

NOTES AND STUDIES

NOTES ON INCIDENTAL GOSPEL QUOTATIONS IN JEROME'S COMMENTARY ON ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL¹

WHEN I began nearly ten years ago to collect materials for a new and critical edition of this commentary, I found to my surprise that almost everything had to be done, that in fact there was no solid basis to work upon. It became in the first place clear that Jerome quoted *in extenso* only such parts of the Gospel as he intended to comment upon; in the second place that these portions were not quoted exactly from the Vulgate text which he had constituted some years before; in the third place that a lot of capitular material of various sorts had been allowed to accumulate round various old manuscripts, and that therefore presumably none of it came from Jerome himself; in the fourth place that one family of manuscripts was more distinguished for Old-Latin Bible characteristics than the other; and finally that the published texts were capable of considerable improvement. As the publication of the edition is likely to be delayed for some time, for reasons over which I have had no control, I have thought it well to call attention to some passages of the commentary, practically as they will appear in my edition,² now.

The text of the *lemmata* from St. Matthew's Gospel is, as I have said, not identical with the Vulgate revision made by Jerome himself and critically edited in our time by Wordsworth and White. It will be an object of study later. In this later study would be included also a review of the incidental quotations from Matthew's Gospel made in the course of the notes. But at this stage it can be said that

¹ Earlier articles on this commentary by the present writer are: 'Traces of an unknown System of *Capitula* for St. Matthew's Gospel' (JOURNAL, xxxiii, p. 188 f.); 'A Latin Manuscript of Problematical Origin' (*Speculum*, viii, pp. 156-64); 'Greek and Hebrew Words in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel' (*Harvard Theological Review*, xxviii, pp. 1-4); 'Portions of an Old-Latin Text of St. Matthew's Gospel' (*Quantulacumque, Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake* [London, 1937], pp. 349-54); 'Abbreviations in Clm 6272 from Freising Abbey' (*Classical and Mediaeval Studies in honor of Edward Kennard Rand* [New York, 1938], pp. 273-6).

² Of the manuscripts referred to, A = Karlsruhe Aug. ccliii, B = Boulogne 47, C = Karlsruhe Aug. cclxi, D = Vat. Pal. 177, E = Karlsruhe Aug. cxciv, F = Paris B.N. 9530, G = Aberdeen Univ. 686. A slight ambiguity with the symbols indicating several Vulgate manuscripts will hardly cause confusion.

out of about 104 incidental quotations made from this Gospel only 33 harmonize with the Vulgate text, while the other 71 are definitely different.

In the other Gospels the situation is similar. Out of 16 made from St. Mark 8 agree with the Vulgate and 8 differ. In St. Luke out of 38, 12 agree with the Vulgate and 26 differ. In St. John, out of 30, only 4 agree with the Vulgate.

From all this it is clear that Jerome had no particular respect for his own revision (which was in any case made to order)¹, even when he was writing a commentary on a Gospel. He was most often content to follow his recollections of an Old-Latin form or to translate quotations literally from some Greek commentary or other. A study of the Gospel quotations in his commentary on Jeremiah, as edited by Reiter, tells the same story. This is a very material fact that has hardly, if ever, been insisted on in such investigations. Can we then correlate these incidental quotations or references with any Old-Latin manuscript that has survived?

As far back as 1910 the late Dr. Herman C. Hoskier and I² independently proved that Jerome had in use, for St. Luke's Gospel, a text almost identical with *a* (codex Vercellensis), and this, so far as I know, is as yet the only fixed point in the investigation of this subject. Let us see what is the character of the quotations from St. Luke in our Matthaean commentary as critically reconstructed, though indeed such incidental quotations are much less apt to have been tampered with by scribes than are *lemmata*.

