

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

## NOTES AND STUDIES

SAINT AUGUSTINE'S BIBLE AND THE *ITALA*.

## I

FOURTEEN years ago, in 1896, I published a book in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies* called 'The Old Latin and the Itala'. In that book I attempted to prove, amongst other things, that the Latin version of the Bible which S. Augustine mentioned in the *De Doctrina Christiana* ii 22, under the name *Itala*, was none other than the new Revised Version of S. Jerome, now known as the Vulgate. My attention has now been called to a couple of articles in the *Biblische Zeitschrift*, published at Freiburg in Baden, one by Dr H. J. Vogels (1906), the other by Herr J. Denk (1908), both of Munich. Both articles are definitely opposed to the positions I took up, and both to some extent do raise new questions. It seems therefore not inappropriate to make a fresh examination of the general relation of S. Augustine to versions of the Bible, of which his mention of the *Itala* in the *De Doctrina Christiana* is only a single detail.

Together with the theories of Herr Denk and Dr Vogels it will be convenient to consider the theory brought forward in Dr F. Weihrich's admirable edition of Augustine's *Speculum* (*CSEL* xii), published in 1887, to the effect that the Biblical text of that work does not come direct from S. Augustine's Bible, but is a later accommodation to the Vulgate. This theory, not disavowed in Weihrich's admirable edition of the *De Consensu* (1904), is assumed as true by Dr Vogels, so that it demands a definite examination here.

I may as well begin by restating the positions which I actually took up in my book *The Old Latin and the Itala*. These positions are three in number:—

(1) 'To the end of his days in short easily remembered phrases from the Gospel S. Augustine often used the Old Latin' (p. 57).

(2) 'During S. Augustine's episcopate, from about A.D. 400 onwards, the Church at Hippo read the Gospels from S. Jerome's version, though for the Acts it retained a very pure form of the Old African Latin' (p. 57).

(3) 'In the Old Testament . . . while habitually using the LXX—i. e. the Old Latin—he [S. Augustine] values the new translation highly, and occasionally uses it for comparison' (p. 63).

On the opposite side Herr Denk contends that Augustine's use

of *caerimoniae* (*Retr.* ii 37), a word which does not occur in the Old Latin, but does occur in the Vulgate, proves that Augustine's *Itala* cannot be Jerome's new version. Dr Vogels contends that the Gospel-text in the *De Consensu*, which is practically pure Vulgate, is not the text put there by Augustine, but that the Vulgate has been substituted for Augustine's text. Dr Weihrich contends that the same thing has happened in the case of the *Speculum*.<sup>1</sup>

It is perhaps easier to discuss these questions in England than in Germany, because with us 'Itala' is, happily, not a naturalized word. As every one knows, the *Itala* is only named once by Augustine, viz. in the *De Doctrina Christiana* ii 22. Dom Sabatier understood Augustine's phrase to mean 'the Latin version called *Itala*, which I prefer and therefore use'. Building upon this, he attempted to reconstruct Augustine's Bible, which he (Sabatier) called *Itala*, and to which he always, when possible, gave the place of honour in his great collection of pre-Vulgate Latin quotations and texts. Sabatier's collection, still indispensable to the student, had so great an influence that continental scholars took to calling all pre-Vulgate texts *Itala*. In other words, 'Itala' means in German what we in England call 'Old Latin', and especially the 'European Old Latin', i. e. the texts of such MSS as *a b ff g*, texts quite different from anything to be found in any of Augustine's works. Thus 'Itala' means sometimes the Old Latin, sometimes 'European' texts of the Old Latin, sometimes the text of Augustine's Bible, sometimes a text so named by him in a certain place. To avoid confusion I shall use it in these pages only in reference to *De Doctrina Christiana* ii 22, not for Augustine's Bible generally. It will, however, introduce no confusion to call S. Jerome's Revised Version by the familiar name of the Vulgate.

