



HAL
open science

The Contribution of Philip's Commentary on Job to the History of the Text of the Book of Job: Outline of a Study

Marie Frey Rébeillé-Borgella

► **To cite this version:**

Marie Frey Rébeillé-Borgella. The Contribution of Philip's Commentary on Job to the History of the Text of the Book of Job: Outline of a Study. European Association of Biblical Studies (EABS) Annual Conference, Jul 2022, Toulouse, France. hal-03922432v2

HAL Id: hal-03922432

<https://hal.science/hal-03922432v2>

Submitted on 1 Mar 2023

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.

The Contribution of Philip's Commentary on Job to the History of the Text of the Book of Job: Outline of a Study

EABS Conference – 6th July 2022

Marie Frey Rébeillé-Borgella

First of all, I would like to thank the research unit chairs for having accepted this paper.

It will focus on a Latin commentary on the book of Job written by Philip, a disciple of Jerome, and on the two ways in which the studying of this commentary can make a contribution to the history of the text of the book of Job. The first way, which will be the main part of my paper, will deal with the contribution to the textual criticism of the Latin translation Jerome has made of the book of Job, on the Hebrew text. It will also deal with the diffusion of Philip's readings of this translation. Some authors, as well late-Antiquity as mediaeval authors, are using readings that are not known in the manuscripts that editors have used when editing the critical text of the Vulgate, or that, on the basis of the critical editions of the Vulgate, can be thought to be specific to a state of the text in a particular century where as they have been actually used and quoted at other times. I won't go as in-depth in presenting the second way in which Philip's commentary could make a contribution to biblical textual criticism. However, if I have some time left, I will expose readings specific to Philip that let me think Philip may have had under his eyes other versions of the book of Job than the Hebrew, Greek and Latin ones that we currently know.

Philip's commentary and its manuscripts

To begin with, some words on Philip and his commentary. Philip is known through his commentary, although manuscripts are sometimes misattributing the commentary, and through Gennadius of Massilia, who devoted a note to him in a section of his *De uiris illustribus* on illustrious men of Provence, in South France. On Philip, we don't know anything more than what Gennadius said: he was Jerome's "*optimus auditor*", "best disciple", and he died in 455-456. When he wrote his commentary is actually uncertain. The commentary is dedicated to *Nectari pater beatissime*, but who was Nectarius remains a disputed question. It was either between 390 and 397, either between 439-455.

What is much more important for today's paper is the textual tradition of Philip's commentary. Philip's commentary has a Clavis Patrorum Latinorum number, CPL 643. However, he had not been included in its time into Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. Migne's *Patrologia* has included an 9th century-abridged version of the commentary, which Clavis number is CPL 757, which I will not address today. There are three manuscripts of this epitome.

Much more manuscripts of the commentary are currently known. There are indeed thirteen of them, some of which are very fragmentary, plus an edition published in 1527 by Johannes Sichard on the basis of a now lost manuscript to which Sichard has said to have got access through the abbot of Fulda. There is still no critical edition of the work, and I am currently working on one. Through this work, I have been to distinguish between what I believe to be three manuscripts families.

One of the family survives, as far as I know, in only one manuscript: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. 426 [SC 2327], ninth century, f. 1–118v, England, only Books I and II. When the two other families have divergent readings, Oxford is the manuscript with whom we can decide on which should be considered as the original reading. Therefore, the current paper is taking its examples in books I and II of the commentary, that is in books 1 to 31 of the book of Job.

Another family includes the following:

- Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 470, eighth century, ff. 205, which is complete and comes from England.
- The manuscript that Sichard copied, whose date and place of copying are unknown, provided that Sichard didn't altered the readings of this very manuscripts while copying it.

A third family is represented in the following manuscripts:

- The Hague, Huis van het boek (olim Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum), 10 A 1, ff. 1–41, 44–199, first half of the eighth century, originally from Tours, that contains the three books, except for a short excerpt missing
- Fragments that are Berne, Burgerbibliothek, 99, ninth-century, ff. 1–8, f. 170–171, fragments most likely from Western France
- Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 111, second half of the ninth century, ff. 1–99v, West France, which lacks the end of Book III, from the middle of chapter 40 to the end of chapter 42
- Troyes, Médiathèque Jacques-Chirac (olim Bibliothèque Municipale), 552, second half of the ninth century, ff. 1–88v, + Paris, BNF, Lat. 1764, ff. 9–10, whose origin is uncertain and in which the first eight chapters of Book I and part of the ninth chapter are missing.

