

# The Biblical text of Jerome's Commentary on Galatians

Houghton, H.A.G.

DOI:  
[10.1093/jts/ftt211](https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/ftt211)

License:  
Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*  
Houghton, HAG 2014, 'The Biblical text of Jerome's Commentary on Galatians', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/ftt211>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

#### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Published by Oxford University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.  
doi:10.1093/jts/ftt211

#### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

#### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## THE BIBLICAL TEXT OF JEROME'S COMMENTARY ON GALATIANS

H. A. G. HOUGHTON

*Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing, University of Birmingham*  
H.A.G.Houghton@bham.ac.uk

### Abstract

After an analysis of Jerome's presentation of the scriptural lemmata in his *Commentary on Galatians*, their text is compared with variant readings in the tradition and the quotations of the Epistle in the exegetical sections. This sheds light on the complex transmission of the biblical text in this commentary, during which initial lemmata and expository quotations have both been subject to alteration. The earliest interventions precede the extant manuscripts of the work but can sometimes be identified through traces of substituted readings. Despite later preference for the Vulgate form of text, numerous Old Latin readings occur in both the editorial text and critical apparatus of the recent Corpus Christianorum edition. While not all of these are authorial, it is suggested that the significance of the non-Vulgate variants has been underestimated in this edition and that in many places it is possible to recover a form of biblical text closer to that used by Jerome. An appendix is provided of non-Vulgate readings in the commentary.

JEROME's commentary on Galatians is one of four he composed on Pauline Epistles in the year 386. All rely heavily on Origen, as Jerome himself acknowledges, and it is possible to reconstruct portions of Origen's lost commentaries from Jerome's text.<sup>1</sup> For

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 283302 (COMPAUL: 'The Earliest Commentaries on Paul in Greek and Latin as Sources for the Biblical Text'). An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Cambridge Senior New Testament Seminar in May 2013; I would also like to thank my colleagues on the COMPAUL project and Andrew Cain for their helpful comments. The English translations are my own.

<sup>1</sup> For Galatians, see *Jerome's Commentary on Galatians*, trans. A. Cain (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), pp. 25–9 and the footnotes throughout the translation. Jerome states that 'sensing the weakness of my own abilities, I have followed the commentaries of Origen' (*imbecillitatem uirium mearum sentiens Origenis commentarios sum secutus*; praef. 33), and lists five other sources in the preface, including Didymus of Alexandria and Eusebius of Emesa. A lengthy portion of Origen is translated verbatim at

his biblical text, however, Jerome used an existing Latin version. Although he was responsible for the revision of the Gospels which was later adopted as the Vulgate, the other books of the New Testament are believed to be the work of another reviser a few years later. The *Commentary on Galatians* is therefore a potential witness for the Old Latin tradition of this Epistle. Nevertheless, it is possible that many or even all surviving manuscripts of the work no longer transmit the authorial biblical text but have instead been brought into conformity with other forms by users updating the commentary according to the version current in their context, normally the Vulgate. Careful analysis is therefore required to establish whether or not it is likely that the biblical quotations reflect the form used by the author, including the investigation of variants in the manuscript tradition, comparison between the lemma and quotations in the exegesis, and the affiliation of the scriptural text.<sup>2</sup>

For the *Commentary on Galatians*, we are fortunate to have a recent Corpus Christianorum edition by Giacomo Raspanti, which has provided the text for two English translations.<sup>3</sup> Raspanti offers a comprehensive analysis of the textual tradition and reports the readings of 14 manuscripts (selected from a total of 65 dating from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries), split into two families, and five earlier editors: Erasmus (1516), Vittori

Gal. 5:13a. For the reconstruction of Origen in the Commentary on Ephesians, see Ronald E. Heine, *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). On Jerome's use of other Latin commentators, see A. Cain, 'Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius in Jerome's Commentary on Galatians', *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 55 (2009), pp. 23–51.

<sup>2</sup> Souter undertook a comparable study in his work towards an edition of Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew*, as reported in Alexander Souter, 'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St Matthew's Gospel', *JTS* OS 42 (1941), pp. 12–18. It is noteworthy that, even in a commentary written several years after his revision of the Gospel, Jerome's biblical lemmata preserve Old Latin readings.

<sup>3</sup> *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*, I. 6: *Commentarii in Epistulam Pauli Apostoli ad Galatas*, ed. G. Raspanti (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 77A; Turnhout: Brepols, 2006) (hereafter cited as 'Raspanti'); *Jerome's Commentary on Galatians*, trans. Cain; *St. Jerome's Commentaries on Galatians, Titus, and Philemon*, trans. Thomas P. Scheck (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010). A justly laudatory review of the Corpus Christianorum edition by Michael Winterbottom appeared in *JTS* NS 58 (2007), pp. 298–300, although the present study casts doubt on Winterbottom's comment that 'the citation of multiple witnesses is of no great assistance' regarding differences in the biblical text: if Raspanti had only used F, N, and B (as Winterbottom suggests), the variant readings in DEQCA would not have been reported.

(1579), Martianay (1706), Vallarsi (1734–42), and Migne (1845/1865).<sup>4</sup> One of the immediate gains of this new edition is the restoration of biblical readings which had been substituted by previous editors. The most striking is at Gal. 3:14, where all five printed editions replaced Jerome's *repromissionem* with the Vulgate *pollicitationem*. Again, at Gal. 3:24 every edition omits the last word of *in Christo Iesu* against the unanimous witness of the manuscripts. Martianay, Vallarsi, and Migne likewise give a Vulgate lemma for the first half of Gal. 4:24, *quae sunt per allegoriam dicta*, where all manuscripts agree on *quae quidem sunt allegorica*. Such substitutions are found not only in the lemma but also in the text of quotations in the exegesis, as at Gal. 1:6, where *sic* is omitted by these editors in both the lemma and Jerome's repetition of the verse at line 34. Such clear evidence of editorial substitution confirms that the biblical text printed in earlier editions must be treated with caution.<sup>5</sup> The critical apparatus of the Corpus Christianorum edition now makes possible an examination of the transmission of the biblical text in this work based on the earliest surviving manuscripts.<sup>6</sup>

The overall non-Vulgate affiliation of the lemmata was already apparent before the Corpus Christianorum edition. A comparison of their text in Raspanti's edition with the Stuttgart Vulgate brings to light 85 differences across the 149 verses of Galatians, more than one every two verses, most of which were accepted by previous editors.<sup>7</sup> Many are paralleled in surviving Old Latin manuscripts, including *malo* for *nequam* (1:4), *glorificabant* for *clarificabant* (1:24), *repromissionem* for *pollicitationem* (3:14), *nescientes* for *ignorantes* (4:8), *omnium nostrum* for *nostra* (4:26),

<sup>4</sup> A complete description of all manuscripts is given on pp. xvi–lx with a stemma on p. cxxvii. Family 1 (also identified as *a*) has 42 members, of which DEQCAGIHFN are used for the edition, and Family 2 (or  $\mu$ ) has 20 members, of which BSLZ appear in the apparatus.

<sup>5</sup> See further H. A. G. Houghton, 'The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 392. None of these editions features thoroughgoing substitution with the Vulgate, but there has clearly been some adjustment of the biblical text.

