



Philippus Presbyter's Commentary on Job: A Source for the Study of Latin Translations of the New Testament

Marie Frey Rébeillé-Borgella

► To cite this version:

Marie Frey Rébeillé-Borgella. Philippus Presbyter's Commentary on Job: A Source for the Study of Latin Translations of the New Testament. Twelfth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Jan 2021, Birmingham, United Kingdom. hal-03345463

HAL Id: hal-03345463

<https://hal.science/hal-03345463>

Submitted on 15 Sep 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

PHILIPPUS PRESBYTER'S COMMENTARY ON JOB: A SOURCE FOR THE STUDY OF LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT¹

PHILIP'S COMMENTARY ON JOB²

The lemmatic commentary that Philip, a priest and disciple of Jerome, wrote on the book of Job has not been critically edited. One of the reasons for this probably lies in the fact 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 *Patrologia* and could therefore be mistaken as 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 106, p. 1-266 (ninth century); Karlsruhe Aug. perg. 193, f. 1-262 (tenth century), in which the text is attributed to Hrabanus Maurus; Paris lat. 12016, f. 1-89 (eleventh century).
- PL 23 (1407-1470), a printing of a collection of biblical glosses from the Book of Job that borrow widely from Philip's commentary, that comes from a St Petersburg manuscript, F.v.I.3. (second half of the eighth century), which also has the Vulgate translation of Job according to the Hebraic text and is therefore used for critical editions of the Vulgate.

But neither of these two texts is the full text of Philip's commentary. Two printed editions from the sixteenth century are nevertheless available and provide a basis for work of contemporary scholars. These editions were each printed from a single manuscript - not the same one - and they cannot therefore take the place of a critical edition of Philip. The first one has been published by Johannes Sichardus in Basel in 1527. 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 Arsenal 315, was published in Paris in 1545 by Jean de Roigny under the name of Bede the Venerable. As such, it was then reprinted among Bede's whole works, by Johann Herwagen in Basel in 1563, and in Cologne in 1612 and 1688. Both editions are presenting Philip's commentary as divided into three books, as is the case for the manuscripts themselves. However, the commentary on Job was not reprinted in the *Patrologia*, and as a consequence scholarship did not very much investigate it, its datation, or its sources.

¹ This paper has widely benefited from the thoughts and comments of Laurence Mellerin and Pierre Chambert-Protat. I am very grateful for their help.

² The exact title of Philip's commentary is one of the many points currently unclear. SICHARDUS's printed title is *In historiam Iob commentariorum libri tres*, while CICCARESE is using *Expositio in Iob*. In this paper, I chose therefore to use a shortened version of the title, *In Iob*.

Sichard and Roigny-Herwagen editions are printing Philip's text divided into three books - which division is also conveyed by all the currently known manuscripts - and forty-two chapters, following the now-traditional divisions in chapters of the Book of Job: Book I: ch.1-17; Book II: ch. 18-31; Book III: ch. 32-42.

There are eleven known manuscripts of, several of whom are very incomplete:

- Cambrai *Bibliothèque municipale* 470, eight century, ff. 205, is complete and comes from England.
- From the first half of eight century is also The Hague *Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum* 10 A 1, f. 1-41, 44-199, originally from Tours, that contains the three books, except for a short excerpt missing.
- Paris *Bibliothèque nationale de France* lat. 1839, ninth century, f. 123-200v, probably from Eastern France, has only the text of the third book.
- Troyes *Bibliothèque municipale* 552, f. l-88v, + Paris *Bibliothèque nationale de France* lat. 1764, f. 9-10, backs to the second half of the ninth century. It is unsure where it comes from. The first eight chapters of Book I and part of the ninth chapter are missing.
- Vatican City *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* Reg. lat. 111, f. l-99v, second half of the ninth century, West France, lacks the end of Book III, from the middle to chapter 40 to the end of chapter 42.
- Oxford *Bodleian Library* Bodl. 426 [SC 2327], f. 1-118v, ninth century, England, has only Books I and II.
- Troyes *Bibliothèque municipale* 559, f. 119-238v, is from the end of ninth century and may come from Auxerre. Book III is missing, as is the end of Book II.
- Paris *Bibliothèque nationale de France* lat. 12157, f. 97v-116v, 88-95v, 117-142, backs also to ninth century. It has only Book III. GORMAN holds it has been copied on Paris *BNF* lat. 1839.
- Berne *Burgerbibliothek* 99, f. 1-8, f. 170-171, are fragments from a ninth-century manuscript, coming most probably from Western France, and has been copied in the ninth century.
- Paris *Bibliothèque nationale de France* Nouv. acq. lat. 2332, f. 3, is a one-folio fragment from the ninth century.
- Paris *Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal* 315, 116 ff., is the eleventh-century manuscript printed by Jean de Roigny under Bede's name. It lacks only a bifolium.
- Florence, *Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana* San Marco 722, 246 ff., is a nearly-complete twelfth-century manuscript. The last chapter, chapter 42, of Book III is lacking.
- Madrid *Biblioteca nacional* 437 (*olim* A.82), f. 102-175v, fourteenth century, is complete.