LUKE		<i>vg.</i>
i. 1-2 (p. ³ 16)	rerum quae in nobis completae sunt GR (<i>hiat a</i>) sermonem et mini- strauerunt ei (<i>hiat a</i>)	quae in nobis com- pletae sunt rerum et ministri fuerunt sermonis
ii. 14 (p. 225)	excelsis (<i>a etc.</i>) super terram (3 MSS) (<i>a etc.</i>) hominibus (<i>omn. exc.</i> <i>uno</i>) (<i>a etc.</i>)	altissimis in terra in hominibus

¹ Note the word *cogis* (you use force) in the preface addressed to Damasus.

² *The Golden-Latin Gospels in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan* (New York, 1911, privately printed), pp. xxix, civ; A. Souter in the *JOURNAL*, vol. xii, pp. 583 ff.

³ These are the pages of the 1884 reprint of Migne, *P.L.* xxvi (Paris, 1845).

LUKE		<i>vg.</i>
iii. 1 (p. 100)	uero (<i>stylistic improvement by Jerome</i>)	autem
iii. 16 (p. 30)	calciamenti	calciamentorum
v. 8 (p. 56)	domine quia uir peccator sum (a, <i>exc. that domine is the last word</i>)	quia homo peccator sum domine
v. 32. 31 (<i>thus</i>) (p. 135)	iustos uocare enim (<i>om. B*D</i>) opus habent sani hi qui se (<i>om. ABC</i>) operibus	uocare iustos <i>om.</i> egent qui sani sunt qui omnibus filiis
vii. 35 (p. 76) (= Matt. xi. 19, <i>he is perh. referring to Greek</i>)		
ix. 28 (p. 126)	post dies (a) <i>om.</i> adsumpsit (<i>vv. ll. adsumens, adsumit</i>) Iesus (= E)	dies et adsumsit
	et Iacobum et Iohannem (A <i>etc. d r</i>)	et Iohannem et Iacobum
x. 22 (?) (p. 188)	omnia quae patris sunt mihi tradita sunt	omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre
xi. 4 (p. 206)	quam ferre non possumus (<i>possibly gloss</i>)	<i>om.</i>
xi. 15 (p. 160)	hic (<i>om. ACD</i>) (<i>hiat a</i>)	<i>om.</i>
xi. 20 (p. 82)	si autem ego (c d) (<i>hiat a</i>)	porro si
	daemones (<i>hiat a</i>)	daemonia
xii. 6 (p. 69)	duobus assibus (l)	dipondio
xii. 7 (p. 69)	uestri autem et capilli capitis	sed et capilli capitis uestri
	melioris (plures <i>one MS.</i>)	pluris
xii. 49 (p. 31)	super (<i>hiat a</i>) quam uolo ut ardeat (f. Ambr <i>sed accendatur</i>) (<i>hiat a</i>)	in quid uolo nisi accendatur
xiii. 3 (p. 182)	egeritis (a <i>etc.</i>)	habueritis
xiii. 27 (p. 50)	recedite (c d) <i>om.</i> (T <i>aur*</i>) nescio uos	discedite omnes <i>om.</i>

LUKE		<i>vg.</i>
xiii. 35 (p. 86) (= Matt. xxiii. 38)	<i>om.</i> dimittetur (d Aug)	ecce relinquitur
xiv. 27 (p. 70)	accipit (accepit <i>tres codd.</i>) cottidie (T)	baiulat <i>om.</i>
xvii. 5, 6 (p. 93) (cf. Matt. xvii. 20)	domine (b c e <i>etc.</i>) amen dico uobis (<i>cf.</i> l) habueritis (a <i>etc.</i>) quasi monti huic (d) migna de loco isto et migraret	domino <i>om.</i> haberetis sicut huic arbori moro eradicare et trans- plantare in mare et oboediret uobis
xxii. 12 (p. 201)	atque mundatum	<i>om.</i>
xxii. 15 (p. 197)	pascha hoc	hoc pascha
xxii. 30 (p. 82)	soliis	thronos
xxiii. 34 (p. 42)	ignosce eis quod enim faciunt nesciunt <i>It is well known that this verse is absent from a b d among Old-Latins</i>	dimitte illis non enim sciunt quid faciunt
xxiii. 50 (p. 223)	(βουλευτής) consiliarius (δ)	decurio

