

Augustine's Adoption of the Vulgate Gospels*

H. A. G. HOUGHTON

*Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing, Department of
Theology and Religion, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham
B15 2TT, England*

This paper examines Augustine's text of the Gospel according to John to trace the process by which he adopted Jerome's revision of the Gospels. An important feature is the distinction between 'primary citations' taken from a codex and 'secondary citations' likely to have been made from memory, which change affiliation at different rates. Augustine's progress from Old Latin to Vulgate text-types is illustrated by the comparison of selected passages with surviving manuscripts. Textual variants in these citations suggest that Augustine's biblical text has been transmitted accurately.

Keywords: Augustine, Vulgate, Jerome, Latin, Bible, Gospel, John

Patristic citations are not only of value for the text of the NT, but may also shed light on a Church Father's use of the Bible. Augustine's adoption of Jerome's revision of the Gospels, later known as the Vg, is one instance of this. In addition to readings from the OL Gospels preserved in his citations, Augustine also provides important evidence for the oldest form of the Vg. This shift cannot, however, be illustrated without reference to Augustine's citation technique, encompassing his use of gospel manuscripts and his reliance on memory. It is insufficient to suppose that once Augustine encountered Jerome's new version, he automatically quoted this on every subsequent occasion.¹ Different codices would have been available at different times and places, and not all works were written or copied under the same circumstances. After outlining a way of taking these discrepancies into account, this study will consider citations of John in selected writings from three periods: early works, works composed between 403 and 420, and writings

* A version of this paper was delivered in the Textual Criticism seminar at the Annual Meeting of SNTS in Sibiu, Romania, in 2007. I should like to thank Professors J. K. Elliott and H.-G. Bethge for their invitation to speak in the seminar. The original research on which this study was based was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

¹ This is one of several errors which beset C. H. Milne, *A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text or Texts of the Gospels used by Saint Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1926). Milne does not consider the biblical text of any works composed after 401.

from the last decade of Augustine's life. By comparing these citations with Latin gospel manuscripts, the pattern of Augustine's affiliation with different types of text becomes clear.²

Primary and Secondary Citations

In order to differentiate between citations that were drawn from a biblical exemplar and those that were probably produced from memory, I would like to introduce the two categories of 'primary' and 'secondary' citations. Primary citations are those which are most likely to have been made with reference to a manuscript. These are sometimes indicated by Augustine's explicit comments on his use of a gospel codex and may also be identified by their length, their context or the type of work in which they appear. Commentaries, expository works and collections of *testimonia* are more likely to contain primary citations, although not every citation in such writings is a primary citation, as will become clear below. The relationship of the scriptural text to surviving gospel manuscripts is also important, although this should not be relied on in isolation: for a start, the preservation of OL forms of text is quite haphazard, and patristic material may well provide a reading which has not survived elsewhere in the tradition. What is meant is that a primary citation does not normally show signs of paraphrase or other alteration when compared with the biblical tradition.

Secondary citations, in contrast, may feature variants and abbreviation characteristic of citations from memory. They are normally shorter. While it is possible that they were made with reference to a codex, there is no explicit or implicit indication of this. The fact that the majority of secondary citations were probably quoted from memory, in accordance with ancient custom, does not mean that they are textually insignificant. Memory must be memory of something, even if the accuracy of someone's recall may vary. Nonetheless, they do not demonstrate the same direct connection with biblical manuscript tradition that characterises primary citations. In some places where Augustine appears to be citing from memory, he produces a consistent form of text for a particular verse, which may be termed his 'mental text'. This form often occurs in the majority of his citations, and it is deviations from this which are most significant for analysing his biblical text.³

² Considerations of space mean that only a representative selection of works can be included here. For a fuller analysis of writings which contain a significant number of citations from John, see H. A. G. Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2008).

³ For a description of the types of variant which are characteristic of memory, and the process of 'flattening', see Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John*, 67–76, or H. A. G. Houghton, 'Flattening in Latin Biblical Citations', forthcoming in *Studia Patristica*.

Vulgatisation

One of the most common objections to the use of patristic evidence in biblical textual criticism is the question of ‘vulgatisation’. How can we be sure that the text of Augustine’s citations has not been altered by copyists and made to conform with versions known to them? A review of the manuscript tradition of his works as provided by the critical apparatus of modern editions shows that there is minimal variation in the form of citations from the Gospel according to John. A few later manuscripts of Augustine, most dated after the twelfth century, do substitute Vg readings in a piecemeal and sporadic way. The consistency of the rest of the tradition does not rule out very early editorial activity, although for some works the earliest surviving manuscript may have been copied during Augustine’s lifetime.⁴ However, the most convincing indication that the authorial text has been transmitted accurately will be the analysis which constitutes the rest of this study.

