

THE VULGATE TEXT  
OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

# VETUS LATINA

DIE RESTE DER ATTLATEINISCHEN BIBEL

NACH PETRUS SABATIER NEU GESAMMELT  
HERAUSGEGEBEN VON DER ERZABTEI BEURON

AUS DER GESCHICHTE  
DER LATEINISCHEN BIBEL

BEGRÜNDET VON BONIFATIUS FISCHER  
HERAUSGEGEBEN VON THOMAS JOHANN BAUER

42

ISSN 0571-9070

**HERDER**

THE VULGATE TEXT OF THE  
CATHOLIC EPISTLES:  
ITS LANGUAGE, ORIGIN AND  
RELATIONSHIP  
WITH THE VETUS LATINA

by  
ANNA PERSIG

HERDER 

FREIBURG · BASEL · WIEN

© Verlag Herder GmbH, Freiburg im Breisgau 2022  
Alle Rechte vorbehalten  
[www.herder.de](http://www.herder.de)  
Satz: SatzWeise, Bad Wünnenberg  
Herstellung: PBtisk a. s., Příbram  
Printed in the Czech Republic  
ISBN Print 978-3-451-32938-8

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is a revised and improved version of my doctoral thesis, which represents the principal outcome of my doctorate carried out at the University of Birmingham in partnership with the University of Nottingham between 2017 and 2021. The research that has led to this publication has been generously funded by the Midlands4Cities Doctoral Training Partnership (M4C) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), which believed and invested in this project. I am grateful for the time spent at the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing (ITSEE) and the ongoing support of its members and PhD candidates.

The thesis on which this book is based has much benefitted from the expertise and guidance of the supervisory team consisting of Hugh Houghton, Philip Burton and Thomas O’Loughlin. I am deeply indebted to Hugh Houghton who supervised the thesis with competence, precision, patience and admirable commitment and kindly lent me several books that would have been hard to find. I would like to thank him for all the opportunities I was given and for what I learned from him in the past three years. Philip Burton made a number of acute observations derived from his deep knowledge of the subject of study. Thomas O’Loughlin assisted with his theological expertise and wide erudition.

The discussions arisen from the doctoral defense, which took place in January 2021, have greatly contributed to the completion of this book: I thank my examiners Christina M. Kreinecker and Ailsa Hunt for their comments which I integrated in this revised version of the thesis and for making the *viva voce* examination an enjoyable and profitable experience. My position at KU Leuven as postdoctoral researcher on the ›New Testament in Translation‹ project (Internal Funds KU Leuven 3H190608) has provided the means and resources to undertake the necessary revision of the thesis. I express my gratitude to Thomas Johann Bauer, who provided constructive criticism as respondent to my presentation at the General Meeting of the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* 2021 and accepted to publish the book in the series *Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* so that it can stand beside Thiele’s monographs on the *Vetus Latina Catholic Epistles*, published in the same series. I sincerely thank Herder for the efficient work and collaboration in the publication of this book.

Giovanbattista Galdi invited me for a research stay at the University of Ghent in March 2020 and gave valuable feedback on a partial draft of the thesis. I approached the study of the Latin New Testament following the suggestion of Rolando Ferri, who advised me to pursue a doctorate in this field.

On a personal level, the encouragement of my partner Paolo has been essential for the accomplishment of the present book. My parents supported me throughout my education and stirred my interest in literature and culture: grateful for their love, care and abnegation, I dedicate this work to them.

*Leuven, January 2022*

## CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
1. The Catholic Epistles: from the Greek Text to the Latin Translations . . . . .	1
2. The Problem of Canonicity of the Catholic Epistles in the West . . . . .	4
3. The Direct and Indirect Tradition of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles . . . . .	5
a. The Manuscript Tradition . . . . .	5
b. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Jerome . . . . .	7
c. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Augustine . . . . .	10
d. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Pelagius, His Circle and Adversaries . . . . .	11
4. Prefaces and Order of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles . . . . .	13
5. The Question of the Authorship . . . . .	15
6. Stylistic Differences and Principles of Revision . . . . .	18
7. ›Christian Latin‹ . . . . .	19
8. ›Late‹, ›Vulgar‹ and ›Colloquial‹ Latin . . . . .	21
9. <i>Status Quaestionis</i> and Aims of the Research . . . . .	23
10. Methodology . . . . .	25
II. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES . . . . .	30
1. Introduction . . . . .	30
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	35
a. Loan-words . . . . .	35
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	37
b.1 Periphrases . . . . .	37
b.2 Calques and ›Matching‹ Words . . . . .	38
b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds . . . . .	40
b.4 Etymologising Renderings . . . . .	41
3. Latin Language . . . . .	43
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	43
b. Postclassical and Late Latin Formations . . . . .	46
c. Rare Words . . . . .	49
d. Revivals of Archaic Words . . . . .	50
4. Morphology . . . . .	51

5. Syntax . . . . .	52
a. Graecisms . . . . .	52
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	52
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	53
b. Verbal Constructions and Syntax . . . . .	56
6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek . . . . .	58
a. Number . . . . .	58
b. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	59
7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	60
a. Rendering of Greek Articles . . . . .	60
b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions . . . . .	61
c. Unfocused Renderings . . . . .	66
8. Variations . . . . .	66
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	67
b. Variations in the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	69
c. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	69
d. Variations in the Vulgate and the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	70
9. Participial Renderings . . . . .	70
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	70
b. Participles . . . . .	72
10. Statistics . . . . .	74
a. Lexicon . . . . .	75
b. Participles . . . . .	76
c. Word Order . . . . .	77
11. The Vulgate and <i>Vetus Latina</i> as Sources for the Greek Text . . . . .	78
12. Conclusions . . . . .	80
 III. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER . . . . .	 85
1. Introduction . . . . .	85
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	90
a. Loan-words . . . . .	90
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	92
b.1 Periphrases . . . . .	93
b.2 Calques and ›Matching‹ Words . . . . .	94
b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds . . . . .	96
b.4 Etymologising Renderings . . . . .	97
3. Latin Language . . . . .	100
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	100
b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words . . . . .	104
4. Morphology . . . . .	105

5. Syntax . . . . .	107
a. Graecisms . . . . .	107
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	107
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	107
b. Verbal Constructions and Syntax . . . . .	111
6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek . . . .	112
a. Number . . . . .	112
b. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	113
7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina . . . . .	114
a. Rendering of Greek Articles . . . . .	114
b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions . . . . .	116
c. Unfocused Renderings . . . . .	118
8. Variations . . . . .	119
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	119
b. Variations in the Vetus Latina . . . . .	121
c. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	121
d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina . . . . .	121
9. Participial Renderings . . . . .	122
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	122
b. Participles . . . . .	123
10. Statistics . . . . .	124
a. Lexicon . . . . .	124
b. Participles . . . . .	125
c. Word Order . . . . .	125
11. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text . . .	126
12. Conclusions . . . . .	129
IV. THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER . . . . .	132
1. Introduction . . . . .	132
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	135
a. Loan-words . . . . .	135
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	136
b.1 Periphrases . . . . .	136
b.2 Calques and ›Matching‹ Words . . . . .	137
b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds . . . . .	137
c. Etymologising Renderings . . . . .	139
3. Latin Language . . . . .	141
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	141
b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words . . . . .	144
4. Morphology . . . . .	145

5. Syntax . . . . .	145
a. Graecisms . . . . .	145
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	145
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	146
b. Postclassical Constructions . . . . .	149
6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek . . . . .	149
a. Number . . . . .	149
b. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	150
7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	151
a. Rendering of Greek Articles . . . . .	151
b. Focused Renderings and Constructions . . . . .	151
c. Unfocused Renderings . . . . .	153
8. Variations . . . . .	156
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	156
b. Variations in the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	157
c. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	157
d. Variations in the Vulgate and the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	157
9. Participial Renderings . . . . .	158
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	158
b. Participles . . . . .	158
10. Statistics . . . . .	159
a. Lexicon . . . . .	160
b. Participles . . . . .	161
c. Word Order . . . . .	161
11. The Vulgate and the <i>Vetus Latina</i> as Sources for the Greek Text . . . . .	162
12. Conclusions . . . . .	163
 V. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN . . . . .	 167
1. Introduction . . . . .	167
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	172
a. Loan-words . . . . .	172
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	175
b.1 Calques and ›Matching‹ Words . . . . .	175
b.2 Alpha Privative Compounds . . . . .	176
b.3 Etymologising Renderings . . . . .	176
3. Latin Language . . . . .	177
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	177
b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words . . . . .	179
4. Morphology . . . . .	180

