

6. PHILIPPUS PRESBYTER'S COMMENTARY ON JOB: A SOURCE FOR THE STUDY OF LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

MARIE FREY RÉBEILLÉ-BORGELLA*

PHILIP'S COMMENTARY ON JOB¹

The commentary on the book of Job, written by Philip—a priest and disciple of Jerome—has never been critically edited. One reason for this is that Philip's *In Iob* does not form a constitutive part of the *Patrologia Latina*. Two texts very similar to this commentary appear in the PL and could therefore be mistaken for Philip's original commentary:

- PL 26.619–802, printed among Jerome's works and under his name, is indeed a commentary on Job but it is in fact a ninth-century compendium of Philip's work, conveyed by three manuscripts: St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 106, fols. 1–266 (ninth century); Karlsruhe, Badische Landes-

* This paper has widely benefited from the thoughts and comments of Laurence Mellerin and Pierre Chambert-Protat. I am very grateful for their help.

¹ The exact title of Philip's commentary is one of the many points currently unclear. Sichard's printed title is *In historiam Iob commentariorum libri tres*, while Ciccarese's is *Expositio in Iob*. In this paper, I have decided to use a shortened version of the title, *In Iob*.

bibliothek, Aug. perg. 193, fols. 1–262 (tenth century), in which the text is attributed to Hrabanus Maurus; and Paris, BnF, Lat. 12016, fols. 1–89 (eleventh century).

- PL 23.1407–1470, a printing of a collection of biblical glosses from the Book of Job that borrows widely from Philip's commentary found in St Petersburg, NLR, F.v.I.3 (second half of the eighth century). This manuscript also contains the Vulgate translation of Job and is used for critical editions of the Vulgate.

Neither of these two texts is the full version of Philip's commentary, although two diplomatic editions from the sixteenth century are available and provide a basis for the work of contemporary scholars. These editions were each printed from a single manuscript—not the same one—and cannot therefore take the place of a critical edition of Philip. The first was published by Johannes Sichard in Basel in 1527.² It relies on a manuscript that the publisher claims to have read in Fulda Abbey which has now been lost. The other edition, based on a manuscript from the Saint Victor Abbey—now Paris, Arsenal, 315—was published in 1545 by Jean de Roigny under the name of Bede the Venerable.³ As such, it was reprinted among the complete works of Bede by Johann Herwagen in Basel in 1563, and again in Cologne in 1612 and 1688.⁴ Both editions present Philip's commentary as divided into three books, representative of the manuscripts themselves. However, the commentary on Job was not reprinted in the PL,

² Philippus Presbyter, *In historiam Iob commentariorum libri tres*, ed. Johann Sichard (Adam Petrus: Basel, 1527).

³ Jean de Roigny, ed., *Venerabilis Bedae Presbyteri Theologi Doctissimi Juxta Ac Sanctissimi, Commentationum in Sacras Literas, Tomus Primus*, (Paris, 1545).

⁴ Johann Herwagen, ed., *Opera Bedae Venerabilis presbyteri anglosaxonis, uiri in diuinis atque humanis literis exercitissimi, omnia in octo tomos distincta*, (Basle, 1563); Anton Hierat and Johann Gymnich, eds., *Venerabilis Bedae Presbyteri Anglosaxonis, Viri sua aetate doctissimi. Opera quotquot reperiri potuerunt omnia*, (Cologne, 1612); and Johann Wilhelm Friessen II, ed., *Venerabilis Bedae Presbyteri saxonis, doctoris ecclesiae vere illuminati: Opera quotquot reperiri potuerunt omnia* (Cologne, 1688).

and consequently, no further investigation has been made regarding it, its dating, or its sources.⁵

The editions of Sichard and Roigny-Herwagen printed Philip's text divided into three books—a division also conveyed by all extant manuscripts—and forty-two chapters, following the contemporary chapter divisions of the Book of Job (i.e., Book I: ch.1–17; Book II: ch. 18–31; and Book III: ch. 32–42).

There are thirteen known manuscripts, several of which are fragmentary:

⁵ The first study of Philip's commentary was Desiderius Franses, 'Het Job-commentaar van Philippus Presbyter', *De Katholiek* 157 (1920): pp. 378–386 in which he investigated six possible manuscripts. See also André Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia: extraits des manuscrits latins de la reine Christine conservés au Vatican*, Studi e Testi 59 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1966), pp. 315–322, in which he focused on Vat. Reg. Lat. 111, a ninth-century manuscript. In Irénée Fransen, '*Le commentaire au livre de Job du prêtre Philippe*' (Lyons: Thèse de la Faculté Catholique de Lyon, 1949), the author conducted a preliminary study towards a critical edition. However, his list of manuscripts is far from being exhaustive and should not be used currently. Other works are Maria Pia Ciccarese, 'Filipo e i corvi di Giobbe 38,41: alla ricerca di una fonte perduta', *Augustinianum* 35 (1995) and investigations in 'Una esegesi "double face"', 'Filippo e i corvi di Giobbe' and 'Sulle orme di Gerolamo: la "Expositio in Iob" del presbitero Filippo', *Motivi letterari ed esegetici in Gerolamo: atti del Convegno tenuto a Trento il 5–7 dicembre 1995*, ed. Claudio Moreschini (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1997), where the author explains why Philip's work could be a witness to the Origenian exegesis of Job, and that his biblical text reflected an early stage of Jerome's translation on the book of Job. Ciccarese had planned a critical edition of the text to be published in the CCSL collection, but it is no longer on the agenda. Magdalena Jóźwiak, in her 'Commentary to the Story of Job by Philip Presbyter Versus the Epitome of the Work: A Monographic Article Conducive to Comparative Research on these Texts', *Vox Patrum* 62: *Festschrift in Honour of Rev. Prof. Franciszek Drączowski* (September 2014): pp. 185–95 explained the way the anonymous author of PL 26 deals with Philip's original commentary. Finally, Kenneth B. Steinhauser, in 'Job in Patristics Commentaries and Theological Works', *A Companion to Job in the Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 34–70, had discussed the delicate matters of the commentary dating and whether Sichard's edition is reliable, as well as reviewing nearly all the literature on Philip from 1920 to 2016.