<sup>6</sup> All line references are to this edition. Several of the key manuscripts are now also fully digitized and available online. The only error I noticed when comparing these images with the Corpus Christianorum apparatus is that I (Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 128) reads *perseueret* rather than *permaneret* in the lemma for Gal. 2:5.

<sup>7</sup> The editorial text of the Stuttgart Vulgate, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. R. Weber, R. Gryson, et al., 5th edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), is taken as the standard throughout this study.

*possidebunt* for *consequentur* (5:21), *mansuetudinis* for *lenitatis* (6:1), and *circumcisi sunt* for *circumciduntur* (6:13). This is consistent with Jerome's use of an existing translation rather than making his own version. Furthermore, Jerome's criticisms of the lemma and the Latin translator distance him from the biblical text.<sup>8</sup> For example, he gives the standard Latin form of the second half of Gal. 1:16 in the lemma, *continuo non acquieui carni et sanguini* ('straightaway I did not assent to flesh and blood'), but immediately goes on to say *siue, ut in graeco melius habet, non contuli cum carne et sanguine* ('or, as it is better expressed in the Greek, I did not confer with flesh and blood'). It is the latter text which he expounds and quotes in full during his exegesis.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the lemma of Gal. 5:4 is followed by the observation *κατηργήθητε enim ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ non, ut in latino male interpretatum est, euacuati estis a Christo, sed in Christi opere cessastis magis intellegitur* ('for *κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is better understood not as it is badly translated into Latin as "You have been emptied from Christ" but "You have given up in the work of Christ"). Three comments appeal to Origen's Greek text as a standard, as at Gal. 3:1: *legitur in quibusdam codicibus: quis uos fascinauit non credere ueritati? sed hoc, quia in exemplaribus Adamantii non habetur, omisimus*. ('In some codices, the reading is: "Who has bewitched you not to believe the truth?" But we have left out this addition because it is not found in the copies of Origen.')<sup>10</sup> An even wider range of authorities is quoted at Gal. 5:7: *nec in graecis libris nec in his qui in apostolum commentati sunt hoc scriptum inuenimus* ('We have not found this written in either Greek books or commentators on the Apostle').

Jerome's comments about the text of the lemmata are most frequent around the beginning of Book 3 of the commentary (Gal. 5:7 onwards). In fact, while he appears to have refrained from altering his biblical source in the first two books, there are three occasions at the opening of the third when he may have

<sup>8</sup> Mention is made of a *latinus interpres* at Gal. 2:2, 5:4, 5:7, 5:9, 5:13; 5:24, 5:26, and 6:3, while *codices latini* are cited at Gal. 2:2, 3:1, 5:7, 5:8, 5:9, and 5:21 as well as in references to Luke 22:37/Isa. 53:12 in the commentary on Gal. 4:4 and 1 Cor. 13:3 at Gal. 5:26.

<sup>9</sup> See also Gal. 2:2, where Jerome observes that the same Greek verb is there translated as *contuli*.

<sup>10</sup> The other references to Origen occur at Gal. 4:28 and 5:24. When examining Old Testament citations in the commentary (e.g. Gal. 3:10–13), Jerome quotes the versions of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, demonstrating his use of Origen's *Hexapla*.

intervened.<sup>11</sup> The most straightforward is at Gal. 5:11, where the lemma is interrupted by a similar comment to that above on Gal. 5:4: *euacuatum est (siue, ut in graeco melius habet, cessauit) scandalum crucis*. (“The scandal of the cross is emptied”, or, as it is better expressed in Greek, “has ceased”). At Gal. 5:8, the lemma is given as *persuasio uestra non est ex eo qui uocauit uos*, which is immediately followed by the observation *in latinis codicibus ita scriptum repperi: persuasio uestra ex deo est qui uocauit uos*. (“In Latin manuscripts, I have found it written as “Your persuasion is from God who called you”). After advancing a text-critical explanation for the variant, Jerome concludes *melius igitur et uerius sic legitur: persuasio uestra non est ex eo qui uocauit uos*. (“Therefore it reads better and more truly as follows: “Your persuasion is not from him who called you.””). What is not clear is whether Jerome was responsible for the form of the lemma or whether it was also a Latin reading known to him: *ex eo* is, in fact, the reading of both the Vulgate and the majority of surviving Old Latin manuscripts, and this criticism may have been inspired more by the text he found in the commentaries of Ambrosiaster and Marius Victorinus. In the following verse, however, it appears that Jerome has amended the lemma. The exegesis begins as follows:

male in nostris codicibus habetur: *modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit*, et sensum potius interpretes suum, quam uerba apostoli transtulit. hac autem ipsa sententia Paulus et ad Corinthios utitur...ait quippe: *non bona gloriatio uestra. nescitis quia modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit? siue (ut iam emendauimus) totam conspersionem fermentat?*<sup>12</sup>

The lemma given is *modicum fermentum totam conspersionem fermentat* with the Latin cognates corresponding to the Greek ζύμη...ζυμοῖ: although the subsequent comment *ut iam emendauimus* (“as we have already corrected it”) could be taken to

<sup>11</sup> Later in the third book, however, he reverts to his earlier practice: compare the treatment of *longanimitas* in Gal. 5:22 or the lemma of Gal. 6:17. It is possible that Jerome was responsible for some of the forms of biblical lemmata otherwise unattested in Latin biblical tradition (cf. Raspanti, p. clxiv), but in the absence of explicit comments such as those quoted in this paragraph these could also be considered as unique survivals of Old Latin renderings.

<sup>12</sup> ‘Our manuscripts are wrong in reading “A little leaven ruins the whole lump” and the translator has rendered his own sense rather than the words of the apostle. For Paul himself uses the same expression to the Corinthians...where he says: “Your boasting is not good; do you not know that a little leaven ruins the whole lump?” or (as we have already corrected it) “leavens the whole dough?”’

refer to the intervening occurrence of the same phrase in 1 Cor. 5:6, with no evidence for a commentary on or translation of that letter by Jerome it seems more likely that *iam* indicates the form of the verse preceding the exposition. This alternative form differs from every other surviving witness to the Latin text of the Epistle: had Jerome been responsible for the revision of the Pauline Epistles adopted in the Vulgate, it would surely have had a much wider diffusion.<sup>13</sup>

The interrelationship between the text of the lemmata in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* and his quotations in the exegetical sections means that it would be difficult to alter the text of one without creating an inconsistency in the other. It is worth observing too that many of the oldest surviving manuscripts of this work do not have a marked visual distinction between the lemma and the exegesis such as rubrication or capitalization, unlike other witnesses to early Latin commentaries.<sup>14</sup> If this goes back to the author, it suggests that Jerome treated the initial statement of the biblical text as an integral part of his commentary; in consequence, the interruption at Gal. 5:11 mentioned above would be less extraordinary than it may appear in an edition when the lemmata are presented as a separate unit. This lack of easy identification of the lemmata in the manuscripts would also make a thoroughgoing replacement of the biblical text more of a challenge. Even so, there are more than 100 variants to the lemmata reported in the critical apparatus of the Corpus Christianorum edition, and Raspanti acknowledges the difficulty of establishing the text of the Epistle used by Jerome.<sup>15</sup> In the rest of this essay, these variants will be

<sup>13</sup> In his exposition of Gal. 5:24, Jerome quotes a form of the verse which he identifies as the *uulgata editio* ('*si uulgatam editionem sequimur legentes...*'; line 41). Although this appears to be authorial, the modern Vulgate was not known as such until many centuries later; in this period *uulgata editio* usually referred to the Latin Septuagint, and Cain, in *Jerome's Commentary on Galatians*, p. 242, duly notes that the Old Latin version is intended. Not only is the use of the term with respect to the New Testament surprising, but the reading itself does in fact correspond to the Vulgate rather than surviving Old Latin codices. However, the most distinctive reading, *uitiis et concupiscentiis*, is paralleled in Ambrosiaster and was therefore present in Old Latin tradition. It is also worth noting that Jerome has *audistis* rather than *legistis* throughout Gal. 4:21, matching the standard Greek form rather than Old Latin and Vulgate tradition.