Let us begin by considering two very well-known passages, where Augustine's use of Jerome's version is undisputed. In *De Doctrina Christiana* iv 16 he quotes Amos vi 1-6 from the Vulgate,<sup>2</sup> and proceeds in the following four sections to comment in detail upon the passage. It is not Augustine's usual custom to quote the Old Testament from Jerome's version,—I certainly never contended that it was,—and therefore this departure from custom must have a definite cause. The cause, of course, is perfectly obvious from the context. S. Augustine, to use the modern phrase, is making an 'appreciation' of Biblical eloquence. For the moment he is not concerned with

<sup>1</sup> The work in question is the collection of texts beginning *Quis ignorat*, perhaps not published before Augustine's death in 430. It has nothing to do with the ps.-Augustinian *Speculum*, commonly quoted as *m*.

<sup>2</sup> *Vae qui opulenti estis . . . super contritione Ioseph.*

allegory, but with rhetoric. He has just given an analysis of 2 Corinthians xi 16-30, and he goes on to give an example of the eloquence of the Prophets. Let me give Augustine's reasons for his choice of a passage in his own words (c. 15):—

‘Dicendum ergo mihi aliquid esse uideo et de eloquentia Prophetarum, ubi per tropologiam multa obteguntur. Quae quanto magis translatis uerbis uidentur operiri, tanto magis cum fuerint aperta dulcescunt. Sed hoc loco tale aliquid commemorare debeo, ubi quae dicta sunt non cogar exponere, sed commendem tantum quomodo dicta sint. Et ex illius prophetae libro potissimum hoc faciam, qui se pastorem uel armentarium<sup>1</sup> fuisse dicit, atque inde diuinitus ablatum atque missum ut Dei populo prophetaret. Non autem secundum LXX interpretes, qui etiam ipsi diuino Spiritu interpretati, ob hoc aliter uidentur nonnulla dixisse, ut ad spiritalem sensum scrutandum magis admoneatur lectoris intentio; unde etiam obscuriora nonnulla, quia magis tropica, sunt eorum: sed sicut ex hebraeo in latinum eloquium presbytero Hieronymo utriusque linguae perito interpretante translata sunt.’

This passage is surely as clear as words can make it. Augustine says in effect: ‘I want an example of eloquence from the Prophets. They are often obscure from excess of meaning, and the Septuagint (from which of course the Latin version in ecclesiastical use was taken) sometimes even adds to the obscurity, by introducing fresh inspired meanings. I will therefore quote this time from the plain rendering made direct from the actual Hebrew words of the Prophet by Jerome, a most competent scholar.’ *Pro hac vice* Augustine wants not an inspired version, but the words of Amos, and so he goes to that interpretation which is *uerborum tenacior* combined with perfect perspicuity. The fourth Book of the *De Doctrina*, in which this quotation from Amos appears, belongs to the second edition of the work and was published in 426, but the general attitude of Augustine towards revisions and versions of the Bible seems to me to remain very much what it had been nine and twenty years before, when the first three Books were issued. It is the attitude of many an English ecclesiastic towards the Revised Version.

The other passage, equally well known, is *De Ciuitate Dei* xviii 44. In the two preceding chapters S. Augustine has told the story of the Seventy Interpreters who made the translation for Ptolemy Philadelphus, and has gone on to assert that the work of the Seventy was inspired by the same Spirit that was in the ancient Prophets themselves. Whatever, he says, is to be found in the Septuagint, but is not in the Hebrew codices, the Spirit preferred to say by the inspired

<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact the Old Latin of Amos vii 14 has *pastor*, while Jerome has *armentarius*, for the trade of the Prophet.

