

indication may have been removed as of too special a character, when the Psalm was taken into the public collection of the Praises of Israel (עֲלֵנוּ, *ψαλμοί*). But however this may be, I submit that the clearest suggestion that the present text makes as to the occasion of the composition of Ps. iv is that it was written in view of a drought which had succeeded in shaking the friends and acquaintances of the Psalmist in their faith in JEHOVAH.

W. EMERY BARNES.

ST LUKE IX 54-56 AND THE WESTERN 'DIATESSARON'.

THE story of James and John wishing fire from heaven to come down and consume the Samaritan village that would not receive our Lord is found in a longer and a shorter form. The text has been often discussed in works on textual criticism; my object in once more examining some details of the evidence is connected with the text of the 'Diatessaron' as preserved in Codex Fuldensis and the Dutch Harmonies. For this purpose it is needful to get as clear an idea as possible of the true text of the Latin Vulgate, quite apart from the question of the original text of St Luke's Gospel. The plan of this Note is (i) to give reasons why I think the Vulgate as issued by St Jerome had the shortest text, and (ii) to discuss in the light of this conclusion the affiliation of our authorities for the Western text of the 'Diatessaron'. First, then, as to the text of the Vulgate.

I. The Vulgate Text.

The longest text, Greek and Latin, runs thus:

- 54 . . . James and John said: Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come
down from heaven and consume them,
even as Elias did. (a)
- 55 And he turned and rebuked them
and said: Ye know not what spirit ye are of; (b)
- 56 *the Son of Man came not to destroy souls but to save.* (c)
- And they went away to another village.

A glance at Tischendorf or von Soden tells us that **b** and **c** go together: all texts that attest **b** also attest **c**, except Codex Bezae which alone omits **c**. As it is not in any way supported in this, it seems best to treat the Bezan reading as the result of some accident of transcription and to regard **b** + **c** as a single variant, to be inserted or omitted. Several authorities, on the other hand, omit **a** while retaining **b** + **c**, or

vice versa. Among these is the Vulgate: **a** is omitted but **b** + **c** retained both in 'Wordsworth and White' and in the Clementine text.

If we examine the Oxford apparatus it will be found that the MSS fall into three groups:

(1) *om.* **a b** and **c**: D \mathfrak{P} F G Q Y *gat* 'Mediol. 1. 61 *inf.*'*

(2) *habent a b* and **c**: Θ M O^{gl} *cor.vat.**

(3) *habent b* and **c** only: all other Vulgate MSS, including A.

No. (2) is a curious group: Θ is the leading MS of the Theodulfian edition, while M (Ambrosianus) is the oldest known MS of the Vulgate Gospels (sixth century) and one of the most correct. O is the Bodleian 'Gospels of S. Augustine': Mr Lobel, Sub-librarian of the Bodleian, has kindly informed me that O^{gl} is 'a hand of the 10th or even 11th century', which reads *al. sicut elias fecit. h' addit*'. It would be interesting to know how the glossator knew this! *Cor.vat* is the Vatican Correctorium of the thirteenth century, which often preserves interesting readings. That the agreement of Θ , M, and *cor.vat** is not fortuitous appears from the fact that in *ver.* 58 the same authorities (with H and R) add *hominum* to *animas*, as also do the Old Latin *a b f q* and *r*. No doubt, therefore, the ultimate source of the text of Θ + M + *cor.vat** in this passage is the Old Latin, and (I should say) the special cause of the addition was that the text seemed defective, i.e. that the Vulgate base of Θ + M lacked **b** and **c** as well as **a**. It may be noted in passing that the source whence Θ + M derived the longer text was not the Gothic, as that version does not add 'of men' to 'souls' in *ver.* 56.

Group (1) seems to me a very strong combination: it only lacks A to be decisive. D (Armagh) and Q (Kells) are Irish, and \mathfrak{P} (Echternach) has an Irish element, but the Irish element of \mathfrak{P} is mostly seen in orthography; in fact \mathfrak{P} might be not unfairly described as a copy of the Northumbrian text made by a scribe who was Irish in culture. Readers of Dom Chapman's writings will remember that there is in \mathfrak{P} an element derived from the codex of Eugippius, copied (it is said) from St Jerome's autograph: in any case \mathfrak{P} contains many readings of special excellence. Of F (Fuldensis) nothing need be said at present, except that there is nothing Irish in its composition. G (Sangermanensis) is a Gallican text: it often agrees with the Irish family, but probably rather because the Irish Vulgate text seems to have come from Gaul, than by later contamination: on the other hand *gat* (S. Gatien) has some 'Irish' readings, so that its presence in this group may be only due to the D Q element. Y (Lindisfarne) is the twin-brother of cod. Amiatinus; the two differ very rarely, and where they do so it is not always A that preserves the better reading. 'Mediol. 1. 61 *inf.*'¹ is the famous

¹ Read 'Ambrosianae Mediol. J. 61 *sup.*': see Streitberg p. xxvi; Berger p. 58.

palimpsest in the Ambrosiana at Milan, the lower writing of which contains fragments of St Matthew in Gothic. The upper writing (eighth century) is a Gospel-book from Bobbio, so that it may have been written by an Irish monk, but its text appears to be as much influenced by the Old Latin directly as by the Irish Vulgate text, to judge from the readings excerpted by Berger (*Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 58).