5. Syntax . . . . .	181
a. Graecisms . . . . .	181
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	181
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	186
b. Postclassical Constructions . . . . .	188
6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek . . . . .	188
a. Number . . . . .	188
b. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	188
7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina . . . . .	189
a. Rendering of Greek Articles . . . . .	189
b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions . . . . .	192
c. Unfocused Renderings . . . . .	193
8. Variations . . . . .	194
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	194
b. Variations in the Vetus Latina . . . . .	199
c. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	199
d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina . . . . .	200
9. Participial Renderings . . . . .	201
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	201
b. Participles . . . . .	201
10. Statistics . . . . .	202
a. Lexicon . . . . .	202
b. Participles . . . . .	203
c. Word Order . . . . .	203
11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text . . . . .	204
12. Conclusions . . . . .	207
VI. THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN . . . . .	211
1. Introduction . . . . .	211
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	212
a. Loan-words . . . . .	212
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	213
3. Latin language . . . . .	213
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	213
4. Syntax . . . . .	214
a. Graecisms . . . . .	214
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	214
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	214

5. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with the Greek Text . . . . .	215
a. Number . . . . .	215
b. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	216
6. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	216
a. Rendering of Greek Articles . . . . .	216
b. Verbal Constructions . . . . .	216
7. Variations . . . . .	217
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	217
b. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	217
8. Participial Renderings . . . . .	218
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	218
b. Participles . . . . .	218
9. Statistics . . . . .	219
a. Lexicon . . . . .	219
b. Participles . . . . .	220
c. Word Order . . . . .	220
10. The Vulgate and the <i>Vetus Latina</i> as Sources for the Greek Text . . .	221
11. Conclusions . . . . .	221
VII. THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN . . . . .	223
1. Introduction . . . . .	223
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	224
a. Loan-words . . . . .	224
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	224
b.1 Periphrases . . . . .	225
b.2 Calques and ›Matching‹ Words . . . . .	225
b.3 Etymologising Renderings . . . . .	226
3. Latin Language . . . . .	226
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	226
4. Syntax . . . . .	227
a. Graecisms . . . . .	227
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	227
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	227
5. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek . . . . .	229
a. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	229
6. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the <i>Vetus Latina</i> . . . . .	229
a. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions . . . . .	229
b. Unfocused Lexical Renderings and Constructions in the Vulgate . . . . .	230

7. Variations . . . . .	230
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	230
b. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	230
8. Participial Renderings . . . . .	231
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	231
b. Participles . . . . .	232
9. Statistics . . . . .	233
a. Lexicon . . . . .	233
b. Participles . . . . .	233
c. Word Order . . . . .	234
10. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text . . .	234
11. Conclusions . . . . .	234
VIII. THE EPISTLE OF JUDE . . . . .	237
1. Introduction . . . . .	237
2. Greek Lexicon . . . . .	240
a. Loan-words . . . . .	240
b. Rendering of Greek Compounds . . . . .	241
b.1 Alpha Privative Compounds . . . . .	241
b.2 Etymologising Renderings . . . . .	242
3. Latin Language . . . . .	243
a. Abstract and Derived Words . . . . .	243
4. Morphology . . . . .	245
5. Syntax . . . . .	246
a. Graecisms . . . . .	246
a.1 Reported Speech . . . . .	246
a.2 Greek Constructions . . . . .	246
6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek . . . .	247
a. Comparatives and Superlatives . . . . .	247
7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina . . . . .	248
a. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions . . . . .	248
b. Unfocused Lexical Renderings and Constructions in the Vulgate	250
8. Variations . . . . .	251
a. Absence of Variations . . . . .	251
b. Variations in the Vulgate . . . . .	251
c. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina . . . . .	251
9. Participial Renderings . . . . .	252
a. Articular Participles . . . . .	252
b. Participles . . . . .	253

10. Statistics . . . . .	254
a. Lexicon . . . . .	254
b. Participles . . . . .	254
c. Word Order . . . . .	255
11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text . . . . .	255
12. Conclusions . . . . .	257
 IX. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	 261
 APPENDIX . . . . .	 273
 BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 274
 INDEX OF LATIN MANUSCRIPTS . . . . .	 285
 INDEX OF GREEK MANUSCRIPTS AND PAPYRI . . . . .	 288
 INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES . . . . .	 290
 INDEX OF ANCIENT AUTHORS AND WRITINGS . . . . .	 304
 INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND MODERN AUTHORS . . . . .	 315

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The affiliation of the citations of Jerome from the Catholic Epistles . . . . .	9
Table 2. Rendering of articular participles in James . . . . .	70
Table 3. Rendering of non-articular participles in James . . . . .	72
Table 4. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in James . . . . .	74
Table 5. Lexical renderings in James . . . . .	76
Table 6. Participial renderings in James . . . . .	76
Table 7. Word order in James . . . . .	77
Table 8. Rendering of articular participles in 1 Peter . . . . .	122
Table 9. Rendering of non-articular participles in 1 Peter . . . . .	123
Table 10. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in 1 Peter . . . . .	124
Table 11. Lexical renderings in 1 Peter . . . . .	124
Table 12. Participial renderings in 1 Peter . . . . .	125
Table 13. Word order in 1 Peter . . . . .	126
Table 14. Rendering of articular participles in 2 Peter . . . . .	158
Table 15. Rendering of non-articular participles in 2 Peter . . . . .	159
Table 16. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in 2 Peter. . . . .	159
Table 17. Lexical renderings in 2 Peter . . . . .	160
Table 18. Participial renderings in 2 Peter . . . . .	161
Table 19. Word order in 2 Peter . . . . .	161
Table 20. Use of conjunctions in the reported speech in 1 John . . . . .	185
Table 21. Use of conjunctions in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles . . . . .	185
Table 22. Rendering of articular participles in 1 John . . . . .	201
Table 23. Rendering of non-articular participles in 1 John . . . . .	201
Table 24. Lexical renderings in 1 John . . . . .	202
Table 25. Participial renderings in 1 John . . . . .	203
Table 26. Word order in 1 John . . . . .	203
Table 27. Rendering of articular participles in 2 John . . . . .	218
Table 28. Rendering of non-articular participles in 2 John . . . . .	218
Table 29. Lexical renderings in 2 John . . . . .	219
Table 30. Participial renderings in 2 John . . . . .	220
Table 31. Word order in 2 John . . . . .	220

Table 32. Rendering of articular participles in 3 John . . . . .	231
Table 33. Rendering of non-articular participles in 3 John . . . . .	232
Table 34. Lexical renderings in 3 John . . . . .	233
Table 35. Participial renderings in 3 John . . . . .	233
Table 36. Word order in 3 John . . . . .	234
Table 37. Rendering of articular participles in Jude . . . . .	252
Table 38. Rendering of non-articular participles in Jude . . . . .	253
Table 39. Lexical renderings in Jude . . . . .	254
Table 40. Participial renderings in Jude . . . . .	254
Table 41. Word order in Jude . . . . .	255
Table 42. Comparison between 2 Peter and Jude . . . . .	259
Table 43. Word order in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles . . . . .	265
Table 44. Lexicon in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles . . . . .	266
Table 45. Participial renderings in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles . . . . .	267

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1. The Catholic Epistles: from the Greek Text to the Latin Translations

The corpus of the Catholic Epistles is made up of seven letters: James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John and Jude. The denomination ›Catholic‹ (ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαί), first used by Origen in the third century, alludes to the general audience to whom the letters are addressed.<sup>1</sup> In the West the Epistles were called *canonicae*, which means universally accepted.<sup>2</sup> The authorship and dating of these texts are doubtful: although the writers of the Epistles are presented as James, ›the Lord’s brother‹ (Galatians 1:19), the apostles Peter and John, and Jude, the brother of James mentioned at Mark 6:3 and Matthew 13:55, these are likely to be pseudonyms.<sup>3</sup> James was possibly written between 70 and 80–5 while 1 Peter is variously attributed to the reigns of Domitian (81–96), Trajan (98–117) and Hadrian (117–38).<sup>4</sup> 2 Peter was composed between 140 and 160 since it is later than Jude, dated to 100–20.<sup>5</sup> The period of composition of the Johannine letters is more difficult to determine: 2 John and 3 John probably predated 1 John and the three letters were written after the first redaction of the Gospel of John and before its final redaction, which took place between 70–90 and 125–50.<sup>6</sup> From the fourth century the Catholic Epistles were combined in manuscripts with the Acts of the Apostles to form the so-called *Praxapostolos*, which, however, may also include either Revelation or the Pauline Epistles.<sup>7</sup> The Epistles of John form with the Gospel of John and Re-

---

1 Lockett (2012: 3). Schlosser (2004: 9–10) affirms that the adjective ›Catholic‹ used by Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica* 4,14,1 and 5,18,5) when explaining the content of Clement of Alexandria’s *Hypotyposes* and reporting Apollonius’ accusation against Themison reflects Eusebius’ terminology and not the actual expressions employed by Clement and Apollonius at the end of the second century.