interpreters rather than by the inspired seers. 'But,' he continues (xviii 44) 'some one will say, How am I to know what the prophet Jonah said to the Ninevites, whether *Triduum et Nineue euertetur*, or *Quadragesima dies*? For who does not see that both cannot then have been said by the prophet, who had been sent to frighten the city by the threat of imminent catastrophe? If the destruction was to be on the third day, it could not be on the fortieth day; but if on the fortieth day, then not on the third day?' Here was a definite case of difference, and it cannot be said that Augustine does not put the alternatives clearly. The LXX, followed of course by the Old Latin, has 'three days' in Jonah iii 4, while the Masoretic text, followed by Jerome, has 'forty days'. What then is Augustine's solution? He distinguishes. 'Si ergo a me quaeritur,' he says, 'quid horum Ionas dixerit, hoc puto potius quod legitur in Hebraeo *Quadragesima dies et Nineue euertetur*.<sup>1</sup> Septuaginta quippe longe posterius interpretati aliud dicere potuerunt quod tamen ad rem pertineret et in unum eundemque sensum, quamuis sub altera significatione concurreret, admoneretque lectorem utraque auctoritate non sprete ab historia sese ad tollere ad ea requirenda propter quae significanda historia ipsa conscripta est.'<sup>2</sup> That is to say, when we are only concerned with the plain historical sense Augustine is as faithful as Jerome himself to the *Hebraea Veritas*, which is now accessible to the Latin-speaking world through Jerome's translation. No doubt Jonah wrote forty days, not three days. But, he goes on to assert, we ought for religious purposes to raise ourselves above history, and then we shall find a fresh source of inspiration in the Seventy. In the present instance Augustine sees in Jonah a type of Christ, who was with His disciples forty days after His resurrection, which is further hinted at by the 'three days' substituted in the LXX for the 'forty days' of the original Hebrew.

The typological exegesis of S. Augustine does not concern us here. What I have quoted him for is to exhibit his view of the relative values of the Hebrew and of the Septuagint text, because it is only when we keep these views, to us so strange, steadily in mind, that we can understand how Augustine could prepare his *Speculum* from the text of

<sup>1</sup> The MSS of the *De Ciuitate* vary between *euertetur* and *subuertetur*. The Vulgate has *subuertetur*, as also Lucifer and Jerome in his own commentary. The temptation to scribes of the *De Ciuitate* to assimilate the verb to that in the previous quotation (which has *euertetur*) would be quite as strong as the temptation to assimilate it to the Vulgate. For *Septuaginta quippe* the new CSEL edition (p. 339 line 8) has *Septuaginta quinque* by a slip.

<sup>2</sup> Augustine in the next sentence shews his dependence on the really original thinker Tyconius, whose views on general principles and special illustrations in Scripture history Augustine has adopted (see *Liber Regularum* iv 41 line 24; 42 line 2).

Jerome's Vulgate, while he himself in the preface to that work continues to use the Old Latin.

It will be seen from what I have already said that Herr Denk's argument about *caerimoniae*, from which he concludes that my theories about the 'Itala' involve a 'sprachliche Unmöglichkeit', is, if I may venture to say so, somewhat off the point. Herr Denk (p. 229) observes that Augustine excuses himself in *Retr.* ii 37 for having used the word *caerimoniae* for Jewish observances, *quod nomen non est in usu sanctorum litterarum*. That is to say, *caerimoniae* is an 'un-Biblical' word. Herr Denk goes on to shew, at some length, that *caerimoniae* does not occur in any extant fragment of the Old Latin,<sup>1</sup> apparently because the word had heathen associations. Therefore, concludes Herr Denk, Augustine did not know the Vulgate even in 427, when he wrote the *Retractations*, because in the Vulgate *caerimoniae* is freely employed.

This would be a very good argument against any one who was rash enough to maintain that the Vulgate Old Testament was in Church use at Hippo during Augustine's episcopate. But that is exactly the contrary of what I have maintained. The only part of what we now call the 'Vulgate' that I imagine to have been in Church use during Augustine's episcopate is the Gospels, in which the word *caerimoniae* does not occur at all in any Latin text. I quite agree with Herr Denk that during Augustine's time *caerimoniae* was a word not much in Christian use and that it had an un-Biblical sound. But that is no argument against the use of the Vulgate *Gospels* at Hippo. As I have already suggested, Augustine's attitude towards the Vulgate Old Testament was that of many a conservative Anglican towards the Revised Version: can we not imagine at the present day an English clergyman writing about (say) 'Eternal Punishment', who might find it convenient to use the word 'Hades'? Very likely he would make some apology for using this un-Biblical word. But it would not prove that he was unacquainted with the Revised Version. As matters stand to-day, it might quite well be said of 'Hades', as Augustine said of *caerimoniae*: '*quod nomen non est in usu sanctorum litterarum*.'

