

NOTES

THE PROBLEM OF THE ITALA

The appearance of the third volume of Adolf Jülicher's *Itala*¹ should stimulate new discussion among those who are interested in the history of the Vulgate text of the New Testament. For it is only by examining the various versions grouped under the general term *Itala* (given currency by St. Augustine) that we can come to a better appreciation of Jerome's work of revision and, so far as the New Testament is concerned, more clearly determine the nature of the so-called Western Text. For this we need a scientific edition of the *Itala* versions; and we are fortunate that the work undertaken by Jülicher under the auspices of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Mark: 1940; Matthew: 1938) is being continued, after the death of his two colleagues, by Kurt Aland. Despite certain inevitable shortcomings, the present volume on Luke remains in the classical tradition of German biblical scholarship.

For a complete evaluation of the New Testament revision which Jerome produced between the years 382 and 385 we would, of course, require a definitive edition of the original Vulgate stratum which underlies the Clementine Vulgate of 1592. But here we are not so well served; for the New Testament we must still rely upon the incomplete edition of Wordsworth and White (or the complete *editio minor* of 1911); the great Benedictine edition inaugurated under the aegis of Dom Henri Quentin is far from anything like completion.² But in the meanwhile, with Wordsworth-White as the best provisory witness for Jerome's original text, Hetzenauer's critical edition of the Clementine Vulgate, and the *Itala* versions of Jülicher so far as they have gone, we can get at least a glimpse of the work that remains before us.

Those who are familiar with the previous Jülicher volumes need no introduction to this one. Jülicher and his colleagues did not fall into the error made by Rahlfs in his reconstruction of the Septuagint text—an error to which scholars following the lead of P. Kahle have repeatedly called attention—that it is possible to restore a single, consistent Greek version. Instead the aim of the Jülicher volumes is merely to present the manuscript

¹ *Itala: Das Neue Testament in allateinischer Überlieferung nach den Handschriften herausgegeben von Adolf Jülicher*, "revised and seen through the press" by Walter Matzkow (†) and Kurt Aland. Vol. 3: *Lucas-Evangelium*. Pp. 282. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1954.

² For a criticism of the Vulgate project so far as it has gone, see B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1951) pp. 261-63, with the literature there cited.

evidence objectively; and this procedure results in a *versio tripartita*: the versio Afra (or African Itala), Jülicher's Itala (or the European Itala), and a third or mixed type represented, for example, by a codex Bezae at Cambridge (*d*), which I prefer to call *versio tertia*. The format (with which no one will perhaps be completely satisfied) dispenses with any *apparatus criticus*, the verses with their variants being printed right across the page. Thus in Lk 11:2:

2. Pater sancte, qui in caelis es
Pater noster, qui in caelis es
Pater noster, qui es in caelis,

where the first line is the European (or Jülicher's) Itala, the second is the text of *d* (Bezae, 6th c.), the third is the African version; and there are also symbols (not reproduced here) to show that the words "sancte . . . es" are omitted by one European codex as well as by Jerome's Vulgate.

For the work, besides the Vulgate text, sixteen MSS have been used. Of these, however, only ten are regularly cited for the European text (or Itala) and, of course, the codex Palatinus (5th c.) alone for the African. But a study of the European readings would seem to reveal that a further division should be made for those Itala MSS which are closest to Jerome's Vulgate, e.g., *f* (Brixianensis, 6th c.), *q* (Monacensis, 6th or 7th c.), and *aur* (Stockholm, 7th c.). For it is among these, which we may call the Brescia group (because of the most important MS, *f*), that Jerome seems very often to have drawn his readings when he departs from the regular European tradition. A few examples should make clear the importance of the new Jülicher volume and, it should be added, the apparatus of Merk, Bover, and Nestle will have to be modified in most places where they cite the Itala for Luke.