2 The Epistles are referred as *canonicae* in the preface *Non ita ordo est*, by Augustine, Junilius and Cassiodorus whereas Jerome is the only western writer who calls them *catholicae* (Nienhuis, 2007: 84).

3 Lockett (2012: 10–3, 42–5, 77–9 and 80–2).

4 Konradt (2020: 515) and Gielen (2020a: 529–31). Gielen (2013: 161–83) argues that 1 Peter was composed around 130 since the addressees of the letter are the Christian communities in the provinces visited by Hadrian in his journeys of 123–4 and 129: the author of 1 Peter addresses the problem of the conflict between imperial cult, which was strengthened by Hadrian in the eastern provinces, and Christianity.

5 Wasserman (2006: 73–98) concludes that Jude was the model of 2 Peter. On the timespans proposed for the dating of 2 Peter and Jude, see Gielen (2020b: 539 and 2020c: 569).

6 Kügler (2020: 545–8).

7 Parker (2008: 283–6). For instance, P74 (P.Bodmer XVII) hands down the Acts and the Catholic Epistles (Houghton, 2018: 6).

relation the Johannine corpus. The ideological and linguistic features shared by these writings do not necessarily point to a single origin and authorship, considering that the Johannine style could have been easily imitated.<sup>8</sup> It has been argued that in the second century the Johannine corpus may have been perceived as a conceptual and perhaps physical unity attributed to a single writer, but from the third century the authenticity of Revelation and 2–3 John was questioned and the Epistles of John were assembled in manuscripts with the other Catholic Epistles.<sup>9</sup> However, Greek manuscripts containing the Epistles of John without the other Catholic Epistles are not preserved and the hypothesis of the circulation of the Johannine corpus in manuscripts derives from the reconstruction of the lacunose Codex Bezae and the fragmentary manuscript GA 0232 while intertextuality, which was used in antiquity for the whole Bible, is not a strong argument in support of this hypothesis.<sup>10</sup> Lieu and De Boer conclude that ›there is little if any explicit evidence that they [the Gospel and three Epistles of John] ever circulated together as did the Pauline corpus.‹<sup>11</sup> The development of the canonical New Testament was a gradual process, as may be seen in manuscripts such as the fourth-century pandects, although Trobisch has argued that details such as the order and titles of the books, cross-references and so on (including the Johannine material) point to the assembly of a ›canonical edition‹ at an earlier stage than is normally thought to have been the case.<sup>12</sup> A greater uniformity in the transmission of the New Testament books would have been expected as a consequence of the existence of an early ›canonical edition.‹<sup>13</sup> From the second up to the mid-third century, 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John and Jude appear to be the only Epistles known and cited by Irenaeus (with the exception of Jude), Tertullian (with the exception of 2 John) and Clement of Alexandria.<sup>14</sup> 1 Peter, 1 John and Jude are ac-

---

8 Lieu (2008: 1–4 and 17–19) and Hill (2004: 1–2).

9 Hill (2004: 449–64) affirms that the acknowledgment of the Johannine corpus is demonstrated by the intertextual use of these writings for the sake of interpretation in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, the Muratorian Fragment and by the possible codicological unity of the works of John, as Codex Bezae, GA 0232 and the anonymous writing *Contra Noetum* might suggest.

10 Hill (2004: 454–6). Parker (2008: 285) suggests that the lacuna of Codex Bezae may have contained Revelation and the Johannine Epistles, placed between the Gospels and Acts.

11 Lieu and De Boer (2018: 1).

12 Trobisch (2000), followed by Schlosser (2004: 17). Trobisch bases his argument on the study of the *nomina sacra*, the order and titles of the New Testament books, the cross-references between the books and the codicological evidence. The cross-references between 2 Peter and Jude and the attribution to John of the Fourth Gospel, the Johannine Epistles and Revelation are among the arguments adduced by Trobisch to demonstrate the internal coherence of the ›canonical edition.‹

13 This is one of the points raised by Parker (2002: 301–3) as counter-evidence against Trobisch's hypothesis. Wasserman (2006: 123–4) also supports the hypothesis of a gradual development of the collection of the Catholic Epistles.

14 Nienhuis (2007: 44, 47). Gamble (1985: 48) affirms that ›for the remaining Catholic Epistles – James, 3 John and 2 Peter – there is simply no evidence for their use in the second

knowledgeable as scripture at an early date, when they are quoted in the ›Apostolic Fathers‹.<sup>15</sup> Origen is aware of all the seven Epistles although he has doubts about the authenticity of 2 Peter (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6,25,8; Rufinus of Aquileia, *De principiis* 2,5,135 and *Homiliae in Leviticum* 4,4,18), 2 and 3 John (*Historia ecclesiastica* 6,25,9).<sup>16</sup> The formation of a unitary collection dates back to the late third century and the acceptance of the Catholic corpus in the eastern canon is attested by Eusebius of Caesarea (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2,23,25 and 3,25,3), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses* 4,36), the Synod of Laodicea (Canon 60), Athanasius of Alexandria (Epistle 53,9), Gregory of Nazianzus (*Carmina* 1,12,5), Amphilocheus of Iconium (*Epistula iambica ad Seleucum* 310–5) and the Third Synod of Carthage (Canon 24).<sup>17</sup> Jerome explicitly mentions the seven Catholic Epistles in Epistle 53,9 of the year 394, and Augustine names them in *De doctrina christiana* 2,8,13 dated to 396–7.<sup>18</sup> However, the earliest attestations of the Latin Catholic Epistles precede that date: these appeared in Northern Africa at the end of the second century, as the citations of Tertullian witness, and slightly later in Europe: the citations of Novatian date back to the third century. The number of the Latin versions exponentially increased from the fourth century onwards.<sup>19</sup> The collective term *Vetus Latina* (Old Latin in English) groups together the numerous Latin versions of African and European origin, produced from the second to the fifth century and transmitted by the direct and indirect tradition, in contrast with the Vulgate, the revision of the Gospels accomplished by Jerome between 382–4 and by one or more anonymous revisers in the other New Testament books between the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century.<sup>20</sup>

---

century. They came into consideration as authoritative documents only later, and then with difficulty.

15 McDonald (2007: 941–3).

16 Nienhuis (2007: 52–62).

17 Lockett (2012: 4), Metzger (1987: 201–14) and Schlosser (2004: 4–5).

18 *Iacobus, Petrus, Iohannes, Iudas septem epistulas ediderunt* (Epistle 53,9). *Petri duabus, tribus Iohannis, una Iudae et una Iacobi* (*De doctrina christiana* 2,8,13).

19 The Latin translations of the works of the ›Apostolic Fathers‹ are considered to be among the earliest European versions. However, the timeframe in which they were produced remains unknown: the scholarly debates on the possible dating of 1 Clement will be presented in the chapter on James (p. 30).

20 The term ›version‹, which is sometimes equivalent to ›translation‹ and ›text type‹ in New Testament textual criticism, is used here in a broader sense than the other nomenclatures to refer to a form of text which may be transmitted by the direct and indirect tradition and be either a direct translation from Greek or a revision of a preceding translation.