<sup>14</sup> According to the descriptions in Raspanti (pp. xvi–lx), among the fourteen manuscripts selected for the edition the lemmata are distinguished only in E (coloured initials) and B (coloured initials and uncial script).

<sup>15</sup> See pp. clxiii–clxiv of the introduction; Raspanti should be saluted for going further than many editors in investigating possible parallels for the

examined with reference to their textual affiliation with biblical tradition, their consistency with the following exegesis, and their strength of attestation.

The expected direction of change would be the adjustment of a non-Vulgate text to that of the Vulgate, the predominant form of the Latin Bible for most of the work's transmission. There are indeed examples of this, including one supported by 13 of the 14 manuscripts (the omission of *et* from Gal. 2:13). However, based on the current editorial text, there does not seem to be any sustained pattern of alteration: there is a cluster of four Vulgate alternative readings for the lemmata of Gal. 6:13–15 in manuscripts EQC, but otherwise the distribution is haphazard, with several Vulgate forms only attested by one or two manuscripts. For instance, at Gal. 4:26, manuscript S reads *quae est mater nostra* in the lemma against the Old Latin *quae est mater omnium nostrum* in all other witnesses. At the end of the first sentence of exegesis, Jerome repeats these words and this time S agrees with the rest of the tradition (apart from DEA, with *nostrorum* for *nostrum*): only the lemma has been replaced with the Vulgate form and this has not been carried through into the commentary despite the proximity of the quotation.

Surprisingly, correspondences with the Vulgate only account for around one-fifth of the variants to the lemma.<sup>16</sup> In contrast, there are no fewer than 81 instances reported in the critical apparatus on which one manuscript, or more often a group, provides a non-Vulgate reading. This is almost the same as the number of non-Vulgate readings already accepted in the editorial text of the lemmata. Up to a quarter of the variants may be discounted as nonsense readings, orthographic differences, or omissions probably due to copying oversights. This leaves about 60 non-Vulgate alternatives which have not been adopted by the editor but merit further investigation: might these be further authorial Old Latin readings, or do they represent later intervention in the textual transmission of the work? Even though the introduction of Old Latin readings runs counter to the normal direction of change, the Balliol manuscript of Pelagius' *Commentary on Paul* shows that biblical lemmata

biblical quotations. It is hoped that the present study, from the perspective of New Testament textual criticism, will complement his initial scholarship, which made it possible.

<sup>16</sup> The 19 examples I have counted occur in Gal. 1:16, 2:1, 2:3, 2:7, 2:13, 3:18, 4:9, 4:15, 4:25, 4:26, 5:10, 5:13, 5:21 (twice), 6:13 (twice), 6:15 (twice), 6:17.



close to the Vulgate could sometimes be completely replaced with an earlier version.<sup>17</sup>

One potential scenario which may be ruled out is an accommodation of the lemmata to quotations in the exegesis, because a quarter of the variants concern passages which are not quoted by Jerome. For example, at Gal. 1:9 the lemma has the Vulgate *praeter id quod* but manuscripts DECA read *praeterquam*, an Old Latin form attested in the oldest strand of biblical codices (VL 75, VL 89) as well as the majority of early Latin commentaries (Marius Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, and Augustine); this is also true of *credimus* rather than *credidimus* at 2:16. The same four manuscripts have the word order *neminem uidi* at 1:19 and omit *enim* from 4:15, both readings shared with VL 89 and Marius Victorinus. In addition, two or more of them have *repro-missionem* rather than *promissionem* at 3:18 and add *enim* after *quicumque* at 6:12, both paralleled in Old Latin sources. Certain readings are not found in biblical manuscripts, such as *incederent* in 2:14 (a variation on *incedunt* in place of the Vulgate *ambularent* in the lemma), *spirituum* rather than *spiritu* in 5:5, and *uero* for the first *enim* in 5:17. At Gal. 2:1, no fewer than nine of the 14 manuscripts of the commentary (representing both families) have *dehinc* rather than *deinde*, a unique reading. Among the alternatives present in single manuscripts are *magnificabant* in B at 1:24 (the majority Old Latin reading) and *christum* for *deum* in F at 4:7 (another Old Latin form), while *solum modo* in Q at 3:2 and *lege esset* in H at 3:18 are both unique. While some of these may be ascribed to fluctuation and ‘noise’ during the transmission of the work, the Old Latin parallels and multiple attestation indicate that the variation is not entirely haphazard.

As the lemma is potentially more vulnerable to alteration than biblical quotations embedded in the exegetical sections, comparing the two is a means of assessing whether the variants might derive from an authorial form of text. There are nine occasions when a non-Vulgate alternative to the lemma matches the editorial text of the exegesis:

2:6b uidebantur] + esse aliquid EQCB<sup>sup.1</sup> Z  
 2:16b iustificabitur] iustificatur DEQCA (F -bi- scr. sup. l)

<sup>17</sup> See further H. J. Frede, *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus* (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 3; Freiburg: Herder, 1961); T. de Bruyn, *Pelagius' Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

- 3:7 Abraham] Abrahæ DEQCAL<sup>18</sup>  
 3:19 promissum erat] repromissum erat DEQCA  
 4:14 excepistis] suscepistis DEQA  
 4:24b a] in AC<sup>p.c.</sup> L  
 5:13 occasionem] occasione IN  
 5:24 carnem] + suam AB  
 6:18 nostri] *om.* DA<sup>19</sup>

The most compelling of these is Gal. 4:14, where the verse is quoted twice in the exegesis, both times with *suscepistis* (lines 31 and 91). Indeed, there are two more expository references which might also be considered worthy of being identified by italics: *quasi angelum et, ut plus dicam, quasi Dei Filium susciperetis* (line 60) and *ita ut angelum, et plusquam angelum, suscepistis* (line 74). The verb *suscipere* also appears at line 29. No variations are reported in the critical apparatus for any of these five occurrences and *excipere* does not appear at all in the exposition, implying that *suscepistis* was the form used by Jerome: while it does not survive in any biblical manuscripts, there is some support in other Latin commentaries.<sup>20</sup> At Gal. 2:16b, which is treated as a separate section of commentary, the variant *iustificatur* repeats the present tense from the first half of the verse but is paralleled in Old Latin tradition (including VL 64, VL 89, and Marius Victorinus). Furthermore, there is no future tense in Jerome's exposition: instead, *iustificatur* is found three times in the eight lines which follow, again suggesting that this was the authorial text.<sup>21</sup> For Gal. 3:19 the Vulgate has *cui promiserat* but the majority of Jerome manuscripts have a unique form, *cui promissum erat*, which the editor has adopted in the lemma. In the following exegesis, however, Jerome does not read *promissum erat* but *repromissum erat*, matching the lemma variant in DEQCA and a contemporary collection of biblical *testimonia*, the *Liber de diuinis scripturis*. There is a slight complication in that two of the manuscripts with the alternative reading in the lemma introduce

<sup>18</sup> The genitive is the standard form in the quotations of Gal. 3:14 and 3:29 in Jerome's commentary.

