

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Old-Latin Biblical Texts *Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. III. The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (q) with a Fragment from St. John in the Hof-Bibliothek at Vienna.* Edited, with the aid of Tischendorf's Transcript (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury), by Henry J. White, M.A., of the Society of St. Andrew, Salisbury. With a Facsimile. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 4to. pp. lvi. 166. 12s. 6d.

T. K. Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 10 / December 1888, pp 312 - 314

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193667, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193667

How to cite this article:

T. K. Abbott (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 312-314 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193667

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Fasti, and is to be found under date of *May 2*. Again, in writing of the *Floralia*, he is guilty of wholly misconstruing a passage of *Valerius Maximus* (ii. 10, 8), in which the story is told how *Cato the younger* declined to stay at these games and witness the customary undressing of the 'meretrices.' Moved by his withdrawal, says *Valerius*, the people reverted to the 'priscus mos' of the festival, *i.e.* gave up a disgusting practice which had grown up with the corruption of society. *Steuding* noticed the words 'priscus mos,' and jumped at the conclusion that *Valerius* meant that this undressing was itself a really primitive custom. Will it be believed that he is actually drawn on by this blunder to suggest that this immodest stripping was symbolical of the fall of the blossoms 'nach der Befruchtung?' Perhaps these are only two examples among many of the way in which attention is drawn now-a-days away from the ancient texts themselves, and devoted to the consideration of what has been written about them by the learned German world of to-day. If such a process were allowed to go on for long, the honest search for truth would become impracticable and hopeless.

Though it is impossible to avoid disappointment with a good deal of the work presented

to us in these articles, and equally impossible to feel that it has in all cases realised the expectations raised by the editor's original preface, we may gladly acknowledge that our dissatisfaction is based quite as much on defects of form as of matter; and bearing in mind the extreme difficulty of treating subjects so complicated in a limited space, we may readily allow that many of them are handled as well as could be expected from men whose natural bent is not in the direction of succinct compilation. And as was said at the beginning of this review, there are already some signs of improvement. The work is moving more slowly, which may mean that *Dr. Roscher* has begun to realise the vast amount of labour entailed on the editor of such a *Lexicon*. The addition of *Deecke* to the staff is a great accession of strength, though it will need all an editor's care to avoid confusion between the conclusions of an *Etruscan specialist*, and those of scholars who have studied *Roman worships* without a very complete knowledge of other *Italian religious ideas*. Lastly, we may repeat that for all the later aspects of the religion of the *Roman world*, this *Lexicon* contains the best work that has as yet been published.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

OLD-LATIN BIBLICAL TEXTS.

Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. III. The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (g) with a Fragment from St. John in the Hof-Bibliothek at Vienna. Edited, with the aid of *Tischendorf's Transcript* (under the direction of the *Bishop of Salisbury*), by *HENRY J. WHITE, M.A.*, of the *Society of St. Andrew, Salisbury*. With a Facsimile. Oxford: at the *Clarendon Press*. 4to. pp. lvi. 166. 12s. 6d.

THIS, the third part of the *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, issued by the *Clarendon Press*, contains, as the title indicates, the text of the *Codex Monacensis*, known since *Tischendorf's* time as *g*. It formerly belonged to the monastic library at *Freising*, which has the distinction of being mentioned in the *Preface to the Authorised Version of the Bible*, where it is referred to as containing *Bishop Valdo's translation of the Gospels into 'Dutch rhyme.'* The monastery was founded by *Corbinian* († 730) about 724;

the library by *Bishop Hitto*, fifth in order from *Corbinian*. The present MS. was probably there from the first, as it bears no library marks except that of *Freising* and its present *Munich number* (*Lat. 6224*).

The text is printed from *Tischendorf's transcript*, carefully revised with the MS. by *Mr. White*. It is written in semiuncials of the seventh century (although *Tischendorf* assigned it to the sixth), and in double columns. The initial sentences of the Gospels and of the chapters into which each Gospel is divided are marked by capital letters outlined in ink and ornamented in colours, without gold, the two or three lines following being also written in colours. The initials are also frequently adorned with figures of birds, and the blank spaces at the end of the chapters are similarly adorned with figures of birds, beasts, and fishes. The last page is ornamented with a cross, in the head of which is a half-length portrait of a man (intended for the scribe

himself), and in the centre the subscription 'ego ualerianus scripsi.' Such signatures in Latin MSS., not only those of Irish or Saxon, but also those of German origin, appear from the instances cited by Wattenbach and Mr. White not to be so uncommon as Silvestre supposes, at least from the seventh century. The scribe adds, 'quia tribus digitis scribitur et totus membrus laborat.' Similar expressions more or less ungrammatically expressed are quoted by Wattenbach and Mr. White from many MSS., for instance, 'scribere qui nescit nullum putat esse laborem; tres digiti scribunt totum corpusque laborat.' One writes: 'O quam gravis est scriptura; oculos gravat, renes frangit, simul et omnia membra contristat. Tria digita scribunt totum corpus laboret.'