This linguistic argument can perhaps be turned round the other way, so far as the Gospels are concerned. What about *porro*? I do not suppose that *porro* had any heathen associations, but whatever be the cause it certainly is not *in usu sanctorum litterarum* before the Vulgate. Jerome, on the other hand, is quite fond of it and uses it freely in the Vulgate O. T. as a variation for *autem*.<sup>1</sup> In the Vulgate

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian's use of it is no exception, for Tertullian's vocabulary is quite un-Biblical.

<sup>2</sup> e. g. Susanna 31 and 38, where Lucifer has *autem*.

N.T. it occurs four times (Matt. viii 27; Lk. x 42, xi 20; 1 Cor. vii 35), but never once in any Old Latin text. In Matt. viii 27 (*porro homines mirati sunt*) nine Old Latin MSS are extant; they all have *autem*. The evidence in Lk. x 42 is given below: no Old Latin text, revised or unrevised, has *porro*. In Lk. xi 20 (*porro si in digito Dei*) ten Old Latin MSS are extant; four have *si autem*, six have *sed si*, while the Patristic evidence varies between *quod si*, *si enim*, and *si autem*. In 1 Cor. vii 35 the Old Latin evidence varies between *autem* and omission. When, therefore, we find *porro unum est necessarium* in Augustine's quotations of Lk. x 42 (*Serm.* 104 and 169) we may be sure it is derived from the Vulgate. The whole clause is absent from every unrevised Old Latin text (*abcdeffilr* Ambr.); the revised texts have *unum est autem opus* (*f*) and *unius autem est opus* (*g*). I have not, however, made a special study of the sources of Augustine's Sermons or his methods of quotation in them; it is conceivable that the word *porro* is due in each case to a later editor, though I do not know any evidence for this. That Augustine himself attests ἐνὸς δὲ ἔστιν χρεία (against the consensus of genuine Old Latin texts) is clear;<sup>1</sup> it is therefore not very easy to see whence he would have been likely to get this reading, if not from the Vulgate.

Coming now to the *Speculum*, it will be remembered that this work was prepared about 427, some three years before S. Augustine's death, and therefore after the *Retractations* had been already published. It is not a collection of proof-texts arranged under headings, like Cyprian's *Testimonia*, but consists of a series of extracts from most of the Books of the Bible in the Biblical order, from the Decalogue in Exodus to Apoc. xii 16. Short prefaces are placed in front of the extracts from the various divisions of the Bible, with a longer preamble at the beginning, explaining the plan and object of the work. Dr F. Weihrich, who edited the work for the Vienna Corpus in 1887 (*CSEL* vol. xii), based his text on five MSS, two of the ninth century (*M, C*), two of the tenth (*P, S*), and one of the thirteenth (*R*). Of these *MPCR* form one family, *S* keeping somewhat apart. But all the MSS agree in this, that, whereas the occasional Scripture quotations in the prefaces present an Old Latin text, the extracts themselves, including those from the New Testament, all are taken from the Vulgate. Dr Weihrich therefore concludes (p. xviii) that the Biblical text, as we have it, does not come from Augustine, but only the prefaces, some later editor having substituted the Vulgate for the text of the Old Version.

<sup>1</sup> See also *Quaest. Ev.* ii 20. It looks to me as if Augustine sometimes quoted from himself, i.e. from memory: *circa multa es occupata* is neither the reading of any Old Latin text nor a literal rendering of the Greek.

There is, it must be confessed, something attractive in this theory. The composition of the *Speculum* would lend itself to such a wholesale substitution, because the extracts are arranged in the biblical order. It is very likely that Augustine never wrote out the work himself. All he would need to do was to write the Prefaces, and then to mark the passages to be transcribed from a codex or codices of the Bible. The corresponding passages might with a little trouble be marked in a Bible made from another text, and these passages might be fitted to the Prefaces.<sup>1</sup> The theory of substitution is undoubtedly far more probable in this case of the *Speculum* than in that of the *De Consensu*, presently to be considered. Yet even here it is my belief that it is erroneous, and that the MS tradition gives us the work substantially as intended by Augustine.