<sup>19</sup> Ironically, both these manuscripts include *nostri* in the quotation in the exegesis.

<sup>20</sup> *Suscepistis* is found in a variant to the lemma of Gal. 4:14 in Augustine's *Commentary on Galatians* and is also the rendering in the Latin version of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

<sup>21</sup> It may be noted in passing that, while manuscript B and the early printed editions replaced the first instance of *iustificatur* in the exegesis with *iustificabitur*, the other two were allowed to stand unchanged.

an inconsistency in the exposition: C has *promiserat*, while A has the halfway-house *promissum erat*. As all the manuscripts with *promissum erat* in the lemma have *repromissum erat* in the exegesis, this supports the latter as Jerome's text. The situation in C and A, where the exegesis rather than the lemma appears to have been altered, demonstrates the vulnerability of all biblical quotations in the work's transmission. Nonetheless, the consistency of these lemma variants with the uncontested text of the exegetical quotations and their attestation in one or more of the manuscripts DEQCA, which have already been noted as presenting Old Latin forms for text not present in the exegesis, appears to be a significant argument in their favour.<sup>22</sup>

Despite these examples of agreement between the quotations and alternative readings in the lemma, there are 40 times when a non-Vulgate lemma variant is recorded in the apparatus but the exegesis supports the editorial text, which almost always agrees with the Vulgate.<sup>23</sup> On nine of these occasions, however, there is also a variant reading reported for the exegesis which matches the lemma variant. Some may be the peculiarity of an individual witness: at Gal. 5:23 manuscript F alone reads *eiusmodi* rather than *huiusmodi* on both occasions, although it should be noted that this is attested as an Old Latin form by VL 89. Others are shared more widely, such as *praescriptus* for *proscriptus* in Gal. 3:1, appearing in the lemma in DEQCAGBSLZ and the fourth word of the exegesis in the same ten manuscripts plus N (I reads *perscriptus* on both occasions). Multiple quotations in the exegesis may introduce complications. For example, at Gal. 2:5, the editorial lemma and further references at lines 13 and 34 of the commentary have the Vulgate *permaneat*. An Old Latin form *permaneret*, also attested in Augustine's *Commentary on Galatians*, is found in the lemma in DECA. Of these, A has *permaneret* in both quotations, while DEC have *permaneat* the first time but *permaneret* the second. As with the inconsistency mentioned in the previous paragraph, this confirms that in this work the exegetical quotations were as liable to alteration as the *lemmata*, whatever the original may have been.

On occasion, there are some Old Latin variants to the lemma which are worthy of consideration even though they conflict with the form of exegetical quotations in the same manuscripts. For

<sup>22</sup> Raspanti notes that the agreement of these five manuscripts represents an antigraph with 'un buon numero di lezioni genuini' (p. clix).

<sup>23</sup> The exceptions are Gal. 3:14 (*repromissionem*) and 5:17 (*sibi inuicem*); the latter is a Vulgate variant, discussed in the following paragraph.

instance, at Gal. 5:14, where the Vulgate *impletur* is found in the lemma but the exegesis appears to support *impleta est* (matching Augustine), manuscript S reads *completur*, also the form in VL 51. Two verses later, where Jerome has the singular *desiderium* in the lemma and throughout his exposition (apart from the final line), the plural *desideria*, widely attested in Old Latin sources, is read in the lemma by DEQAGF. In Gal. 3:13b, it is intriguing that the variation *homo* in place of *omnis* in the lemma in manuscript B is only matched by the Balliol manuscript of Pelagius; the subsequent alternative *pendit* (in GI<sup>a-c</sup>; cf. A) corresponds to a variant in the textual tradition of Augustine's *Commentary on Galatians*. Galatians 6:16 is the site of considerable disagreement: the editorial text of the lemma has *sequuntur*, like Ambrosiaster and VL 61, but a paraphrase *secutus fuerit* in the exegesis, italicized by the editor, supports the Vulgate. Manuscripts DEQCA, however, read *sectantur* in the lemma, the earliest and best-attested Old Latin reading (VL 64, VL 75, VL 89, Marius Victorinus, and Augustine) which could subsequently have been adjusted to the more common *sequuntur*, perhaps through the intermediary of the common orthographic form *secuntur*.

Among the alternatives to both the editorial lemma and exegesis are six of the seven instances when the editor has gone against a form of the lemma attested in all manuscripts, or all but one:

- 2:13 et caeteri] caeteri *codd. omn. praeter* N  
 2:20c filii Dei] filii Dei et Christi *codd. omn. praeter* L (et C<sup>corr</sup>)  
 3:25 iam] *om. codd. omn. (deest* S; *sup. l. scr.* DZ)  
 4:14 in] quae erat in *codd. omn.*  
 5:17 sibi inuicem] inuicem *codd. omn. (deest* C)  
 5:19 luxuria] impudicitia *codd. omn. praeter* L  
 5:25 spiritu et ambulemus] spiritui obtemperemus *codd. omn.*

Three of these (4:14, 5:17, 5:25) are treated by Raspanti in the introduction as errors common to all codices, but further investigation raises some doubts. At Gal. 2:13, where the phrase is not quoted verbatim in the exegesis, the non-Vulgate reading has been preferred solely on the basis of N.<sup>24</sup> At Gal. 2:20, 3:25, and 4:14, the lemma has been adjusted by the editor to match

<sup>24</sup> For two other occasions when the text rests solely on N, see Raspanti, p. clx, n. 323. The agreement of the other manuscripts with the Vulgate is not in itself a guarantee of the authenticity of such a minor difference: nonetheless, the paraphrase *ita ut etiam caeteri qui ex Iudaeis erant* in the exegesis could be adduced in support of the intensifier in the lemma.