- Cambrai, BM, 470, eighth century, fols. 205, complete and originally from England.
- The Hague, Huis van het boek (*olim* MW), 10 A 1, fols. 1–41, 44–199, first half of the eighth century, originally from Tours. The manuscript contains the three books, except for a short missing portion.
- Paris, BnF, lat. 1839, ninth century, fols. 123–200v, likely originated in Eastern France and has only the text of the third book.
- Troyes, Médiathèque Jacques-Chirac (*olim* BM), 552, second half of the ninth century, fols. 1–88v, + Paris, BnF, lat. 1764, fols. 9–10. Its origin is uncertain. The first eight chapters of Book I and part of the ninth chapter are missing.
- Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 111, second half of the ninth century, fols. 1–99v, originally from Western France. The manuscript lacks the end of Book III, from the middle of chapter 40 to the end of chapter 42.
- Oxford, Bodleian, Bodl. 426 [SC 2327], ninth century, fols. 1–118v, originally from England. The manuscript only contains Books I and II.
- Troyes, Médiathèque Jacques-Chirac (*olim* BM), 559, end of the ninth century, fols. 119–238v, may originate in Auxerre. Book III is missing, as is the end of Book II.
- Paris, BnF, Lat. 12157, ninth century, fols. 97v–116v, 88–95v, 117–142. The manuscript has only Book III. Gorman believes that it was copied from Paris BnF lat. 1839.
- Berne, Burgerbibliothek, 99, ninth century, fols. 1–8, fols. 170–171, fragments most likely originating in Western France.
- Paris, BnF, nouv. acq. lat. 2332, ninth century, fol. 3, one-folio fragment.
- Paris, Arsenal, 315, eleventh century, 116 fols., printed by Jean de Roigny under Bede's name. It lacks only one bifolium.
- Florence, BML, San Marco 722, twelfth century, 246 fols., nearly complete, lacking only the last chapter of Book III.

- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 437 (*olim* A.82), fourteenth century, fols. 102–175v, complete.⁶

If Sichard's assertions in his preface are to be believed, his own edition is based on a twelfth-century manuscript. However, as sources and dates were not provided, we cannot know whether his dating is correct or where it was copied.

To date, no one has made a full classification or tried to establish a stemma of these manuscripts. Michael Gorman identifies two main families of manuscripts, Cambrai, BM 470 and The Hague MW 10 A 1 being the head of each. He also asserts that Sichard's manuscript, which belongs to the Cambrai BM 470 family, is witness to an inferior recension, while Kenneth Steinhauser asserts that Sichard has *lectiones difficiliores* and should therefore be regarded as a more reliable witness.

Only the completion of a thorough critical edition will lead us to determine which family of manuscripts is closer to the original text. Initial surveys of the manuscripts have led to the conclusion that Sichard's text contains unique textual variations against all other extant manuscripts.⁷ Therefore, it may still belong to a more reliable family of manuscripts whilst not constituting the most reliable witness for its family, but Cambrai BM 470 would provide a better text for this family of witnesses.

PHILIP AND THE DATING OF *IN IOB*

Much is unknown about Philip's life. Apart from the manuscript of his commentary on Job, he is known solely by a notice in Gennadius of Massilia's *De viris illustribus* (LXII):

⁶ The most important study, and the only complete one, of Philip's commentary manuscripts is Michael M. Gorman, 'The Manuscripts and Printed Editions of the Commentary on Job by Philippus', *Revue bénédictine* 116 (2006): pp. 193–222. My work on Philip is deeply indebted to his detailed research. The list of manuscripts with which I provide here is a summary of his work. For further details, see pp. 200–206.

⁷ This is true of Philip's own words and his biblical citations. For example, see Sichard, *In historiam Iob*, vol. II, p. 82, where the citation of 1 Cor 11:10 is: *debet mulier uelamen habere supra caput propter angelos*; but all the manuscripts convey *debet mulier potestatem habere supra caput propter angelos*.