Early Works

De diuersis quaestionibus

Augustine’s earliest primary citation of John occurs in *Quaestio* 64 of *De diuersis quaestionibus*, written between 391 and 395.⁵ This discussion of the Samaritan woman includes much of the pericope cited sequentially, an indication that a manuscript has been used for the citation. The section covering John 4.9–14 runs as follows:

Sed carnaliter intellegens respondit: *Tu cum sis Iudaeus, quomodo a me bibere petis, cum sim mulier Samaritana? Non enim coutuntur Iudaei Samaritanis. Cui dominus noster dixit: Si scires donum dei, et quis est qui dicit tibi: Da mihi bibere, tu magis petisses ab eo, et dedisset tibi aquam uiuam ... Sed adhuc illa mulier carnaliter sapit; sic enim respondit: Domine, neque hauritorium habes et puteus altus est; unde mihi habes dare aquam uiuam? Numquid tu maior es patre nostro Iacob, qui dedit nobis hunc puteum, et ipse ex eo bibit et filii eius et pecora eius? Nunc uero iam dominus exponit quid dixerit. Omnis, inquit, qui biberit de aqua ista sitiet*

4 For examples of vulgatisation in later manuscripts of *De diuersis quaestionibus* and *De consensu euangelistarum*, see Houghton, *Augustine’s Text of John*, 140–1 and 159. The oldest manuscripts of Augustine are listed in E. A. Lowe, ‘A List of the Oldest Extant Manuscripts of Saint Augustine with a Note on the Codex Bambergensis’, *Miscellanea Agostiniana* (ed. A. Casamassa; Rome: Vaticana, 1931) 235–51. Of particular note is the St Petersburg manuscript containing works from 395–6, which has been dated to the beginning of the fifth century: the most recent discussion (with references) is Kenneth B. Steinhauser, ‘Codex Leningradensis Q.v.I.3.: Some Unresolved Problems’, *De doctrina christiana. A Classic of Western Culture* (ed. Duane W. H. Arnold and Pamela Bright; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1995) 33–43.

5 The dates cited for Augustine’s works in this paper have been taken from José Anoz, ‘Cronología de la producción agustiniana’, *Augustinus* 47 (2002) 229–322.

iterum; qui autem biberit de aqua quam ego dederò, non sitiet in sempiternum; sed aqua illa quam dederò fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in uitam aeternam (De diuersis quaestionibus 64.4–5).⁶

This text clearly does not correspond to the Vg:⁷

4.9 dicit ergo ei mulier illa samaritana: quomodo tu Iudaeus cum sis bibere a me poscis quae sum mulier samaritana? non enim coutuntur Iudaei Samaritanis. 4.10 respondit Iesus et dixit ei: si scires donum Dei et quis est qui dicit tibi da mihi bibere, tu forsitan petisses ab eo et dedisset tibi aquam uiuam. 4.11 dicit ei mulier: Domine neque in quo haurias habes et puteus altus est. unde ergo habes aquam uiuam? 4.12 numquid tu maior es patre nostro Iacob, qui dedit nobis puteum, et ipse ex eo bibit et filii eius et pecora eius? 4.13 respondit Iesus et dixit ei: omnis qui bibit ex aqua hac sitiet iterum. qui autem biberit ex aqua quam ego dabo ei, non sitiet in aeternum, 4.14 sed aqua quam dabo ei fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in uitam aeternam.

Indeed, when Augustine's text of John 4.9 is compared with Jerome's version, the change in word order and the repetition *cum sis . . . cum sim* suggest that it might even be a paraphrase. However, an identical form of this verse is found in the OL Codex Rehdigeranus, which supplies an exact parallel for the direct speech in the next verse too, in which five OL codices read *magis* rather than *forsitan*. Similarly, *hauritorium* in 4.11 is the text of the majority of OL Gospels. The inclusion of *dare mihi* at the end of this verse in Codices Rehdigeranus and Sarzanensis appears to be another OL feature, although Augustine has a slightly different word order. Codex Rehdigeranus is also one of a handful of OL witnesses with the future perfects *omnis qui biberit* and *quam ego dederò* in 4.13. Unfortunately, an omission at the end of the verse means that the rendering of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in this manuscript is unknown. Augustine's *in sempiternum* is only preserved in Codices Veronensis and Usserianus. Variants in this passage which are not paralleled in Codex Rehdigeranus are found in other OL manuscripts, such as *de aqua ista* in John 4.13, which is also present in Codex Monacensis.

In short, the nature of this passage indicates that it is a primary citation, drawn from a codex with an OL text type. It is not identical to any surviving witness: as Roger Gryson has remarked, it would be extraordinary if any extended citation in a Church Father coincided exactly with one of the few surviving OL manuscripts.⁸

6 A. Mutzenbecher, ed., *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars 12.2, Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Diuersis Quaestionibus octoginta tribus* (CC 44A; Turnhout: Brepols, 1975) 140–1.

7 The Stuttgart Vulgate is used for the text of the Vg (R. Weber, R. Gryson et al., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 5th ed., 2007]); punctuation has been added at the end of sense lines. OL manuscripts are cited from W. Matzkow, A. Jülicher and K. Aland, *Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung. IV. Johannes-Evangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963).

