INTRODUCTION

The most complete authority for the text of the Old Latin Heptateuch is the Lyons Manuscript edited by Ulysse Robert, the first part at Paris in 1881, the second part at Lyons in 1900. This MS gives an Old Latin text of about one-third of Genesis, one-half of Exodus, three-quarters of Leviticus, and the whole of Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges except the last chapter and a half of Judges. More fragmentary, but equally important, are the Munich fragments of the Pentateuch, edited by L. Ziegler (Munich 1883), containing over a thousand verses, about three hundred and eighty from Exodus, a hundred and eighty from Leviticus, three hundred and thirty from Numbers, and one hundred and sixty from Deuteronomy. The Würzburg Palimpsest edited by E. Ranke (Vienna 1871) differs from both the preceding in containing portions of some of the Prophetical books, as well as fragments of the Pentateuch, but in the present work only the latter, consisting of about three hundred and sixty verses (twenty-four from Genesis, one hundred and seventy-two from Exodus, one hundred and thirty-six from Leviticus and twenty-six from Deuteronomy) are dealt with.

These three MSS (which will be denoted respectively by Lugd., Mon. and Wir.) are apparently all of the fifth or sixth century, but of course represent Latin texts which were current before the Vulgate gained general acceptance in the West, that is to say rather in the fourth or (as will be shown in the case of one of them) the third century A.D. Altogether there are about one hundred and twenty verses which are contained in both Mon. and Wir., sixty-eight from chs. xxxi, xxxix and xl of Exodus, forty from chs. xi, xix and xx of Leviticus, and fifteen from Deuteronomy xxxi. Lugd. exists in all these chapters except Leviticus xix and xx, so that we have one hundred verses represented in all three MSS, though some of them are very much mutilated in Mon. Lugd. however is missing for the twenty-four verses of Genesis and the twenty verses of Exodus xxii which are quoted in Wir., and for the long extracts from
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Exodus ix to xx (nearly two hundred verses) which are contained in Mon.

The two treatises of Augustine, Quaedestionum in Heptateuchum Libri VII and Locutionum in Heptateuchum Libri VII (denoted by Qu. and Loc.), together give a version of portions of the Heptateuch which, though not so continuous as those in Wir., yet cover altogether a greater number of verses, and represent a text of more distinctive character than that MS.

In addition to these four principal authorities, most of the other available evidence for the text of the Old Latin Heptateuch has been collected and examined. This consists of the quotations in the other works of Augustine (Aug.), in Ambrose (Amb.), Cyprian (Cyp.), Hilary (Hil.), Jerome (Jer.), Lucifer (Luc.), Novatian (Nov.), Priscillian (Prisc.), Rufinus (Ruf.), Tertullian (Tert.), and Tyconius (Tyc.), as well as the passages quoted in the collection of Biblical texts called the Speculum (Spec.). One or two passages in which Cassian and Niceta have used an Old Latin text have also been quoted for comparison; but the works which may represent third-century texts are more important for our purpose. Conspicuous among these is the treatise Aduersus Iudaos which was for so long associated with the name of Tertullian; but others which are contained in the Appendix to the Vienna edition of Cyprian, De Laude Martyrii, Ad Novatianum, De Rebaptismate, Aduersus Iudaos, and especially De Pascha Computus also provide occasional readings which are of great interest as being almost if not quite contemporarv with Cyprian.

There are also many Old Latin readings in the Codex Ottobonianus (Ottob.) which were collected by Vercellone in his Variae Lectiones Vulgatae (Rome 1860); these vary in length from a few words to passages of thirty to forty verses, and altogether represent an Old Latin version of about two hundred verses of Genesis and Exodus. Portions of chs. xii, xiii, and xv of Genesis are given by a Vienna palimpsest edited by J. Belsenheim in 1885, and the text of Genesis xxv–xxviii used in a Latin version of Philo’s Quaeditiones was published by F. C. Conybeare in the Expositor (iv. 4); these two authorities are quoted in this work under the titles Vindob. and Philo respectively. A few references have been made to the Biblical text of
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the Latin translations of Irenaeus (Iren.) and Origen (Or.-Lat.); and the versions of Deut. xxxii and Jud. v used in the Commentary of Verecundus (Verec.) have provided a few readings of great interest for comparison with Lugd.