Philippus presbyter, optimus auditor Hieronymi, commentatus In Iob edidit sermone simplici librum. Legi eius et familiares epistulas et valde salsas et maxime ad paupertatis et dolorum tolerantiam exhortatorias. Moritur Marciano et Avito regnantibus.

Philip the priest, **Jerome's best disciple**, published a book of commentary on Job in simple language. I also read his letters to his relatives, which were full of spirit and encouraged them very strongly to endure poverty and torment. He died while Marcian and Avitus were reigning.

The biographical note about Philip comes immediately after that of John Cassian and before that of Eucherius of Lyons, suggesting that Philip, who has today largely fallen into oblivion, benefitted from a certain level of notoriety. Marcian was Roman Emperor of the East from 450 to 457 CE and Avitus was Roman emperor of the West from July 455 to October 456 CE. Philip's death would have occurred around 455 CE. The placement of his short biography in Gennadius's work may suggest that he died in Provence, and this place of death can be a clue to resolve the complex problem of *In Iob's* dating.

Philip's commentary is the first known Latin commentary on Job to use Jerome's translation as the basis of its biblical quotations. The dating of the text is still disputed, and much of the debate is based mainly on the identification of Nectarius, who is mentioned in the dedicatory epistle preceding the commentary:

Adhortante te, immo potius compellente, Nectari pater beatissime

'Because you impelled me to do it, or rather you forced me to do it, Nectarius, blessed father...'⁸

Kenneth Steinhauser, following others, identifies Nectarius with the Patriarch of Constantinople from 381 CE to his death in 397 CE.⁹ By contrast, Michael Gorman considers that Nectarius of Constantinople would have been too high-ranking a figure to be addressed with the level of language of the dedication.¹⁰ For this

⁸ Sichard, *In historiam Iob*, p. 1.

⁹ Steinhauser, 'Job in Patristic Commentaries and Theological Works', p. 47.

¹⁰ Gorman, 'The Manuscripts and Printed Editions', p. 195.

reason, he believes that the Nectarius to whom the commentary was dedicated would have been a less important bishop—Nectarius, Bishop of Avignon (439–455 CE).

It seems to me that the words *pater beatissime* are not sufficient criteria to identify Nectarius. Indeed, in the fourth and fifth centuries, *beatissime pater* is used in letters addressed to bishops, included high-profile bishops. Paulinus of Nola calls Alypius of Thagaste, Delphinus of Bordeaux and Florentius of Cahors *beatissime pater*.¹¹ It is also true that Augustine of Hippo is called *domine merito uenerabilis et uere beatissime pater* by Quodvultdeus, though this is a more unctuous formulation than Philip's dedication.¹² Michael Gorman also wonders how Philip could have been in contact with the patriarch of Constantinople, given that he was a 'mere' priest. But if history has recorded his name as *optimus auditor Hieronymi*, 'Jerome's best pupil', it may very well be that Jerome introduced Philip to Nectarius of Constantinople. The wording of the dedication and its presumed obsequiousness are not sufficient to identify the recipient of the letter with confidence. Instead, other aspects may help to shed more light on this issue.

The current consensus dates Jerome's revision of the Book of Job to approximately 394 CE.¹³ On the basis of the study of Philip's quotations from the translations of the Hebrew canon and the Greek books of the Hebrew Bible, Kenneth Steinhauser's dating is, in my opinion, to be preferred.¹⁴ Indeed, when he is quoting

¹¹ See Letters to Alypius of Thagaste; Delphin of Bordeaux; and Florent of Cahors, in Paulinus of Nola, *Letters of St. Paulinus of Nola*, vol. 1, trans. P.G. Walsh (New York: Newman Press, 1966).

¹² Quodvultdeus, *Letters*, 221, p. 2.

¹³ Jérôme, *Préfaces aux livres de la Bible*, SC 592, trans. Aline Canellis (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2017), p. 392.

¹⁴ Even while there is no critical edition of *In Iob*, the study of the manuscripts is sufficient to prove which Latin translation Philip was using for which biblical books. Indeed, there are no significant variants in the biblical lemmas in the different groups of manuscripts that would leave the question of an Old Latin or Vulgate citation undecided. When the case remains undecided, it is because the Vulgate translator—Jerome or someone else—has kept an Old Latin rendition as their own translation.

books that Jerome had finished revising, Philip uses the Hieronymian revisions rather than the Old Latin to quote the Hebrew Bible or deuterocanonical books, even when comparisons with the Old Latin are part of his exegesis. Apart from the Psalms—for which he always quotes Jerome's translation of the Septuagint—Philip uses Jerome's revised version to quote from Genesis, Numbers, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, Malachi, and Jonah. Quotations from Deuteronomy are a mixture of Vulgate and Old Latin. Those of Isaiah and Proverbs come, at times, from Jerome's revisions, at times from the Old Latin and also from sources not always identified. As Jerome translated the Pentateuch in one sitting, either Philip is simply not consistent in the translations he used of the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books, or he used Jerome's available translations as he was writing his commentary on Job without the translation of the Pentateuch and Isaiah being fully available. If this is the case, the relative chronology of Jerome's translations would require revision: it is currently assumed that Jerome translated Isaiah before the Pentateuch, and the most common opinion on the Pentateuch places its translation ca. 398 CE. However, while he sometimes uses the Vulgate version of the Pentateuch, Philip most often quotes Isaiah in the Old Latin. The only dating hypothesis for Jerome's revisions that would match Philip's quotations is the one put forward by Roger Gryson in which the Pentateuch would have been translated in 393 CE and Isaiah around 390–392 CE.¹⁵ Nevertheless, an alternative hypothesis regarding Philip's pattern of quotations from the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books may be preferred.