- Troyes, Médiathèque Jacques-Chirac (olim Bibliothèque Municipale), 559, end of the ninth century, ff. 119–238v, which may come from Auxerre and in which Book III is missing, as is the end of Book II
- Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 315, eleventh century, 116 ff., printed by Jean de Roigny under Bede’s name. It lacks only one bifolium.
- Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 722, twelfth century, 246 ff., nearly-complete, lacking only the last chapter—chapter 42—of Book III
- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 437 (olim A.82), fourteenth century, ff. 102–175v, complete.

The three left manuscripts are:

- Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Lat. 1839, ninth century, ff. 123–200v, probably from Eastern France, which has only the text of the third book.
- Paris, BNF, Lat. 12157, ninth century, ff. 97v–116v, 88–95v, 117–142. that has only Book III, and which may have been copied from Paris BNF lat. 1839.
- Paris, BNF, Nouvelles acquisitions latines, 2332, ninth century, f. 3, one-folio fragment.

What is quite interesting with Philip’s manuscripts is that the biblical text has NOT been harmonized. There is therefore critical editing work to do with the lemmas and all the biblical material used by Philip.

Philip’s commentary and textual criticism of the Latin Bible

I am beginning with Philip and Jerome’s translation *iuxta emendationem Graecam*, as said in the title of the preface Jerome himself gave to the translation, with which I will deal very quickly.

This translation has conveyed by three manuscripts:

- Tours Bibliothèque Municipale 18 = La^α
- Oxford Auct. E infra 2 (Bodl 2426) = La^β
- Sankt Gallen 11 = La^γ

This translation has been used by Augustine in the lemmas he has commented on in his *Adnotationes in Iob*.

There is no complete edition currently available. In 1893, C. P. Caspari published *Das Buch Hiob 1,1-38,16 in Hieronymus's Uebersetzung Aus Der Alexandrinischen Version*. There have also been two

thesis dissertations: J.H. Gailey, *Jerome's Latin Version of Job from the Greek. 1-26*, Princeton 1948 , and P. J. Erbes, *Die Iob-Übersetzungen des hl. Hieronymus*, Freiburg-im-Brisgau 1950.

As Philip has often resorted to comparison between the two Latin translations, there are many quotations from this translation. I have listed a few ones. None of these examples have been used by Philip as lemmas. All are used for textual comparisons, often preceded sentences such as: *sic* (or *ut*) *dixerunt alii interpretes* / *sic* (or *ut*) *habet alia editio*.

Here are a few examples of Philip's readings that are common to him and to Augustine. I won't comment it further.

[6:7] *uideo escas meas sicut est odor leonis* : Philip, *In Iob*, Sichard (ed.) 20 ; Augustine, *Adnotationes in Iob*, VI, CSEL 28/2, 519

[13:27] *posuisti in conpede pedem meum* : Philip, *In Iob*, Sichard (ed.) 50 ; Augustine, *Adnotationes in Iob*, XIII, CSEL 28/2, 538

[18:11] *multi circa pedes eius* : Philip, *In Iob*, Sichard (ed.) 75 ; Augustine, *Adnotationes in Iob*, XVIII, CSEL 28/2, 547

[27:6] *nec enim conscius sum mihi iniquum quid commisisse*: Philip, *In Iob*, Sichard (ed.) 108 ; Augustine, *Adnotationes in Iob*, XXVII, CSEL 28/2, 564

Caspari's edition was a printing of La^v with a critical apparatus filled with readings from La^u La^β and Augustine (named A). For the above examples, La^v and Philip's readings are the same:

[6:7] *uideo escas meas sicut est odor leonis* (in agreement with La^u, while La^β has *uideo carnes*)

[13:27] *posuisti in conpede pedem meum* (La^u and La^β have *conposuisti*)

[27:6] *nec enim conscius sum mihi iniquum quid commisisse* (in agreement with La^u, while La^β has *iniquid cōmisse*)

It also happens that Philip is using readings common to La^u, La^β and Augustine, that La^v doesn't have. Here are a few examples:

[3:17] *ibi impii **deposuerunt** furorem suum*

The reading in La^v is *posuerunt*, while La^u and La^β both have the reading *deposuerunt*, as does Augustine.