8 Roger Gryson, 'Les citations scripturaires des œuvres attribuées à l'évêque arien Maximinus', *Revue Bénédictine* 88 (1978) 45–80; this observation is made on p. 70.

Nonetheless, not only does it have a broadly similar character to Codex Rehdigeranus, but also almost all Augustine's non-Vg readings in this passage are preserved within the OL tradition, which suggests that the surviving manuscripts constitute a cross-section of different versions in circulation at the end of the fifth century.

De mendacio

There are three citations of John in *De mendacio*, composed in 395. The form of John 3.21 at *De mendacio* 17.35 does not reveal much about Augustine's biblical text, as it corresponds both to the Vg and to the majority of OL manuscripts. His citation of John 15.12–13, however, has five non-Vg readings:

*hoc est mandatum meum, ut diligatis inuicem, sicut et ego dilexi uos. maiorem dilectionem nemo habet, quam ut animam suam ponat pro amicis suis. (De mendacio 6.9).*⁹

Five OL witnesses have *mandatum* rather than *praeceptum*, and Augustine's text of John 15.12 is identical to one of these, Codex Vercellensis, the only surviving manuscript to include *et ego* in this verse. Although there are parallels in the OL tradition for the omission of *hac* and *quis*, Augustine's text of the next verse appears to have a slightly different affiliation, as four of the five manuscripts with *mandatum* also read *caritatem* rather than *dilectionem*. The exception is Codex Bezae, but this reads *huius* rather than *hac*, and the addition of *quam* is not present in OL Gospels.

John 18.23 is the most interesting citation in this work. Six of the eight OL manuscripts with this verse read *si male locutus sum, testimonium perhibe de malo*. The two exceptions supply an alternative second verb: Codex Vercellensis has *testimonium dic* and Codex Usserianus has *testificare*. Augustine's version, however, has a completely different verb: *si male dixi, exprobra de malo (De mendacio 15.27)*. This rendering appears in two of Augustine's other citations of this verse, *De sermone domini in monte* 1.19.58, which is slightly earlier than *De mendacio*, and *Epistula* 138.2.13. His consistency, along with the suitability of this verb in context, suggests that *exprobra* is an OL form which has not been preserved in a gospel manuscript. This thesis is supported by three of Cyprian's letters which also read *exprobra de malo (Epistulae 3.2; 59.4; 66.3)*, so it may therefore derive from an African version.¹⁰ As there is no indication that Augustine relied on a codex when composing *De mendacio*, these shorter citations can only be classed

9 Joseph Zycha, ed., *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera. Sect. V. Pars 3* (CSEL 41; Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1900) 426.

10 Codex Palatinus, the manuscript believed to preserve the greatest proportion of 'African' readings in John, is not extant for this verse.

as secondary citations. Even so, they confirm the OL character of Augustine's gospel text at this time.

De trinitate

Five years later, in 400, Augustine began *De trinitate*, a work he was not to complete for over twenty years. Its chronology is further complicated by additional material inserted in the earlier books.¹¹ Despite this, certain parts of book one have a distinctive OL affiliation which is not found in later books. These all occur in the oldest stratum of the work, which contains detailed discussions of four groups of verses from John including the following extract from John 16:

Hoc significans ait: *Haec uobis locutus sum in similitudinibus; ueniet hora quando iam non in similitudinibus loquar uobis, sed manifeste de patre nuntiabo uobis; id est iam non erunt similitudines cum uisio fuerit facie ad faciem. Hoc est enim quod ait, sed manifeste de patre nuntiabo uobis, ac si diceret, 'manifeste patrem ostendam uobis'. Nuntiabo quippe ait quia uerbum eius est. Sequitur enim et dicit: Illa die in nomine meo petetis, et non dico uobis quia ego rogabo patrem; ipse enim pater amat uos quia uos me amatis et credidistis quia ego a deo exiui. Exiui a patre et ueni in hunc mundum: iterum relinquo mundum et uado ad patrem. (De trinitate 1.10.21).*¹²

It is highly likely that these neighbouring verses were cited from a codex, particularly as Augustine often uses the verb *sequitur* when following the text of a biblical manuscript (e.g. *Sermo* 374). Its text type, however, is not that of the Vg:

16.25 *Haec in prouerbiis locutus sum uobis. uenit hora cum iam non in prouerbiis loquar uobis, sed palam de Patre adnuntiabo uobis.* 16.26 *illo die in nomine meo petetis, et non dico uobis quia ego rogabo Patrem de uobis.* 16.27 *ipse enim Pater amat uos quia uos me amastis, et credidistis quia ego a Deo exiui.* 16.28 *exiui a Patre et ueni in mundum: iterum relinquo mundum et uado ad Patrem.*

The OL Codex Vercellensis is the only surviving gospel manuscript which has *similitudinibus* rather than *prouerbiis* in John 16.25. It provides other parallels for the first two verses of Augustine's citation, including the future *ueniet hora*, the uncompounded *nuntiabo uobis* and the feminine *illa die*, but has further non-Vg readings in the later verses. Despite the similarity of John 16.27–8 in *De trinitate* and the Vg, it should be noted that Augustine's text is identical to the OL Codex Monacensis, which also has the addition of *hunc* before *mundum* characteristic of the earlier versions. Other variants are also found in the OL tradition: for exam-

11 See further A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches de chronologie augustiniennne* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1965) 69–77 and 165–77.