It is certain that Jerome had finished his revision of the Book of Job when Philip wrote his commentary, as Philip is using it for the lemmas on which he is commenting. Philip's quotations from the Pentateuch and Isaiah may lead one to think that Jerome was still working on both revisions and that neither had yet been finalised while Philip wrote *In Iob*. Therefore, Jerome's revision of the Book of Job, which we believe to have been completed in

¹⁵ Hermann Josef Frede and Roger Gryson, *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel* (Freiburg: Herder, 2004), pp. 536–537, 542–544, 546–547.

394 CE, may have been completed a little earlier than 394 CE, possibly around 392 CE. This period is commonly thought to be when Jerome also completed the revision of the Twelve Prophets which, as we saw, Philip quotes consistently.¹⁶ The revisions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel were assuredly completed before 393 CE, perhaps around 390 CE.¹⁷ From these observations the following hypothesis can be drawn: Philip would have written *In Iob* around 392 CE, when Jerome's revision had been completed. At this time, the revisions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve Prophets would have also been completed and Jerome would have been working on the Pentateuch and Isaiah, with Philip having Jerome's work at hand. In this case, there would be no complexity with Philip's quotations from the Hebrew Bible and this hypothesis would be chronologically coherent.

However, one may argue that it was common for a Christian Latin writer to use Old Latin quotations as well as the Vulgate long after Jerome had completed his revision of the Latin Bible. Further inquiries are therefore necessary to establish the value of the biblical material for the dating of this commentary. Furthermore, a pre-394 CE dating of Philip's commentary would also raise the problem of Philip's age when he wrote it. If he died—as Gennadius asserts—around 455 CE, he would have died a very old man and would have written his commentary whilst still very young, without revising his text once or writing any other biblical commentaries in his subsequent, sixty-one years. My current work on this commentary would lead me to believe that Philip is using rabbinical exegetical material that Jerome was also using in Bethlehem. If this is true, he would not have had access to it if he had written his commentary in Provence towards the end of his life. The matters of dating may also impact the study of the presbyter's New Testament quotations, as Philip's attitude towards the Latin text of the Hebrew Bible and deuterocanonical books corresponds to his use of the Old Latin and Vulgate in the text of the New Testament. Nevertheless, one

¹⁶ Canellis, *Préfaces aux livres de la Bible*, p. 466.

¹⁷ Canellis, *Préfaces aux livres de la Bible*, pp. 97–98, 438 and 444.

can still study Philip's New Testament material with great benefit even while the dating of his commentary remains disputed.

PHILIP'S NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

Although Philip's commentary is on a book of the Hebrew canon, there are many New Testament quotations in his work. They are easily identifiable in both the Old and New Testament, as Philip frequently introduces his quotations with introductory formulae such as *sicut dicitur in Psalmo/Euangelio/...*, *sicut Euangelium/propheta/psalmista ait*, *secundum Euangelium*, *ut ait Apostolus* or *de quo dicit in Euangelium/in Euangelio*. There are approximately 275 New Testament quotations in *In Iob's* forty-two chapters—or the 210 pages of Sichard's edition. Indeed, it would seem that Philip's exegesis is based on at least three main points: highlighting Hebrew etymologies and using rabbinical exegesis in a Christianised way; providing comparisons between the translation of the Vulgate and other textual traditions of the Bible; and drawing up typologies—Job being seen as a prefiguration of Christ. This third point explains the frequent use of New Testament quotations. The examples provided here are far from exhaustive but this chapter's expressed aim is to suggest some avenues of analysis for Philip's choices of New Testament quotations.

When Philip quotes the New Testament, his preference seems to be the Old Latin versions. Still, this general tendency is far from systematic. Indeed, it appears to depend on the dating of Philip's work. The Hieronymian revision of the Gospels had been completed before Philip began to compose his commentary, for Jerome's revision took place in 383 or 384 CE. It is very likely then, that the Catholic Epistles had been revised at the time Philip was composing his commentary. Indeed, at that time the Vulgate text of the Epistle of James is quoted in Letter 41 of Pseudo-Jerome (384 CE) and the Vulgate text of the Epistle of Jude is used by Jerome, in 386 CE. As far as the translations of the Pauline Epistles are concerned, their revision is probably later, although we have no certainty. In the context of the present work, it must also be noted that it is not always possible to distinguish clearly between the text revised or retranslated by Jerome and the Old

Latin text, especially when the text of Jerome or his disciples appropriates one of the Old Latin translations. When Philip quotes a verse that has remained identical in both the Old Latin and in the Vulgate, we cannot *a priori* affirm that he is quoting the Vulgate and not the Old Latin.

