



PROJECT MUSE®

---

*Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin  
Gospel Manuscripts* (review)

Roland J. Teske S.J.

Journal of Early Christian Studies, Volume 17, Number 4, Winter 2009,  
pp. 686-687 (Review)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/earl.0.0298>



➔ *For additional information about this article*  
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/366694>

H. A. G. Houghton

*Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and  
Latin Gospel Manuscripts*

Oxford Early Christian Studies

Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2008

Pp. xii + 407, \$99.00.

Anyone who has worked with the text of Augustine or of any other Latin author of the fourth or fifth century is well aware of the variety of ways in which the biblical text is cited. Jerome's translation, which we now call the Vulgate, was being produced at the time Augustine was writing and was not universally adopted as soon as it was available, and nor was it immediately available everywhere in the Roman Empire. Houghton's very learned study is skillfully executed, highly enlightening, and extremely valuable for anyone working with the biblical text of Augustine. The work focuses upon the Latin text of the Gospel of John used by the bishop of Hippo, but much that Houghton writes is applicable to Augustine's use of other books of the Bible as well as to the use of them by other authors of the period.

The volume has three parts. The first part entitled "Augustine and the Gospels" is more general and will prove of value even to someone who has not specialized in Augustine's use of the text of John. The first of its four chapters discusses Augustine and the history of the biblical text. The second chapter deals with the use and production of the books of the Bible in Augustine's time. The third treats Augustine exposition and citation of the Bible, and the fourth assesses Augustine's position as a witness to the New Testament text.

Jerome's translation of the gospels appeared in 383. Prior to that time Augustine had at his disposal only the Old Latin, which existed in many different versions, only a few of which have survived. But by approximately 403 he adopted Jerome's translation of the gospels, although he continued to use an Old Latin version, especially when he was preaching away from his home church in Hippo and may have had only an Old Latin text available to him. The situation is complicated by the fact that Augustine often quoted from memory so that one finds in some works a passage from the Vulgate combined with an Old Latin version and Augustine's remembered text. The second chapter on the use and production of biblical books in Augustine's time sums up a great deal of information that we, who think of the Bible as one book, are likely to forget, for in that period manuscripts circulated and were produced in codices that usually contained a group of biblical books, such as the gospels or the Pauline writings. The third chapter studies Augustine's exposition of the biblical text and his way of citing it and is again of much of value for any student of Augustine's works. The fourth chapter looks at Augustine as a witness for the New Testament text and serves in some sense as a conclusion for the whole book since the remaining two parts are mainly illustrations of Augustine's adoption of Jerome's translation in all of his works and particularly and more in detail his citations from John's Gospel.

The second part examines the citations of the Gospel of John in the *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*, other sermons, and in the early works, those from 403

to 419, and those after that period and shows that, although Augustine began using Jerome's translation around 403, he continued to use an Old Latin version for at least fifteen years afterward and even later in secondary citations that he made from memory.

The third part, which runs more than half of the length of the book, examines Augustine's citations of John and the differences between the text he cites and the Vulgate. Houghton's aim is to "assess the significance of Augustine's readings for the history of the biblical text" (183). Hence, this part is intended to provide "a basis on which to justify the inclusion of Augustine in a critical apparatus to an edition of the Gospel" (183). In order to do this the author provides a brief commentary on each of the verses that Augustine's cites from the Gospel of John, pointing out the divergences from the Vulgate and variants of the Old Latin that are used. The last part serves more as a source to consult than as something to be read. The whole volume is part of the preparation of the *Vetus Latina Iohannes* and well illustrates the detailed scholarship of those who are preparing it.

Roland J. Teske, S.J., Marquette University

Geoffrey D. Dunn

*Tertullian's Aduersus Iudaeos: A Rhetorical Analysis*

North American Patristics Society, Patristic Monograph Series, 19  
Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2008  
Pp. xiv + 210.

Geoffrey Dunn's close study of the rhetoric of *Aduersus Iudaeos* seeks to restore an oft-neglected treatise to center stage, both as a source for understanding Tertullian's rhetorical training and also as an important indicator of North African Jewish-Christian relations. Dislodged as a possible forgery in the eighteenth century, *Aduersus Iudaeos* has been ignored by many historians; those interested in Tertullian's rhetoric have also neglected the work, in part because of its uncertain status. Dunn aims to rectify the lacuna, first by demonstrating that Tertullian actually did write *Aduersus Iudaeos* and then by placing the work within an appropriate socio-historical context. *Aduersus Iudaeos*, Dunn argues, is an unfinished early work of the orator, likely published posthumously by a clumsy editor. As such, it offers important evidence not only of Tertullian's early career but also of his encounters with the Jews of North Africa.

The book begins with comprehensive survey of modern opinions regarding the composition of *Aduersus Iudaeos*. Poorly written and repetitive, both internally and in comparison to *Aduersus Marcionem*, *Aduersus Iudaeos* has regularly been regarded as either partially or fully forged. A nearly identical set of Scripture citations in the two works suggest that they must be related: either *Aduersus Marcionem* served as a source for whoever forged *Aduersus Iudaeos* or Tertullian mined the unfinished *Aduersus Iudaeos* himself when pulling together *Aduersus Marcionem*. Dunn advocates the latter theory, suggesting that self-plundering of