

CHRONICLE

PATRISTICA.

Clemens Alexandrinus: Erster Band, Protrepticus und Paedagogus, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Von Dr OTTO STÄHLIN, Professor am k. Maxgymnasium in München [griech.-christl. Schriftsteller, Band 12]. (Leipzig; 1905.)

In the end of 1794 the learned Johannes von Müller wrote to his brother telling him that he had just read the *Paedagogus* of Clement and advising him to do the same¹. The advice is as good now as it was then, and it is a pleasure to meet with such a masterly edition as that of Dr Stählin in which to read it. As is well known, the study of Clement has been much hampered in recent times by the unfortunate edition of Dindorf which the Clarendon Press published in 1869. That edition will be entirely superseded by the present, of which the first volume lies before us. Dr Stählin has been known to be working on Clement for a considerable time, and the generous way in which he put his results at the disposal of Mr Barnard some years ago ought not to be forgotten by Englishmen. It is greatly to the profit of students of Clement that two such competent workers, who have been over the same ground, should compare their conclusions. The present edition of the *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus* opens with an introduction in which the ancient *testimonia* to Clement are collected, the manuscripts of all the works of Clement, as well as the MSS of extracts and the *catenae*, described, the editions enumerated and characterized, and modern translations indicated. The introduction, which fills eighty-three pages, deals with all these matters so minutely yet so clearly as to leave nothing to be desired. Many scholars are thanked for help given—Jackson, Weyman, Schwartz, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff among others—but especially Prof Joseph B. Mayor, whose critical notes on Clement in *Philologus* and *The Classical Review* 'sind die wertvollsten Beiträge zur Textkritik unseres Autors, die seit der Ausgabe Sylburgs erschienen sind. Kein Herausgeber hat solche Mühe darauf verwendet, den vor-

¹ See Professor J. E. B. Mayor's *Juvenal* vol. i p. xvi.

liegenden Text zu verstehen oder zu verbessern wie er' (p. lxxxii). On page lxxiv the (Hort) Mayor edition of *Stromateis VII* is deservedly given the highest place as an introduction to the minute understanding of Clement. The manuscript tradition of the *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus* is as follows: The archetype is Paris. graec. 451 (of date 914), a famous MS which once belonged to Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, the former owner of the Clarkianus of Plato. From it are descended Mutinensis III D. 7 (126) (saec. x or xi) and Laurentianus V 24 (s. xii), the latter of which contains the *Paedagogus* without the *Protrepticus*, Genuensis, Miss. Urb. 28, and Paris. Suppl. Graec. 254. Mutinensis, in its turn, has three existing descendants, Laurentianus eight, and Genuensis one. Of the four chief descendants of Paris. graec. 451 (P), which now lacks a considerable portion of the *Paedagogus*, the first and second are alone of consequence, because they alone were copied from P at a time when it was complete and had not been disfigured by corrections of the fourteenth or fifteenth century. The way to form the text, then, is to follow P where extant, and compare Laur. (F) and Mut. (M) where it is not. Of these two M is the more reliable; F has occasionally, however, better readings than P or M, which must have been obtained from some outside source. The important manuscripts, though three only in number, are good, and there is thus less necessity for emendation than in the case of the *Stromateis*, which depends entirely on one Florence MS which is very corrupt. Dr Stählin's text is provided with Sylburg's and Potter's pages in the margin, with very full *testimonia* and references to quotations, as well as with critical notes, some fifty pages of Greek *scholia* on the two treatises, and indexes of passages quoted, proper names and interesting words. This volume is a great advance on all previous editions, and it is doubtful whether it will ever be improved. It can be confidently recommended to all classical scholars, theologians, and students of ancient manners and customs, who will look forward to the appearance of the remaining volumes.

G. MERCATI I *Un Frammento delle Ipotiposi di Clemente Alessandrino.*

II *Paralipomena Ambrosiana con alcuni appunti sulle Benedizioni del Cereo Pasquale* (Studi e Testi 12). (Roma: Tipogr. Vatic.: 1904.)