The great use which has been made of the lists of words in the Bobbio Gospels (k) and in Tyconius (given in Prof. Sanday’s edition of the former, and Prof. Burkitt’s edition of the latter) showed the advisability of having word lists as complete as possible for the chief authorities for the text. Such lists have been made for use in the present work for each of the Old Latin mss, and for the Heptateuch quotations of some of the Fathers; and on account of the extreme importance of Cyprian the list of words in his case was made for all his Biblical quotations and not for those from the Heptateuch only. These lists are not reproduced here but results derived from them have been constantly used. In the examination of the vocabulary of the Würzburg fragments the portions of the Prophets contained in them have been entirely omitted from consideration, and wherever the usage of Augustine is referred to, his usage in the two treatises on the Heptateuch above mentioned is meant unless the contrary is stated. In the first chapter words are frequently referred to as primitive without the evidence that they are so being given. To have given the evidence there would have interrupted the argument, but in nearly every instance these words have been assumed to be primitive because they are used exclusively or characteristically either in Cyprian or the Bobbio Gospels (k); the grounds on which most of them have been considered ‘African’ will be found set out in the list of words which forms the concluding portion of the work. It would have taken up much more space to make this a complete vocabulary to the Old Latin Heptateuch, but it is hoped that all interesting words and all those the usage of which is likely to throw any light on the Old Latin version have been included.

Considerable use has been made of the readings of the Codex Sessorianus of Cyprian’s Testimonia, not of course as representing Cyprian’s Bible, but as indicating one direction of subsequent revision. The alterations made in Cyprian’s Heptateuch text by this ms are not considerable except in one passage of special interest (Ex. xxii. 21–24); they are most evident in
INTRODUCTION

Psalms, where half the quotations are entirely reworded, and they are frequent in Proverbs and the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, but less numerous in Isaiah, though half a dozen passages in that book are quite changed. The text of this MS is here generally referred to as the A text of Cyprian, A being its designation in Hartel's edition of Cyprian.

The terms ‘African,’ ‘Cyprianic,’ and ‘primitive’ are used as synonymous, the state of our knowledge of the Version probably making it advisable not to attempt any distinction between these terms at present. The same applies almost as much to the terms ‘late’ and ‘European’; it is possible indeed to see in Novatian at times traces of those characteristics which are probably correctly described as European but can obviously not be classed as late, and there is no doubt a distinction to be made between the Late African and the European types of text; but in view of the close connection between the European types of text and texts (such as the Speculum) which are perhaps correctly described as Late African, the actual points of divergence between the Late African and the European texts are matters to be discovered rather than assumed.

The abbreviations used will probably be readily understood. In addition to those mentioned above for the Latin MSS and Fathers, the abbreviations Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Deut., Josh., and Jud. are generally used for the seven books of the Heptateuch; O.L. is often used for the Old Latin version as a whole, LXX for the Septuagint, Syro-Hex. for the Syro-Hexaplar, Symm. and Theod. for the versions of Symmachus and Theodotion, and occasionally Arm., Boh., Eth. and Sah. for the Armenian, Bohairic, Ethiopic and Sahidic versions. The MSS of the LXX are always quoted from and denoted by the letters used in the Larger Cambridge Septuagint, a work without which Chapter III at least could not possibly have been written. The number of occurrences of words in various texts is sometimes indicated by fractions; e.g. Mon. 4/6 means that the Greek word in question is represented in Mon. six times, and in four occurrences is represented by the Latin word under consideration. In the case of Augustine such fractions unless otherwise indicated refer only to occurrences in the two treatises on the Heptateuch, and in the case of Wir. only to the Pentateuch (not
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the Prophetic) portions of the ms. All statements about the occurrence of words in Ambrose or the Speculum refer only to occurrences in their Heptateuch quotations; but on account of the special importance of Cyprian and Novatian as early witnesses, occurrences of words from all their quotations having been collected and tabulated, statements about the usage of these two writers (and in the case of a few special words of Hilary also) refer to all their Biblical quotations.