The MS. appears certainly both from the writing and the ornamentation, as well as the style of the subscription, to have been written in Germany; it deserves notice therefore that the word 'apparitio,' supposed to be a Spanish expression, occurs in a marginal lectionary note as = Epiphany. We must infer that the term was not exclusively Spanish.

Faults of orthography are common. Some of these may be due to careless pronunciation, such as *abuisti*, *ospes*, *huret*, *habuit*, *veneri(t)*, *accesserum(t)*: but many are certainly due to careless writing, especially the repetition or dropping of letters, the latter occurring chiefly though not exclusively where the same letter recurs after a short interval; ex. gr., *aspiens* for *aspiciens*; *ailli* for *ait illi*, Mk. ii. 14; *hierolyma*, *mistravimus*. Compare the counter error in: *farisisei*, *patitientiam*, &c. Such errors as *cū exercito suo* (Lk. xxiii. 11) are rather grammatical. *qūm* as the contraction for *quoniam* is noticeable; *thensaurus*, *pupticanus*, *adulescens*, *Moyse*, occur regularly; *nequa* (which occurs also in *g* and *s*) is judged by Bishop Wordsworth to be an old indeclinable noun.

Two later hands have been employed on the MS., one of the eighth or ninth century, the other of the fourteenth. The latter, besides correcting faults in orthography, has supplied the names appropriate to some of the roughly-drawn figures of animals.

The order of the Gospels was originally the usual Old-Latin order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, but the binder, with the perversity of his race, has made a violent attempt to change the order, even cutting the vellum leaves for the purpose. As some of the pages contained the end of one Gospel

and the beginning of the next, he has only succeeded in producing confusion.

As to the text, Dr. Hort classes the MS. among the Italian class, viz., that 'due to various revisions of the European text, made partly to bring it into accord with such Greek MSS. as chanced to be available, partly to give the Latinity a smoother and more customary aspect.' It would thus be classed with Brixianus (*f*) rather than with Vercellensis (*a*) or Veronensis (*b*). Mr. White, after a most careful analysis, arrives at a somewhat different conclusion. He considers that, although in the underlying Greek text *q* may run with *f*, in its Latinity it represents an older type, agreeing sometimes with *a* against *b*, more frequently with *b* against *a*; sometimes presenting genuine African readings, and now and then those of *D*, while occasionally it stands alone.

As to reading, for example, in Matt. v. 11, it reads (with *f*, *Am.*) *propter me*, not *propter iustitiam*.

Matt. xi. 23, *quae usque ad caelum exaltata es*, not *numquid*, &c.

It omits, Jno. v. 4 (the stirring of the pool at Bethesda), and in Jno. ii. 3 it omits *quoniam finitum erat vinum nuptiarum*.

As to renderings, Mr. White takes as a test of affinities the renderings of certain words, such as *δοξάζω*, *ἐπιτιμάω*, which are subject to a great variety of treatment. Thus *δοξάζω* is rendered in different MSS., *clarifico*, *glorifico*, *honorem accipio*, *gloriam accipio*, *honorifico*, *honoro*, *magnifico*. Our MS. *q* has in S. Matt. (with one exception), and throughout S. Luke, *magnifico*; in S. John and S. Mark (where the word occurs but once), and once in Matt., it has *honorifico*. Now in the latter chapters of S. John *b* has *clarifico*, but in all the other instances it agrees with *q*, while *f* often has *glorifico*. The rendering *clarifico* in *b* and *f* is curious, being distinctly of African use. *ἐπιτιμάω*, again, is rendered in eleven different ways, not reckoning *arguere* of Cod. Usser. Of these renderings six are found in *a*, seven in *b*, four in *f*, and seven in *q*. In the first nine instances *q* and *b* agree, changing together from *impero* to *praecipio*, *increpo*, *prohibeo*. *f* has in Mark *comminor* eight times and *increpo* once; while in Luke it has *comminor* once and *increpo* eleven times, whereas *b* and *q* have *increpo* throughout S. Luke with one exception, where both have *impero* (*imperavit febri*, iv. 39). In Mark *q* agrees once with *f* against *b*, twice with *b* and *f*, and four times it differs from both. But in Matt. it agrees with *b* in all

(seven) instances, although four different words are used.