[6:22] *numquid aliquid uos **petii**, aut fortitudine uestra indigeo*

The reading in La^v is *petit*, while La^u and La^β both have the reading *deposuerunt*, as does Augustine.

[9:32] *non est etenim homo sicut et ego, cui **contradicam**, ut ueniamus pariter ad iudicium*

La^v is the only manuscript whose reading is *contradicat*, while the two other manuscripts, Augustine and Philip have the reading *contradicam*.

I could provide with many other examples of this situation, where there are discrepancies between Philip's and La^v readings.

Philip's commentary on Job is also interesting as it has provided with readings with which Caspari didn't meet during his edition.

[15:27] **incrassata** *ceruice scuti sui* Sichard, p. 61: Augustine, La^u and La^v's reading is *in crassa ceruice scuti sui*. (La^o's one is nearly the same, with *scutis*.)

[18:19] *non **erit** cognoscibilis in populo suo*

La^v has *non cognoscibilis in populo suo*, while La^o, La^u and Augustine have *non sit cognoscibilis*.

[19:27] **haec omnia mihi** *consumata sunt in sinu*

La^v, La^o, La^u and Augustine : *omnia mihi* (no critical apparatus)

While these readings from Philip are currently unparalleled, there are nonetheless interesting as they are the proof that there was some state of the text that didn't survive in the manuscripts of the translation *iuxta Graecum* we have kept.

From all of this, one can suggest that, if a critical edition of Jerome's translation were to be made, it would be legitimate for the editors to consider whether Philip's text should be used to decide between alternate readings, especially when Philip and Augustine's readings are in agreement against some of the three manuscripts.

When it comes to Philip's readings of Jerome's translation of the book of Job *iuxta Hebraeos*, these readings are, of course, often to be found in Vulgate manuscripts or in late-Antiquity or Middle Ages authors.

Philip's commentary has been widely used by the Benedictine monks of Saint Jerome who worked on a critical edition of the Vulgate. The lemmas of his commentary have been of great help when it came to reconstructing the text of the archetype – if there has ever been an archetype. Here is one, amongst many.

[16:16] *saccum consui super cutum meam et opere cinere **cornu meum***

None of the Vulgate manuscripts used by the monks for their work convey *cornu meum*. However, some similar lessons are conveyed by some of them :

corpus meum K (Köln, Dombibliothek 43, 8th century)

carnem meam L (Vatican City, Vat. Palat. Lat. 24, 7th-8th century), A (*Amiatinus*, Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Amiatino 1, 7th-8th century), Λ^L (León, Real Colegiata de San Isidoro 2, 10th century)

As all of Philip's manuscripts convey *cornu meum*, and as it is consistent with the Hebrew text, the Benedictine editors of the Vulgate assumed that Philip's text may have been the archetypal one.

Another case is when Philip's text is often in agreement with readings that can be found in the critical apparatus of the Benedictine Vulgate. Therefore, Philip's text may reflect a state of the text whose diffusion and use were wide in the Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, but which was neither a majority nor a marginal state of the text.

There are also a few cases when Philip's readings are known by the monks of St Jerome whereas they are not attributed to Philip in the Benedictine Vulgate apparatus:

[22:11] *impetu aquarum inundantium non oppressum iri* (vs *oppressurum* BV)

Alcuinian manuscripts have it, as do the Corbeiensis (E = Paris BNF Lat. 11533) and most of 9th manuscripts.

This reading is unparalleled in Latin authors.

But there are also cases in which Philip's reading, which is not found in any manuscript used for the critical edition of the Benedictine Vulgate, is not included in the critical apparatus of the BV, whereas Philip has used it and it is not unique to him.

[31:16] *si negabam quod uolebant pauperibus* (*negavi* BV)

Bernard of Clairvaux is using the reading *si negabam* in his *Sermones super Cantica*, XII, 3, 1, as per the *Sancti Bernardi opera*, J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot et H.M. Rochais (edd.) 1957-1958

One of the main questions to deal with when addressing the parallels for Philip's readings is: are there are some authors whose works have more than others parallels with Philip's readings, especially when Philip's readings have no cowitnesses in Vulgate manuscripts? Among them, there are the pelagianist bishop of Eclanum, Julian, and the pope Gregory the Great.