## 2. The Problem of Canonicity of the Catholic Epistles in the West

Not all the seven Catholic Epistles were either known or considered to be authentic in the West between the late second and third century. Tertullian cites 1 Peter and 1 John and knows Jude while Cyprian quotes only 1 Peter and 1 John. Frisius affirms that ›the books of 2 and 3 John are universally seen as unused and unknown in early third-century North Africa‹ and demonstrates that Tertullian ›is aware of Jude, but does not appear familiar with the text. He does not display any knowledge of 2 Peter or James, although it is unclear if this is because he has rejected these works or simply has never come into contact with them.‹<sup>21</sup> On the other hand, Novatian quotes James, 1 and 2 Peter and 1 John. The authenticity of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John and Jude was widely disputed in antiquity: the Muratorian fragment mentions Jude and two letters of John.<sup>22</sup> The Mommсен or Cheltenham canon, dated after the middle of the fourth century, includes three Epistles of John and two Epistles of Peter, both followed by the indication *una sola*, which appears to point out that only 1 John and 1 Peter are authentic.<sup>23</sup> 2 John is cited as early as the Protocol of the Synod of Carthage (CY sent) of the year 256. Jerome observes differences in language and style between 1 and 2 Peter in Epistle 120,11 from the years 406–7 as well as in *De viris illustribus* from 393.<sup>24</sup> In the fourth century, Hilary of Poitiers (*De trinitate* 1,18,3 and 4,8,28) quotes James and considers 2 Peter to be authentic, while Ambrosiaster cites all the Epistles except Jude in his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and attributes 2 Peter and 2 John to the apostles (Commentary on Romans 12,18,2, Commentary on Philippians 1,3–5 and Commentary on 1 Timothy 2,4,2).<sup>25</sup> 1 and 2 John and Jude are quoted by Lucifer of Cagliari. We can conclude that in the West the seven Catholic Epistles formed a fixed corpus only at the end of the fourth century, when the circulation of the seven letters is acknowledged by Jerome in Epistle 53,9.<sup>26</sup>

---

21 Frisius (2011: 1, 17).

22 Lieu (2008: 26–8) and Metzger (1987: 197, 307). However, the text of the Muratorian Fragment is corrupt in this passage. On the hypothesis that the Muratorian Fragment is a fourth-century forgery see Guignard (2015) and Rothschild (2018).

23 Metzger (1987: 231–2). Nienhuis (2007: 81) dates the Cheltenham canon to the latter third of the fourth century and McDonald (2007: 945) to the year 360.

24 *Denique et duae epistulae, quae feruntur Petri, stilo inter se et caractere discrepant structuraque verborum; ex quo intellegimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus.* For the passage from *De viris illustribus* see footnote 72 on page 14.

25 Nienhuis (2007: 82).

26 See footnote 18 on page 3.

### 3. The Direct and Indirect Tradition of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

The study of the textual tradition is a primary approach to illuminate the origin and set a precise timeframe for the production of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles. A brief description of the principal manuscripts transmitting the Vulgate and of the earliest attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles in the quotations of the Church Fathers is helpful to contextualise them and lay the basis for the study of their language.<sup>27</sup>

#### a. The Manuscript Tradition

At a certain point in the textual tradition, the Vulgate New Testament, which comprises Jerome's revision of the Gospels on one hand and the Acts, the Epistles and Revelation in their revised form on the other, was assembled as a unitary corpus in manuscripts. In earliest times biblical writings circulated in separate groups (for instance the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles), as the surviving copies and Augustine's evidence (*Contra Felicem* 1,3 and Epistle 29, 4–5) attest.<sup>28</sup> Pandects, i. e. manuscripts containing the entire Old and New Testament, were produced in the West from the fifth century.<sup>29</sup> The oldest surviving Latin pandect of the Old and New Testament is the Palimpsest of León (León, Archivio Catedralicio, 15), written in the seventh century, which contains the Vulgate Pauline Epistles, but Acts and the Catholic Epistles in the Old Latin version.<sup>30</sup> The earliest complete manuscript of the Vulgate New Testament is Codex Fuldensis (Fulda, Landesbibliothek Bonifatianus, 1) copied in the sixth century and containing a harmony of the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles plus the Epistle to the Laodiceans, the Catholic Epistles, Acts and Revelation corrected by Victor of Capua in the years 546–7. The name of Jerome precedes the harmony of the Gospels and not the whole New Testament.<sup>31</sup> Another important source for the textual history of the Vulgate is Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Amiatino, 1), copied in Northumbria at the

---

27 A full list of the manuscripts transmitting the Vulgate and Old Latin Catholic Epistles is present in Thiele's introduction to the *Vetus Latina* edition (1956–69: 11–50). The principal manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina* are described in the introductory sections of the following chapters and are listed in the index of Latin manuscripts.

28 Petitmengin (1985: 94–5). The manuscripts transmitting only the Gospels represent the majority of the surviving evidence: a significant exemplar is Codex Sangallensis (St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 1395), the earliest manuscript with the Vulgate Gospels from the first half of the fifth century (Houghton, 2016: 48).

29 Houghton (2016: 13–4).

30 Thiele (1956–69: 16–7) and Houghton (2016: 63).

31 Bogaert (2013: 525).

beginning of the eighth century. It shares with Cassiodorus' *codex grandior* a large format and is a pandect of the Latin Bible with a text derived from various sources.<sup>32</sup> Two subscriptions contained in the Bible of Saint Germain des Prés (VL 7: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 11553) copied around 810, which are attributed by Bogaert to the booksellers responsible for the first distribution of the Vulgate, are the first explicit manuscript witnesses that claim Jerome as the reviser of the Old and New Testament.<sup>33</sup> The subscription at the end of Esther attests that the editor collected the manuscripts of Jerome's translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew in order to produce a pandect (*fecique pandectem*) while the subscription at the end of Hebrews contains the attribution of the whole New Testament to Jerome.<sup>34</sup> This manuscript is a copy of a fifth century pandect and conveys a mixed text, mainly Vulgate, apart from Matthew, which is Old Latin, and some Old Latin elements in the other Gospels and James.<sup>35</sup> According to Bogaert, the combination of the Gospels with the other writings not revised by Jerome was promoted by booksellers in the first half of the fifth century for commercial reasons.<sup>36</sup> Bogaert bases his argument on the subscriptions of VL 7, the early use of the complete New Testament by Victor of Capua and Cassiodorus, who implicitly states that his small pandect contains the Old and New Testament in the Vulgate version.<sup>37</sup> It must be noted that the copies of fifth-century pandects, such as Fuldensis, Amiatinus and Sangermanensis, are composite and therefore their affiliation is not thoroughly Vulgate: the quality of the text changes according to the biblical books, which were contained in different manuscripts used to assemble the pandects.<sup>38</sup>

The Old Latin was gradually superseded by the Vulgate: the increasing diffusion of the latter, mainly in mixed-text manuscripts and mixed-text versions of individual books, is witnessed by Isidore and the number of surviving manuscripts of the Vulgate overcame that of the *Vetus Latina* in the sixth century.<sup>39</sup> In the year 604 Pope Gregory allowed the use of the Vulgate in the liturgy alongside the *Vetus Latina*.<sup>40</sup> The mixture of the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate within a single book of the Bible or the alternation of Old Latin and

---

32 Thiele (1956–69: 20–1) and Houghton (2019: 77–8).

33 Bogaert (2013: 521) and Sparks (1970: 522).

34 Bogaert (2013: 521–2) translates the subscriptions into English whereas Houghton (2016: 88) reports the Latin text of the second subscription.

35 Thiele (1956–69: 23) and Houghton (2016: 213–4).

36 Bogaert (2013: 519): 'With the aim of offering a complete New Testament under Jerome's authority, booksellers very early attached the Gospels to a revised translation of the missing sections. Taken as one, this then became the New Testament 'Vulgate', and according to affirmations of Jerome (more programmatic than real), was circulated under his authority.'

37 Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1,12,2. See Bogaert (2013: 519) and Houghton (2016: 58).