Disregarding for the moment the evidence of F, it seems to me that the combination $\mathfrak{P} G Y$, with M attesting an aberrant text, suggests that A has here adopted a widely-spread non-Northumbrian reading, and that the true Cassiodorian-Eugipian text omitted the doubtful clauses in *vv.* 55 and 56 as well as the doubtful clause in *ver.* 54.

Again, from another line of argument altogether, it seems to me easier to understand the existence of group (1) which supports the shortest text on the view that it preserves the true Vulgate, than on any other view. It is not here a question of the probability or improbability of the shorter reading being 'genuine'. Both the longer and the shorter readings existed before St Jerome's day: if the shorter reading be found in any Vulgate MS it is there because of the real or imaginary authority for the shorter reading, not by an accident of transcription. The longest reading is found in the 'European' Old-Latin (i. e. in *abcfqr*); it is highly edifying; to omit it is a work of criticism. Who was more likely to cut it out, an unknown editor of the Dark Ages, or the scholarly St Jerome, who certainly did sometimes follow MSS which agree with B and Dr Hort?

For these reasons I regard the shortest text as being the reading accepted by Jerome, and consequently I believe that the Northumbrian-Eugipian text was in this case more faithfully preserved by the Lindisfarne Gospels (Y) than by the Amiatinus (A).

II. The text of the Latin *Diatessaron*.

Let us turn now to the Latin 'Diatessaron', preserved in Codex Fuldensis (F), and in the Dutch Harmonies L (Liège) and S (Stuttgart). F dates from 546, while L and S are of the early fourteenth century. All three present a text which has been almost entirely assimilated to the Vulgate, and they agree so much together that it is plausible to argue that F itself is the ultimate source of the late Dutch texts. If therefore these are to be regarded as serious helps towards the reconstruction of the original Harmony the first thing is to prove their independence of Victor of Capua and his work (F).

It will be well to begin by considering what kind of differences between F and LS are possible, on the assumption that the Dutch Harmonies are, after all, direct descendants of F. We might find

considerable changes in the harmonistic mosaic and even in the order of the incidents; such changes might be introduced at any time on the plea that the new order was more in keeping with the evidence of the Gospels. In the case of a fresh translation, again, such as that from Latin into Dutch, a more paraphrastic style might be felt to be suitable and explanatory glosses or notes might be added here and there. On the other hand, if the actual text of the exemplar was discovered to be defective, changes might be made or words be added to make the text more correct. But when we consider that F was written in 546, only about half a century before the death of Gregory the Great, there is one new feature that we must not expect. There will be no fresh Old-Latin readings introduced. The textual changes will all be in the direction of the common mediaeval Vulgate, a text not indeed scientifically fixed, but nevertheless only variable between narrow limits. In concrete terms, where L and S differ textually from F we must always expect to find their reading to be that of the great majority of the MSS cited in 'Wordsworth and White'. Conversely, if we find L or S differing from F to agree with some of the ancient Old-Latin texts, and supported by no Vulgate MSS or very few, then we must reject our initial hypothesis, and believe that the parent of the Dutch Harmonies was not a descendant of F at all, but was derived from a source independent of the revised text of the Harmony made by Victor of Capua.

It may be remarked here how difficult it often is to ascertain the Latin words which the Dutch texts really attest. Thus it is impossible to tell whether the Dutch *Beelsebuc* corresponds to the Vulgate *Beelzebub* or the Old-Latin *Beelzebul*. Or again, as I pointed out in my former article on these Harmonies (*J. T. S.* xxv 124), we cannot safely infer that 'I am the true Vineyard (*wyngart*)' in L 214 implies anything different from *ego sum uitis uera*, seeing that in L 206 we find *van wyngards vrochte* corresponding to *de hoc genimine uitis* (Matt. xxvi 29). In general the text of the Liège MS is more paraphrastic than that of the Stuttgart MS, or that at Cambridge, but the more I study these texts together the more it seems to me that the lively paraphrastic style of L does not go deeper than the Dutch rendering, and that the Latin from which L was translated kept close to the Gospel text, to a text as much, or nearly as much, assimilated to the Vulgate as that of F.