The 5th-century commentary by Julian, the pelagianist bishop of Eclanum, is, like Philip's one, a lemmatic commentary. It may have written a little before Philip's commentary, or after. Julian has some readings similar to Philip. As an example, he has commented this one, who is also

found in commentaries on Job by Gregory the Great, Bruno of Segni (12th century) Denis the Carthusian (15th century):

[15:29] *nec mittet **in terram** radicem suam* (vs ***in terra*** BV)

Julian, *Expositio super librum Iob*, XV, CCSL 88

Bruno of Segni, *Expositio in librum Iob*, XV, PL 164, 606

Denis the Carthusian, *Ennaratio in librum Iob*, articuli 35 et 36

While the Benedictine Vulgate has edited *in terra*, some Vulgate manuscripts have also *in terram*, as do Philip, Julian and Gregory's commentaries, but neither of the main manuscripts used as the most reliable ones by the Benedictine Vulgate editors has them. Two manuscripts on which I will speak again during this paper also have *in terram*. Π^F and Σ^T . Σ^T , a 10th-century manuscript, is the Toletanus, a witness for the Spanish text of the Vulgate. Π^F is the Codex Casinensis 521, a 11th-century manuscript of Cassinian type, that is with high Spanish influences. The common readings and the discrepancies between Philip's and Julian's versions of the book of Job is a subject for further research.

Amongst the authors whose readings identical to Philip's readings should be investigated is, of course, the Pope Gregory the Great, who wrote the *Moralia in Iob*. Gregory's biblical text is not always coincidental with/common with Philip's one, but both authors shared common readings, such as:

[10:5] *numquid sicut dies hominis dies tui aut anni tui* (vs *aut anni tui* BV)

Gregory, *Moralia in Iob*, IX, 47

After a time jump, in the 12th century, Bruno of Segni's commentary is to be noted as he seems to have retained some readings unique to Philip.

[2:6] *egressus igitur Satan a facie Domini percussit Iob **uulnere pessimo*** (vs *ulcere pessimo* BV)

Bruno of Segni, *Expositio in librum Iob*, II, PL 164, 560, and XIX, 617.

This reading is an insertion of the translation *iuxta Graecum* into the one *iuxta Hebraeos*. It is also found in the whole family of manuscripts Φ , the Alcanian ones.

A 12th century-commentary on Job that is very probably from Rupert, abbot of Deutz, is following closely the *Moralia in Iob* written by Gregory. It is therefore not surprising that Rupert's commentary has common readings of the Latin Job with Philip, such as this one, which is also shared by Gueric d'Igny, but which is not found in any of the manuscripts studied by the Benedictine Vulgate:

[20:23] *pluat super **eum** bellum suum* (vs *pluat super **illum** bellum suum* BV)

Gueric of Igny: *Sermones in resurrection* II, Sources Chrétiennes n°202, 242.

Rupert of Deutz: *Commentarius in Iob*, XX, PL 168, 1050.

It is therefore no surprise that Rupert is quoting a reading unique to Philip where Philip has inserted a Septuagint textual feature in Jerome's translation on Hebrew.

[11:4] *et mundus sum in conspectu eius* (vs *in conspectu tuo* BS)

LXX: καὶ ἄμεμπτος ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ

Rupert: *Commentarius in Iob*, X, PL 168, 1016.

Some 13th-century authors have also used readings that Philip has used, and that could give us a clue on where Philip's readings were read are were circulating. Thomas of Aquinas is one of them.

[20:6] *si ascenderit usque in caelum* (vs *ad caelum* BV)

Vulgate manuscripts: Λ^L , E^2 , Θ^{HA} , Ω^M

Thomas of Aquinas *Expositio super Iob iuxta litteram*, XX l. 48

But also Bonaventura *Commentarius in Euangelium sancti Lucae* X, 15, 25

Bernardine of Siena *Quadragesimale de christiana religione* XIII, 2, 2

(The Vulgate manuscript E is the result of a comparison between Alcuinian Bibles and Theodulfian ones.)