IF scholars had the offer of any single undiscovered ancient work bearing on the Canon of the New Testament, the *Hypotyposes* of Clement would probably be first favourite. Though we do not despair of such good fortune, we must for the present be content with the fragments which have appeared. The latest has been discovered by Mgr Mercati on the margin of Codex Vaticanus graecus 354 (f. 30)

(= S of the Gospels), opposite λεπρός (Matt. viii 2), and is introduced by the words Κλήμεντος ἐκ τῆς 5' τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων. It contains a legend on the healing of lepers by priests, and is in itself interesting enough, but its special importance arises from the fact that it contains a new *testimonium* for the Western text of the Gospels. The legend is to the effect that the priests were accustomed to cure lepers on fixed days by the power of God. On finding themselves unable to cure one of them after many attempts, they declared that the Messiah alone could cure him, and that he must wait for His coming. This cure the Saviour effected by the following command—ἄπελθε καὶ δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν εἰς μαρτύριον. The μαρτύριον is explained as evidence that the Messiah had really come, and that they must believe on Him, since the cure they prophesied had been effected by Him. This tradition is not known elsewhere in ancient literature, except for an implicit reference in St Ambrose's homilies on Luke. The origin of it is uncertain, though no doubt it came from some written authority. The fragment calls it παράδοσις. This gives Mgr Mercati a clue; he searches in the works of Clement for other examples of this expression, and finds in the *Stromateis* the phrases—καὶ Μαθθίας ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσι παραινῶν and λέγουσι δὲ ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσι Μαθθίαν τὸν ἀπόστολον . . . εἰρηκέναι, and in the *Hypotyposes* φέρεται μενοῦν ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσιν, and finds that the term παράδοσις is used of apocryphal writings such as 'The Acts of John', and indicates the authority rather than the nature of the work referred to. To come to the question of the text. In the parallel passage of Luke (v 14) εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς instead of εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν is read by the following authorities, *D a b c ff₂ l g* Tert. Ambr. Marcion and the Lewis Syriac. It is evident that the reading is older than the middle of the second century. The present passage points to what was very likely the original form in both Matthew and Luke, εἰς μαρτύριον simply. Mercati also prints three pages of interesting scholia from S. I must hurry over the remaining contents of this interesting volume. Under the title *Paralipomena Ambrosiana* we are presented with editions of two hymns of St Ambrose, one *On the Excellence of the Number Three*, the other on Easter, as well as an edition of a beautiful fragment—'de pudicitia et castitate'. The first hymn has appeared in editions of Alcuin and Hincmar, both of whom quote it entire. The second has not hitherto appeared in any edition of Ambrose, but is in the *Antiphonary of Bangor*. The fragment on chastity was rejected by the Benedictines, but may be genuine for all that. These three pieces are accompanied by notes and discussions shewing the brightness and learning which we expect from Mgr Mercati.

CARL SCHMIDT *Plotin's Stellung zum Gnosticismus und kirchlichen Christentum*: CARL SCHMIDT *Fragment einer Schrift des Märtyrer-Bischofs Petrus von Alexandrien*: OTTO STÄHLIN *Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Clemens Alexandrinus*. (Leipzig, 1901.)