If we take the Gospels in the ancient order (John not having the word) we find that, with one exception, the disagreement with *b* commences with Mark, iv. 39.

Such tables are very valuable to those engaged in tracing the affinities of MSS.

We may notice the following readings or renderings:—

Matt. iii. 9, nolite preferre uos dicentes intra uos (a conflate reading; *b f* have nolite preferre uos dicentes, *a* and *Am.* ne uelit dicere intra uos).

Matt. v. 11, exprobauerint = *t* (maledixerint *k Am.*).

Matt. v. 13, (sal) fatuatum fuerit (euanuerit *a b Am.*, fatuum fuerit *f*).

Matt. vi. 19, erugo et tinea et comestura (conflate, erugo et tinea = *a b* and *f* nearly; comestura = *k*.)

In S. John the revision is more complete, and the agreement with *f* is greater.

John i. 48, we have arbore fici (ficulnea *f*, arbore ficulnea *b*).

John i. 32, testatus est (testimonium perhibuit *a f*; testificatus est *b*).

In John ii. 2, the addition $\delta\tau\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta$ δ $\acute{o}\lambda\upsilon\sigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ is excised in *q* and *f*, though found in *a b* and *r*. In ii. 9 again the shorter form of the verse is found with *f* against the European addition 'et uidentes factum mirabantur' of *a, b*. On the other hand in iii. 6, while the addition 'quia deus spiritus est' of *a, r*, &c. is excised, the European addition 'quoniam de carne natum est' found in *a, b, r*, &c. remains, though excised in *f*.

In John ii. 9, we have 'ignorabat' (nesciebat, *a, b*, non sciebat, *f Am.*).

John ii. 15, pecunias = *a* (acs *f Am.*; nummos *b*).

John ii. 22, rememorati = *a, b* (recordati *f*).

John iii. 1, Nicodemus nomen eius [nomine *N, b (f Am.)*], cui nomen, *N. a*.

John iii. 25, factum est ut fieret quaestio (facta est ergo *q. a [b] f Am. &c.*).

Luke xiii. 19, Simile est granum synapis quod accepto homo misit (= *a₂*).

Mark ii. 17, non egent fortes = *b* (non opus habent sani *f*).

Mark ii. 21, adsummentum = *d Am.* (additamentum *f*. Other MSS. have insumentum, commissuram, iniectioem).

It results on the whole that *q* cannot be classed with any one definite branch of the Old-Latin family, but has come under the influence of every group in turn. As Mr. White remarks, the comparison of mere test-passages is fallacious, because these would be the first which would altered by a reviser. It is the minor agreements which show the affinity of the MS.

I may take this opportunity of drawing attention to certain fragments of an Old-Latin version of the Apocalypse, published in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, t. xlv. 1883, by M. Omont, from the MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. No ancient MS. has hitherto been known containing the Apocalypse. Belsheim's MS. *Gigas Holmiensis* is of the thirteenth century. Sabatier's text is extracted from the *Commentary* of Primasius. The fragments in question are palimpsest of the sixth century, and contain on ten folios parts of the Acts and on two a fragment of the Apocalypse (i. 1–ii. 1; viii. 7–ix. 12). The MS. was known to Sabatier, but he has not given its variants except in two chapters of the Acts. The text agrees closely with that used by Primasius. M. Omont in the paper cited expresses his intention of publishing the text of the fragments of the Acts, together with a palaeographical account of the MS. in a notice on the uncial MSS. of Fleury (from which library these leaves came). I cannot say whether this notice has been published or not.

T. K. ABBOTT.

MUELLER'S NONIUS.

Noni Marcelli Compendiosa Doctrina, emendavit et adnotavit LUCIAN MUELLER. Part I. Books I.–IV., pp. VIII. and 699. Leipzig: Teubner. 20 Mk.

At last the first instalment of Prof. L. Mueller's long-promised edition of Nonius

has appeared. It consists of a preface of four pages, followed by the text of the first four books, with an *apparatus criticus*, and a very short commentary. The remaining books are to follow, with *Adversaria* discussing the mutual relation of the MSS., and the merits of the various readings sug-