Additionally, if we believe Sichardus' assertions in his dedicating preface, his own edition is based on a twelfth-century manuscript, for which sources and dates were not provided, so that we don't know whether that datation is correct nor where it has been copied.

To date, no one yet has made a full classification, or tried to establish, a stemma of these manuscripts. Michael Gorman states there are two main families of manuscripts, Cambrai *BM* 470 and The Hague *MMW* 10 A 1 being each at the head of one family. He also asserts

that Sichardus' manuscript, which belongs to Cambrai *BM 470's* family, is witness to an inferior recension, while Kenneth Steinhauser, asserts that Sichardus 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 figure out which family of manuscripts is closer to the original text. My first surveys of the manuscripts have led me to conclude that Sichardus' text contains sometimes its own textual variations against all preserved manuscripts.³ 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 with a better text for this very family.

PHILIP AND THE *IN JOB'S* DATING

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

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, priest, **Jerome's best disciple**, published a book of commentary on Job in simple language. I also read his letters to his relatives, who 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. That would lead us to thinking that Philip, who has today largely fallen into oblivion, then benefitted from a certain level of notoriety. Marcian was Roman Emperor of the East from 450 to 457 and Avitus was Roman emperor of the West from July 455 to October 456. Philip's death would have occurred around 455. Apart from what is said in this notice, nothing more is known about him. The place 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 the *In Iob's* datation.

Philip's commentary is the first known Latin commentary on Job to comment on this book using Jerome's translation as the basis of its biblical quotations. The dating of the text is still disputed and much 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...'

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

³ This is as well for Philip's own words than for Philip's biblical citations. For example, in *In Iob* II, 20 (Sichardus p. 82), the citation of 1 Cor 11, 10 printed by Sichardus is: *debet mulier uelamen habere supra caput propter angelos*; but all the manuscripts convey *debet mulier potestatem habere supra caput propter angelos*.

the level of language of the dedication. For this reason, he believes that the Nectarius to which the commentary was dedicated would have been a less important bishop, Nectarius, Bishop of Avignon (439-455).

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. Pauline of Nole is calling Alypius of Thagaste, Delphin of Bordeaux or Florent of Cahors *beatissime pater*. It is true that Augustine of Hippo is called *domine merito uenerabilis et uere beatissime pater* by Quoduultdeus, which is a more obsequious formulation than Philip's dedication. 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 has introduced Philip to Nectarius of Constantinople.

The language level of the dedication and the presumed obsequiousness is not sufficient, in my view, to confidently identify the recipient of the letter. Other aspects may help to shed more light on this issue. The date of Jerome's revision of the Book of Job, on which there is currently a consensus, is around 394. On the basis of the study of Philip's quotations from the translations of the Hebrew canon and the Greek books of the Hebrew Bible⁴, I tend to agree with Kenneth Steinhauser's datation. Indeed, when he can, that means when he is quoting books that Jerome has finished revising, Philip, to quote the Hebrew Bible or the deuterocanonical books, rather uses the Hieronymic revisions than the Old Latin, even when comparisons with the Old Latin are part of his exegesis.