Several 13th-century Franciscan authors also have readings common to Philip's commentary that are a minority in the textual tradition. As we just saw, Bonaventura and Bernardine of Siena are two of them.

Peter of John Olivi, whose *Postilla super Iob* are commenting Thomas of Aquinas' commentary on Job, is one of them. I will only give an example of reading he has in common with Philip:

[21:15] *quid nobis prodest si orauerimus eum* (vs *illum* BV)

Only two of the manuscripts looked at by the Benedictine Vulgate are sharing the reading: *si orauerimus eum*: Π^F , a manuscript with Spanish features, and Ω^S . Alain Boureau, who edited the *Postilla* in the Corpus Christianorum collection, wondered whether Olivi could have used a "Franciscan Vulgate" while working.

Could this "Franciscan Vulgate" have had some links with another text still unidentified? In his praefatio to the Leonine edition of the *Expositio super Iob ad litteram* by Thomas of Aquinas, Antoine Dondaine has examined the difficult matter of the Biblical text that Thomas had under his eyes while commenting the book of Job. According to Dondaine, Thomas of Aquinas' biblical text was quite close to the Ω family, and especially to Ω^S , but it also seems that this text was sharing readings with Π^F . As Peter of John Olivi has written his commentary partly as a reaction to Thomas of Aquinas' one, it is not surprising that both commentaries have common readings with Π^F . My question today is: could these commentaries be witnesses for Philip's readings that get somehow lost in the wide manuscript tradition of the Vulgate for the book of Job, for example through the Spanish family of manuscripts whose some manuscripts would have kept Philip's readings ?

The purpose of the survey I have made here was qualitative and not quantitative. A quantitative study could only be made on the basis of a critical edition of Philip's commentary, and this edition is still not achieved, or at least through a comprehensive comparison between all the manuscripts for Philip's commentary on one hand and on the critical apparatus for the Benedictine Vulgate and the full critical edition of each commentary on Job in the second hand. The present paper's scope is way too small for such a huge task, but I am planning to work on it.

This comprehensive survey would lead to study more precisely the links that Philip's readings have with each Vulgate manuscript, or manuscripts families, that the editors of the Benedictine Vulgate have used. The question is indeed: is there a state of the text that was circulating, which was very close to Philip's one, and who had influence on Vulgate manuscripts that are currently known? Were there one or several biblical manuscript for the book of Job whose text was Philip's one? As for now, I have noticed that Philip's readings seemed to have a particular closeness to either some of the family named Ω – which may not be as homogeneous as usually thought – or to at least one manuscript of this family. This closeness is some kind of proof that, while they were undocumented before the 13th century in the Benedictine Vulgate, some readings of the Ω could be traced back to the end of the 4th or the middle of the 5th century. Here is an example, on which all of Philip manuscripts and Ω^M are agreeing:

[8:4] *dimisit eos iniquitatis eorum* (vs *suae* BV)

The biblical text of Job kept in Philip's manuscripts also seems to have links with Π^F and Σ^T , on which I just said some words. Here are two examples. The first is these reading whose only other witness is, *De aduentu et statu et uita Antichristi*, by the Dominican friar Jacopo de Benevento. The text was printed with Thomas of Aquinas's works.

[19:29] *quoniam ultor iniquitatis gladius est* (vs *iniquitatis* BV)

According to the BV apparatus, three Vulgate manuscripts also have it: Π^F , Σ^T , and a Theodulf Bible, Θ^G .

I would like to point out that, Π^F , Σ^T and the family Ω are very probably NOT the only manuscripts in which Philip's readings may have survived, and there is need to look closely at other Vulgate manuscripts.

The comprehensive comparative survey that needs to be done is not without complications. There are sometimes, as usual in textual history, conflicting readings in Philip's manuscripts. It happens that some of the readings have very few parallels in Latin and Biblical literature, except in works by authors I have always named today. As for an exemple, 23:13 is as such in the Benedictine Vulgate

[23:13] *anima eius quodcumque uoluerit hoc facit* (BV)

Another reading, *quodcumque uoluerit hoc fiet*, is supported by the Oxford Bodl. 426 and by part of the biggest family of manuscripts (The Hague MMW10A1 ; Troyes 559), the one whose head is MMW 10 A 1. But Cambrai and Sichard, as well as another part of the MMW 10 A 1 family, have another reading

anima eius quodcumque uoluerit hoc fecit

which has no cowitness other than Philip in the Benedictine Vulgate apparatus but which also used by Thomas of Aquinas, in his *Expositio super Isaiam ad litteram* (chapter XIV). Some manuscripts of Philip's commentary are therefore conveying an unique reading that was known by Thomas of Aquinas.