the form of quotations in the exegesis: nonetheless, the addition of *et Christi* in 2:20 has strong Old Latin support despite the tautology caused by the retention of *filii*, while the explanatory *quae erat* in 4:14 may be a translational variant.<sup>25</sup> The addition of *sibi* in Gal. 5:17 is a significant editorial intervention, since it is absent from all manuscripts at both the lemma and the sole quotation in the commentary. Raspanti justifies his decision by asserting that ‘it seems clear, then, that the omission of *sibi* is a novelty introduced by the author of the Vulgate’ and that, in the absence of explicit comment, Jerome would have followed the Old Latin.<sup>26</sup> In fact, *sibi* is absent from VL 75 and VL 89, the two witnesses to the earliest direct Latin tradition of the Epistle, confirming this as an Old Latin reading. Galatians 5:25 provides one of the most fascinating variants. The phrase *spiritui obtemperemus* is unique to this work, yet it is conceivably a literal rendering of *πνεύματι στοιχῶμεν*.<sup>27</sup> Raspanti observes that the two instances of *ambulare* in the exegesis, including an apparent paraphrase *cum spiritu uixerit spiritu ambulat*, support the standard Latin translation of the whole verse (*si uiuimus spiritu, spiritu et ambulemus*). Yet the next sentence of the commentary reads *uir perfectus in Christo semper uiuit in spiritu: spiritui oboedit, numquam uiuit in carne* (‘the man perfected in Christ always lives in the spirit: he obeys the spirit, he never lives in the flesh’), in which *spiritui oboedit* may be taken as a paraphrase of the alternative lemma. In the commentary on the following verse Jerome refers back to Gal. 5:25 as follows: *ita hunc locum cum superioribus copulabimus: si spiritu uiuimus spiritui obtemperemus* (‘thus we will combine this place with those preceding: “if we live in the spirit, let us be obedient to the spirit”’). Apart from two manuscripts reading *obtemperamus*, the textual tradition is

<sup>25</sup> For a discussion of 2:20c, see Raspanti, n. 46 (p. 250); the absence of *et Christi* from the exegetical citation may reflect Jerome’s use of a Greek source or be a later adjustment due to the fact that it abuts the following lemma. Raspanti (p. lxvi) dismisses *quae erat* in 4:14 as an error in the lemma of the archetype, based on the following citation and its lack of attestation in biblical tradition. The relative clause finds a parallel in the Latin translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia’s commentary on this verse. The earlier printed editions do not include Gal. 4:14 as part of the lemma following 4:12b–13, but substitute it (including the phrase *quae erat*) for the resumptive citation at line 50 of the commentary: on the unity of the section see Raspanti’s n. 80 (p. 262).

<sup>26</sup> ‘appare chiaro, quindi, che l’omissione di *sibi* è una novità introdotta dall’autore della Vulgata’ (p. lxvii).

<sup>27</sup> This verb causes some trouble to Latin translators of Galatians; see also the versions of 4:25 and 6:16 discussed below.

again unanimous. Raspanti dismisses this as 'clearly... a repetition in the form of a paraphrase' which, through the intermediary of a marginal note, subsequently corrupted the previous lemma.<sup>28</sup> This backwards interpolation seems excessively ingenious, given the support in the exegesis for the motif of obedience and the literal correspondence with Greek; the verbatim agreement with the first half of the verse, together with the formal reference to combining the two *loci* tells against a paraphrase. The references to *ambulare* in the exegesis may be explained as the influence on Jerome of the standard version from biblical codices, a reminiscence of Gal. 5:16 or the influence of other Latin source material. There is therefore reasonable justification for allowing the reading of all manuscripts to stand at both points.

The only non-Vulgate form attested by thirteen of the fourteen manuscripts which is demonstrably wrong is the reading *impudicitia* at Gal. 5:19. In his commentary on this verse, Jerome treats each vice in turn and all witnesses are unanimous in placing *luxuria* third, indicating that this was the authorial text. What is more, at the end of his exposition Jerome mentions that some Latin codices include *impudicitia* and *homicidia* in the catalogue of vices, but rejects these as extraneous to the 15 listed.<sup>29</sup> This demonstrates that manuscript L is the only one of the 14 to preserve (or restore) the authorial text and all others have been corrupted. By the same token, however, as Jerome always names the fourth vice as *idolatria* in the commentary, this Old Latin form should be restored to the lemma of Gal. 5:20 in place of the Vulgate *idolorum seruitus* found in all fourteen manuscripts.<sup>30</sup> (The process of alteration during transmission can be seen in manuscript H, where *idolorum seruitus* has been added in the margin alongside *idolatria* in the commentary.) The same principle may be applied to exclude a variant to the lemma at Gal. 1:2, where Jerome observes *quod autem ait 'ecclesiis*

<sup>28</sup> 'Chiaramente la ripresa del versetto 25 non è letterale, ma si tratta di una ripresa in forma parafrasata' (pp. lxxiii–lxxix).

<sup>29</sup> *In latinis codicibus adulterium quoque et impudicitia et homicidia in hoc catalogo uitiorum scripta referuntur. sed sciendum non plus quam quindecim carnis opera nominata, de quibus et disseruimus* (lines 199–202 of the commentary on Gal. 5:19). It may be noted that manuscripts DEQCAF omit *et homicidia* from this observation even though they do not include it in the lemma either.

<sup>30</sup> The spelling *idolatria*, found in the majority of manuscripts of this work and matching Old Latin codices and other sources, is preferable here to the more correct transliteration *idololatria*.

*Galatiae*, et hoc notandum quia hic tantum generaliter non ad unam ecclesiam unius urbis, sed ad totius prouinciae scribat ecclesias ('We should, however, also note his words "to the churches of Galatia" because here he is writing in general not to a single church of a single city but to the churches of an entire province'). The alternative reading *ecclesiae* in manuscripts DEAF is therefore clearly not original despite its Old Latin antecedents.

Nonetheless, Jerome's comments about the text of biblical codices are not always a sure indication of his reading. In his exposition of Gal. 2:1, he gives a full quotation of Gal. 2:5: *et hoc esse quod in codicibus legatur latinis: Quibus ad horam cessimus subiectioni, ut ueritas Euangelii perseueraret apud uos.* ('And this is what is read in Latin manuscripts: "To whom we submitted for a time, in order that the truth of the gospel should endure among you."') Although his focus here is the absence of the negative in the first clause (i.e. *quibus neque*), a point which he makes again at length in the following commentary on this verse, it is the form *perseueraret* which is of interest. While there are surviving Old Latin witnesses which omit the negative, there is no other example of *perseueraret* for *διαμείνη*. In his lemma text for 2:5 and two citations in the following exegesis, Jerome has *permaneat* (with the variant *permaneret* discussed earlier). One manuscript, F, has *permaneret* in place of *perseueraret* in the comment on 2:1, but two closely related manuscripts, G and I, read *perseueret* [*sic*] in the lemma of 2:5.<sup>31</sup> Although this accords with the earlier quotation, in the subsequent exposition both of these witnesses have *permaneat*: this suggests that the lemma was altered at some point to correspond to the earlier citation, but this was not extended to the following quotations. As for the initial reading *perseueraret*, it is possible that, having made his point about the absence of the negative here, Jerome quoted the rest of the verse from memory and introduced an error which he did not trouble to correct when he reached the exposition of this verse: the reference to Latin manuscripts indicates that this is not an alternative deriving from Jerome's direct translation of a Greek source.