12 W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie, eds., *Aurelii Augustini opera. Pars 16. Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Trinitate* (CC 50; Brepols: Turnhout, 1968) 58.

ple, Codex Palatinus reads *ueniet hora quando* in v. 25 and omits *de uobis* after *ego rogabo patrem* at the end of v. 26. There is no extant gospel manuscript with *manifeste* as a rendering of *παρρησίᾳ* in John 16.25, but it is found in the majority of witnesses at John 11.14 as well as two codices in John 10.24. It seems likely that *manifeste* appeared in this verse in a version which has not been preserved. The same types of readings and affiliations are found in the other groups of verses from John in the first book of *De trinitate*.¹³

The Arrival of the Vulgate

De consensu euangelistarum

Augustine's first reference to Jerome's revision of the Gospels occurs in a famous passage in his letter to Jerome, *Epistula* 71.6, dated to 403. Given that Augustine does not mention this version in their earlier correspondence but offers enthusiastic praise here, it is likely that he had only recently become aware of its existence. He also states that he has compared Jerome's revision with a Greek text, finding it 'almost without fault' (*et paene in omnibus nulla offensio est, cum scripturam Graecam contulerimus*).¹⁴ This would have been an ideal preparation for Augustine's close verbal analysis of each evangelist in the work *De consensu euangelistarum*, which is contemporary with this letter to Jerome.

The current scriptural text of *De consensu euangelistarum* is demonstrably Vg. There are twenty-nine places in verses of John cited in *De consensu euangelistarum* where the Stuttgart Vg differs from all the OL witnesses reported in Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland, and Augustine has the Vg reading in twenty-five of these (86%). If the selection is extended to include readings peculiar to the Vg and one OL manuscript, the Vg reading appears in *De consensu* on thirty-seven of fifty occasions (74%).¹⁵ Nonetheless, this does not by itself prove authorial use of the Vg: this sort of commentary would be particularly susceptible to alteration in order to conform with a version of the Gospels in later circulation. In addition to his correspondence with Jerome, however, certain considerations suggest that Augustine did take his gospel citations from the Vg.

13 For the differences between citations of John in book one and later books of *De trinitate*, see Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John*, 153–6. Changes in rendering, as in the case of *παράκλητος* for which book one has *aduocatus* but book two has *paracletus*, suggest that Augustine used a different codex for the first book.

14 K. D. Daur, ed., *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars 3.2. Epistulae LVI–C* (CC 31A; Turnhout: Brepols, 2005) 38.

15 Further explanation along with a list of these characteristic readings is presented in H. A. G. Houghton, 'Augustine's Citations and Text of the Gospel according to John' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2006).

First, the biblical text is inconsistent: some citations of the same verse correspond to the Vg, but others are OL or even unique to Augustine. The Vg readings generally occur when the Gospel is being cited in sequence, that is to say the primary citations for which Augustine is most likely to have used a codex, while the non-Vg alternatives appear later in the discussion, or in out-of-sequence illustrative citations. Of course, this could still have been the work of a reviser, although most of the distinctive Vg readings go back as far as the manuscript tradition of this work can be traced. A group of later witnesses does feature Vg readings in some of the other citations, but these are sporadic and may be errors of memory; a high number of interpolations means that these manuscripts are not considered an important branch of the textual tradition.

The best proof of authorial use of the Vg is the occurrence of distinctive Vg readings outside scriptural citations, which are embedded into the commentary and therefore likely to have escaped the notice of a reviser. A number of these were identified in each Gospel by Burkitt, including the following:¹⁶

hanc ostensionem domini post resurrectionem intellegitur et Iohannes commemorasse sic loquens: *cum esset ergo sero die illo una sabbatorum et fores essent clausae, ubi erant discipuli congregati propter metum Iudaeorum, uenit Iesus et stetit in medio et dixit eis: pax uobis. et hoc cum dixisset, ostendit eis manus et latus.* ac per hoc his uerbis Iohannis possunt coniungi ea quae Lucas dicit, idem autem Iohannes praetermittit. (*De consensu euangelistarum* 3.25.74).¹⁷

This is a primary citation in keeping with the pattern described earlier: the text of John 20.19–20 is identical to the Stuttgart Vg (with the exception of *dixit* rather than *dicit*, as found in other Vg sources). Most OL witnesses have an ablative absolute, *ostiis clusis*, and the word *fores* is unique to the Vg. At the end of the next paragraph, Augustine summarises his discussion:

et adhuc inde, sicut Lucas dicit, loquentibus stetit in medio eorum dominus et ait illis: *pax uobiscum*, sicut Lucas et Iohannes. fores autem clausae erant, cum ad eos intrauit, quod solus Iohannes commemorat. (*De consensu euangelistarum* 3.25.75).¹⁸

There is already one inaccuracy: the citations of both Luke and John in the previous paragraph have *pax uobis* rather than *pax uobiscum*. But, more significantly, the term *fores* is kept in the context of John. It is highly unlikely that a reviser would have noticed this or changed Augustine's own words. Given its absence from the surviving OL tradition, however, Augustine's use of *fores* must have

¹⁶ See F. C. Burkitt, 'Saint Augustine's Bible and the *Itala*', *JTS* 11 (1910) 447–58, especially 451–5.

