftliche Festgabe zum zwölftundert-jährigen Jubiläum des heiligen Korbinian* (Munich 1924) pp. 79-102.

be commended as the subject of a thesis. Nor should this comparison be confined to Matthew, for the translator has an equal kinship with *q*, where he is quoting from other gospels, e.g. Mark xiv. 12-15 (pp. 188-189, Kl.) and Mark xiv 44 (p. 217, 16 Kl.).¹ Such a detailed comparison should also call attention to those passages where *q* 'presupposes a different Greek text from that which underlies the other Old-Latin manuscripts'.² We cannot, therefore, dismiss the possibility that *q* is based in part at least on the Origen translation, and that the borrowing lies the other way from that which we have suggested. Yet the Markan resemblances seem to point in the way I have argued. That the resemblances between the two texts are very striking is undeniable. And, if the archetype of *q* was North-Italian, then the translator of Origen was probably also North-Italian.³

The second point to which I wish to refer is that of the latinity of the translator, which is well worthy of a special study. The indefatigable Carl von Paucker had gone through the work collecting rarer words, and these are for the most part to be found recorded in his *Supplementum Lexicorum Latinorum*, Pars I, A-L (Berlin, 1885) and in his other numerous papers, whence they have passed into the Latin-French dictionary of Benoist and Goelzer. Dom Morin's lists have independent value.⁴ In the following list the words printed in heavy type have escaped Benoist and Goelzer; the others are selected as rarities: **adfectuosius** (p. 14, 31), *angaria* (263, 15), **anteeruditus** (114, 7), *arguitio* (229, 10), *ascensor* (47, 11.12.14), *colligatio* (32, 24.27), **conci-bus** (194, 24), **conuicio** (262, 24), **corporallior** (107, 15), *derisio* (270, 12), *deuotatio* (202, 13), *discussor* (36, 16), **duricordius** (119, 6), *exemplarium* (87, 28; 274, 10), **exsuffoco** (187, 4), *fictrix* (**finctrix**) (40, 16), *gubernatorius* (23, 8), *homicidalis* (oldest MS *homicidialis*) (42, 4),⁵ **homicidaliter** (26, 12), *indisco* (179, 13), *indiscussus* (49, 4; 164, 1), *intemptabilis* (210, 18), *iugator* (47, 13), *magnanimiter* (45, 11), *mortifer* (68, 30), *mysterialis* (39, 5), *noviter* (87, 14; 253, 29; 260, 15), *nutritorius* (38, 14), *optabiliter* (248, 32), 'ossum', *ut ita dicam* (39, 20), **pestifico** (73, 11), *potatorius* (38, 13), *praecisio* (82, 19; 93, 14), *praecisura* (21, 27), *praepositura* (107, 6), *prodifico* (24, 1; 59, 5; 84, 19;

¹ When a satisfactory edition of the *Opus Imperfectum* appears, the enquiry might be extended to the lemmata in it.

² *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London 1913) p. 43.

³ Dom Morin, quite independently, argues for Italy or what was left of Latin-Illyricum as the place of origin of the *Opus Imperfectum*, and for the sixth century as its date (p. 262).

⁴ In the article referred to, p. 63 n. 2.

⁵ The same doubt as to the true form of this word arises in the Latin Irenaeus (see *Nov. Test. S. Irenaei*, p. lxxxii), that is, whether it comes from *homicida* or from *homicidium* (so with *parricidalis*, &c.).

155, 30; 156, 1, etc., etc.¹), *promoueo* [*intrans.*] (201, 2), **protomartyr** (50, 8), **psaltatrix**² (89, 3), *puriter* (232, 3), **pusillanimiter** (208, 24), *requisitio* (30, 9), *superfluitas* (93, 14), *superlimen* (21, 14), *surrectio* [*dub.*] (216, 1), **taedior** [*depon.*] (205, 15), *tortuositas* (36, 15), **trans-audio** (227, 21), *uicino* [*verb*] (31, 5), **uirginifico** (145, 22).³

A. SOUTER.

A SYRIAC CORPUS OF ATHANASIAN WRITINGS

IN this JOURNAL some years ago (vol. xxx, pp. 249 ff) Mr Cyril Moss called attention to a Syriac manuscript acquired by the British Museum in 1920 and containing a collection of patristic treatises: Oriental MS 8606, parchment, estrangela, two columns to a page, Nisan A. Gr. 1034 (A.D. 723). Mr Moss noted what he considered the most important items in the collection, among which was Athanasius's homily on Matt. xii 32. Its title, 'Again a homily of the same Athanasius' &c., shewed that there were other works by the same author, and at my request Mr Moss very kindly re-examined the codex and sent me a list of the Athanasian pieces contained in it. They comprise the first ten treatises in the manuscript⁴ and form the only known Syriac corpus of Athanasian writings⁵:

1. f. 1a, *Contra Apollinarium I* (Migne, *P.G.* 26, 1094).
2. f. 6b, *Ad Adelphium* (*P.G.* 26, 1071).
3. f. 12b, *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos* (*P.G.* 26, 984).
4. f. 27a, *Ad Maximum* (*P.G.* 26, 1085).
5. f. 29b, *Ad Jovianum* (*P.G.* 28, 531).
6. f. 30a, *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi* (*P.G.* 28, 25).
7. f. 31a, *Quod unus sit Christus* (*P.G.* 28, 121).
8. f. 34b, *Homily on Matt. xii 32* (*P.G.* 26, 648).
9. f. 43a, *Epistola ad Afros episcopos* (*P.G.* 26, 1029).
10. f. 50, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (*P.G.* 26, 795).

¹ This is in fact a pet-word of the translator, cited elsewhere only once, from Jerome; as Dom Morin does not cite it from *Op. Impf.*, this is one serious difference between the two writings.

² The sense demands this, but the translator forgot *psalttria*, and seems to have got mixed up with *saltatrix*.

³ It is interesting to compare Dom Morin's pre-Klostermannian lists (pp. 247-250), with which my own have no sort of relation.

⁴ Number three appears to have been inadvertently omitted in the numbering of the manuscript. The *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos* is numbered (4) and the rest consecutively.

⁵ Scattered Syriac versions of Athanasian writings are listed by Baumstark *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, see Index.