On the basis of the gospel quotations used by Philip, we can see that, although he quotes the Vulgate at times, he does not hesitate to quote the Old Latin as well, even when it is known that Jerome's revision had, by then, already been finalised and was, in all likelihood, available to Philip. This is observable in two telling examples:

- **John 8:56** (*In Iob I, 14; p. 52*): *Abraham pater uester concupiuit ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gauisus est.*¹⁸
Vulgate: *Abraham pater uester exultauit ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gauisus est.*
- **Luke 11:21** (*In Iob III, 40; p. 200*) *cum fortis armatus custodit domum suam in pace sunt ea quae possidet.*
Vulgate: *cum fortis armatus custodit atrium suum in pace sunt ea quae possidet.*

The following question requires further consideration: when Philip's quoted text differs from the Vulgate, where does his biblical text come from? Several sources are identifiable: 1) Philip's quotation is matched in one or more other patristic (or other) sources, without any variation in vocabulary or syntax; 2) his quotation combines several known translations of the same verse; 3) at times, part of the translation quoted by him is a rendering or a formulation that is currently undocumented elsewhere.

Quotations matched in other authors

Whereas Philip sometimes has renderings of biblical passages that are unique to him, he relies primarily on formulations found in other Church Fathers and Christian Writers in the fourth and fifth centuries.

¹⁸ The pagination used for quotations of Philip's commentary is that of Sichard's 1527 edition.

- **Luke 4:34** (*In Iob* II, 21; p. 86): *quid uenisti ante tempus perdere nos?*¹⁹

Vulgate: *quid nobis et tibi Iesu Nazarene uenisti perdere nos?*

At the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth century, this particular textual variant is known only to Augustine and is frequently used by him throughout his work (e.g., *Adnotationes in Iob*; *City of God*; *Sermons*; *Homilies on the First Epistle of St John*). Two Old Latin manuscripts also have this variant: VL 4 (Codex Veronensis), with an Italian Old Latin text from the fourth century, and VL 6 (Codex Colbertinus), part of which is an ancient Old Latin form (for example, in Luke).²⁰

- **John 8:44** (*In Iob*, II, 24; p. 98): *ille homicida fuit ab initio*

Vulgate: *ille homicida erat ab initio*

This reading can be found in Old Latin manuscripts as well as in the writings of the Church Fathers. The Old Latin manuscripts are: VL 4; VL 5 (Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis), a bilingual manuscript copied around 400 CE; VL 10 (Codex Brixianus), close to the Vulgate but with some similarities to the Old Latin and the Gothic versions; VL 11 (Codex Rehdigeranus), whose text is an Italian Old Latin from the end of the fourth century; VL 14 (Codex Usserianus primus), whose Old Latin text is typical of a Welsh-Irish textual family; and VL 15 (Codex Aureus Holmiensis), whose text is nearly identical to the Vulgate but retains Old Latin features.²¹ Quotations of this verse identical to Philip's text are also found in the *Quaestiones Veteris et Noui Testamenti* of Ambrosiaster, probably written in Rome between 370 and 375 CE,

¹⁹ All examples in this chapter are cases when all manuscripts—or all but one—agree on a rendition that can be safely assumed to be Philip's choice of wording. There are cases of biblical quotations for which a critical edition of the commentary is required before studying them: these are not included here.

²⁰ H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 212–213.

²¹ Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, pp. 212–219.

and Rufinus' translations of Origen, believed to have been finalised later than Philip's *In Iob*.²²

- **Revelation 9:17** (*In Iob* III, 41; p. 204): *et ex ore eorum exiit ignis et fumus et sulphur.*
Vulgate: *et de ore ipsorum procedit ignis et fumus et sulphur.*

Ex ore eorum exit is text-type K, an African translation. The formulation can be traced to Cyprian of Carthage and is supposed by Roger Gryson to have been used by Tyconius in his commentary on Revelation.²³ This reading is known only from Church Fathers and is not contained in any Old Latin manuscripts.

Philip's text combines several known translations

In these particular instances, none of the parts of the verse quoted by Philip are without parallel in Christian literature and in Latin biblical manuscripts, but the passages as a whole are a combination of the parts, resulting in phrasing unique to *In Iob*.

- **John 8:56** (*In Iob* I, 14; Sichard p. 52): *Abraham pater uester concupiuit, ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gauisus est.*
Vulgate: *Abraham pater uester exultauit ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gauisus est.*

The first part of the verse, *Abraham pater uester concupiuit*, is not paralleled in any Old Latin manuscripts, but is used both by Augustine and by Quodvultdeus.²⁴ However, for both authors, the second part of the verse is not the same as appears in *In Iob*. Augustine's full rendering appears as: *Abraham pater uester*

²² Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones Veteris et Noui Testamenti*, ed. Alexander Souter (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1908), p. 150; J.P. Migne, PL 12, *In Exodum Homiliae* VIII, pp. 350–361.

²³ While Gryson has published a reconstruction of Tyconius's *Commentary on Revelation*, Steinhauser earlier maintained that such a commentary cannot be reconstructed; see Kenneth B. Steinhauser, 'The Structure of Tyconius' Apocalypse Commentary: A Correction', VC 35 (1981): pp. 354–357.