¹⁷ F. Wehrich, ed., *Sancti Aureli Augustini Opera. Sect. III Pars 4. De Consensu Euangelistarum* (CSEL 43; Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1903) 374.

¹⁸ Wehrich, ed., *De Consensu Euangelistarum*, 379.

derived from the Vg. This, along with Burkitt's other examples, confirms the indication in *Epistula* 71 that Augustine possessed and used a copy of Jerome's revision of the Gospels at this time.¹⁹

Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium

Around three years later, Augustine began to preach his sermon-commentary on John, the *Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium*, to his congregation in Hippo. Although these tractates were preached and dictated over the course of several years, and there is no guarantee that Augustine always used the same gospel codex, the overall affiliation of Augustine's text is with the Vg. This is shown by a comparison of the initial citation in each sermon with the distinctive Vg readings mentioned above: this work features fifty-six of the eighty-two readings for which the Vg differs from all surviving OL Gospels (68%), and it also agrees with the Vg on 148 of the 202 occasions when a reading is present only in this and one OL manuscript (73%). Again, this correspondence could be the work of an editor ensuring that Augustine's commentary matched a later version of the Gospel, but as with *De consensu euangelistarum* the Vg readings are not just present in verbatim citations but found throughout the discussion.

A good example of this is found in *Tractatus* 12, delivered in 407:

Et sequitur: *Si terrena dixi uobis, et non creditis, quomodo, si dixero uobis caelestia, creditis? Quae terrena dixit, fratres? Nisi quis natus fuerit denuo, terrenum est? Spiritus ubi uult spirat, et uocem eius audis, et nescis unde ueniat, et quo eat, terrenum est? Si enim de isto uento diceret, sicut nonnulli intellexerunt, cum quaereretur ab eis quid terrenum dixerit Dominus, dum ait: Si terrena dixi uobis, et non creditis, quomodo, si caelestia dixero, creditis? Cum ergo quaereretur a quibusdam, quid terrenum dixerit Dominus, angustias passi dixerunt, quod ait: Spiritus ubi uult spirat, et uocem eius audis, et nescis unde ueniat, et quo eat, de isto uento dixit. Quid enim nominauit terrenum? Loquebatur de generatione spiritali; secutus ait: Sic est omnis qui natus est ex Spiritu. Deinde, fratres, quis nostrum non uideat, uerbi gratia, austrum euntem de meridie ad aquilonem, aut alium uentum uenientem ab oriente ad occidentem? quomodo ergo nescimus unde ueniat et quo eat? Quid ergo dixit terrenum, quod non credebant homines? an illud quod de templo resuscitando dixerat? Corpus enim suum de terra acceperat, et ipsam terram de terreno corpore susceptam parabat suscitare. Non ei creditum est terram suscitaturum. Si terrestria, inquit, dixi uobis et non creditis, quomodo, si caelestia dixero, creditis? Hoc est, si non creditis quia templum possum resuscitare deiectum a uobis, quomodo creditis quia per Spiritum possint homines regenerari? (*Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium* 12.7).²⁰*

¹⁹ Incidentally, Burkitt did not notice that a few paragraphs later, at *De consensu* 3.25.85, Augustine refers to this verse with the OL form *clausis ostiis*. This can be explained as an OL reading quoted from memory in this out-of-sequence reference.

²⁰ R. Willems, ed., *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars 8. Sancti Aurelii Augustini In Iohannis Euangelium Tractatus CXXIV* (CC 36; Turnhout: Brepols, 1954) 124–5.

In his initial citation of John 3.12, Augustine reads *terrena*, which appears throughout his discussion in both this form and the singular, *terrenum*. This rendering is not unique to the Vg, but is found in five OL manuscripts. The other six extant codices in this verse have *terrestria*, which occurs in the final citation in the extract above. It is beyond the bounds of probability that Augustine's text originally had the OL form *terrestria* throughout, which was assiduously changed in both singular and plural forms by an editor in both commentary and citations with the sole exception of the last verbatim citation. Instead, the Vg form was that used by the author.