1) Lk 11:2-4 (The Lord's Prayer): The Afra and Itala (i.e., the European text) in general try to harmonize the Lucan version with Matthew's. For example, we have "fiat voluntas tua in caelo et in terra," added by both, which was omitted by Jerome, then added by the Sixtine edition (1590) and removed in turn by the Clementine (1592).³ Note that in 11:3 Jerome

³ It is not here the place to enter into a discussion of the various changes that took place under Pope Sixtus V and the commission headed by Cardinal Antonio Carafa. The most serious charges of the Clementine commission, headed by Cardinal Bellarmine, were apparently the omissions (e.g., Nm 30:11-13, Jg 17:3, Prv 25:24, Mt 27:35), the typographical errors (e.g., "liberavit" for "libravit" in Is 40:12) and the change in the numbering of the verses. The new edition was called "Sixto-Clementine" or the like because the new commission under Bellarmine rightly took the view that Sixtus would have corrected the edition had he lived. Actually a closer study of the Itala versions may help

had "cotidie" following the best Greek text, whereas the Sixtine and Clementine editions both have "hodie" following the Afra and Itala.

2) Lk 4:5: "in montem excelsum" in some MSS of the Itala ("supra montem": Afra), omitted by Jerome following the Greek MSS B A and S(inaitic), but restored by the Sixto-Clementine.

3) Lk 12:31: "et iustitiam eius" is not in any of the Itala MSS or the Greek; omitted by Jerome, it occurs in the Sixto-Clementine. It may ultimately be due to a gloss on "regnum" or perhaps a transcriptional error for "regnum eius" (the reading of Itala MSS *a c*).

4) Lk 12:35: "in manibus vestris" has no foundation in the Greek tradition, was most probably omitted by Jerome (since it occurs in only two late MSS), is omitted by Afra, and was taken by the Sixto-Clementine text undoubtedly from a tradition represented by two Itala MSS, *c* and *ff*² (Paris and Corbie).

5) Lk 16:21: "et nemo illi dabat," not in the Greek tradition, was most probably omitted by Jerome (e.g., in 4 MSS), not in Afra or Itala though found in two Itala MSS, *l* (Breslau) and *m* (Rome)—*m*, however, though used by Merk is not cited by Jülicher—and was adopted by the Sixto-Clementine.

6) Lk 17:36: "duo in agro . . . relinquetur" (for which the Greek tradition is poor, and is hence omitted by Merk, Bover, and Nestle) is retained by Jerome and the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate following the Itala MSS; there is evidence for it also in the Afra though there the last three words are omitted. I do not think it is authentic: it probably arose as a partial gloss on the previous sentence or else out of a desire to have a triadic structure.

7) Lk 23:5: (in the accusation of the crowd, after the words "usque huc") "et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis, non enim baptizantur sicut et nos nec se mundant" is added by the Afra and the single Itala MS *c* (Paris), although *c* simply ends with "sicut nos" omitting the rest. Marcion knew of a similar Greek reading (embracing in sense from "et" to "avertit") inserted in 23:2 after "Caesari." Though the verse was not preserved in either the Greek or the Vulgate tradition, it is possible that it does reflect some primitive stratum of Luke, now lost.

8) Lk 23:17: "necesse autem . . . unum." This explanatory verse, omitted as a gloss in the Greek text of Nestle, is retained by Bover and Merk. It was certainly in Jerome (and hence in the Sixto-Clementine) and, in some

to make the dispute clearer; for instance, in changing "erunt" to "erant" in Lk 13:30, Sixtus was following the Afra tradition; in changing "suscipiens" to "suspiciens" in Lk 10:30 he had the support of three Itala MSS; but "compellebantur" for "complebantur" in Lk 8:23 must have been an error.

form, in all the MSS of the Afra and Itala tradition. Two Itala MSS, *c* (Paris) and *q* (Munich), add the word "vinctum" at the end; another, *l* (Breslau), adds, after "unum," "quemcumque voluisset populus." It is to be noted that some good Greek MSS preserve this reading in some form, e.g., S, Theta (Koredethi), D, and I feel that it must be given serious consideration as part of the authentic text.

9) Lk 24:12: "Petrus . . . fuerat." This entire verse is rejected by Nestle as the result of harmonization with Jn 20:8-10 although it is found in some form in all the best Greek MSS (including B A S and Theta). It is completely omitted by Afra and by the Itala MSS *a b d l r*¹ (as cited by Jülicher), although four of the Itala MSS including two of the Brescia group (*aur* and *f*) have it in some form. It was of course included by Jerome, although he omitted the word "sola" after "linteamina," and this was added by the Sixto-Clementine following the Brescia tradition. The apparatus of Merk, Bover, and Nestle must be supplemented here; in any case, the verse should be further discussed as a possible interpolation in the Lucan text.