Another grey area concerns biblical verses quoted out of the sequence of the Epistle. As these are less likely to have been altered during an updating of the biblical text of the commentary, they may provide testimony for the original form of text;

<sup>31</sup> The reading of G, based on the digital image provided at <<http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0128/49/>>, is a correction to Raspanti's edition.

equally, as illustrative citations are often made without reference to a codex, they can include errors of memory which were never present in biblical tradition.<sup>32</sup> For instance, in his commentary on Gal. 1:17b Jerome misquotes Gal. 1:20 with *dico* rather than *scribo*.<sup>33</sup> One example where this type of evidence does confirm a reading is Gal. 1:13. Despite having *expugnabam*, the reading of all scriptural codices, in the lemma, the quotation at line 30 reads *deuastabam*; this root is also found in *uastator ecclesiae* (line 6) and *praedo uastabat* (line 33). In his commentary on Gal. 4:12a, Jerome refers back to this verse with the phrase *ecclesiam Christi . . . persequens deuastabam*, making the case for this as the authorial text.<sup>34</sup> The potential drawbacks of such evidence are illustrated by his quotation of Gal. 4:24–5 in his commentary on 1:17 (lines 58–61), reading: *Quae quidem sunt, inquit, per allegoriam dicta. Haec enim sunt duo Testamenta: unum quidem a monte Sina, in seruitutem generans, quae est Agar. Sina enim mons est in Arabia, qui iunctus est ei quae nunc est Hierusalem*. A quotation of this length and accuracy was probably made with reference to a codex. However, it features two major differences from the lemmata of the commentary on these verses: all manuscripts read *quae quidem sunt allegorica* at 4:24a and there is no example of *iunctus* in 4:25, where the readings *conterminus*, *coniunctus*, and *conterminatus* are all attested for the lemma. The presence of the Vulgate form of 4:24 in the out-of-sequence quotation suggests that this has been subject to alteration.<sup>35</sup> This is confirmed by

<sup>32</sup> Jerome himself makes this observation with regard to quotations of the Old Testament at his commentary on Gal. 3:8–9 (lines 13–18): *Hoc autem in omnibus paene testimoniis quae de ueteribus libris in nouo adsumpta sunt Testamento obseruare debemus, quod memoriae crediderint euangelistae uel apostoli et tantum sensu explicato saepe ordinem commutauerint, nonnumquam uel detraxerint uerba uel addiderint*. ('We should note that this is the case in almost all quotations which are made from the earlier writings in the New Testament, because the evangelists or apostles relied on memory and, once they had merely given the meaning, often changed the sequence and occasionally omitted or introduced words.')

<sup>33</sup> Line 21. Compare also *est scriptum* in place of *dicit* in the form of Gal. 3:16 quoted at Gal 3:8 (line 11).

<sup>34</sup> Line 24. Further support for *deuastabam* is found in Jerome's *Commentary on Ephesians* (col. 512, l. 43): *sciebat se namque persecutorem fuisse, et christi ecclesiam deuastasse*. The lemma *uastabam* is found in the commentaries of Augustine and the Latin Theodore of Mopsuestia.

<sup>35</sup> Raspanti suggests (n. 87, pp. 264–5) that the citation of 4:24 at 1:17 preserves the authorial text ('secondo il testo tradizionale e circolante') but that Jerome decided to retranslate the verse when he came to this point in the exposition. One problem with this is that none of the surviving Old Latin forms of Gal. 4:24 preserved in biblical codices match this so-called



variants in the manuscript tradition at this point: CFZ read *in* rather than *a* (matching the reading of AC<sup>p.c.</sup> L in the lemma) and DECAH have *coniunctus* in place of *iunctus*. In fact, *coniunctus* is the only form paralleled in biblical tradition. What is more, in the exegesis of 4:25, Jerome quotes the verse with *confinis est ei*, on which the manuscripts are unanimous. Quotations in Jerome's other writings suggest that *confinis* was his preferred form, leaving the reading of the lemma a mystery.<sup>36</sup>

There is one final category of inconsistency in the biblical text of the commentary, involving 13 examples of a non-Vulgate reading in the lemma followed by an exegetical quotation matching the Vulgate.<sup>37</sup> On five occasions, alternative readings are present in the manuscript tradition restoring the Vulgate in the lemma, such as *posset* for *potuisset* in GIZ at Gal. 4:15. The only witness with all five variants is Z, one of the latest manuscripts included in the edition, suggesting that some of its biblical lemmata had been revised. The other eight are uncontested: for example, in the lemma of Gal. 5:3 every manuscript has *contestor*, a form unique to Jerome, but *testificor* in the quotation of the entire verse during the exposition. The lemma for the second half of Gal. 5:21 features three non-Vulgate readings, two of which (*et* and *possidebunt*) correspond to the earliest surviving form of the Latin biblical text: *sicut et praedixi quoniam qui haec agunt regnum dei non possidebunt*. At line 185 of the following exegesis, all manuscripts have the Vulgate form of the verse, *sicut praedixi quoniam qui talia agunt regnum dei non consequentur*. While shorter instances of this phenomenon might be explained as Jerome's direct translation of Greek commentators or his use of other Latin sources which happen to coincide with the Vulgate, the length of some of the exegetical quotations tells against this. An alternative suggestion is that, where biblical lemmata were not clearly marked in the manuscript tradition, some of the quotations in the exegesis were misidentified as

'traditional text', although it is the form transmitted in the commentaries of Marius Victorinus and Ambrosiaster. Furthermore, Jerome does not discuss the text here as he does elsewhere when amending it.

<sup>36</sup> Occurrences of *confinis* in Jerome are found in his *Commentary on Isaiah* 5.16.3.13 and 9.30.6.11; *Commentary on Jeremiah* 5 (308:15 and 309:5); *Commentary on Ezekiel* 9.30; *Commentary on Obadiah* 340, 693. This verse is not quoted in Augustine's commentary, but he also has the reading *confinis* at *De utilitate credendi* 3.8.

<sup>37</sup> Examples not given later in this paragraph occur at Gal. 1:7 (*nisi si*); 1:24 (*quondam*); 2:7 (*contra*); 3:25 (*sub paedagogo sumus*); 5:10 (*quia*); 6:1 (*mansuetudinis*); 6:3 (*seipsum*); 6:15 (*est*); and 6:16 (*sequuntur*, discussed above).

lemmata and brought into line with the Vulgate by later editors who had overlooked earlier examples of the same verse. This seems particularly likely in the case of Gal. 5:21, where the intervening portion of commentary between this and the original lemma is unusually long.

A number of conclusions may be drawn from the evidence presented above, some peculiar to this work and others more typical of biblical commentaries in general. It has become clear that both the scriptural lemmata and the quotations in the exegetical sections of Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* have been subject to alteration. The presentation of the text in the manuscripts of the work, where there is sometimes little differentiation between text and exposition, may have contributed to some apparently indiscriminate changes. The preservation of numerous Old Latin readings, some unique, indicates that there was no thoroughgoing attempt in late antiquity or the early medieval period to conform the biblical text of the commentary to the Vulgate. It is clear from inconsistencies between Jerome's observations and the lemmata that some of the alterations to the biblical text predate the entire surviving textual tradition (e.g. *expugnabam* in 1:13 and *idolorum seruitus* in 5:20). Alternative readings attested in surviving manuscripts in the lemmata often provide a better match with the form of text quoted in the exegesis: given that these appear to be independent of the latter quotations, they should therefore be adopted in the editorial text, usually in preference to the Vulgate (e.g. *iustificatur* in 2:16, *suscepistis* in 4:14, *spiritui obtemperemus* in 5:25, etc.). Many of these Old Latin forms are transmitted by multiple members of a subset of Family 1, manuscripts DEQCA.<sup>38</sup> The evidence suggests that the attestation of a non-Vulgate reading in several of these manuscripts should make it worthy of serious consideration (e.g. *praeterquam* in 1:9 or *sectantur* in 6:16). Nonetheless, the substitution of *ecclesiae* in DEA at 1:2 shows that some of the non-Vulgate readings in this group may not be authorial but instead derive from editorial intervention at an early stage in the work's transmission.<sup>39</sup> While it is not beyond the bounds

<sup>38</sup> Souter, 'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations', notes similarly that in Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew* 'one family of manuscripts was more distinguished for Old-Latin Bible characteristics than the other' (p. 12).