The change in Augustine's biblical text can be explained by the difference between primary and secondary citations. It is clear that, when preaching, Augustine drew his initial citations from a manuscript, as shown by several comments on the codex he was holding.²¹ On the other hand, during the course of his exposition, he seems not to have referred back to the exact text of this exemplar but reverted to OL forms in his 'mental text' of the Gospel. This can also be seen in his treatment of John 7.10:

Haec cum dixisset, ipse mansit in Galilaea. Vt autem adscenderunt fratres eius, tunc et ipse adscendit ad diem festum; non manifeste, sed quasi in occulto. Ideo non ad diem festum hunc, quia non gloriari temporaliter, sed aliquid docere salubriter, corrigere homines, de die festo aeterno admonere, amorem ab hoc saeculo auertere, et in Deum conuertere cupiebat. Quid est autem: quasi latenter adscendit ad diem festum? non uacat et hoc Domini. Videtur mihi, fratres, etiam hinc, quod quasi latenter adscendit, aliquid significare uoluisse; nam consequentia docebunt sic eum adscendisse mediato die festo, id est mediatis illis diebus, ut etiam palam doceret. Sed quasi latenter dixit, ne se ostenderet hominibus. Non uacat quod latenter adscendit Christus ad diem festum, quia ipse latebat in illo die festo. (Tractatus 28.8).²²

The initial citation of the verse follows the Vg, ending *quasi in occulto*. When paraphrasing the text in the next sentence, however, Augustine uses *quasi latenter*; this phrase occurs twice in the next few lines and even inspires the use of the verb *latebat*. The appearance of the adverb *latenter* in two of the four other works in which Augustine cites this phrase shows that this was an OL reading known to him, and it is preserved at this point in Codex Palatinus.²³ At the end of the next paragraph, not quoted above, Augustine gives the whole of the second half of the verse with *in occulto*, with the implication that, oblivious to his inconsistency, he was once more reading the text from his codex. This shows that, depending on a Father's citation technique, not all biblical references within the commentary can be identified as primary citations. The variant readings may be interesting, in that

21 E.g. *Tractatus* 15.1 and 40.1.

22 Willems, ed., *In Iohannis Euangelium Tractatus*, 281–2.

23 *Latenter* also appears in *Epistula* 82.2 and *Contra Faustum* 22.36.

they enable us to identify the OL text-types with which Augustine was familiar before he encountered the Vg, but they remain secondary citations drawn from memory.

Sermones ad populum

In the two commentaries just discussed, Augustine seems to have made a conscious choice to use Jerome's revision of the Gospels. This also supplies the text for the primary citation of John 3.1–21 in *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* 1.30.59, composed in 411. However, it does not follow that he automatically used the Vg in every work after 403. In many of his sermons, Augustine expounds an OL text of John. For example, in *Sermo* 329, delivered between 410 and 412, he considers John 12.24 in the form *nisi granum tritici cadens in terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet*. The Vg, along with Codices Rehdigeranus and Aureus, has *granum frumenti*, but the other OL manuscripts all preserve *tritici*.²⁴ Similarly, in *Sermo* 126 from 416–7, he cites John 5.19 in two parts:

et dicebat quod audistis: *Non potest Filius a se facere quidquam, nisi quod uiderit Patrem facientem . . . Attende et quod sequitur: Quaecumque enim facit Pater, eadem et Filius facit.* (*Sermo* 126.5.7–6.8).²⁵

The latter half differs markedly from the Vg, which reads *quaecumque enim ille fecerit haec et filius similiter facit*. It is far closer to the OL Codex Palatinus, with *quae enim pater facit, eadem et filius facit*. Furthermore, later in this sermon, Augustine reverts to his mental text of the verse which does not correspond to any surviving manuscript, *quaecumque pater facit, haec eadem et filius facit*. This confirms that these initial citations are likely to be primary citations.

OL lections are particularly common in sermons known to have been preached in Carthage. *Sermo* 134, delivered in 413/4, has three differences from the Vg in its text of John 8.31, including *uerbo* where the Vg uniquely reads *sermone*. *Sermo* 138, dated to 411, features several readings only found in OL manuscripts, such as *pastor bonus animam suam ponit pro ouibus* in John 10.11, the addition of *autem* in the following verse, the phrase *non est ei cura de ouibus* in John 10.13 and the characteristic rendering *grex* rather than *ouile* in John 10.16. Finally, *Sermo* 294, preached in Carthage in 413, followed an OL lection of John 3, including:

Audi similitudinem quae sequitur: *Et sicut Moyses exaltauit serpentem in eremo, sic oportet exaltari Filium hominis, ut omnis qui credit in eum, non pereat, sed habeat uitam aeternam.* (*Sermo* 294.10.11).²⁶

This text of John 3.14 contains a rendering not preserved in any OL manuscripts,

²⁴ No date is given for *Sermo* 329 in Anoz, 'Cronología'. The suggestion of 410/2 is recorded in H. J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel* (Vetus Latina 1/1; 4th edn.; Freiburg: Herder, 1995).

²⁵ Ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 38 (1845) 701.

