

preceded by a slightly longer quotation from the Sa'idic of v 1 than ends the ostracon text. The atrocious spelling proves that the scribe knew no Greek. The ostracon agrees with Sa 1093 in 2 δυναμείων (but 1093 adds σου with Bo &c.) εξαποστειλει σε, and supports them and others in the omission of σου after 3 αγιων. It agrees with Sa alone in adding σου after 3 αρχη; and with 1093 alone in the strange reading κατακυριευουσιν (-ευσει 55) in v 2, and in the spelling εξαπεστηλεν (-ταλ- 1093) in the same verse; while in v 4 it omits ει with 1093 and the Lucianic text, A, and 55—probably a genuine Upper-Egyptian, and pre-Lucianic, reading. In v 3 ται(σ) λαμπροτησιν it appears to agree with Sa &c, against the singular of 1093 &c. In the omission of δ in v 1 it is supported only by R; and in v 3 it has the unique reading εξεγεννηκα (-σα 1093 with S R 55, but γεγεννηκα in some of the Lucianic MSS and Hesychius of Jerusalem).

P. L. HEDLEY.

### THE VULGATE IN ENGLAND<sup>1</sup>

THIS important and interesting work is in a sense a continuation of the same author's *Britannien und Bibeltext* (Leipzig, 1930), but Dr Glunz is emphatic in pointing out that the problems to be dealt with are essentially different from those met with in pre-Alcuinian days. In the days of Charlemagne the text of the Vulgate was in great confusion. During the Dark Ages the text of S. Jerome's revision had been, particularly in the New Testament, mingled with reminiscences of the Old Latin, and the political isolation of the various peoples had resulted in the perpetuation of uncorrected mistakes of various kinds, producing local varieties of text. Charlemagne wished for order and uniformity. He commissioned Alcuin to prepare a text which should be a standard for all places in his wide realms. Alcuin was both capable and conservative, and the revision he produced, very largely embodying the excellent tradition of Northumbria (of which the codex Amiatinus is an example), was eminently successful. After Alcuin, to quote the words of Samuel Berger, *le niveau a passé sur ces singularités du texte* (Vulgate, p. xvii). Accidental survivals apart, the Old Latin has disappeared. But there is a small new crop of variants, small both in number and extent. It is these that Dr Glunz has studied, both as

αυτην εισ αιωνα τον αιωνα; xlv 10 και πεποικιλμενη; [lxiv 2 σε πρεπει]; lxxi 18 του ισραηλ; lxxvii 66 hab. αυτου, 68 οιν. το ult., 69 αυτην] αυτα (i.e. αυτο); ciii 2 ο αναβαλλομενος; civ 41 και εξεπορευθησαν; cx 9 αυτου ult.] σου κν.

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon*, by H. H. Glunz (University Press, Cambridge, 1933).

to their occurrence and their origin. They lead up to the *Exemplar Parisiense*, the origin of which Dr Glunz has for the first time succeeded in explaining, and he has also succeeded in explaining the true nature of the bitter polemic which Roger Bacon practised against it.

The question at stake is nothing less than the nature of the authority of the Bible. Holy Scripture is decisive, authoritative: so much was common ground. But this authority was not in the mere words, their *sonus*. To begin with, the Bible as read in the West was not the original, but a translation, whether Jerome's or another's. The authority lay in the sense of Holy Scripture. But who could tell what was the real sense? Here again there was agreement: the Fathers knew, and they had expounded it. In practice the Fathers meant Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great. To ascertain the real sense, the *sententia*, of a passage of Holy Scripture one must read what the Fathers had said about it. This led to compendious Commentaries on Scripture, Commentaries which had in them little or nothing original but were made up of extracts or adaptations from the Fathers: this stage is exemplified by Rabanus Maurus of Fulda (Glunz, pp. 97-102) and Remigius of Auxerre (pp. 114-124).