38 Fischer (1985: 33).

39 Houghton (2016: 60–8), Elliott (1992: 221) and Petitmengin (1985: 97).

40 Elliott (1992: 221).

Vulgate books in the Bible were long-lasting phenomena up to the Carolingian age, at the end of which the standard format of the Bible had become the pandect. Under the influence of Charlemagne's admonition to prepare correct copies of the Bible, Alcuin, abbot of Tours, and Theodulf, abbot of Fleury and bishop of Orléans, attended to their editions of the Vulgate and supervised the copying of accurate and refined manuscripts in their scriptoria.<sup>41</sup> To strengthen the idea of a unitary revision and in order to associate it with the name of Jerome, Epistle 53 of Jerome to Paulinus of Nola was placed at the beginning of the Bible, a practice probably initiated by Alcuin.<sup>42</sup> The authorship of Jerome was considered a guarantee of accuracy and reliability, since he was held in high regard for his linguistic skills, as a good command of Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and perhaps Syriac and Aramaic, was exceptional at Jerome's time.<sup>43</sup> The Vulgate acquired an indisputable and official recognition with the Council of Trent: the *vetus et vulgata editio* became the authoritative version of the Bible, to be preferred to any other Latin versions because of its established use through the centuries.<sup>44</sup> From the sixteenth century the term *Vulgata*, which originally referred to the Greek Koiné, the Septuagint and the *Vetus Latina*, was used, first as an adjective and then as a freestanding noun, to refer to Jerome's revision.<sup>45</sup> The epithet was applied to the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, the revision initiated by Pope Sixtus V, accomplished for Pope Clement VIII in the year 1592 and in use until 1979, and was firmly associated with Jerome's version.<sup>46</sup>

#### b. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Jerome

The attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles in the indirect tradition give a *terminus ante quem* for the dating of the revision. Jerome attests readings and renderings of the Vulgate in writings dated to the end of the fourth century.<sup>47</sup> The most striking examples are the citations contained in the second book of *Adversus Iovinianum*, of the year 393, such as the participial renderings in agreement with the Vulgate at James 1:12–15 and 1:17, the lexical similarities at 2 Peter 2:17–18 and 1 John 2:2–6, 3:9, 4:13, 15, 5:16 and 18. However, these are not the earliest citations of Jerome with readings and renderings consistent with the Vulgate: lexical and syntactical similarities can be observed in the

---

41 Bogaert (2012: 80) and Houghton (2016: 81–6).

42 Bogaert (2012: 84).

43 Rebenich (1993: 56).

44 Sutcliffe (1948a: 37–8) and Vosté (1946: 313).

45 Bogaert (2012: 69 and 2013: 510–1). A list of the earliest attestations of the term *Vulgata* in the modern sense is present in Sutcliffe (1948b: 349–52).

46 Sutcliffe (1948b: 351).

47 Thiele (1965: 157–8) and Fischer (1972: 74).

quotations of James 1:15 and 1 Peter 1:11 in Jerome's translation of Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto*, made in the year 387. The lexical renderings in common with the Vulgate in Jerome's four Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, written in the year 386, may be either accidental similarities or later adjustments towards the Vulgate.<sup>48</sup> These isolated instances, which mainly concern the vocabulary, are not sufficient to demonstrate the use of the Vulgate by Jerome at such an early stage of the textual tradition. Nonetheless, verses 5–7 of Jude are cited according to the Vulgate in Epistle 46, also dated to 386, two years after the revision of the Gospels: this is the earliest attestation of a Vulgate text of the Catholic Epistles within the corpus of Jerome's quotations. This citation is extremely informative about the origin of the Vulgate because not only does it contain rare lexical features but also renderings of participles and word order in common with the Vulgate as well as the translation of the same Greek variants. Therefore, the revision of Jude seems to precede that of the other Epistles, which are all cited from 393 onwards, in *Adversus Iovinianum*, as said above, and in further contemporary writings. Verse 3:2 of James in Epistle 50, dated to the year 394, contains readings and renderings characteristic of the Vulgate. The extensive citations of 1 Peter 5:2–4 in Epistle 52, composed in the year 397, plus the Vulgate readings and renderings at 1 Peter 3:15 (*Contra Iohannem Hierosolymitanum*) and 5:13 (*De viris illustribus*), show that the revision of 1 Peter predates the year 397. A similar timeframe can be suggested for the Vulgate version of 1 John: readings and renderings characteristic of the Vulgate are attested in *Commentariorum in Abacuc prophetam* (verses 2:20 and 2:27) and *De viris illustribus* (1:1), both of the year 393. In addition, the lexical renderings of 2 John 1 and 3 John 1 agree with the citations of these passages in *De viris illustribus* and the latter with Epistle 146 of 398.

These observations are not sufficient to lead to the conclusion that Jerome revised the Vulgate Epistles: Jerome's quotations of the Catholic Epistles with features in agreement with the Vulgate are the exceptions rather than the rule, as it is possible to see in the table below, which illustrates the distribution of the citations in each category:

---

48 Houghton (2014a: 17–8 and 2017: 90) observes the introduction of Vulgate readings and Old Latin variants in Jerome's Commentary on Galatians in which not only the lemmata but also the exegesis was adjusted, although not consistently, according to the Vulgate.

EPISTLES	CITATIONS WITH READINGS DISTINCTIVE OF V	AGAINST V	NOT SIGNIFICANT (V= VL)	TOTAL NUMBER OF CITATIONS	PERCENTAGE OF CITATIONS WITH READINGS DISTINCTIVE OF V
JAMES	32	40	28	100	44 %
1 PETER	68	185	89	342	27 %
2 PETER	13	38	12	64	25 %
1 JOHN	80	90	59	229	47 %
2 JOHN	1	7	0	8	12 %
3 JOHN	3	4	1	8	43 %
JUDE	9	10	7	26	47 %
TOTAL	206	374	196	777	35 %

Table 1. The affiliation of the citations of Jerome from the Catholic Epistles<sup>49</sup>

The quotations with readings and renderings of the Vulgate represent 35 % of the total number. The majority of these citations are not entirely Vulgate but contain isolated features distinctive of the Vulgate together with Old Latin and unique readings. Inconsistencies in the affiliation of the biblical text can be noticed within the citations and between different quotations of the same verse, even in contemporary writings. On one hand, Jerome's citations do not correspond to a precise Vetus Latina text type as reconstructed by Thiele; on the other, they are characterised by numerous readings and renderings unique to Jerome. The biblical text of Jerome in 2 Peter is so peculiar that Thiele groups the citations from the first book of *Adversus Iovinianum*, *Explanationum in Esaiam* and Epistle 140 in the specific text type X, which represents the biblical text of Jerome and Paulinus of Aquileia.<sup>50</sup> However, it cannot be excluded that the citations of Jerome, although apparently unique, represent an Old Latin text no longer preserved elsewhere. Although readings of the Vulgate occur in the quotations of Jude of the year 386 and in the other letters of 393, the biblical text of later writings, such as *Explanationum in Esaiam*, *Commentariorum in Zachariam prophetam*, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos* and *In Hieremiam prophetam*, does not follow the Vulgate consistently. The data gathered from Jerome's citations demonstrate that Jerome is unlikely to be the reviser of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles because his biblical text rarely matches the Vulgate.<sup>51</sup>

49 The abbreviation VL is used to refer to the Vetus Latina and V to the Vulgate. The citations that are not significant are subtracted from the total number of citations in order to calculate the percentage.

50 Thiele (1956–69: 77).

51 However, it has been noted that Jerome does not cite the Vulgate version of Matthew, which

## c. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Augustine

The biblical text of Augustine in the Catholic Epistles is variable: not only does it change according to the Epistles but also swings between text types within each epistle: the citations are used by Thiele to reconstruct the African text type C, the European text type T and are indicated by the siglum A when the text is unique to Augustine.<sup>52</sup> Only in James do most of the quotations agree with the Vulgate.<sup>53</sup> Readings distinctive of the Vulgate in the Catholic Epistles can be found in Augustine's outputs spread out across a wide timespan, from the writings dated from 400 (*De natura boni; Contra Cresconium; De consensu evangelistarum; In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus; Contra litteras Petilianii*) up to the late ones from the decade 420–30 (*De correptione et gratia; De gratia et libero arbitrio; Contra Iulianum; Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem; Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum; De dono perseverantiae; De VIII Dulcitii quaestionibus*). James 1:14 and 2:14 quoted in *De continentia* were once taken as early attestations of the Vulgate, but this is no longer the case following the redating of the writing from 395 to the second decade of the fifth century.<sup>54</sup> The Vulgate Gospels began to be cited by Augustine in the same period as James, from the year 403, when the Vulgate is mentioned in Epistle 71,6 to Jerome, and in the same works, *De consensu evangelistarum* and *In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus*.<sup>55</sup> The affiliation of Augustine's biblical text in his lost commentary on James cannot be ascertained.<sup>56</sup> The similarity between Augustine's citations of James and the Vulgate across his entire corpus might be explained only by suppositions: a. the dependence of Augustine on the Vulgate, if the latter had been accomplished by the beginning of the fifth century, or on a common Old Latin version; b. later adjustment of the biblical text towards the Vulgate in the manuscript tradition; c. Augustine's involvement in the revision of James, although this hypothesis seems to be unlikely.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, Augustine did not know the revision

---

was revised by him, in his Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. See Lagrange (1918: 254), Chapman (1933: 123) and Souter (1941: 12–18).