Our story of the Samaritan village is given in F 137, L 185, S 182, and in the Arabic, at the same curious place, between John xi and xii, which is so odd that we may be certain that the original Harmony did really insert it there. The Arabic (the text of which has been

assimilated wholesale to the Peshitta) of course has all three doubtful clauses **a**, **b**, and **c**. So also has **S**, but **F** omits all three, while **L** has only **b** and **c**. The question is, which of these gives us the true text of the Old-Latin Harmony?

Here comes in the point of the foregoing discussion. If the omission of the three clauses be regarded as due in the West to some accident of the aberrant Irish text, and the Northumbrian-Eugipian text by which Victor of Capua corrected the ancient Harmony be supposed to have retained clauses **b** and **c**, then it is difficult to think of their absence in **F** as due to any other cause but faithful transmission. In other words, we should be almost compelled to assume that the true Old-Latin Harmony had the shortest text, agreeing with **B** and **Dr Hort**—and the presence of clause **a** in **S 182** would be an insoluble puzzle. But if the true Northumbrian-Eugipian text really omitted all three clauses, and the presence of two of them in **cod. Amiatinus** is due to the scribe here deserting his exemplar to follow a widely-spread addition derived from the Old-Latin, then it is likely that Victor's text also omitted all three clauses and they would then have no place in **F**, whatever the unrevised Harmony found by Victor may have had. We may therefore here reject the evidence of **F**, as representing not the text of the pre-Victorian Harmony but that of the true Vulgate.

As between **L** and **S**, there can here be little doubt. **L 185** omits **a** but retains **b** and **c**, as does the current text of the Vulgate. **S 182**, on the other hand, has the clause *also Helyas dede*. This was almost unknown in the Western world after the days of Charlemagne, and rare before that. Its appearance in a fourteenth-century Dutch text can only be due to faithful transmission, and I have no hesitation in accepting it as evidence that the Old-Latin Harmony, before Victor revised it, had all three extra clauses in the story of the Samaritan village. This is, of course, just what might have been expected, for all three clauses are found in the 'European' branch of the Old-Latin, with which the old Harmony certainly had the greatest affinity.

What, however, is the chief moral of this long discussion of a single point is the demonstration that **S**, and therefore also **L**, contains an element independent of **Codex Fuldensis** which is not derived from what it could have picked up since the sixth century. There are, of course, other indications of this. **Dr Plooi** has brought forward several, but some of them did not seem to me compelling. Most of them indeed seemed capable of another explanation. But the evidence here brought forward from the text of **Lk. ix 54-56** cannot, I think, be put aside. Any one who wishes to maintain that the late Dutch Harmonies are not connected by a real, if sometimes rather a tenuous, thread with the pre-Victorian 'Diatessaron' will have to explain away

the decisive words *also Helyas dede* in the 'Harmonia Evangeliorum Flamandice' at Stuttgart.

It may be added that the Cambridge fragment (Dd xii 25) is here extant and supports S (*als Elyas dede*).

III.

I have left out of account the Greek and Syriac evidence, because I cannot suppose that Greek or Syriac texts had any influence on Victor of Capua or Dutch mediaeval Harmonies. In Greek the outstanding feature is that many MSS retain **a** ('as Elias did') but omit **b** and **c**, i. e. exactly the opposite of the mass of Latin Vulgate MSS: this seems to me to shew that Greek texts had no influence here in the West.

In Syriac the Arabic Diatessaron has all three clauses in agreement with the Peshitta; syr. *S*, on the other hand, omits them all in agreement with **NB**, while syr. *C* has **b+c** but not **a**. Thus syr. *C* agrees with the mass of Vulgate codices, with the Liège Harmony, and with *e*. It seems easy at first sight to call in the Diatessaron to explain this isolated coincidence between syr. *C* and the Liège Harmony, but it will not explain the addition of **a** in the Stuttgart MS, or the text of *e*, or indeed that of the Clementine Vulgate. The Liège MS, in fact, is the only text which suggests that 'Tatian' accepted **b** and **c** but rejected **a**, and its evidence is discounted by the fact that it agrees textually with the mediaeval Vulgate.

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON THE TEXT OF THE *CANTICUM SOLIS*.

ST FRANCIS of Assisi died on the fourth of October, 1226, so that this Number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* is contemporary with the Septicentenary celebrations at Assisi and elsewhere. It seems, therefore not inappropriate to offer a small tribute here to the memory of the Poverello in the form of a Note on the text of the well-known *Canticle of Brother Sun*, with the special object of evaluating the received text, which in this case is happily that of the most ancient MS, in the light of the newly discovered text from Perugia, and other evidence recently made available.

Most persons, I suppose, read the Canticlè from Sabatier's edition of the *Speculum Perfectionis*, where the whole poem is quoted (§ 120). In this work M. Sabatier, recognizing that the MSS of the *Speculum* gave a very poor text, relegated their testimony to an Appendix and inserted in the text of his book the text of *Assisi* 338 (= A), the oldest and