<sup>39</sup> It should, however, be noted that *ecclesiae* is not attested in any surviving Old Latin biblical codices but only the early commentaries of Marius Victorinus and Ambrosiaster. The only example I have found of *ecclesiae* in a biblical manuscript is Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6236, a 9th-c. Vulgate witness, which suggests that this simple error is also a Vulgate

of possibility that non-Vulgate readings were introduced at this point in an ancestor of the group, the consistency of many of these variants with Jerome's text in the exegesis stands in favour of their originality. If more of the readings of this subset of Family 1 are adopted, a greater disjunction may become apparent between these witnesses and the other manuscripts of both families, characterized by the adjustment of several of the biblical lemmata towards the Vulgate.<sup>40</sup> However, the later prevalence of the Vulgate means that this could easily have happened independently. The inconsistency of the affiliation of the biblical text within each manuscript (and also between manuscripts) makes it difficult to identify anything more than a trend: adjustments to the text of the Epistle appear to have been made sporadically throughout the tradition, no doubt with further cross-contamination, obliterating traces of any single point of recension and giving most lemmata a generally Vulgate shape.<sup>41</sup>

The textual tradition of Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* does not appear to be any more or less complicated than that of most other contemporary exegetical writings, but it demonstrates the complex nature of the transmission of biblical quotations. This study has shown the importance of the comprehensive reporting of variants to scriptural verses in the critical apparatus of a modern edition, regardless of the stemmatic reconstruction of the tradition. Although fluctuations in the lemmata may be unrelated to the transmission of the rest of the work, they can also provide traces of different stages of editorial activity as well as making connections with the parallel history of the text of the New Testament. Thorough analysis of the biblical text, including comparison of the words quoted in the exegetical sections and reference to differing forms preserved in direct biblical tradition, is necessary for the reconstitution of the scriptural text used by the commentator. Preconceptions about the

alternative. The appearance of *ecclesiae* in manuscript F of Jerome's commentary may be an independent instance of the same error. Another instance of an erroneous reading from an ancestor of DEQCA is the omission of *ei quae nunc est* from the lemma of 4:25.

<sup>40</sup> The principal criterion for the division into two families is the order of Jerome's commentaries within the manuscript, with Family 2 ( $\mu$ ) having the biblical sequence (Raspanti, p. lxii). However, as this is also found independently in later members of Family 1 ( $\alpha$ ), it might prove to be a secondary consideration.

<sup>41</sup> The more notable exceptions to this are the Old Latin text of Gal. 4:8–9, the unique forms of Gal. 4:24 and 5:25, and Jerome's own version of Gal. 5:9.

affiliation of this version should be left to one side: it is not necessarily the case that Old Latin forms are always to be preferred, or that readings which now appear to characterize the Vulgate were absent from earlier tradition. The preservation of non-standard forms, particularly in multiple strands of the manuscript tradition, is always worthy of careful consideration, even if different editors may reach different conclusions. The variety of alternatives in biblical quotations in patristic writings both witnesses to the ongoing use of these texts and constitutes significant evidence for the indirect tradition of the Bible.

APPENDIX: A List of Old Latin Readings in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*

The initial reading is that of the Stuttgart Vulgate.

HI<sup>txt</sup> indicates an Old Latin reading in the lemma in the Corpus Christianorum edition.

HI<sup>com</sup> indicates a form supported by biblical quotations in the exegesis. This includes readings reported from Latin codices. If HI<sup>com</sup> is not indicated, the exegesis either agrees with the lemma or contains no quotation.

The suffix <sup>-var</sup> is used for manuscript variants reported but not adopted in the edition. Not all variant readings listed in the Corpus Christianorum apparatus have been included, but only those which may be of interest for the history of the biblical text.

An asterisk indicates a form which this study proposes should be adopted as the reading of the lemma against the text of the Corpus Christianorum edition.

- 1:2 ecclesiis] ecclesiae HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 1:3 nostro] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 1:4 nequam] malo HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 1:6 christi] + iesu HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 1:7 nisi] + si HI<sup>txt</sup> HI<sup>com-var42</sup>  
 1:9 praeter id quod] praeterquam HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 1:10 aut deo] an deo HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 1:13 expugnabam] deuastabam HI<sup>com\*</sup>  
 1:16 euangelizarem] euangelizem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 1:17 hierosolyma] hierosolymam HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 1:17 neque] + enim HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 1:17 reuersus] regressus HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 1:17 antecessores] praecessores<sup>43</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>

<sup>42</sup> For a discussion of this inconsistency, see Raspanti, n. 19 (p. 240).

<sup>43</sup> This text is found in an out-of-sequence quotation at Gal. 2:1, line 26; the commentary *ad loc.* corresponds to the Vulgate.

- 1:18 diebus] dies HI<sup>com</sup>  
 1:19 uidi neminem] neminem uidi HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 1:22 christo] + iesu HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 1:24 aliquando] quondam HI<sup>txt</sup>, aliquando HI<sup>com</sup>  
 1:24 clarificabant] glorificabant HI<sup>txt</sup>, magnificabant HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 2:1 deinde] dehinc HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 2:1 annos quattuordecim] quattuordecim annos HI<sup>com</sup>  
 2:1 iterum] rursum HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:1 hierosolyma] hierosolimam HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:2 illis] eis HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:2 uidebantur] + esse aliquid HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 2:3 gentilis] ex gentibus HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:4 sed propter subintroductos] propter subintroductos autem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:5 permaneat] permaneret HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>, perseueraret HI<sup>com, txt-var</sup>  
 2:6 uidebantur 2] + esse aliquid HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 2:7 e contra] contra HI<sup>txt</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>, e contra HI<sup>com</sup>  
 2:9 Iacobus et Cephas] Petrus et Iacobus HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:10 hoc ipsum facere] facere hoc ipsum HI<sup>com</sup>  
 2:10 pauperum] pauperes HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 2:11 Cephas] Petrus HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:12 et segregabat] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 2:13 ceteri] et caeteri HI<sup>txt</sup>, caeteri HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 2:13 ut et] ut HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 2:14 recte ambularent] recto pede incedunt HI<sup>txt</sup>, recto pede incederent<sup>44</sup> HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 2:14 Cephae] Petro HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:16 credidimus] credimus HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 2:16 ex fide] in fide HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:16 iustificabitur] iustificatur HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
*The commentary does not quote or discuss Galatians 2:17-18.*  
 2:20 uero] autem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 2:20 dei] + et christi HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 2:20 se ipsum] semet ipsum HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:1 fascinauit] + non credere ueritati HI<sup>com</sup>  
 3:1 proscriptus] praescriptus HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 3:1 est] + in uobis HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:2 solum] + modo HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:3 stulti] insipientes<sup>45</sup>

<sup>44</sup> This is also supported by an out-of-sequence quotation at line 95 of the preface.