A review of these passages reveals little that is definite. Hardly a citation is of any great length, and some seem to have been made from memory. A number of them cannot be compared with *a*, because *a* is at those points lost. Yet coincidences with the readings of *a* are to be found here and there. The most notable difference between *a* and Jerome lies in the fact that Jerome has the famous verse Luke xxiii. 34, which is not found in *a*. Harnack in fact attributed it to Marcion.¹ It was certainly known to Justin² and to Tatian and Irenaeus,³ but has altogether a precarious tenure in the oldest Gospel manuscripts in which it finds a place. The various Latin forms which it takes in the Fathers are worth a more extended study than they have yet received: the verse in fact abounds there from about 370 onwards. We can now pass to St. Mark and St. John.

¹ Cf. Vogels, *Evangelium Palatinum* (Münster i. W. 1926), p. 97.

² W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), p. 134 f.

³ *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei* (Oxford, 1923), p. 73.

MARK		<i>vg.</i>
iii. 30 (p. 83)	quia (a b)	quoniam
vi. 16 + Matt.	ipse	hic (ipse <i>Matt.</i>)
xiv. 2 (p. 120)	<i>om.</i> (a <i>etc.</i>)	ideo
vi. 39, 40 (p. 104)	terram	uiride faenum
viii. 11 (p. 85)	uolumus a te signum uidere de caelo	quaerentes ab illo signum de caelo
xi. 13 (p. 159)	nondum	non
xii. 42 (p. 39)	in corbanam (<i>vv. ll.</i> corbanan, corban)	<i>om.</i>
xiv. 13 (p. 201)	et inuenietis, ait, quendam portantem lagenam aquae (a <i>has</i> portans)	et occurret uobis homo lagenam aquae baiulans

These are obviously paraphrastic in the main.

JOHN		<i>vg.</i>
i. 26 (p. 83)	stat intra uos quem (+ uos EG) nescitis stat = a inter uos = a	uestrum stetit quem uos non scitis
i. 29 (pp. 71, 73)	ecce qui (a <i>etc.</i>)	qui
ii. 19 (p. 209)	ego in triduo suscitabo triduo = a <i>etc.</i> suscitabo = b <i>etc.</i>	in tribus diebus excitabo illud
iii. 26 (p. 72)	magister, cui tu praebuisti testimonium ad Iordanen, ecce discipuli eius baptizant et plures	rabbi, quierat tecum trans Iordanen cui tu testimonium perhibuisti, ecce hic baptizat et omnes
v. 37 et viii. 18 (p. 127)	ego testimonium non dico pro me, sed pater qui me misit, ipse pro me dicit testimonium dicit = a (v. 37 et viii. 18) <i>clausularum ordinem fere retinet</i> a (viii. 18)	qui misit me pater ipse testimonium perhibuit de me (v. 37) testimonium perhibet de me qui misit me pater (viii. 18)