The reason which led S. Augustine to cling to the LXX was, as we have seen, not its faithfulness but its inspiration. It had more 'tropolgy' than the bare Hebrew, and therefore it gave the Christian more to know and believe. It had more divine mysteries, some of which were difficult to solve. But such things were not the only use of Holy Scripture. It was also useful for direct instruction in morals and Christian love, and for such instruction, the plainer it was the better. For such instruction the *Speculum* was directly intended. 'Who does not know,' he says in the Preface, 'that in the Holy Scriptures some things are placed simply to be known and believed, such as that "in the beginning God made<sup>2</sup> heaven and earth" and that "in the beginning was the Word", and whatever deeds of God or man are narrated merely to be known. But some things are so commanded, that they may be observed and done, or prohibited that they should not be done, such as "Honour father and mother" and "Thou shalt not commit adultery". Of these commands and prohibitions, some are hidden mysteries, come to an end with the Old Dispensation, e.g. the Sabbath and unclean foods. But others are still in force for Christians *ad uitam piam exercendam moresque*, and these are collected in this *Speculum*, together with a few words about the rewards and punishments of the good and bad. Scripture history and Scripture mysteries may be sought for elsewhere: here is something for the plain believer to do or avoid.' I have greatly abbreviated the Preface, but what I have left gives the plan of the work; it does not seem to me impossible that with such an object in view Augustine should have chosen the text of the Revised Version of Jerome, without in the

<sup>1</sup> Dr Weihrich (p. xiii) further urges that in Possidius's Life of Augustine (c. 28) he mentions the *Speculum* immediately after telling us that Augustine left several works unfinished at the time of his death in 430.

<sup>2</sup> *Quod . . . fecerit*, i.e. Augustine in his own person follows the LXX ἐποίησεν, not the Vulgate creauit.



least abating the claims of the ecclesiastical text or any intention of abandoning it for the future.

Dr Weibrich's theory is that the author of this Preface and of the shorter Introductions to Proverbs, Canticles, and Acts, an author who habitually quotes from the 'Old Latin', cannot be the person who arranged the extracts from the Vulgate which form the bulk of the *Speculum*. But it appears to me quite possible, if that person was S. Augustine, writing with the declared object of exhibiting only the plain commands and prohibitions of Scripture. In fact, the compiler of the *Speculum* almost apologizes for not inserting some familiar proof-texts, on the ground of their unsuitableness and mystery. He says<sup>1</sup> that almost the whole Book of Proverbs, if properly understood, is suitable for teaching moral conduct; but here he will leave out certain passages which are really deeper and more mysterious than appears on the surface. 'For what seems clearer and at the same time more silly, if you take the literal sense, than *Ab aqua aliena abstine te et de fonte alieno ne biberis?*'<sup>2</sup> Then he quotes two other verses from the Old Latin, the latter of which is *non enim nascuntur filii malignis*,<sup>3</sup> adding 'All such things we are leaving out of the *Speculum*, that its contents may be quite clear to those who wish to live well and only desire to be plainly told what to do'. Of course the famous proof-text *Ab aqua aliena*, which is one of the additions to the Book of Proverbs found in the LXX but not in the Masoretic text, would really have suited Augustine's moral purpose very well, because it obviously means 'Do not commit adultery'. But the African Church from Cyprian and Nemesianus onwards applied it as a warning against heretical baptism. No doubt, therefore, Augustine regarded the distich as a clear example of the prophetic inspiration of the Seventy. Nevertheless this use was an applied one, something to be made by the Church rather than the individual layman, and for the *Speculum*, designed for laymen rather than theologians, it would give Augustine no qualms to use a version of the Bible in which a famous but metaphorical saying had no place.

The section devoted to Canticles (pp. 74, 75) consists of a Preface (*Restat ille . . . caritatem*), followed by four short quotations from the Vulgate text. The quotations in the Preface are from the Old Latin, including two from the N. T. No doubt S. Augustine was quoting from his own memory, his own knowledge of the Divine Library, and so he does it in the version most familiar to him. Even John xv 13 is given according to the Old Latin with *caritas* instead of *dilectio*, and without *quis*. S. Augustine was no pedant in such matters. In *De*

<sup>1</sup> CSEL p. 48 f.