Setting aside the Psalms, that he always quotes Jerome's translation from the Septuagint, as did many Western Christians long after the Vulgate has come into use, here are the books that Philip quotes in Jerome's revised version: 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 go, two interpretations of these observations can be made. Either Philip is simply not consistent in his translations of the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books – but from that hypothesis we can learn nothing, or he used Jerome's available translations as he was writing his commentary on Job, but the Pentateuch and Isaiah were not fully available yet – that is, Jerome was still working on them. In that case, the relative chronology of Jerome's translations would have to be revised: it is currently assumed that Jerome translated Isaiah before the Pentateuch, and the most common opinion on the Pentateuch is an around 398-translation; however, whereas he is sometimes using the Vulgate version of the Pentateuch, Philip is most often quoting Isaiah in the Old Latin. The only datation hypothesis for Jerome's revisions that would match with Philip's quotations is the one Roger Gryson put forward. According to Gryson the Pentateuch would have been translated in 393 and Isaiah around

⁴ Even while there is no critical edition of the *In Iob*, the study of the manuscripts is sufficient to prove which Latin translation Philip was using for which biblical books. Indeed, there are not significant variants in the different groups of manuscripts for the biblical citations that would let the question of the citations on Old Latin or Vulgate undecided. When the case remains undecided, it is due to the fact that the Vulgate translator, Jerome or someone else, has kept an Old Latin rendition as his own translation.

390-392. Yet, I am led to wonder whether the pattern of quotations of the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books used by Philip couldn't lead us to another hypothesis.

It is certain that Jerome had finished his revision of the Book of Job on the Hebraic text when Philip wrote his commentary, as Philip is using it for the lemmas he is commenting. Philip's quotations from the Pentateuch and Isaiah may lead to think that Jerome was still working on both revisions and that none had yet been finalised while Philip wrote his *In Iob*. Therefore, Jerome's revision of the Book of Job, which we know had been completed in 394, may have been completed a little earlier than 394, maybe around 392. This period, around 392, is commonly thought to be the one during which Jerome also completed the Twelfth Prophets' revision which, as we saw, Philip quotes consistently. Jeremiah and Ezekiel's revision were for sure completed before 393, maybe around 390. It seems to me that one can draw from all these observations the following assumption: Philip would have written the *In Iob* around 392, when Jerome's had completed its revision of Job; at this time, the revisions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelfth Prophets had been fully done, Jerome was working on the Pentateuch and on Isaiah, and Philip had Jerome's work at hand. In this case, there would be no complexity with Philip's quotations from the Hebraic Bible and this hypothesis would chronologically coherent.

This dating of Philip's commentary a little before 394 would however raise the problem of Philip's age when he wrote it: if he died, as Gennadius asserts, around 455, he would have died a very old man and he would have written his commentary whilst still very young, without revising his text once, and without ever writing any other biblical commentary in the subsequent sixty-one years. On the contrary, my work on the commentary would lead me to believe that Philip is using rabbinical exegetical material that Jerome was also using in Bethlehem: he certainly would not have had access to it if he had written his commentary in Provence towards the end of his life, in Provence.

The dating matters are important even in the purpose of studying Philip's New Testament quotations, as Philip's attitude towards the Latin text of the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books may give us clues for understanding his attitude towards the text of the New Testament and his use of Old Latin and Vulgate.

PHILIP'S NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

Although Philip's commentary is on a book of the Hebrew canon, there are many Neo-Testamentary quotations in his work. They are easy to identify for, in both the Old and New Testaments, Philip introduces his quotations and makes little use of allusions. The use of introductive 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* is frequent in his writings, making it easier to identify scriptural quotations.

There are about 275 New Testament quotations in *In Iob*'s set of forty-two chapters, or the 210 pages of the Sichardus edition printed in A4 equivalent. Indeed, I would argue that Philip's exegesis is based on at least three main points: highlighting Hebrew etymologies and

use of the 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 I will provide here are therefore be far from exhaustive and this paper main aim is to suggest some clues of analysis of Philip's choices of New Testament quotations.