The same happens with this example:

[24:13] *ipsi fuerunt rebelles luminis*

It is the Benedictine Vulgate text, supported by all Philip's manuscripts BUT two: Cambrai and Sichard's transcription, whose variant reading is *rebelles lumini*. According to the Benedictine Vulgate's apparatus, *rebelles lumini* is a reading that is not to be found before the 13th manuscripts. However, it is widely used during the late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages : Julian, Gregory, Lathcen, Bernardino of Siena, Bonaventura, Thomas of Aquinas. And it is the reading of an 8th century-manuscript, Cambrai BM 470.

To sum up: most of, or at least an huge part of, Philip's readings are known and conveyed in Vulgate manuscripts. However, some others aren't known in Vulgate manuscripts. Amongst those actually unknown through Vulgate manuscripts, some are common to other theological or exegetical works, but some others are currently unknown outside Philip's work.

As stated by Robert A. Kraft in his review of the volume 12 of the Benedictine Vulgate (*Sapientia Salomonis. Liber Hiesu Filii Sirach*), "The goal of this edition, as of the earlier Benedictine volumes, is not to determine the 'original' Latin form of the Vulgate text [...] but to recover as nearly as possible a presumed 5th/6th century archetype from which the extant MSS derive."¹ Could Philip's commentary help to recover a state of text closer to the 'original' Vulgate than the 5th/6th century archetype? It seems to me that the question should be considered.

Philip's commentary and other biblical versions

¹ *Gnomon*, Dec., 1965, 37. Bd., H. 8 (Dec. 1965), pp. 777-781.

As I am coming to the end of my paper, after having gone through the posterity of Philip's readings, I would now make the opposite move and address the topic of the links between Philip's readings and ancient textual traditions for the book of Job in other languages than Latin and Greek. As I am absolutely not specialized in these languages, I didn't through the whole textual tradition of the book of Job and I began to work with the French translations from these languages which were available to me. Therefore, what I will say now is nothing else than the beginning of a work I hope to extend in the months and years to come.

My first example is in the first chapter of the book of Job. From 1:15 to 1:19, four messengers come to Job and they announce him the calamities he and his family have just suffered. The end of the verses are:

[1:15] *et euasi ego solus ut nuntiarem tibi*

[1:16] and [1 :19] *et effugi ego solus ut nuntiarem tibi*

[1:17] *et ego fugi solus ut nuntiarem tibi*

Philip has commented the following wording:

et remansi ego solus, ueni ut nuntiarem tibi

This is not a quotation from the translation Jerome has made on the Greek text. So where does it come from? Is this an invention or a mistake by Philip? This wording has actually a parallel in the Armenian translation of the third homily on Job of Hesychius of Jerusalem, whose original Greek text is lost. Here is an English translation of the Armenian text:

“And I remained alone and I came to announce it to you.”

On which translation did Hesychius, who was bishop in the first half of the 4th century, wrote his commentary? Antoine Wenger has shown that Hesychius' homilies on Leviticus, although known only through their Latin translation, had been written on the basis of the Septuagint text². Did Hesychius worked on a Greek text for his homilies on Job? There is not parallel for “remansi”/”remain” in the Hexapla, so this Greek may not be one from Theodotion, Aquila or Symmachus. Could Hesychius have used a rabbinic exegesis, such as a Targumic, in despite of him being anti-Semitic, a source he would have shared with Jerome and Philip? The recent works of Matthew Kraus on Jerome's translations and the rabbinic exegesis they are sometimes reflecting make this hypothesis credible. I haven't time to deepen into this matter today but I have begun to work on traces of Targum Job in Philip's commentary and there are some, so the hypothesis of a common rabbinic source to Philip and Hesychius shouldn't, in my opinion, be discarded too soon.