52 The classification of Augustine's biblical text in each letter will be described in the chapters dealing with the linguistic analysis of the Epistles.

53 Houghton (2008b: 84): ›Augustine does not seem ever to have been familiar with the versions of the Epistles, Acts, or Revelation which became part of the Vulgate.‹ In Acts, Augustine agrees with the Vulgate when the readings are also supported by the Old Latin text types D and I (Petzer, 1991: 43–5). However, these instances do not demonstrate the dependence of Augustine on the Vulgate in that the readings identified by Petzer are not distinctive of the Vulgate.

54 Bonnardière (1959) proposes the period 416–18 and Gryson 418–20 (2007: 210).

55 Houghton (2008a: 456–60). Although Augustine's citations from the Gospels agree with the Vulgate from 403 onwards the Vetus Latina was not completely abandoned.

56 Augustine, *Retractationes* 2,58; Possidius, *Indiculum operum S. Augustini* 10,3,10; Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1,8,5.

57 Augustine affirms in the years 426–7: *ipsam epistulam ... non diligenter ex graeco habebamus*

of the other Catholic Epistles and cited them according to the *Vetus Latina* and a version unique to him among surviving texts.

d. The Citations of the Church Fathers:  
Pelagius, His Circle and Adversaries

It has been acknowledged that Pelagius and his followers John Cassian, Caelestius, Eucherius of Lyons, Julian of Eclanum, Rufinus the Syrian, the authors of the Caspari corpus and the Pseudo-Pelagian and Pseudo-Hieronymian literature are among the earliest patristic sources who cite the Vulgate.<sup>58</sup> The biblical text of these writers has been also transmitted by their opponents, such as Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine and the anonymous author of the *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos sive Caelestianos haereticos*. Nonetheless, most of their citations derive from the period 420–50 and are therefore later than those of Jerome and Augustine. Although a detailed study of the biblical text of Pelagius' followers and opponents is urgently required, only the earliest witnesses, which are valuable to assess the questions of the dating and authorship of the Vulgate, can be discussed in this context.<sup>59</sup>

Pseudo-Jerome's Epistle 41 written in the year 384 cites James 1:12 and 5:1–5 according to the Vulgate. The latter verses contain a stylistic modification unique to the Vulgate, the rendering of the verb ἐσπαταλήσατε with *in luxuriis* to avoid the juxtaposition of two neighbouring verbs as found in Greek and the *Vetus Latina*, and the translation of the expression σητόβρωτα γέγονεν with the periphrasis *a tineis comesta sunt* against the verb *tiniaverunt* of the Old Latin text types S and F.<sup>60</sup> In 1 Peter, the citations with a text close to the Vulgate are quoted in fifth-century writings: the biblical text of Caelestius at 1:14–16 cited by Augustine in *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* of the year 414 completely agrees with the Vulgate while the Pseudo-Pelagian Epistle 148, written between 413–4, features readings of the Vulgate at 3:1–6. The *Hypomnesticon*, dated to the beginning of the fifth century, is affiliated to the Vulgate in James 1:13–15, 17; 3:14 and 4:1; 1 Peter 2:24–25 and 5:10–11; 2 Peter 2:1–3; 1 John 2:1, 15–17; 3:8; 4:8–10 and 5:20, despite the presence of a few Old Latin elements in the quotations. The citations of the Caspari corpus, dated between 408 and 416, are mainly Vulgate in 2 Peter 1:4–5, 8; 3:10–12 and 15–

---

*interpretatam* (*Retractationes* 2,58). On the hypothesis, now outdated, that Augustine is the reviser of some biblical books, see De Bruyne (1931).

58 Fischer (1972: 74), Frede (1975–82: 155) and Thiele (1956–69: 64, 72, 77, 85, 96).

59 The attribution of the Vulgate Epistles to Rufinus the Syrian and the character of the citations in the *Liber de fide* will be considered in section 5 (p. 15).

60 However, the biblical text of Pseudo-Jerome's Epistles may have been altered by the copyists or the modern editors: a new critical edition is wanted in order to replace the only available at the moment in *Patrologia Latina*.

16 but affiliated to the *Vetus Latina* in 1 Peter and 1 John, in which they agree with the African text type K. Pseudo-Augustine's *De vita christiana*, written before 413, has 2 Peter 2:20–22 and 3:9 according to the Vulgate. The only citations of 1 John that have a pure Vulgate text are 1 John 2:16–17 of Julian of Eclanum in Augustine's *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem* (428–30). The quotations of Caelestius, which correspond to the Vulgate in 1 Peter, are close to the Old Latin text type T in 1 John while elements of text type K are present in Pelagius, the Caspari corpus and the Pseudo-Pelagian Epistles 13 and 148. The biblical text of 2 and 3 John is not cited by the followers and opponents of Pelagius except a general allusion of Pelagius to the latter in the *Expositiones*. None of the citations of Jude feature a pure Vulgate text: those that contain readings and renderings of the Vulgate are Jude 6 in Cassian's *Conlationes patrum* (420–6) and Jude 4 in the *Hypomnesticon*.

Overall, the affiliation of the biblical text of the followers and opponents of Pelagius is inconsistent and changes according to the epistles. The most stable texts are those of the *Hypomnesticon*, which has features of the Vulgate in all the Epistles cited, and Pseudo-Prosper's works *De vocatione omnium gentium* of the year 450 and *Epistula ad Demetriadem de vera humilitate*, written around 440. Although Pseudo-Prosper is not an early source, these writings contain citations that are mostly Vulgate with a minority of Old Latin renderings. The development of the biblical text from the mixed form of the early citations towards the Vulgate in the late ones has not been identified: the affiliation is also changeable in the late writings of Cassian, Eucherius and Prosper, dated between 420 and 450. Prosper is close to the *Vetus Latina* text types C and S while Eucherius features lexical renderings of the Vulgate and Cassian a mixture of Vulgate, *Vetus Latina* and unique readings.<sup>61</sup> Considering that the majority of the Pelagian and anti-Pelagian witnesses are not consistent and mix the Vulgate with the *Vetus Latina*, their biblical text may have either relied on a Latin version which was an intermediate stage between the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate or have undergone contamination. The quotations of 1 Peter, 2 Peter and 1 John according to the Vulgate are later than those of Jerome and do not represent the earliest attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles, with the exception of the citations of James in the Epistle 41 of the year 384. This case is puzzling: either the Vulgate version of James might be contemporary to the revision of the Gospels or be an Old Latin version which was incorporated in the manuscript tradition of the Vulgate in the absence of a revised version of the letter. It can be concluded that the biblical text of the followers of Pelagius in the first half of the fifth century is very close to the Vulgate, although not identical.

---

61 Yevadian (2017: 203) confirms that the biblical text of Cassian does not completely depend on the Vulgate but has Old Latin influences and is based on Greek texts.

## 4. Prefaces and Order of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

The study of the manuscript tradition makes clear that the name of Jerome was conventionally extended from the Gospels to the rest of the New Testament in antiquity. The authorship of Jerome was reinforced by the addition of prologues and prefatory epistles. The preface to the Catholic Epistles, *Non ita ordo est* (PROL cath [S 809]), is a pseudepigraphic letter from Jerome to Eustochium which imitates the beginning of Jerome's prologue to the Minor Prophets (*non idem ordo est*).<sup>62</sup> *Non ita ordo est* is dated to the second half of the fifth century and the earliest Vulgate manuscript attesting the preface is Codex Fuldensis, copied in the mid-sixth century.<sup>63</sup> The preface, which was not written by the reviser of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles, remains anonymous but Priscillian, Peregrinus and Vincent of Lérins have been proposed as possible authors.<sup>64</sup> The topoi of the inaccuracy of the previous translations and concern about the criticism of the Vulgate by Jerome's contemporaries echo the themes of the *Novum opus*, Jerome's prologue to the Vulgate Gospels. The writer of *Non ita ordo est* proposes a correction to the order of the letters by changing the position of the Epistles of Peter, which were placed at the beginning in the former Latin versions.<sup>65</sup> The author of the preface informs us that the Vulgate order – James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John and Jude – follows the convention of Greek manuscripts.<sup>66</sup>

The preface also discusses 1 John 5:7–8, the verses known as the Johannine Comma. The writer blames the Latin translators for the omission of the last part of 5:8, which contains the mention of the Trinity (*pater et filius et spiritus sanctus* in the Old Latin text types K and T and *pater verbum et spiritus* in C).<sup>67</sup> In

---

62 Berger (1904: 11).

63 Houghton (2016: 178) and Gryson (2007: 721).

64 See Ayuso Marazuela (1948: 66–7) who also refers to Künstle and Bludau. Chapman (1908: 262–7) believes that Pseudo-Jerome is dependent on a prologue of Priscillian.