When Philip quotes the New Testament, his preference seems to go to the Old Latin. Still this general tendency is far from being systematic. Indeed, it all seems to depend on the dating of Philip's work. The Hieronymic revision of the Gospels had been completed before Philip began to compose his commentary, for Jerome's revision took place in 383 or 384. It is very likely that the Catholic Epistles had been revised at the time when Philip was composing his commentary. Indeed, at that time the Vulgate text of the epistle of James is quoted in 384 in letter 41 of the pseudo-Jerome and the Vulgate text of the epistle of Jude is used by Jerome in 386 in his letter. 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 pointed out that is not always straightforward to distinguish between the text revised or retranslated by Jerome and the Old-Latin text, especially when the text of the translation by Jerome or his disciples takes up 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 evangelical quotations used by Philip, we can see that, although he sometimes probably quotes the translation now known under the name Vulgate, he does not hesitate to quote the Old Latin as well, even when it is known that the Jerome's revision of the Latin translations had by then already been finalised by Jerome and that they were in all likelihood available to Philip. Ensuing are two telling examples

- **John 8:56** (*In Iob* I, 14; p. 52)⁵: *Abraham pater uester concupiuit, ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gavisus est.*
Vulgate *Abraham pater uester exultavit ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gavisus 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 subject matter I would like to investigate now relates to the following questions: when Philip's quoted text does differ from the Vulgate one, where does his biblical text come from? Several cases arise: 1) Philip's quotation has a complete co-witness in one or more other patristic (or other) sources, without any variation in vocabulary or syntax 2) His quotation in effect combines several known translations of the same verse 3) At times at least part of the translation quoted by him is a rendering or a formulation that is currently not otherwise documented anywhere else.

⁵ The pagination used for quotations of Philip's commentary is that of Sichardus's 1527 edition.

Several of his quotations are identical to formulations of the same verses found in other authors

Whereas Philip is sometimes using renderings of biblical passages that are unique to him, he is at first relying on formulations used, sometimes widely, by other Church Fathers and Christian Writers in the fourth and fifth centuries.

- **Luke 4:34** (*In Iob* II, 21; p. 86): *quid uenisti ante tempus perdere nos*
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, but it is frequently used by him throughout his work: *Adnotationes in Iob*; *The City of God*; *Sermons*; *Homilies on the First Epistle of St John*. Two Old Latin manuscripts also convey this variation: VL 4, *Codex Veronensis*, whose Old Latin text is an Italian one of the fourth century, and VL 6, *Codex Colbertinus*, part of which, for example in Luke Gospel, are archaic Old Latin text.

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

This rendition can be found in Old Latin manuscripts and also in the writings of the Church Fathers. As for the Old Latin manuscripts, they are: VL 4; VL 5, *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*, a bilingual manuscript copied around 400; VL 10, *Codex Brixianus*, close to the Vulgate but with some similarities with Old Latin and the Gothic versions; VL 11, *Codex Rehdigeranus*, which text is an Italian Old Latin one of the end of the fourth century; VL 14, *Codex Usserianus primus*, whose Old-Latin text is typical of a Welsh-Irish textual family; VL 15, *Codex Aureus Holmiensis*, which text is mainly identical to the Vulgate but retains Old Latin features. Quotations of this verse identical to Philip's one are also used in the *Quaestiones Veteris et Noui testamenti* of the Ambrosiaster, probably written in Rome between 370 and 375, as well as in Rufin's translations of Origen, assumed to have been finalised later than Philip's *In Iob*.

- **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.⁶ This rendition is known only by Church Fathers and is not conveyed by 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 is a hapax without parallels in Christian literature and in Latin biblical manuscripts, but the passages are a combination of the parts and the resulting phrasing is currently unique to Philip's *In Iob*.

⁶ While GRYSON has published a reconstruction of Tyconius' *Commentary on Revelation*, STEINHAUSER holds that such a commentary can not be reconstructed.

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

The first part of the verse, *Abraham pater uester concupiuit*, is not paralleled with any Old Latin manuscripts, but this rendition is used at times both by Augustine and by Quoduultdeus. However, for both of these authors, the second part of the verse is not the same as appears in *In Iob*. Augustine's full rendition appears as: *Abraham pater uester concupiuit me uidere; et uidit, et gausus est*; Quoduultdeus' one appears as: *Abraham pater uester concupiuit uidere diem meum et uidit et gausus est*.