²⁴ J.P. Migne, PL 42, p. 678; Quodvultdeus, *Sermo IV: Contra Iudaeos, paganos et Arianos* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), p. 5.

concupiuit me uidere; et uidit, et gauisus est, while Quodvultdeus' rendering appears as: *Abraham pater uester concupiuit uidere diem meum et uidit et gauisus est*.

Philip's second part of the verse, *ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gauisus est*, is both an Old Latin and a Vulgate rendering, but the peculiar combination with Philip's formulation of the first part of the verse is almost exclusive to *In Iob*. Indeed, Philip's complete quotation (*Abraham pater uester concupiuit, ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gauisus est*) is used only in Florus of Lyons' anthology, where Florus provides excerpts from Avitus of Vienne.²⁵ Avitus, a sixth-century bishop from Gaul, is thus the only author to quote the entire verse in the same formulation as Philip. Did Avitus know it through Philip or did Philip and Avitus independently rely on the same source? There seems to be no way to know.

- **John 18:28** (*In Iob* Prologus; Sichard p. 2) *Et ipsi non intrauerunt praetorium, ne contaminerentur*.²⁶

Vulgate: *Ipsi non introierunt in praetorium ut non contaminarentur*.

The segment *non intrauerunt* is not specific to Philip. It is found in the text reconstructed by Roger Gryson of Tyconius' commentary on Revelation and in two Old Latin manuscripts: VL 13 (Codex Monacensis or Codex Valerianus), whose Old Latin text is close to the biblical text of Arian authors and VL 14.²⁷ It should be noted that these two manuscripts do not translate the Greek ἵνα μὴ

²⁵ Florus of Lyons, *Collectio ex dictis XII Patrum, Dicta Aviti Viennensis, pars III* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), p. 352.

²⁶ Since the difference between Old Latin and Hieronymian revision lies in the choice of the verb, *intrauerunt* or *introierunt*, I choose to include this example in my paper even if the *In Iob* manuscripts do not agree on the use of the preposition *in* after *intrauerunt*. However, all agree against Sichard. Indeed, Cambrai BM 470, The Hague MW 10 A 1, Vatican BAV Reg. Lat. 111, Troyes BM 552, Oxford BL Bodl. 426, Paris Arsenal 315, Bern BB 99, Florence BML San Marco 722 and Madrid BN 437 convey the rendition *non intrauerunt praetorium*, while Sichard has printed *non intrauerunt in praetorium*.

²⁷ Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, pp. 217–218.

μικροῦσιν as *ne contaminerentur*, so that they do not share with Philip the second part of the quotation.

- **Luke 11:21** (*In Job III, 40; Sichard p. 200*) *cum fortis armatus custodit domum suam in pace sunt ea quae possidet.*
Vulgate: *cum fortis armatus custodit atrium suum in pace . . .*

The reading *custodit domum suam* has a co-witness in the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaëum*, dated later than Philip's commentary:

*Quamdiu fortis armatus custodit domum suam, in tuto sunt omnia eius: cum autem venerit fortior, diripiet vasa eius.*²⁸

At least three VL manuscripts convey the same reading: VL 10 (Codex Brixianus), VL 14 (Codex Usserianus Primus) and VL 16 (Fragmenta Sangallensia or Fragmenta Curiensia), fragments of an early Italian manuscript.²⁹

- **2 Cor 10:7** *Si quis confidit se esse seruum Christi, hoc cogitet intra se, quia sicut ipse Christi est, ita et nos.* (*In Job I, 12; p. 47*)
Vulgate: *Si quis confidit sibi Christi se esse hoc cogitet iterum apud se quia sicut ipse Christi est ita et nos.*

Se esse seruum/seruus Christi is attested as a minority variant in a work by Ambrosiaster.³⁰ A variant of the word order, *se Christi seruum esse*, is also found in at least three Old Latin manuscripts: VL 75 (Codex Claromontanus; Paris, BnF, grec 107–107A–107B), with the bilingual text-type D—whose origin is disputed; VL 76 (Codex Sangermanensis; St Petersburg, NLR, F.v.XX), a copy of VL 75; and VL 78 (Codex Augiensis; Cambridge, Trinity College, B.17.1), which is often close to the Vulgate.³¹ *Hoc cogitet intra se* is also not found here in Latin Christian literature. The formulation may be a contamination due to familiarity with Mark 2:8 (*quo statim cognito Iesus spiritu suo quia sic cogitarent intra se dicit illis quid ista cogitatis in cordibus vestris*) and Lk 12:17 (*et*

²⁸ *Opus imperfectum in Matthaëum*, pp. xx, 7, 24, l. 54.

²⁹ Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, pp. 219–220.

³⁰ Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Pauli epistulas ad Corinthios* (recensio α), ad Cor. II, 10,7.

³¹ Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, pp. 243–245.

cogitabat intra se dicens quid faciam quod non habeo quo congregem fructus meos), but the formulation is also present in two VL manuscripts, VL 61 (the Book of Armagh; Dublin, Trinity College, Ms 52)—whose text of the Pauline Epistles is a revised Old Latin form—and VL 77 (the bilingual Codex Boernerianus; Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, A. 145b) whose text is very close to VL 75.³² As the first part of the quotation is also known from VL manuscripts, it seems plausible that Philip used an existing Old Latin text here.