10) Lk 24:36: "et dicit eis: Pax vobis: ego sum, nolite timere." This entire second half of verse 36 is omitted (with a reference to Jn 20:18,26) by Nestle. Here we are poorly served by the apparatus of Merk or of Bover. It is, of course, authentic Jerome, preserved by the Sixto-Clementine; but it is omitted by the Afra and by all Itala MSS save *aur f* (Brescia group) and *c* with some minor differences. As for the Greek MSS, from "et" to "vobis" is retained by all the best MSS (save, e.g., D and the margin of W); whereas for the words "ego" to "timere" there is very little good MS evidence save the uncials G and W (with inversion) and some minuscules as cited in Merk. In this case the evidence of the Afra-Itala versions is of extreme importance, just as it is in example 9).

11) Lk 24:49: "ego mitto promissum Patris mei" seems to have been Jerome's original text (despite the variant "mittam" in some MSS of his Vulgate) and this follows the Itala in general (and especially the Brescia group). The Afra has "promissionem meam," omitting "Patris mei" (with D and the Itala MSS *a* and *d*, a detail which should be added to Merk's apparatus at this point). The Sixtine Vulgate followed the reading "mittam" (as in the Itala MSS *a* and *aur*), although this has little foundation in the Greek tradition. The Clementine text finally changed it back to "mitto."

12) Lk 24:51: "et ferebatur in caelum" has the authority of the best Greek MSS although it is omitted by the Afra and by most MSS of the Itala group, save (in some form) *aur c f q r*¹; the word "ferebatur" is in *aur* and *c*. Jerome, of course, included it and it has every right to be included in

the text—a point which Nestle signifies with a symbol (an exclamation mark) even though he prints it in the apparatus.

These dozen examples have been selected to give some idea of the importance of the new Itala of Luke.⁴ The typographical format is in no sense ideal and will give trouble to many; but it has the merit of being absolutely clear (we are never left in doubt about the MS evidence) and absolutely without prejudices. In any case, more experimentation should be done in order to arrive at the ideal method of presenting a multi-recension text (as, e.g., the Shepherd of Hermas, some of the works of Chrysostom and Athanasius, parts of Methodius and other ecclesiastical writers); until such time, it would appear that Jülicher's format is the most feasible, and does credit to the Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bellarmino College, Plattsburgh, N.Y.

HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.

⁴ There are many other minor texts which may nonetheless arouse interest. For example, in Lk 1:35: "quod nascetur ex te," the words "ex te" are in the Afra but not the Itala (save for MSS *a c* and *r*'), have little foundation in the Greek and, though they are found in the Sixto-Clementine, were most probably not in Jerome; in Lk 2:41, for "parentes eius" the best Itala MSS have "Ioseph et Maria"; in Lk 4:18, the Afra and all the Itala codices (save *f*, Brescia) omit the words "sanare contritos corde," but it is not unlikely that Jerome's original text retained it since his readings are regularly close to *f*; in Lk 5:25, the word "lectum" of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate was most probably omitted by Jerome as it was omitted by the Afra and the Brescia group of Itala MSS; in Lk 11:8, "et si ille perseveraverit pulsans" of the Sixto-Clementine is omitted by three Itala MSS (*d f q*: there is a lacuna in the Afra here) and probably by Jerome, and has no foundation in the Greek; in Lk 17:3, "in te," most probably omitted by Jerome, following most MSS of the Itala, was restored by the Sixto-Clementine with the support of the Afra (with four Itala MSS); it is odd that the Sixto-Clementine adds "quidam" after "homo" in Lk 22:10 which has no support in either Itala or Afra and was omitted by Jerome; and finally both Afra and Itala (save for the Brescian MSS) end the Gospel with the words "semper in templo laudantes Deum" (without the rest), and this simplified ending is most probably the right one, although Jerome undoubtedly had the longer one.