JOHN

v. 43 (p. 154)	me recepistis alius ueniet et recipietis eum (recepistis = e <i>etc.</i> recipietis = b)	<i>vg.</i> accipitis me si alius uenerit illum accipietis
vi. 9 (p. 103)	hic quidam puer (hic puer = b e puer hic = a)	puer unus hic
vi. 51 (p. 44)	<i>om.</i> (= 2 Gk. MSS. in Von Soden)	uiuus
viii. 56 (p. 90)	cupiuit diem meum uidere laetatus	exultauit ut uideret diem meum gauisus
x. 8 (p. 17)	qui ante me (<i>cf.</i> d) fuerunt	quotquot sunt
x. 11 (p. 141 f.)	pastor bonus (= a <i>etc.</i>) ponit animam (+ suam B D) (= a <i>etc.</i>) suis (= b <i>etc.</i>)	bonus pastor animam suam dat <i>om.</i>
x. 16 (p. 204)	unus grex (= [a] b <i>etc.</i>)	unum ouile
x. 18 (p. 221)	potest tollere animam meam ponam (B D F) (= e) rursum accipiam eam (<i>cf.</i> 1 <i>etc.</i>)	tollit eam pono potestatem habeo iterum sumendi eam
xi. 16 (p. 197)	ut et nos	et nos ut
xi. 50 (p. 216)	oportet unum hominem mori pro omnibus (<i>paraphrastic</i>)	expedit nobis ut unus moriatur homo pro populo
xii. 3 (p. 199)	nardum pisticam (<i>note the gender: palaeo- graphical error?</i>)	nardi pistici
xiv. 31 (p. 86)	surgite et (<i>om.</i> BCDEF) abeamus hinc	surgite eamus hinc
xviii. 23 (p. 41)	argue <i>om.</i> (<i>exc. cod.</i> A) sin (= D)	testimonium per- hibe de malo si
xix. 15 (p. 165)	crucifige crucifige talem (<i>crucifige bis T</i>)	crucifige eum

JOHN	vg.
xix. 37 (p. 187) quem conpunxerant (verunt in quem transfixerunt 2 MSS. = a etc.)	
xx. 17 (p. 225) ne tangas me	noli me tangere
xxi. 7 (p. 106) (ependyten)	tunicam
<i>transliteration of Greek original</i>	

Here again there are parallels with *a*, but there is nothing very definite that can be said about an Old-Latin text of St. John's Gospel that was in Jerome's mind.

A. SOUTER

PRIVATE PENANCE IN THE EARLY CHURCH¹

THE system of Public Penance which prevailed in the early Church, and its relation to the Private Penance of later times, has long engaged the attention of the historians of dogma. In the seventeenth century Albaspinaeus, Petavius, Natalis Alexander, Sirmond, and Morinus brought their learning to bear on the subject: and they were followed by Francolini, Cardinal Orsi, and Collet in the eighteenth.² For a time interest in the question flagged. But some forty years ago it revived with fresh vigour: and since that time few questions in the history of dogma have been more keenly debated. Among the causes which led to this result a prominent place must be assigned to the publication in 1896 of H. C. Lea's *History of Auricular Confession*. The book contained many inaccuracies; but it unquestionably showed how great was the obscurity regarding the early history of Penance, and propounded difficulties which called imperatively for solution. Not a few scholars of repute turned their attention to the subject, and dealt with it either in books or in articles published in learned periodicals. We may mention the names of Vacandard, Kirsch, Batiffol, Funk, Stufler, Poschmann, d'Alès, and Galtier:³ and this

¹ *The Origins of Private Penance in the Western Church* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939) by R. C. Mortimer, B.D., M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.

² Albaspinaeus (G. de l'Aubespine), *De veteribus Ecclesiae ritibus* (Paris, 1623); D. Petavius, *De la Pénitence publique* (Paris, 1644); Natalis Alexander, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Saec. iii, dissert. 6 sqq. (Paris, 1677); J. Morinus, *Commentarius de disciplina in administratione sacramenti Poenitentiae* (Paris, 1651); J. Sirmond, *Historia Poenitentiae publicae* (Paris, 1651); B. Francolini, *De disciplina Paenitentiae* (Rome, 1708); Card. Orsi, *Dissertatio historica, &c.* (Milan, 1730); P. Collet, *De disciplina veteris Ecclesiae circa Paenitentiam*.

³ E. Vacandard in *Revue du clergé français*, 1907, pp. 113 sqq.; P. A. Kirsch, *Zur Geschichte der kath. Beichte* (1902); F. X. Funk, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, i. 158 sqq.; J. Stufler in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie* (1907),