<sup>2</sup> Proverbs ix 18<sup>b</sup> (LXX).

<sup>3</sup> Proverbs xxiv 20 (LXX).

*Ciuitate* xiv 7 he expressly controverts those who thought *aliud esse Dilectionem siue Caritatem, aliud Amorem*.

With Augustine's avowed ethical purpose in compiling the *Speculum*, and his peculiar views about the inspiration of the variations and additions introduced by the LXX, it is possible to understand how he was prepared to edit a book of extracts from the Vulgate. But on the assumption of Dr Weihrich that the Vulgate text was introduced by a later editor, it is difficult to see why this later editor let the Old Latin quotations stand in the Introductions. The two parts are quite continuous, as follows:—

'Unde ne ad ipsum solum hoc [i.e. John xv 13] pertinere uideretur, ait Iohannes in epistula sua *Sicut Christus pro nobis animam suam posuit, sic et nos debemus animas pro fratribus ponere*:<sup>1</sup> hoc ergo est quoad usque uelit.<sup>2</sup> Legitur etiam in eodem Cantico *Ordinate in me caritatem*.<sup>3</sup>

'Christus quoque ipse ibi dicit: *Pulchra es, . . . Hierusalem*.<sup>4</sup> Et alibi: *Quam pulchra . . . in deliciis*!<sup>5</sup> Et alio loco: *Pone me ut signaculum . . . aemulatio*.<sup>6</sup> Et post unum uersum: *Aquae multae . . . despicient eum*.<sup>7</sup>

Here the chapter on Canticles ends and the extracts from Job begin. It seems to me very difficult to understand why a compiler, who according to Weihrich's theory has put the last four extracts into the Vulgate text, should not at the same time have altered *Ordinate in me caritatem* into *Ordinavit in me caritatem*. It must be remembered that at the time when Augustine wrote the only method of indicating the 'texts' was either transcription, or else marking the passages in a codex. There was no numeration of chapters in most of the books, and certainly no system of verses. Cant. ii 4 is a symbol that for us may stand either for the words in the Vulgate or in the Old Latin, but any system of indication known to Augustine must have contained the word *Ordinate* or *Ordinavit*. And if the system actually adopted by the Bishop of Hippo was to make marks in a codex (for mechanical transcription by others) then it is not a work of mechanical transcription but a work of Biblical erudition to identify the passages in a Vulgate codex that really correspond to the marked passages in the hypothetical Old Latin codex. The theory that Augustine marked his extracts for

<sup>1</sup> 1 John iii 16 (not vg).

<sup>2</sup> Cant. viii 4, quoted previously, from the LXX.

<sup>3</sup> Cant. ii 4 (LXX).

<sup>4</sup> Cant. vi 3 (vg).

<sup>5</sup> Cant. vii 6 (vg).

<sup>6</sup> Cant. viii 6 (vg).

<sup>7</sup> Cant. viii 7 (vg): *despicient eum* (sic, *P<sup>2</sup> R S*) is no doubt the genuine text of the *Speculum* and of Jerome's version as well (sic, *CUL* Dd. 8. 12), but Cod. Amiatinus and many MSS have *despiciet eum*, while most late MSS and the Clementine Vulgate have *despiciet eam*.

the *Speculum* in a Vulgate codex has its difficulties, but Wehrich's theory of the systematic substitution of one text for the other appears to me much more difficult, when we attempt to imagine it in detail.

The greatest difficulty that I find in accepting the traditional text of the *Speculum* as being really Augustine's compilation is that it implies a use of the Vulgate text of the whole of the N.T., not only of the O.T. and the Gospels. If the *Speculum* be, as the Maurists took it, and as I am attempting to take it, a compilation made at Hippo in 427, then it is the earliest tangible evidence we possess for the Vulgate N.T. apart from the Gospels. Apart from the Gospels, the Vulgate N.T. was certainly not in ecclesiastical use at Hippo during Augustine's episcopate. Indeed, it appears to me not so very improbable that Augustine may have considered that the best use to which he could put Jerome's scholarly revision of the Bible was to mark for private study those passages which were ethically useful, seeing that in his opinion the version, as a whole, whatever its scientific merits, was not suitable to replace the other ecclesiastical text in the services of the Church. In all this, of course, an exception has to be made for the Vulgate Gospels, which will be considered presently.