<sup>45</sup> This is the reading of an out-of-sequence quotation at line 57 of the preface and is included here as an unusual reading; the customary form is found in the commentary.

- 3:3 estis] + ut HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 3:6 ei] illi HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:7 abraham] abraham HI<sup>txt</sup>, abraham HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 3:12 uiuet] uiuit HI<sup>txt-var</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 3:13 omnis] homo HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:13 pendet] pendit HI<sup>txt-var</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>, pependit HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:14 pollicitationem] repromissionem HI<sup>txt</sup>, repromissiones HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:15 confirmatum testamentum] testamentum confirmatum HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:16 promissiones] repromissiones HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:16 dicit] dicitur HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 3:16 qui] quod HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 3:17 irritam] irritum HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:18 nam] quia HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:18 lege] + esset HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:18 repromissione] promissione HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:18 promissionem] repromissionem HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 3:19 transgressionem] transgressionem HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 3:19 promiserat] promissum erat HI<sup>txt</sup>, repromissum erat HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 HI<sup>com</sup>  
 3:21 posset] possit HI<sup>txt-var</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 3:24 christo] + iesu HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:25 iam] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 3:25 sumus sub paedagogo] sub paedagogo sumus HI<sup>txt</sup>, sumus sub  
 paedogogo HI<sup>com</sup>  
 3:26 fidem] + quae est HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 3:27 christo] + iesu HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:1 differt] + a HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:2 sed] + et HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:2 est et actoribus] et actoribus est HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:3 mundi] huius mundi HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:6 filii] + dei HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:7 es] est HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:7 deum] christum HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:8 ignorantes] nescientes HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:8 his... seruiebatis] seruistis his HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:8 sunt] erant HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:9 autem] uero HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:9 cum cognoueritis] cognoscentes HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:9 immo] magis autem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:9 sitis] *om.* HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:9 a deo] ab eo HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:9 denuo] rursum HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:10 et menses] menses HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:10 et tempora] tempora HI<sup>txt-var</sup>

- 4:12 et ego] ego HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:14 excepistis] suscepistis HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:14 in] quae erat in HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>, in HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:15 posset] potuisset HI<sup>txt</sup>, posset HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:15 oculos uestros] uobis oculis HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:15 enim] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:16 uerum] ueritatem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:17 uos I] uobis HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:20 modo] nunc HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:20 quoniam] quia HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:21 legistis] audistis HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:22 quoniam] quia HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:23 quae] + quidem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:24 per allegoriam dicta] allegorica HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:24 a] in HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:24 monte] montem HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:25 coniunctus] conterminus HI<sup>txt</sup>, conterminatus HI<sup>txt-var</sup>, confinis HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:25 ei quae nunc est] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:25 eis] suis HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:26 nostra] omnium nostrum HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:26 quae est] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:27 exclama] clama HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 4:27 quia] quoniam HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 4:29 natus erat] natus est HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:29 persequabatur] persequitur HI<sup>com</sup>  
 4:30 liberae] meo Isaac HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:1 nos christus] christus nos HI<sup>txt-var</sup> HI<sup>com-var</sup>  
 5:1 iterum... contineri] rursum... haerere<sup>46</sup>  
 5:2 proderit] prodest HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:3 omni homini circumcidenti] omnem hominem circumcidentem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:3 testifcor] contestor HI<sup>txt</sup>, testifcor HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:3 rursum] *om.* HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:5 spiritu] spirituum HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:7 oboedire] + nemini consenseritis HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:8 persuasio] + uestra HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:8 uocat] uocauit HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:9 massam] conspersionem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:9 corrumpit] fermentat HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:10 quod] quia HI<sup>txt</sup>, quod HI<sup>com</sup>

<sup>46</sup> This text is found in an out-of-sequence quotation at Gal. 5:13a; the commentary *ad loc.* corresponds to the Vulgate.

- 5:11 adhuc *l*] *om.* HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:11 euacuatum est] cessauit HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:13 carnis] carni HI<sup>txt</sup> 47  
 5:13 occasionem] occasione HI<sup>txt-var</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:13 inuicem] in inuicem HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:14 impletur] completur HI<sup>txt-var</sup>, impleta est HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:14 diliges] diligis HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:16 desiderium] desideria HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 5:17 enim *l*] uero HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup>  
 5:17 autem] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:17 inuicem] sibi inuicem HI<sup>txt</sup>, inuicem HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com-var\*</sup>  
 5:17 illa] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:19 sunt] + adulterium HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:19 luxuria] impudicitia HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:20 sectae] haereses HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:20 idolorum seruitus] idololatria HI<sup>com</sup>, idolatria HI<sup>com-var\*</sup>  
 5:21 homicidia] *om.* HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:21 sicut] sicut et HI<sup>txt</sup>, sicut HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:21 talia] haec HI<sup>txt</sup>, talia HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:21 consequentur] possidebunt HI<sup>txt</sup>, consequentur HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:22 bonitas benignitas] benignitas bonitas HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:23 modestia] mansuetudo HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 5:23 huiusmodi] eiusmodi HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:24 carnem] + suam HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 5:24 sunt] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:24 crucifixerunt] crucifigunt HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 5:25 spiritu et ambulemus] spiritui obtemperemus HI<sup>txt-var\*</sup> HI<sup>com</sup>  
 6:1 huiusmodi instruite] instruite huiusmodi HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 6:1 lenitatis] mansuetudinis HI<sup>txt</sup>, lenitatis HI<sup>com</sup>  
 6:3 aliquid esse] esse aliquid HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 6:3 sit nihil] nihil sit HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 6:3 ipse se] seipsum HI<sup>txt</sup>, ipse se HI<sup>com</sup>  
 6:5 onus suum] proprium onus<sup>48</sup>  
 6:8 et] *om.* HI<sup>com</sup>  
 6:12 quicumque] + enim HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 6:13 circumciduntur] circumcisi sunt HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 6:13 legem] hi legem HI<sup>txt</sup>  
 6:14 autem] *om.* HI<sup>txt-var</sup>  
 6:15 in christo enim iesu neque] neque enim HI<sup>txt</sup>

<sup>47</sup> For a discussion of this reading, see Raspanti, n. 100 (pp. 273-4).

<sup>48</sup> This text is found in an out-of-sequence quotation at Gal. 5:10b; the commentary *ad loc.* corresponds to the Vulgate.



6:15 ualet] est  $HI^{txt}$

6:16 secuti fuerint] sequuntur  $HI^{txt}$ , sectantur  $HI^{txt-var*}$ , secuti fuerint  
cf.  $HI^{com}$

6:17 iesu] domini nostri iesu christi  $HI^{txt}$ , domini iesu  $HI^{com}$  <sup>49</sup>

6:18 nostri] *om.*  $HI^{txt-var}$   $HI^{com}$

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion of this reading, see Raspanti, n. 128 (p. 284): he concludes that the lemma is Jerome's text, while the commentary has been influenced by the Greek.