Philip's second part of the verse, *ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gausus est*, is both an Old Latin and a Vulgate rendition, but the peculiar combination with Philip's formulation of the first part of the verse is almost unique to the *In Iob*. Indeed, Philip's complete quotation (*Abraham pater uester concupiuit, ut uideret diem meum et uidit et gausus est*) is used only in Florus of Lyon's anthology, in the part where Florus provides excerpts by Avitus of Vienne. 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 rely each on their own on the same source? There seems to be no way to find out.

- **John 18:28** (*In Iob* Prologus; Sichardus p. 2) *Et ipsi non intrauerunt in praetorium, ne contaminerentur.* (Cambrai, MMW 10 A 1, Sichardus, Vatican, Troyes 552, Oxford Bodleian 426, Paris Arsenal 315, Madrid; Berne BB 99 has *intrauerunt praetorium*)
Vulgate *Ipsi non introierunt in praetorium ut non contaminarentur.*

The segment *non intrauerunt* is not specific to Philip. It is also to be found in the text reconstructed by Roger Gryson from the *Commentary on the Revelation*, by Tyconius, as well as in two Old Latin manuscripts: VL 13, *Codex Monacensis* or *Codex Valerianus*, whose Old Latin text is close to biblical text of Arian authors; VL 14. It should be noted that these two manuscripts do not translate the Greek ἵνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν as *ne contaminerentur*, so that they do not share with Philip the second part of the quotation.

- **Luke 11:21** (*In Iob* III, 40; Sichardus 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 lesson *custodit domum suam* has a co-witness in the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, dated later than Philip's commentary:

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

At least three VL manuscripts convey the same lesson: VL 10, VL 14 and VL 16, an ancient manuscript currently dispatched in fragments.

- **2 Co 10:7** *Si quis confidit se esse seruum Christi, hoc cogitet intra se, quia sicut ipse Christi est, ita et nos* (*In Iob* 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 the Ambrosiaster. A variant of the word order, ***se Christi seruum esse***, is also found in at least three Old Latin manuscripts: VL 75, *Codex Claromontanus*, with the bilingual text-type D, whose origin is disputed; VL 76, *Codex Sangermanensis*, which text is based on VL 75; VL 78, *Codex Augiensis*, which is often close to the Vulgate.

Hoc cogitet intra se is also not found elsewhere in Latin Christian literature. The formulation may be a contamination due to familiarity with Mk 2, 8 (*quo statim cognito Iesus spiritu suo quia sic cogitarent intra se* *diquot illis quid ista cogitatis in cordibus vestris*) and Lk 12, 17 (*et 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 Irish Book of Armagh, whose text of Paulinian Epistles is both European-revised and Italian Old Latin, and VL 77, the bilingual *Codex Boernarius* whose text is very close to VL 75. As the first part of the quotation is also known from VL manuscripts, it seems to me plausible that Philip used an existing Old Latin text here.

- **Luke 12:32** (*In Iob II, 31; Sichardus 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 patristical literature. However, there are mediaeval evidences for this lesson. And it is also to be found in one of the oldest Old Latin manuscripts, VL 3, *Codex Vercellensis*, which was probably copied in the second half of the fourth century and for which the text of the Gospels is probably an Italian one. The variation can also be found in Vat. Reg. lat. 49, a late-end-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, n°32, is not one in which Irish affiliations can be detected.

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: Philip seems to have gathered together fragments from different biblical translations which he had on hand; this assembly was not a voluntary operation but a subconscious one. Philip seems to have gathered together fragments from different biblical translations which he had on hand and the resulting "mix and match" approach was probably not a deliberate choice but rather a largely unintentional one. 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 from 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 from African Old Latin tradition; *infirmitates* is unique to Augustine, and *suscepit* is a X text-type, an early text tradition backing to direct translations on the Septuagint by authors.