No attempt has been made to discuss the orthography of the mss; an adequate treatment of this would have increased the length of the work considerably, and much of the necessary material is already available in the introductions to the published editions of the mss. The spelling which is usual in the ms has generally been adopted without comment, and this will explain why e.g. the same prefix appears regularly as ad- in adponere, but as ap- in apparere. To judge however from one or two conspicuous examples of unusual spellings, it seems probable that some evidence could be derived from this source to strengthen the results otherwise arrived at. Thus Istrahel (with a t) is used regularly in Lugd., and its use in the A text of Cyprian, in the text of De Bened. Patr. used by Ambrose in Deut. and in the Didascalia Apostolorum furnishes additional support to the view that Lugd. is European in its text. Peculiarities of declension and conjugation and other points of accidence and syntax are also for the most part omitted; these also can be studied in the introductions to the editions of the mss, and only a few examples which clearly indicate a primitive literal following of the Greek original are noticed in Chapter iv.

No claim is made that the conclusions arrived at in the present work will prove final, but it is hoped that they will be found incomplete rather than erroneous. As the work proceeded it became obvious that the Biblical quotations of Tertullian and Jerome are more important than might have been expected. The use of primitive Old Latin texts is clear in several of the works of Jerome, and the frequent and peculiar agreements between quotations in Tertullian and later Fathers suggest that Tertullian’s text depends more often than has sometimes been supposed on an already existing Latin Version. An examination of all the Biblical quotations in Tertullian, and
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perhaps in those treatises of Jerome in which he used an ancient Latin Version, will probably throw back some additional light on the subject of the Heptateuch texts. Much remains also to be done on the Lyons Heptateuch, which for the present work has only been carefully and minutely examined where other Old Latin authorities exist with it. It has perhaps been too much taken for granted that the variations in the Old Latin texts correspond altogether with variation in date, but though this is clearly a great, and perhaps the greatest factor, the result of further study of the subject, and perhaps especially of further study of the Lyons ms, may be to establish the conclusion that the separate books of the Bible had from the first more individuality than it has been usual to suppose.

It will not be expected that the study of the text of the Old Latin Heptateuch will throw much light on the progress of Christian life and thought, but it is interesting to notice in the history of a few renderings hints of modification in religious ideas during the third century. The change of *donum* to *munus*, of *festus* to *solemnis*, of *ministrare* to *sacrificare*, and of *otum* and *uouere* to *oratio* and *orare* are evidently not unrelated to the development of thought in the Christian Church, and are interesting as showing the direction of that development.

In addition to the editions of the ms and the Larger Cambridge Septuagint, constant use has been made of the Vienna editions, and where these are not yet available, to Migne's editions of the Latin Fathers. Apart from the articles in the Encyclopaedias and Journals and a very valuable chapter in Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, very little literature so far exists on the Old Latin version especially of the Old Testament. Special mention however must be made of the essay in Sanday's edition of the Bobbio Gospels, and of Prof. Burkitt's *Introduction to Tyconius* and his study on *The Old Latin and the Itala*. None of these three works deals specifically with the Old Latin Heptateuch, but it has been along the lines laid down in those books that the present work has been carried on, and it is to these two scholars, one of Oxford and one of Cambridge, that I am indebted, to the one for having set me on the path of these studies ten years ago, and to the other for the interest which he has taken in the publication of this work.
CHAPTER I

THE VOCABULARY OF THE OLD LATIN HEPTATEUCH

(a) The Vocabulary of the Lyons Manuscript

An examination of the Lyons Heptateuch soon shows that this MS is far from homogeneous in its vocabulary and diction. In fact each of the seven books represented in it has its distinctive renderings and characteristic phrases, so that it would be no exaggeration to say that the Old Latin texts which it furnishes in Exodus and Leviticus differ from one another as widely as do those used by Tyconius and Lucifer. Exodus and Deuteronomy indeed have several common characteristics, and the same is true of Leviticus and Numbers, and to some extent of Genesis and Joshua, but there are very few words or expressions which are characteristic of the Lyons MS as a whole, and even the books which are most closely related show clear signs of independence in other respects.