- **Luke 12:32** (*In Iob* II, 31; Sichard, p. 135) *nolite timere pusillus grex quia placuit patri uestro dare uobis regnum*.
Vulgate: *nolite timere pusillus grex quia conplacuit patri uestro dare uobis regnum*.

The use of *placuit* in this verse is nowhere to be found in Latin patristic literature. However, there are mediaeval witnesses with this reading and it is also found in one of the oldest Old Latin manuscripts, VL 3 (Codex Vercellensis; Vercelli, Archivio Capitolare Eusebiano, s. n.), probably copied in the second half of the fourth century.³³ The variant can also be found in Vat. Reg. lat. 49, a late ninth- or tenth-century manuscript known as *Catechesis Celtica*. However, according to Martin McNamara, the part of the collection in which the verse is quoted—no. 32—is not one in which Irish affiliations can be detected.³⁴

All of Philip's quotations that combine several different families of Old Latin translations fall, in my opinion, into the category of 'mental text' as Hugh Houghton has defined it—a biblical rendering with characteristics typical of citations made by memory.³⁵ Philip seems to use his own Latin version which he

³² Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, pp. 237 and 244.

³³ Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, p. 15.

³⁴ Martin McNamara, 'Sources and Affiliations of the Catechesis Cellica (MS Vat. Reg. lat. 49)', *The Bible and the Apocrypha in the Early Irish Church, A.D. 600–1200: Collected Essays* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), pp. 217–218.

³⁵ H.A.G. Houghton, 'The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 395–396.

has assembled from fragments of different biblical translations available to him—though this was not a deliberate but a subconscious activity. Therefore, Philip's text cannot be confused with another rendering and only reflects the 'mental text' used by Philip from several different textual traditions of the Latin Bible. Researchers must therefore be very attentive when investigating the different sources which would have led to the rearranged biblical quotation.

A similar phenomenon occurs with Philip's quotations of the Hebrew Bible. Striking examples are Isaiah 53:4 and 53:7:

- **Isaiah 53:4** (*In Iob* II, 31; p. 140) *ipse infirmitates nostras suscepit et pro nobis dolet* . . .

Vulgate: *uere languores nostros ipse tulit et dolores nostros ipse portauit* . . .

Pro nobis dolet is characteristic of the third century, African Old Latin tradition (the K text-type); *infirmitates* is unique to Augustine, and *suscepit* is an X text-type—an early text which is possibly an *ad hoc* translation of Greek.³⁶

- **Isaiah 53:7** (*In Iob* II, 31; p. 140) *sicut ouis ad uictimam ductus et sicut agnus agnus tondentem se sine uoce, sic non aperuit os suum*.

Vulgate: *sicut ouis ad occisionem ducetur et quasi agnus coram tondente obmutescet et non aperiet os suum*.

"Ductus" is also found in Augustinian biblical quotations; *ad uictimam* is both X and K text-type; *sicut* is common to Origen and African texts (the European tradition and Augustine have *tamquam*); *tondentem sine uoce* is African.

Even if Philip's attitude towards New Testament quotations seems to differ from his method of quoting the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books, by using Old Latin for the New Testament—even though Jerome's revisions are already available to him—his use of memorised biblical verses is common in all the biblical books where he seems at times unwittingly to create an idiosyncratic mixture of different textual traditions.

³⁶ On the different text-types of the Old Latin Bibles, see Houghton, 'The Use of the Latin Fathers', pp. 385–387.

All or part of Philip's quotation has no known co-witness

Finally, there are cases in which some or even the entire quotation from Philip has no surviving parallel in late antique or medieval literature or in the manuscripts of Latin biblical translations.

- **Luke 1:78–79** (*In Iob* I,1; p. 4) *per uiscera misericordiae Dei, quibus uisitauit*³⁷ *nos Oriens ex alto / ut illuminaret positos in tenebris et umbra mortis . . .*
Vulgate: *Per uiscera misericordiae Dei nostri in quibus uisitauit nos oriens ex alto / inluminare his qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent . . .*

Echoes of *positos in tenebris et umbra mortis* are found in a quotation from a sixth-century text, the *Passio sancti Andreae*, which appears in the collection gathered under the name of *Virtutes apostolorum* attributed to Pseudo-Abdias:

*ut homines **positos in tenebris et umbra mortis** per uerbum Dei ad uiam ueritatis et luminis reuocarem*³⁸

This is the closest resemblance to Philip's variant reading of Luke 1:79 which can currently be found, and dates more than one century after Philip's *In Iob*. Was the biblical text used in the *Virtutes apostolorum* influenced by Philip or does the peculiar wording derive from a common source? There are currently no answers to this question.