- Isaiah 53:7 (*In lob* 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 comes from Augustinian biblical texts; *ad uictimam* is both X and K text-type; *sicut* is common to Origen and African text (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 way of quoting the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books, by using Old Latin for New Testament even though Jerome's revisions are already available to him, his use of biblical memorised verses is common all the biblical books when he seems at times to unwittingly reconstruct an idiosyncratic mixture of different textual traditions he had come across.

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

Finally, there are cases in which part, or even the entire quotation from Philip, has no known parallel in late Antiquity or medieval literature and in the manuscripts of Latin biblical translations.

- **Luke 1:78-79** (*In lob* I,1; p. 4) *per uiscera misericordiae Dei, quibus uisitauit⁷ nos Oriens ex alto / ut illuminaret positos in tenebris et umbra mortis*
Vulgate *Per viscera 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* and attributed to the Pseudo-Abdias:

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

This is the closest resemblance to Philip's variant of Lk 1:79 which can be currently found anywhere in the sources, and it is dated more than a century later than Philip's *In lob* text. Was the biblical text used in the *Virtutes hominum* influenced by Philip or does the peculiar wording derive from a common source? There are currently no answer to this question.

⁷ Sichardus' edition convey *quibus uisitauit*, in accordance with Cambrai *BM* 470, which belongs to the same manuscripts group. However, as the manuscripts MMW 10 A 1 / Vatican Reg lat. 111 / Troyes 559 / Bern BB 99 / Paris Arsenal 315 / Madrid BN 437 all convey *in quibus uisitauit*, I am still unsure on Philip's exact rendition and will be 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, Sichardus included.

- **1 Pet. 4:1** (*In Iob* III,37 ; Sichardus p. 462) *Christus igitur in carne passo et uos eodem sensu armamini, quia passus est in carne*
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 the *In Iob*, and it must therefore be held for the text deliberately used by Philip and subsequent copyists. But no other Old Latin manuscripts is conveying it, and this rendition is currently unparalleled in the Late Antiquity and Mediaeval literature.

I have tried to show that a number of biblical quotations from Philip are not hapaxes but can be linked to known variants, but that a good lot his quotes passages can often be linked to known variations in other manuscripts. It seems therefore that it would be unwise to infer from the sheer absence of known textual parallels that Philip in these instances did not rely on any textual tradition at all in order to quote the New Testament books. Did Philip himself translate these two passages from Greek? For Lk 1:79, it is unlikely, since no minority variant of the New Testament text καθημένοις calls for a *positos* translation. It could therefore be that the biblical quotations of Philip which have no parallels are witnesses to biblical textual variants which are now lost and were previously unknown.

PHILIP'S SOURCES FOR BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

The purpose of this paper is not to provide with an indepth investigation on the origins of the translations used by Philip. However, after searching for co-witnesses to Philip's New Testament quotations, some interesting points can be noted. First, there is a kinship between some of his quotations and Augustine's biblical quotations. Secondly, Philip had a definite knowledge, or access to, African Old Latin. Thirdly, there are several cases of common wordings to *In Iob* and manuscripts VL 10 and VL 14.

These are hypotheses to be verified by an exhaustive study of all the biblical quotations, but they corroborate the first observations I have been able to make on the study of the text of the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books and that reflects on the two Isaiah examples I have 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 similiteries with the biblical text quoted by Augustine, they do no relate exclusively to the New Testament. Indeed, Philip often quotes translations of the book of Job other than the Hieronymic translation of the lemma commented on and theses translations, be it for the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament, are often to be found also in Augustine's works. The question that arises is therefore that of chronology: Philip's manner of quoting the Hebrew Bible and the deuterocanonical books prompt me to date the commentary to before 397, as a dating it between 440 and 450 seems inconsistent with the state of the biblical text of Philip's latin version of the Hebrew Bible. However, the lessons of the Latin translations which, apart from Philip, can only be found in Augustine's works are traditionally dated after 397. Did Augustine and Philip draw separately from the same sources? Which of the two read the other one and became influenced about to the wording of biblical

materials? This is one of the many points a critical edition of Philip's text could contribute to clarify.