This fact, though at first sight so unexpected, is so indisputably clear, and so important in the study of the MS, that it seems worth while to set out a considerable part of the evidence in full. The following are the most noticeable variations in vocabulary between the different books of this MS:

For ἐνια amplified is never used in Lev., Num. or Jud., though found at times in each of the other books; as between adiuc and iam Gen., Lev. and Jud. seldom or never use iam, but Ex., Deut. and Josh. much prefer it.

Proselytus is used exclusively except in Deut. where we find aduena 19/20.

In Lev. altare is regularly used; in Ex. and Num. we have altare, altarium and ara, but in Deut. (except that ara is used for βωμός) sacrarium or sacrificium is used.

In most books uisus est is the regular translation of ὀψθη; paruit and appuuit are found only in Ex. and Deut., and in these two books uisus est is found only three times.

Ἐνάντι and ἐντόπιον are almost uniformly rendered ante in Lev. (about 65/70). Ante is also the usual rendering in Gen., but in Ex. and Deut. it is seldom used, and in conspectu is much the commonest
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rendering; the rare *palam* is also used twenty times in Ex. and Deut., but not elsewhere. In Num. *ante, coram* and *contra* each occur about thirty times.

*Δόξα* occurs several times in Ex. and Num., and is rendered *gloria* in the former, but *honor* in the latter (the ‘African’ *claritas* also occurs in Num.). *Honor* also occurs in Gen. and Josh., but *gloria* in Lev.

*Delinquere* and *delictum* are very rare in all books except Lev., but in that book they are nearly always used; *peccare* and *peccatum*, which are used almost without exception in other books, being correspondingly rare here.

*Desertum* is found in all books, *solitudo* in Deut. and Jud. only. *Eremus* is used in Ex., Lev. and Deut.; in Num. we have the form *eremia* used five times, and *eremus* does not occur.

*Erythreum mare* is regularly used in Num., but in Deut. *rubrum mare* is more frequent.

*Dies solemnis* is used always in Ex. but nowhere else, *dies festus* being the equivalent in other books.

*Άμωμον* is always rendered *immaculatus* in Ex. and Lev., but *sine utio* in Num.

*Introire* prevails in Gen., Lev., Num. and Josh., but *intrare* in Ex., Deut. and Jud.

*Furor* (θυμός) is used a dozen times in Deut., but elsewhere is not common. *Indignatio* and *indignari* on the other hand occur several times in Num., but seldom in the other books.

*Iste* (for hic) is found nearly fifty times in Deut., and is common in Gen., Josh. and Jud. It is however rare in Lev. and Num., and is not found at all in Ex.

*Iustificatio* is used for δικαίωμα in Num. (5/6), elsewhere *iusstitia*; in Deut. we also find *aequitas*.

*Libare, libatio* and *libatoria* are regularly used in Ex., but *litare* and *litatio* in Num.; both words are very rare in other books.

*Commorari* is frequently used in Gen., Deut. and Josh. (in Gen. generally *morari*) in place of *habitate* and *inhabitare*; it is however never found in other books.

The renderings of *γενέα* vary very much even in the same book, but the use of * progenies* may be considered characteristic of Ex., while *natio* is rare except in Num.

Except for one occurrence of *nequitia* in Deut., and of *neguia* in Gen., these words, with *nequiter* and *nequissimus*, are found in Num. only.

*Σφόδρα* is rendered by *nimis* or *nimium* always in Num. and generally in Josh., but never in Ex. or Jud., where *salde* takes its place; the two are used equally in Gen. and Deut., but in Gen. *uæhementer* (otherwise rare) is used much more than either.

*Θύρα* is rendered *ostium*, always in Gen. and usually in Ex. and
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Num., but never in Deut. and Josh. where ianua is always found. ianua is also usual in Lev.

Δέρμα occurs frequently in Ex. and Lev.; in the former it is rendered pellis (except once), in the latter always corium.

Consummare and consummatio (tēleiv, tēleivōν and compounds) are used in all books except Lev., where perficere and perfectio always take their place, though these are found nowhere else except twice in Num. In Num., however, initiai is more frequently used than either, though it does not occur in any other book.

For ευτέλεων and ευτολή mandare and mandatum are usual in Num. and Deut., but praecepere and praeceptum in Gen., Lev. and Josh. For συντάσσειν and προστάσσειν on the other hand praecepere is usual everywhere except in Num. where constituei occurs frequently.