- **1 Pet. 4:1** (*In Iob* III,37; Sichard p. 462) *Christus igitur in carne passo et uos eodem sensu armamini, quia passus est in carne . . .*

³⁷ Sichard's edition conveys *quibus uisitauit*, in accordance with Cambrai BM 470, which belongs to the same manuscripts group. However, as the manuscripts The Hague MW 10 A 1, Vatican BAV Reg lat. 111, Troyes BM 559, Bern Burgerbibliothek 99, Paris Arsenal 315, Madrid BN 437, and Florence BML San Marco 722 all convey *in quibus uisitauit*, I am still unsure of Philip's exact rendition and will not discuss Lk 1:78 in this paper. However, Lk 1:79's variant *positos in tenebris and umbra mortis* is attested in all the manuscripts, alongside Sichard's edition.

³⁸ Maximilien Bonnet, ed., 'Passio Sancti Andreae Apostoli', *Analecta Bollandia* 13 (1894): p. 374.

Vulgate: *Christo igitur passo in carne et uos eadem cogitatione armamini quia qui passus est carne desiit a peccatis.*

Eodem sensu is a translation that only Philip quotes. It is present in all the manuscripts of *In Iob*, and it must therefore be original to the text used by Philip. No other Old Latin manuscripts convey this reading, and it is currently unparalleled in late antique and mediaeval literature.

I have demonstrated above that several biblical quotations from Philip are not *hapax legomena* but can be linked to known variants. It seems, therefore, that it would be unwise to infer from the absence of known textual parallels that Philip, in these instances without surviving parallels, did not rely on any Latin tradition at all. Did he translate these two passages from Greek himself? It is unlikely, as in Luke 1:79 there is no obvious variant to *καθημένοις* in Greek which would justify the translation with *positos*. It could therefore be that the biblical quotations of Philip which have no parallels are witnesses to biblical textual variants which are otherwise lost.

PHILIP'S SOURCES FOR BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

The purpose of this paper is not to provide an in-depth investigation into the origins of the translations used by Philip. However, after searching for other witnesses to Philip's New Testament quotations, some interesting points should be noted. First, there is a kinship between some of his quotations and Augustine's biblical quotations. Secondly, Philip had a definite knowledge of, or access to, African Old Latin texts. Thirdly, there are several cases of common wordings between *In Iob* and manuscripts VL 10 and VL 14. These hypotheses are still to be verified by an exhaustive study of all the biblical quotations, but they corroborate the initial observations I have been able to make on the study of the text of the Hebrew Bible and deuterocanonical books and reflect on the two Isaiah examples provided. In my opinion, there may also be a kinship between Philip's biblical text and the one of Tyconius as reconstructed by Gryson.

As for Philip's similarities with the biblical text quoted by Augustine, these do not relate exclusively to the New Testament.

Indeed, Philip often quotes translations of the book of Job other than the Hieronymian translation of the lemma on which he comments. These translations are often found in Augustine's works as well. The question that arises is therefore one of chronology: Philip's manner of quoting the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books prompt me to date the commentary prior to 397 CE, as dating it between 440 and 450 CE seems inconsistent with the state of the biblical text of Philip's Latin version of the Hebrew Bible. However, the readings of Latin translations which, apart from Philip, can only be found in Augustine's works are traditionally dated after 397 CE. Did Augustine and Philip draw separately from the same sources? Which of the two read the other one and became influenced by the wording of the biblical materials? This is one of the many points which a critical edition of Philip's text will clarify. Definite conclusions regarding Philip's links to the textual traditions represented by VL 10 and VL 14 cannot be drawn from so few examples. Like the two preceding points, they call for deeper investigations of Philip's biblical sources for his New Testament quotations.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the biblical quotations presented suggests that the choice of textual traditions quoted by Philip does not depend on the books being quoted. The Gospels as well as the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, and even Revelation, are quoted both in the Vulgate and in textual traditions other than the revisions undertaken by Jerome or following him. Overall, Philip's attitude toward the New Testament text thus seems to follow a more flexible and less systematic approach than his quotations of the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books. This could depend on whether Jerome's revisions of the biblical translations were completed when he was writing *In Iob*. Is Philip thus following in the footsteps of his master, whose preference for the Hebrew books was well known and who did not pay the same attention to the revision of New Testament translations as he had to the Hebrew Scriptures? It is plausible, even if there can be no formal proof. Nevertheless, with regard to the Hebrew canon and to the Greek deuterocanonical books, biblical quotations used by Philip

suggest that he had a very extensive selection of documents at hand. For the Hebrew canon, he appears to be familiar with Jewish biblical commentaries. This detailed knowledge of textual traditions is reflected in the diversity of traditions reflected in the New Testament quotations of Philip. When scholars find a New Testament quotation in Philip's work that does not have any extant parallel, the example of 1 Pet. 4:1 mentioned above would lead us to suppose that Philip's wording and formulation is testimony to an otherwise unpreserved form of the VL. Finally, a study of Philip's biblical quotations shows that the question of the provenance of Philip's biblical material is inseparable from that of the dating of the work. As I have argued in this chapter, this seems to be resolvable by a revised dating of around 392 CE based on Latin quotations of the Hebrew Bible. Further study of the sources on which Philip drew to quote the Latin Bible will continue to be necessary, and a critical edition of *In Iob* will need carefully to assess the evidence that can help us understand Philip's biblical material.