I have looked at other textual traditions of the book of Job which may have links with some readings of Philip, the Ethiopic one and the Coptic bohairic one, and even though I didn't go very far, I found interesting points that call for further investigations. While commenting Job 22:23,

² <https://www.brepolonline.net/doi/pdf/10.1484/J.REA.5.103934>

Philip has quoted what “*alii dixerunt*”, and a translation which doesn’t match with the one on the Septuagint but which has a parallel in the Ge’ez Bible, the Ethiopic one:

[22:23] *instauraberis si te **factorum tuorum poenitat***

The Hebrew word is *shuv*, ‘to return’, and it has sometimes the meaning ‘to repent’. However, Philip’s reading has no parallel in Vulgate manuscripts nor in the translation according to the Septuagint, nor in the Hexapla. The Ge’ez word, *nassəḥa*, used in this verse has a specific sense of “repent”, which makes the Ge’ez verse match with Philip’s one. Is this only coincidental? The Ethiopic version of the Old Testament raises a lot of problems that specialized scholars have explored, such as Hebrew influences on the different stages of the text and the moment they were added to the text. Therefore, I can’t discard the hypothesis of a common rabbinic source for Philip’s reading and the Ethiopic Bible one, which may be traced to the rabbinic exegesis, or may not.

This rabbinic exegesis was, according to me, known by Philip. Indeed, in some verses, he is using themes and wordings which match with the translation or the wording of the Aramaic Targum of Job for this very precise verse. Here is an example:

Call to mind now what person who was innocent *like Abraham* ever perished, and where have the upright *like Isaac and Jacob* been destroyed? (Tg Job 4, 7) (Translation by Céline Mangan)

RECORDARE, OBSECO, TE, QUIS UNQUAM INNOCENS PERIERIT, AUT QUANDO IUSTI DELETI SUNT *Ergo ignoras Abel innocentem in principio creationis occisum ? Et Abraham patriarcham propter uxorem suam fuisse perichitatum ? Isaac quoque, et Iacob passos in sectationem Palaestinatorum [...] ?*

REMEMBER, I PRAY THEE, WHICH INNOCENT MAN EVER PERISHED AND WHEN THE RIGHTEOUS WERE DESTROYED. You are unaware that the innocent Abel was killed at the beginning of creation, that the patriarch *Abraham* was in danger of death due to his wife, and that *Isaac also and Jacob* suffered while pursuing the Palestinians [...] (*In Iob*, I, 4; 12)

The latin text I am quoting here is the one transcribed by Sichard. I could quote more from Philip’s commentary, and specially the beginning of chapter 32, where he has inserted a development on Heliu and Barachel being descended from Abraham, and this in the very verse for which the Targum Job replaces the name Ram by the name Abraham. Inserting part of verses on Patriarchs is a topos for targumic literature, and it is no coincidence that Philip has used this thema in his commentary. The dating of the Targum Job is still disputed, and, as Céline Mangan, who edited it, wrote, almost every century from Gamaliel to the 8th century has been proposed. My hypothesis on the link between Philip’s commentary and the Targum Job is that Philip had access to part of the material which was used to collate or gather what has become the Targum Job as we know it now. Philip was Jerome’s best disciple, according to Gennadius, and through recent researches, for

example Matthew Kraus' ones³, we know that the access Jerome had to rabbinic teaching and exegesis is reflected in his work.

To conclude, I hope I have shown that Philip's commentary on Job is a work that could be studied as much to go deeper into two lines of research. The first on the diffusion of the two Latin translations of the book of Job, especially the most known and used one, the translation and Hebrew, and could be new pieces of the sophisticated puzzle that are the versions of the Vulgate with multiple influences which were circulating in the Middle Ages. The second line is a contribution to the renewal of the way we look at Jerome's and his disciples' work. This renewal is, for years, taking into consideration the sources that Jerome, and in his wake Philip, had at his hand when he worked into his translations of the Hebrew Bible into Latin. The writing style of Philip's commentary on Job may be not be sophisticated. Nonetheless, the work itself is valuable when it comes to the study of the biblical text.

³ M. Kraus, *Jewish, Christian, and Classical Exegetical Traditions in Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus: Translation Technique and the Vulgate*, Boston-Leiden 2017.