The evidence afforded by Augustine's remarks on the 'Apostolic Decree' (*Speculum*, p. 199) does not seem to me more decisive than his quotations from the Old Latin of Proverbs or Canticles. He gives the three texts in which are enumerated the things from which Gentiles are required to abstain (Acts xv 20, xv 29, xxi 25) according to the Vulgate text, i. e. with the four categories of 'what is offered to idols', 'blood', 'what is strangled', 'fornication'. He then goes on to point out in his own words that the general meaning of the Decree was to take away the burden of the Old Law from Gentile believers, except for certain general rules, not (as some thought) to declare that the only deadly sins were Idolatry, Homicide, and Fornication, meaning by the last term all unlawful sexual intercourse. Thus in his own words he speaks of *three* prohibitions, like the Old Latin generally, while the extracts from the Vulgate attest the addition of *καὶ πνικτῶν*, and so seem to make *four* prohibitions.

That Augustine should use the Old Latin in his own remarks while giving the extracts from the Vulgate is, as I have shewn, only what he does elsewhere in the *Speculum*. It is also clear that both Augustine and the Vulgate text are agreed that the 'Apostolic Decree' is meant to forbid certain particular practices, not to define the only deadly sins. It might seem, however, inconceivable that Augustine should speak of three prohibitions just after having given extracts from the Bible which enumerate four. But is it quite certain that the Vulgate does enumerate four categories? Is it not likely that Gaudentius really

does represent the meaning, at least of the Latin Vulgate, when he says *a sanguine, id est suffocatis*? That is to say, that the addition of *suffocato* or *suffocatis* really serves to define *sanguine*, not to create a new category of prohibited things. Certainly the true text of the Vulgate in Acts xv 29 appears to be *ab immolatis simulacrorum et sanguine suffocato et fornicatione*, without *et* before *suffocato*.<sup>1</sup> With such a text before him any one who had been hitherto accustomed to speak of three prohibitions might still consider himself at liberty to do so.

It is certain, at least, that Augustine's exegesis of the passage never changed. To him abstinence *a sanguine* meant neither a forbidding of homicide as Tertullian thought,<sup>2</sup> nor of animal food as Faustus the Manichee would have liked. '*A sanguine*,' says Augustine to Faustus (xxxii 13), '*id est, ne quicquam ederet carnis cuius sanguis non esset effusus. quod alii non sic intellegunt, sed a sanguine praeceptum esse abstinendum ne quis homicidio se continet*'.<sup>3</sup>

Probably I have said enough to make my point of view sufficiently clear. As I confessed at the beginning, Wehrich's theory is in some ways attractive, and the plan of Augustine's *Speculum* makes a wholesale substitution of text not so improbable as it would be in any other work of Christian antiquity. But I think the theory raises more difficulties in detail than it solves. On the other hand, the very peculiar views of Augustine about the LXX, viz. that it was precious rather for its inspiration than for its fidelity to the original, coupled with the avowed ethical and unallegorical aim of the *Speculum*, do in my opinion explain how Augustine could compile a book of extracts from the Vulgate while retaining the current ecclesiastical text both for his own literary use and for public worship. I have compared Augustine's attitude towards the Septuagint with that of many Anglicans towards the Authorized Version. It is surely not so very hard to imagine an Anglican parish priest who would stoutly resist attempts to have anything but the Old Version read in Church, who nevertheless would be quite willing to prepare a set of suitable passages from the Revised Version to be learnt by heart in Sunday School. That is the modern analogy that I suggest to illustrate the textual phenomena of Augustine's *Speculum*.

F. C. BURKITT.

<sup>1</sup> This is clearly also the text of the *Speculum* p. 198 line 17 (*om. et C.S.*).

<sup>2</sup> See *De Pudicitia* § 12.

<sup>3</sup> Augustine goes on to explain that there is really no law against Christians eating hare which has only been knocked on the head.