65 The Petrine letters open the Catholic corpus in the catalogue of Codex Claromontanus, Philastrius, Augustine, Rufinus and the Acts of the Councils of Hippo and Carthage (Nienhuis, 2007: 84).

66 This order is present in Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus. The ›Eastern‹ (James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John and Jude) and ›Western‹ (1 Peter, 2 Peter, James, 1, 2 and 3 John and Jude) arrangements of the Epistles do not group them according to length, as it occurs in the Pauline corpus, but to the author (Lockett, 2012: 133). Despite the predominance of the ›Eastern‹ order of the letters, the ›Western‹ order of the New Testament books (Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles, Catholic Epistles and Revelation) prevailed over the ›Eastern‹ (Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles and Revelation) (Nienhuis, 2007: 87).

67 The Johannine Comma is absent in the Greek manuscripts and possibly attested for the first time by Cyprian in the third century (Thiele, 1959: 68–70). However, it is not included in the contemporary African writing *De rebaptismate*, in the works of Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus of Aquileia, Augustine and Quodvultdeus (Ayuso Marazuela, 1948: 72 and Houghton, 2016: 178–9). Thiele (1959) does not exclude a Greek origin of the Comma on the basis of the dependence of the early Latin translations on a disappeared ›western‹ form of Greek text.

contrast with *Non ita ordo est*, the most authoritative early manuscripts of the Vulgate, such as Fuldensis (F), Amiatinus (A) and Sangermanensis (VL 7), do not feature the Johannine Comma, which is included only in late manuscripts of the Vulgate.<sup>68</sup> Although the allegorical interpretation of 5:8 is first present in Cyprian, the Comma probably originated in Spain given its attestation in the Spanish direct and indirect tradition such as in Priscillian, Peregrinus, the León Palimpsest (VL 67) and the Freising Fragments (VL 64).<sup>69</sup>

The passages on James, Peter and Jude from Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, dated to the year 393, are employed as prefaces in some manuscripts.<sup>70</sup> The biographical note on James shows that Jerome is aware that the letter of James is one of the seven Catholic Epistles and gradually gained authority despite the debates on its authorship.<sup>71</sup> 2 Peter is deemed to be spurious by Jerome because the style differs from that of 1 Peter.<sup>72</sup> Jerome states that, although Jude contains citations from the apocryphal book of Enoch and is therefore considered to be inauthentic, it must be accepted because of its antiquity and diffusion.<sup>73</sup> Excerpts from the biographies of the apostles and summaries of the Epistles of Peter and John in Isidore's *De ortu et obitu patrum* and *Proemia* are also included in manuscripts as prefaces. The *argumenta* to the Epistles (PROL Jac, 1 Pt, 2 Pt, 1 Jo, 2 Jo, 3 Jo and Jud) are brief summaries of their content dated before 700.<sup>74</sup> Some manuscripts also have anonymous prefaces that address the questions of the order of the Epistles and canonicity: prologues 8 (PROL cath 8) and 9 (PROL cath 9) in De Bruyne's edition,<sup>75</sup> the former of Irish origin and the latter dependent on Jerome's *De viris illustribus*,<sup>76</sup> warrant the position of James in front *propter dignitatem* and because of the *prerogativa apostolici ordini*, while prologue 11 notes the inauthenticity of 2 and 3 John.<sup>77</sup> The Catholic Epistles

68 Ayuso Marazuela (1947a and 1947b).

69 Ayuso Marazuela (1948: 72–4) hypothesises that the Comma was introduced in the fifth century by Peregrinus in his edition as a marginal gloss, was later incorporated in the main text by Isidore under the influence of the Spanish tradition, the mention of the Comma in *Non ita ordo est* and its theological significance and passed through Isidore to the Theodulf Bibles.

70 The system of sigla and classification of manuscripts employed by De Bruyne (1920) does not match those of the modern Old Latin and Vulgate editions. Therefore, it is difficult to identify the manuscripts which he cites in his collection of the prefaces.

71 *Iacobus ... unam tantum scripsit epistulam, quae de septem catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quondam sub nomine eius edita adseritur, licet paulatim tempore protendente obtinuerit auctoritatem.*

72 *Scripsit duas epistolas, quae catholicae nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur propter stili cum priore dissonantiam.*

73 *Iudas frater iacobi unam parvam quae de septem catholicis epistulam reliquit. Et quia de libro enoch qui apocryphus est in ea adsumpsit testimonium, a plerisque reicitur, tamen auctoritate uetustatis iam et usu meruit inter sanctas scripturas computari.*

74 De Bruyne (1920: 256–7) and Gryson (2007: 729–30, 737).

75 De Bruyne (1920: 259–60).

76 Gryson (2007: 721).

77 *Reliquae autem duae ... Iohannis presbyteri adseruntur ... et nonnulli putant duas memorias eiusdem Iohannis esse.*

have four series of *capitula*: A of Donatist origin; C attested from the twelfth century; Tur, the capitula of Bede; Sp derived from the Spanish edition of the seventh century.<sup>78</sup>

### 5. The Question of the Authorship<sup>79</sup>

The evidence derived from the manuscript tradition, the citations of the Church Fathers and the prefaces attached to the corpus suggests that Jerome was not the reviser of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles although his authorship was proposed from as early as the mid-fifth century, when *Non ita ordo est* was composed and the archetype of the Bible of Saint Germain des Prés (VL 7) was copied.<sup>80</sup> Jerome's own statements about the extent of the revision are inconsistent: Jerome affirms three times that he revised the whole New Testament (*De viris illustribus* 135, Epistle 71,5 and Epistle 112,20) while he mentions only the Gospels twice (*Novum opus* prologue and Epistle 27,1), to which Augustine's witness of Epistle 71,6 to Jerome must be added. However, both the *Novum opus* and Epistle 27 are contemporary with the revision of the Gospels, but it is improbable that Jerome had completed the revision of the whole Vulgate New Testament by the year 384. These assertions are therefore not reliable in assessing the role played by Jerome in the revision of the Vulgate.<sup>81</sup> On the other hand, Jerome might have exaggerated his merits when mentioning his work on the New Testament in the three later remarks from *De viris illustribus*, Epistles 71 and 112, given that the absence of specific references to the Acts, the Epistles and Revelation seems to be suspicious. Therefore, no certain conclusions can be drawn from Jerome's affirmations.

In the sixteenth century, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples questioned the attribution of the Vulgate Pauline Epistles to Jerome without gaining acceptance among his contemporaries.<sup>82</sup> This hypothesis was reconsidered four centuries later, between 1915–1920, when the studies of De Bruyne (1915), Vaccari (1915) and Cavallera (1920) came out. The main argument of these scholars against Jerome's authorship is the disagreement between the biblical text of the Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and the Vulgate. De Bruyne proposed Pelagius as the possible reviser of the Vulgate Pauline Epistles but his theory

---

78 De Bruyne (1914: 382–90, 417) and Houghton (2016: 178).

79 The question of the authorship of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels is discussed in my forthcoming article 'The Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels' in Houghton H. A. G. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of the Latin Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

80 See pp. 5–6.

81 Chapman (1933: 33).

82 Vaccari (1915: 160–2).

was not based on solid foundations given the uncertain reconstruction of the biblical text of Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of Paul.<sup>83</sup> Nonetheless, the attribution to Pelagius opened the way for the identification of a member of his circle, Rufinus the Syrian, as the reviser of the Vulgate Epistles by Fischer, Frede and Thiele.<sup>84</sup>

The figure of Rufinus the Syrian and the origin, dating and language of composition of the *Liber de fide*, the treatise attributed to him in the colophon of the only surviving manuscript (St Petersburg Q.v.I.6), are surrounded by uncertainties. The idea that the author of the *Liber de fide* corresponds to the reviser of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels is based on two arguments: his biography and the identity between the biblical citations and the text of the Vulgate. The biography of Rufinus the Syrian is a modern reconstruction compiled on the basis of the allusions of Augustine (*De gratia Christi* 2,3,3), Marius Mercator (*Liber subnotationum in verba Iuliani, praefatio* 2) and Jerome (Epistle 81,2 and *Contra Rufinum* 3,24), who, however, may refer to different persons having the name Rufinus.<sup>85</sup> These writers appear to witness that Rufinus the Syrian arrived in Rome under Pope Anastasius between 399 and 402 (*Liber subnotationum in verba Iuliani, praefatio* 2) and was hosted by Pammachius (*De gratia Christi* 2,3,3). Rufinus seems to have been a monk at Jerome's monastery in Bethlehem sent by Jerome to Milan via Rome to defend an unknown Claudius (*Contra Rufinum* 3,24). Jerome also asked Rufinus the Syrian to greet Rufinus of Aquileia when he would have passed through Aquileia (Epistle 81,2).