Primitius and primogenitus are both used for πρωτότοκος in Gen. and Ex.; in Deut. the latter is never used, in the other four books it is always used.

In Ex. only, but there five times, proficisci is used to represent προεισεθαι, though it occurs frequently in Num. for ἐκπροεισεθαι or ἐξέρχεθαι.

For ἐξάλησεθαι propitiare is regularly used in Lev., but elsewhere only twice in Num. xxix; the usual rendering in Num. is depracari, while in Ex. exorare is usual.

As an alternative for the common mundare we have purgare (and purgatio) occasionally in Lev. and Num. (καθαίρεων and καθαρίζεων), while purificatio and purificare are rather characteristic of Ex.

Quemadmodum is very rarely found in Gen., Lev. and Josh., though frequent in Ex., Num. and Jud., and above all (over forty times) in Deut. Quasi is very rare except in Lev. and Jud.; in Num. tamquam and secundum quod (or quae) are often found, while in Gen. and Josh. sicuit is used almost to the exclusion of all its synonyms.

In Gen., Ex. and Deut. quia is used five or six times as much as quoniam, and it also prevails in Josh. especially in the later chapters; on the other hand quoniam is all but regularly used (25/27) in Lev., is much commoner than quia in Jud., and is not infrequent in Num. In Gen. quod is used twenty times though it seldom occurs elsewhere.

Redimere is always used for λυτροῖν (about twenty times) in Lev. and Num.; in Deut. eruere or liberare is used.

Sempiternus (aetionis) is seldom used except in Ex., where it is the usual rendering. In Gen., Lev., Num. on the other hand aeternus is used about thirty times, but sempiternus only once.

In place of the usual suavitias which Lugd. always has in Ex. and Num., we find regularly in Lev., but never elsewhere, suaviolentia.

Simere for accipere is never found in Lev. or Num., and very rarely in Gen., but it is very common in Ex., Deut. and Jud.
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Totus is used for πᾶς a few times in most books; but uniuersus is found twenty-five times in Josh. though seldom or never in other books.

As a synonym for donec (which occurs in most books) usquedum is very common except in Lev. and Num. In Num. quoadusque, which is rare in other books, is the commonest rendering; in Lev. the shorter quoad is used even to the exclusion of donec, though it is found nowhere else in Lugd., and very seldom in the whole of the Old Latin.

Other words characteristic of Ex. are demptio (ἀφαίρεμα), immolare (θυεῖν), and lenire and lenitio (for unguere and unctio). In Num. may be also noticed the rare compound concolligere (six times), decerptio for both ἀφαίρεμα and ἀπαρχαί, and an unusually high number of gerundives and ablatives absolute; in Deut. dies is regularly used with crastinus and hodiernus, though this usage is rare in the other books.

The peculiarities of Leviticus are particularly numerous, giving the text of Lugd. in this book a character which distinguishes it not only from the other books of this ms, but also from all the recognised types of Old Latin texts. Thus we have the very rare renderings abitus and vestitus each four times for στολή, aeternalis in ch. vii, abscisio and exceptio for ἀφαίρεμα, imprudenter for ἀκοννίας, indigentia and indigilens, laedere, laesio and laesura for ἀδικεῖν and ἀδικία, mascel for mascul, peristolum for περισκελές, primitius with or even instead of hircus (chs. ix and x), quoad for donec, regia for atrium, suaria-lentia for suavisitas, and ueruex for ouis. Other renderings which distinguish this book from the rest of Lugd. but are by no means unparalleled in the version are cremare used twice for comburere, execratio five times for abominatio, and induere for uestire (ἐνδόνειν). Again ipse and ille (in place of is) are much rarer in Lev. than elsewhere, while only in this book of Lugd. is servare more common than custodire for φυλάσσειν.

This list of variations has extended to a considerable length, but there are important conclusions to be drawn from it, and it seemed advisable to show that these conclusions are not drawn from insufficient data. It will be clear at once to anyone who is familiar with Cyprian’s Biblical quotations that in many cases, where the usage of the books varies, Lev. and Num. preserve the ‘African’ or Cyprianic rendering, and that these two books rarely reveal the use of distinctively late forms; as