So the way was prepared for Anselm of Laon, a pupil of the great Anselm of Bec, who became Dean of Laon and died in 1117. He wrote '*Enarrationes*', of which survive those on Matthew, Canticles, the Pauline Epistles, and perhaps on John. These consist of a few lines of text, followed by an exposition of moderate length (p. 204). These *Enarrationes*, themselves constructed out of the works of the Fathers, were the foundation upon which Peter the Lombard constructed his larger Commentaries (the 'Great Gloss', 1142), which was boiled down into the *Glossa Ordinaria* and *Interlinearis* (never found apart in MSS), dating from 1160: this in turn was rearranged into a systematic treatise, the famous Sentences (see p. 255). The text used by Peter the Lombard, the 'Master of the Sentences', was widely copied, especially in the handy little Bibles, so frequently found from the 13th century onwards: this text is the *Exemplar Parisiense*, against which Roger Bacon so energetically polemizes.

These are revolutionary conclusions, but Dr Glunz supports them all by reference to actual examination of a mass of MSS, of every period from Alcuin's time to the 13th century. The theory that Walafrid Strabo (+849) was the author of the Gloss is examined and rejected (p. 103). And why the Gloss only appears in MSS dating from 1160 onwards is explained by Dr Glunz as 1160 (or just before) being the actual date of publication, just after the Lombard's sudden death. In a Trinity College MS of the Gospels (B. 5. 5), written at Canterbury Dr Glunz finds the handiwork of Herbert of Bosham, Becket's secretary,

who had himself had a share in bringing out the *Glossa Ordinaria*, and of this MS he gives a collation (pp. 236-245).

Dr Glunz further shews that in many minute particulars the scholastic theory of the meaning of Scripture as determined by the Fathers has influenced the actual text. There had been a certain infiltration of 'Irish' readings into the Alcuinian revision, due to Remigius perpetuating readings introduced by John Scotus, but the readings with which Dr Glunz is particularly concerned are new readings, which had not appeared in early days but are found in MSS of the *Glossa* and later copies generally. They are not large in extent or in intrinsic importance, but are interesting as examples of the scholastic theory. Thus in Lk xv 17 Jerome wrote, in accordance with the Greek, *quanti mercennarii patris mei*. But Ambrose and Augustine in their comments on this verse speak of some *mercennarii* being *in domo patris* and Augustine expressly explains this as being the Church. An important allusion to the Church was therefore understood by the Fathers here, though it was absent from the transmitted text: the next step was to insert it. And so the later MSS of the Vulgate, headed by Harl. 2788 and Wordsworth and White's W, insert *in domo* before *patris*, though neither in the Old Latin nor the pre-Alcuinian texts of the Vulgate is there any trace of this reading (Glunz, pp. 87 f.).

On pp. 256, 257, Dr Glunz gives four specimens of the way in which the revised text accepted by Peter the Lombard contained novelties foreign to the genuine Vulgate text. They are Matt. vii 12 + *bona ita* after *homines*; Matt. xviii 10 om. *in caelis*; John i 29 *peccata* (for *peccatum*); John iii 5 + *sancto* after *spiritu*. Not all of these are derived solely from Patristic comments: *peccata* comes from the *Gloria in excelsis* and others are Old Latin, but the readings are all supported by the short comments in the Gloss.

The fact of variation in the text of the Vulgate did not escape the scholars of the 13th century, as is witnessed by the numerous *correctiones bibliorum*, which still exist. But they did little good, and Dr Glunz shews why. The authors of the *correctiones* were learned enough to track out the sources of the readings, but they had no criterion for acceptance or rejection. 'Which reading was a textual critic of the thirteenth century to adopt; one which was to be found in an ancient MS; or one which was demanded by a Father of the Church, or by the orthodox exposition of the Gloss?' (p. 285). Bacon, says Dr Glunz, had an unwavering answer: only the ancient MSS, lying forgotten on the shelves of the monastic libraries, give the correct text (p. 292; comp. p. 283 on 1 Thess. ii 17 *ad tempus (h)ore*). In all this we see Bacon as the true champion of the scientific textual criticism of authoritative documents, as the forerunner of the decisive struggle of the

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<sup>e</sup>. 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Earlier I had

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> *Revue Bénédictine*, t. xxxvii (1925) pp. 239-262.