The dating of the *Primum quaeritur*, the prologue to the Vulgate Pauline Epistles, might also shed light on the authorship of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels. Fischer and Frede, in order to support the attribution of the Vulgate Pauline Epistles to Rufinus the Syrian, who was in Rome between 399 and 402, dated the *Primum quaeritur* between 393–410 on the basis of its possible dependence on *De viris illustribus*.<sup>86</sup> However, Jerome might have remembered the *Primum quaeritur* when he enumerates in *De viris illustribus* 5 the reasons why the Epistle to the Hebrews is not considered to be authentic.<sup>87</sup>

---

83 De Bruyne (1915: 371). The scholarly debates on the character of Pelagius' biblical text of Paul, which are not relevant to the Catholic Epistles, are summarised in Stelzer (2018: 1–21) and in my forthcoming contribution to the *Oxford Handbook of the Latin Bible*.

84 Fischer (1972: 74), Frede (1966–71: 42) and Thiele (1956–69: 100–1).

85 An opposite stance is taken by Dunphy (2009), who proposes Rufinus of Aquileia as the author of the *Liber de fide*.

86 Fischer (1972: 73–4) and Frede (1975–82: 99–100).

87 The problem of the canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews is raised in both the *Primum quaeritur* and *De viris illustribus* 5 in the same terms although with different conclusions: Jerome considers Hebrews to be inauthentic while the writer of the *Primum quaeritur* accepts the letter in the canon. The authorship of Hebrews was questioned for the following motivations, which are mentioned in both the writings: a. stylistic and linguistic differences with the other letters; b. the absence of Paul's signature; c. the order of the letters. The question of

Considering that readings and renderings of the Vulgate are attested in the citations of the Catholic Epistles contained in Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, as demonstrated above, it cannot be ruled out that Jerome knew at that time both the Vulgate Catholic Epistles and the *Primum quaeritur*, which must have been composed before 393 if Jerome cited it in *De viris illustribus*.

The conclusion that the biblical text of the *Liber de fide* agrees with the Vulgate is refuted by Dunphy, who observes that Miller, the editor of the *Liber de fide*, compares the citations with the Clementine Vulgate and not with the Stuttgart Vulgate, the modern edition of the fourth-century text.<sup>88</sup> In addition, the citations of the *Liber de fide* that at first glance correspond to the Vulgate also agree with the Vetus Latina: only the presence of distinctive readings and renderings of the Vulgate which are not attested in any Old Latin texts would demonstrate the dependence of the *Liber de fide* on the Vulgate.<sup>89</sup> Such cases are very rare, constituting precisely 5 out of 72 citations, all of which belong to the Pauline Epistles.<sup>90</sup> The *Liber de fide* contains only three quotations from the Catholic Epistles: James 3:9 (XXIII), 1 Peter 3:19–21 (XXXIX) and 2 Peter 2:4 (XX). James 3:9 and 2 Peter 2:4 are characterised by unique readings not attested elsewhere in the Latin tradition (*secundum similitudinem* and *qui peccaverunt*) while 1 Peter 3:19–21 is close to both the Old Latin text type T and the Vulgate. The remaining citations from the Pauline Epistles feature Old Latin elements in 42 citations out of 72: the biblical text of the *Liber de fide* appears to be related to that of Ambrosiaster (34 readings out of 50) and other sources grouped in the Vetus Latina edition of the Pauline Epistles under text types I and J, which transmit a form of text circulating in Northern Italy in the middle of the fourth century.<sup>91</sup> The Old Latin affiliation of the quotations of the *Liber de fide*, the attestation of the Vulgate in Jerome's citations of the Catholic Epistles in early writings and the possible dating of the *Primum quaeritur* preceding 393 because of the dependence of Jerome's *De viris illustribus* on the prologue, reject the hypothesis that Rufinus the Syrian revised the Vulgate Epistles when he was in Rome between 399 and 402. The search for the reviser(s) of the Vulgate Epistles remains open.

---

the authorship of the *Primum quaeritur* was addressed by De Bruyne (1915), Plinval (1966), Frede (1966–71: 42; 1975–82: 99–100; 1983–91: 303–4) and Scherbenske (2013: 185–98).

88 Miller (1964: 14–5) and Dunphy (2012: 227).

89 A complete analysis of the citations from the Pauline and Catholic Epistles in the *Liber de fide* is carried out in Persig (2021).

90 1 Corinthians 12:12–13 (in chapter XIII), 2 Timothy 4:6 (XXXIII), 2 Corinthians 12:9–10 (XXXV), 4:16–18 (XXXV) and 5:4 (LI).

91 The presence of features of text types I and J in the citations of the *Liber de fide* from 1 Corinthians is noticed by Fröhlich (1995–8: 221–2).

## 6. Stylistic Differences and Principles of Revision

When assessing Jerome's involvement in the revision of the New Testament, attention has been drawn to the consistency of the revision as a criterion to determine the authorship of these texts. The Vulgate text of Matthew contains more corrections than the other Gospels, which follow Matthew in the order of the Vulgate.<sup>92</sup> On this basis, it was suggested that Jerome could have revised the whole New Testament, making fewer adjustments in the Acts, Epistles and Revelation.<sup>93</sup> However, the lack of interest of Jerome is rather an argument in favour of the opposite conclusion, that he refrained from the revision of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels. The presence of stylistic differences between the Vulgate Gospels and the other books would be a decisive proof against Jerome's authorship. Divergences in style and criteria of revision have been noted in general terms: Fischer and Thiele affirm that Jerome and the reviser of the other books of the New Testament follow different principles of revision, without specifying which these are.<sup>94</sup> This judgement, which seems to be more an impression than the product of a rigorous examination, has been endorsed without any further explanations.<sup>95</sup> On the other hand, Chapman deems the Vulgate to be a unitary text, revised by Jerome with care and attention, according to the same principles.<sup>96</sup> Only a thorough analysis of the language and the style of the Vulgate can ratify or refute these contradictory opinions.

---

92 Houghton (2016: 34). Metzger (1977: 359) suggests that the descending number of interventions is ascribed to Jerome's loss of interest in the revision of the New Testament and his commitment to the translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew.

93 Sparks (1970: 524). Elliott (1992: 221): ›On the other hand, Jerome's own evidence is that he did in fact revise the whole of the New Testament and it is perhaps most reasonable to conclude that his reforming zeal diminished as he worked through it, hence the evident lack of revision in the later books of the Vulgate New Testament.‹

94 Fischer (1972: 21): ›Die Art der Revision des Hieronymus, die in den Evangelien die Vulgata bildet, unterscheidet sich von der Revision, die in den andern Büchern des Neuen Testaments sich als Vulgata durchgesetzt hat, so sehr und so grundlegend, daß eine Identität der beiden Revisoren ausgeschlossen ist.‹ Thiele (1965: 178): ›Als Schöpfer der Vulgata der Katholischen Briefe kommt Hieronymus freilich nicht in Betracht. Die außerordentlich sorgsame, teilweise auch übertriebene Art und Weise, in der die Vulgata der Katholischen Briefe den altlateinischen Text an die griechische Vorlage angleicht, steht in schroffem Gegensatz zu der Praxis, die Hieronymus in der Revision der altlateinischen Evangelien und im Gallicanum handhabt.‹

95 Birdsall (1970: 374), Rebenich (1993: 51), Petzer (1995: 123) and Tkacz (1996: 59).

96 Chapman (1933: 283–4).