Definite conclusions regarding Philip's links to textual traditions of VL 10, an Old Latin version close to Gothic translations, and VL 14, a Welsh-Irish Old Latin, can not be drawn from so few examples. Like the two preceding points, they call for deeper investigations on Philip's biblical sources for his New Testament quotations.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the biblical quotations presented suggests that the choice of the 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 the Revelation, are quoted both in the Vulgate and in textual traditions other than the revisions undertaken by Jerome or following him. On the whole, Philip's attitude to 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, which could probably depend on whether or not Jerome's revisions of the biblical translations were completed when he was writing the *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 regards to the Hebrew canon and to the Greek deuterocanonical books, biblical quotations used by Philip suggest that he had at hand a very extensive documentation. Thus, for the Hebrew canon, my current work tends towards the observation of a certain degree of knowledge of Jewish biblical commentaries. This detailed knowledge of textual traditions seems to me to be reflected in the diversity of traditions from which the New Testament quotations of Philip originate. When scholars find a New Testament quotation in Philip's work that does not seem to have any known co-witness so far, the example of 1 Pet. 4:1 mentioned above would lead us to suppose that Philip's wording and formulation could be a testimony to the VL, for which manuscripts or fragments that are still to be collated could reinforce the evidence.

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 argued in this paper, I am leaning towards a dating around 392, based on Latin quotations of the Hebrew Bible. All this calls for further study of the sources from which Philip drew in order to quote the Latin Bibles. A critical edition of the *In Iob* will have to carefully assess the evidence that can help us understand Philip's biblical material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bonnet, Max, 'Passio Sancti Andrae', *AnBoll* 13 (1894): 373-378.

Ciccarese, Maria Pia, "Una esegesi 'double face': Introduzione all'*Expositio in Iob* del presbitero Filippo", *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 9, 2 (1992): 483-492.

Ciccarese, Maria Pia, 'Filippo e i corvi di *Giobbe* 38,41: Alla ricerca di una fonte perduta,' *Aug* 35 (1995): 137-159.

Ciccarese, Maria Pia, 'Sulle orme di Gerolamo: La '*Expositio in Iob*' del presbitero Filippo', Pages 247-268 in *Motivi letterari ed esegetici in Gerolamo: Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 5-7 dicembre 1995*. Edited by Claudio Moreschini and Giovanni Menestrina, Brescia, 1997.

Fransen, Irénée, 'Le commentaire au livre de Job du prêtre Philippe: Étude sur le Texte.' (Unpublished dissertation, Université catholique de Lyon, 1949)

Fransen, Desiderius. 'Het Job-Commentar van Philippus Presbyter,' *De Katholiek* 157 (1920): 378-386.

Frey Rébeillé-Borgella, Marie, 'Éditer le *Liber interpretationis nominum hebraicorum* : objectifs, problèmes et méthodes' (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the THAT Association, tribute to Marguerite Harl, March 25, 2021.)

Gorman, Michael. 'The Manuscripts and Printed Editions of the Commentary on Job by Philippus', *RBén* 116.2 (2006): 193-232.

Gryson, Roger, *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscrits vieux latins. Répertoire descriptif. I*, Freiburg, 1999.

Houghton, Hugh A. G., 'The Use of Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', Pages 375-405 in *The Text of New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis. Second Edition*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, Leiden/Boston, 2013.

Houghton, Hugh A. G., *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts*, Oxford, 2017.

Jóźwiak, Magdalena, '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 (2014): 185-195. <https://doi.org/10.31743/vp.3585>

McNamara, Martin, 'Sources and Affiliations of the Catechesis Celtica', *SacEr* 34 (1994): 185-237

Philippus Presbyter, *In historiam Iob commentariorum libri tres*, Edited by Johannes Sichardus, Basel, 1527.

Steinhauser, Kenneth B., 'Job in Patristic Commentaries and Theological Works', Pages 43-51 in *A companion to Job in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Franklin Harkins and Aaron Canty, Leiden/Boston, 2016.

Steinhauser, Kenneth B., 'The Structure of Tyconius' Apocalypse Commentary: A Correction', *VC* 35.4 (1981), 357-357.

Wilmart, André, *Analecta Reginensia: Extraits des manuscrits latins de la reine Christine conservés au Vatican*, Vatican City : Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana ,1933.