²⁶ Ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 38 (1845) 1342.

which have *deserto* or *solitudine* rather than *eremo*. Nonetheless, this term is found in the majority of Augustine's other citations of this verse, including *Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium* 12, and Codex Usserianus has *eremo* for the same underlying Greek word at John 6.49, which suggests that this text derives from an OL version no longer extant. In conclusion, despite Augustine's use of the Vg in certain works composed during this period, other primary citations continue to bear witness to OL versions, as do the majority of his secondary citations.

The Triumph of the Vulgate?

De ciuitate dei

The principal sources for primary and, more usually, secondary citations in the last decade of Augustine's life are his theological writings. *De ciuitate dei* has a sequence of primary citations in books 18 to 20, when he goes through the whole of the Bible to show how the coming of Christ was prophesied and then fulfilled. The eight verses from John 5 cited at *De ciuitate dei* 20.5–6 are almost identical to the Stuttgart Vg, with all four variants widely attested in Vg manuscripts.²⁷ Subsequent references to these verses, however, do not correspond exactly to this form of text. At *De ciuitate dei* 20.9.4, Augustine cites John 5.25 with *cum* rather than *quando*, while at *De ciuitate dei* 20.23.2 and 21.1, he gives John 5.29 with *autem* in place of the Vg *uero*:

*Qui bona fecerunt, in resurrectionem uitae; qui autem mala egerunt, in resurrectionem iudicii.*²⁸

Both these alterations are paralleled in OL manuscripts, and it is likely that these shorter citations have been produced from memory. Nonetheless, the latter provides some evidence of a shift in the form of Augustine's mental text. In the majority of his earlier works, he cites John 5.29 with two adverbs, *bene* and *male*; here, he has *bona* and *mala*, in keeping with most gospel manuscripts. There is even a discrepancy between different books: in book thirteen, composed in 418, Augustine cites John 3.5 as:

Si quis non renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum caelorum. (*De ciuitate dei* 13.7).²⁹

Seven years later, the penultimate book has the same verse in a form much closer to the Vg:

²⁷ These are *transiit* in John 5.24, the word order *habere uitam* in John 5.26, the omission of *et* after *ei* in John 5.27, and *ueniet* for *uenit* in John 5.28.

²⁸ B. Dombart and A. Kalb, ed., *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars 14. Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Ciuitate Dei* (CC 48; Turnhout: Brepols, 1955) 743 (line 115), 758 (line 77) and 759 (line 15).

²⁹ Dombart and Kalb, ed., *De Ciuitate Dei*, 390 (line 4).

*Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum Dei. (De ciuitate dei 21.27.3).*³⁰

This variation in secondary citations appears to be evidence of a move towards a form closer to the Vg.

Corrections to Opponents

Augustine's heightened sensitivity to the exact wording of the biblical text is also indicative of his preference for the Vg. In two works written around 420, he criticises minor details in the gospel citations of his opponents. For example, at *De natura et origine animae* 3.11.17, he corrects the very form of John 3.5 which he cited at *De ciuitate dei* 13.7, replacing *regnum caelorum* with *regnum dei*. Two paragraphs before this, he substitutes the regular text of John 14.2 in biblical codices, *multae mansiones sunt in domo patris mei*, instead of an alternative which appears in his own earlier citations, *multae mansiones sunt apud patrem meum*. Neither version supplied as a replacement is unique to the Vg. However, in *Contra aduersarium legis et prophetarum*, he corrects his opponent as follows:

*Sed lex, inquit, per Moysen data est; ueritas autem ab Iesu Christo est. Non ita scriptum est, sed ita: Lex per Moysen data est, gratia et ueritas per Iesum Christum facta est. (Contra aduersarium 2.3.10).*³¹

All OL witnesses read *gratia autem et ueritas* in John 1.17 apart from Codex Aureus which, like the Vg, omits *autem*. On this occasion, therefore, Augustine gives a text characteristic of the Vg as the authoritative form.

Despite this apparent concern for accuracy, his other citations in this work continue to have OL readings. For example, John 1.9 is quoted at *Contra aduersarium* 1.11.14 in a typical OL form, *erat lumen uerum quod illuminat omnem hominem uenientem in hunc mundum*. Renderings such as *notis* rather than *scitis* in John 8.19, and *facta* for *opera* in John 8.39 occur at *Contra aduersarium* 2.5.19 and 2.9.32 respectively. There are even examples of forms unique to Augustine in his mental text: *non opus habebat* in John 2.25 (*Contra aduersarium* 1.20.41) and the version of John 6.54 with first person pronominal adjectives, *nisi manducaueritis carnem meam et biberitis sanguinem meum* (*Contra aduersarium* 1.24.52), are typical of memory and are not paralleled by any surviving OL witness.

Other Later Works

Numerous other secondary citations in works from this period are identical to the Vg. A particularly striking example is the form of John 14.26 in the

³⁰ Dombart and Kalb, ed., *De Ciuitate Dei*, 801 (line 79).

³¹ K. D. Daur, ed., *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars 15.3. Sancti Aurelii Augustini Contra aduersarium legis et prophetarum* (CC 49; Turnhout: Brepols, 1985) 98.

Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium. Augustine's commentary in *Tractatus* 77 is based on the text *ille uos docebit omnia et commemorabit uobis*, an OL reading found in Codex Vercellensis and Usserianus. When he cites these verses at *Tractatus* 104.1 to illustrate John 17, however, he gives the Vg text with *suggeret uobis*.³² In *Contra Maximinum*, from 428, there are three instances of secondary citations which correspond to the Vg against Augustine's standard form which occurs in his earlier works. *Contra Maximinum* 2.22.3 provides one of only three citations with *dixit* rather than *dicebat* in John 7.39; the latter is found in seventeen citations, many of which also have *credituri* rather than *credentes*. In John 8.25, five other references follow the OL *principium quod*, but *Contra Maximinum* 2.17.4 reads *principium quia*, a reading only found in the Vg and Codex Veronensis. Finally, although Augustine cites John 17.3 over forty times, only five of these are identical to the Vg, including *Contra Maximinum* 2.15.4. There are also plenty of non-Vg readings in this work which rebut any suggestion of later alteration. Nonetheless, in these frequently cited verses, Augustine's citations from memory no longer correspond to his mental text as in earlier writings, but betray the influence of the Vg.

OL readings persist, however, even in Augustine's latest works. Although the overall text-type of *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseuerantiae* corresponds to the Vg, both contain OL features, such as the text of John 6.28–9 at *De praedestinatione* 7.12. A continuous citation of John 12.37–40 at *De dono perseuerantiae* 14.35 includes a number of readings not preserved in any OL manuscript featured in Matzkow–Jülicher–Aland, including *et ideo* in John 12.39 and *cor illorum* in John 12.40. Its length suggests that this might be a primary citation, drawn from a codex. If so, it is remarkable that, in the last year of his life, Augustine was still using an OL exemplar.

Conclusion

These examples, representative of a much larger body of evidence, have illustrated a progression in the textual affiliation of Augustine's gospel citations. In his early works, his biblical text corresponds to OL witnesses. It is noteworthy that there are comparatively few readings in Augustine's text which are not present in surviving manuscripts. This suggests that the range of OL Gospels which have been preserved is comparable to the versions known to him. Augustine's praise in *Epistula* 71 of Jerome's revision of the Gospels proves that he had

³² M.-F. Berrouard *Œuvres de saint Augustin* 75. *Homélie sur l'Évangile de saint Jean CIV–CXXIV* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 2003) 45, suggests that the form in *Tractatus* 104 is a correction by a later editor. If this were the case, however, we would expect *Tractatus* 77 to have been corrected as well, rather than the inconsistency.

encountered this text by 403, and he used it for *De consensu euangelistarum* and the *Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium*. Within these commentaries, however, there is a hierarchy of citations: the Vg is principally used for the sequential treatment of the Gospel, while illustrative citations are given from memory in a different form. These secondary citations continue to feature OL readings long after Augustine's initial adoption of the Vg. Although Augustine's longer gospel citations in theological works also correspond to the Vg, he continues to use OL codices in his sermons on John. This is particularly marked in sermons known to have been preached at Carthage. In the last ten years of his life, Augustine's secondary citations reveal the increasing influence of the Vg on his 'mental text' of the Gospels, replacing his customary text even in frequently quoted verses. Nonetheless, Augustine never quite reaches the point where all his citations accord with Jerome's version, and in the last year of his life he still provides evidence for the OL tradition.

Three other features of this study are worthy of note. First, the distinction between 'primary' and 'secondary' citations has provided an insight into Augustine's citation technique. It is not always possible to be certain whether a verse was quoted directly from a codex, but separating biblical manuscripts and citations from memory enables us to trace the different rates at which the Vg influences each category of citation. It also permits the reconstruction of Augustine's 'mental text' for certain verses. Secondly, this research has shown the importance of assembling all the available evidence before assessing a Church Father's scriptural text. Consistent use of the same version cannot be assumed, given the variety of circumstances in which treatises were composed and sermons delivered. Moreover, each work has its own history of transmission during which the text of the biblical citations may have undergone alteration. In the case of Augustine, however, the variations in his biblical text suggest that his scriptural citations have by and large been transmitted intact.³³ This third and final observation indicates that, despite the later hegemony of the Vg, the continued copying of OL forms and readings unique to Augustine has preserved his authentic authorial text of the Gospels. This means that they are not just of importance for NT textual criticism, but can also enable scholars to trace the circulation of different versions and provide a window into how Church Fathers used the Bible.

³³ The principal exception to this, not discussed in this study, is the *Speculum quis ignorat*, a selection of biblical *testimonia*. The format of this work lends itself to updating in a way that Augustine's other works do not. The citations in the prefaces correspond to his mental text but the *testimonia* have been brought into line with the Vg in both OT and NT, although some traces remain of the original version. See further Almut Mutzenbecher, 'Die Nachtrag zu den Retraktionen mit Augustins letzten Werken', *Revue des études augustiniennes* 30 (1984) 60–83, especially 63–71.