THIS part of *Texte und Untersuchungen* (N. F. v 4) consists of the above-mentioned three works, of which the first occupies ninety pages, the second fifty, and the third eight. The first hardly falls within the scope of the series as indicated by the title *Texte* etc., but forms a proper appendix to the edition of the Codex Brucianus in the eighth volume of the previous section of the series. It consists of a study of Plotinus πρὸς τοὺς Γνωστικούς, whom the author regards as an apologist of heathendom against Christianity, and against Gnosticism as closely connected with Christianity. I have neither space nor the necessary qualifications to criticize the author's treatment, but a perusal of the essay has convinced me that it is a very careful piece of work which merits the attention of all students of the philosophy and the Church history and literature of the third century. The second part is a Coptic text, found by the editor on two leaves of a Paris vellum codex (Cod. Copt. 130^b, fol. 123) of the tenth or eleventh century, which formerly belonged to the famous Schenoudi monastery. A German translation is provided for those who do not know Coptic. The work is a portion of a sermon, containing exhortations for the proper keeping of Sunday (κυριακή), curses on those who speak falsely of their neighbours, etc. The most interesting part is the following: 'Höret, auf dass ich erzähle euch, o du Rede liebendes Volk, eine merkwürdige Begebenheit, die zugestossen ist mir, dem Petrus, dem Mitteilhaber der Leiden Christi (1 Pet. iv 13, v 1). Ihr wisset, dass ich, als ich während langer Zeit floh von Ort zu Ort aus Furcht vor Diocletian und seiner Verfolgung, die auf uns (liegt) noch jetzt—, dass ich gegangen bin nach dem Süden Aegyptens, bis ich kam nach Oxyrynchos, d. i. Pemdje. Es nahmen mich auf die Kleriker u. s. w. . . .' Later he mentions that a τάξις of the βουλευτήριον came commanding him to elect a bishop in place of the deceased bishop of Oxyrhynchus . . . The whole fragment is full of interest, both for the method of election of bishops in Egypt and also for manners and customs. Schmidt rightly conjectures that the Peter intended is the martyr-bishop of Alexandria, and gives a detailed account of Diocletian's persecution in Egypt, at the same time shewing the extreme importance of the fragment. Stählin's short paper consists of notes on four MSS of Clement (Monac. graec. 97, Paris. Suppl. graec. 270, 421, and 1000). He shews that the *editio princeps* (of Petrus Victorius) was based on Laur. v 24 (= F) for the *Paedagogus* and on Monac. graec. 97 for the *Protrepticus*, also that the latter MS is derived from M (Mutinensis) corrected. Of the three Paris MSS he enumerates the contents more

minutely than Harnack in the *Altchr. Literatur*, and shews that they are worthless for the text:—a useful piece of work.

Origenes' Johanneskommentar, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Von Lic. Dr Erwin Preuschen in Darmstadt [Griech.-christl. Schriftsteller, Band 10, Werke des Origenes, Band 4]. (Leipzig, 1903.)

THE Berlin edition of Origen moves apace. Within five years the *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, the *Against Celsus*, *On Prayer*, *Homilies on Jeremiah*, *Commentaries on Lamentations*, *Samuel*, *Kings*, and now the *Commentary on St John's Gospel*, have appeared. The Commentary on St John is the longest of Origen's commentaries which we have in the original Greek, and it was critically edited by Mr A. E. Brooke in 1896 (Cambridge: University Press). It seems rather a pity that some arrangement should not have been come to with the Cambridge Press for the re-issue of that edition with any modifications that might have been thought desirable in the interest of this new series. Mr Brooke's handy edition costs about ten shillings less than Dr Preuschen's, but the latter is in some respects an advance upon the former, e.g. it has an index of words extending to fifty-seven three-columned pages. The introduction is in two parts, one on the MSS, the other literary and historical. There are only eight MSS known, the oldest being of the thirteenth (?) century. So it is obvious at once that an editor's task will be no sinecure. The eight MSS group themselves thus:—(Class I) Monacensis graecus 191 (saec. xiii) with Barberinus (now Vaticanus) gr. VI 14 (s. xv), Paris. gr. 455 (s. xvi), and Athous Vatopedinus 611 (s. xv)¹, which are descended from it; and (Class II) Venetus No. 43 (s. xiv) with its descendants Barberinus (now Vaticanus) gr. V 52 (s. xv), Matritensis O. 32 (s. xvi), and Bodleianus gr. Misc. 58 (s. xvii). The problem is, then, to shew the relationship between M and V. Dr Preuschen, after Mr Brooke, proves that V is itself a copy of M, and that the undoubted improvements in V are due to the learning of some scholar, perhaps the scribe of that MS, who wrote in the year 1374. This scholar altered some of the biblical quotations to the form which he approved; for example, 1 John i 5, which Origen read there as B does, he altered into the reading of N A. Dr Preuschen gives a most interesting classified collection of the mistakes in M, which is bound to be of use to editors of Greek texts in general (pp. xlv-lvii), and then an account of the printed editions of the book from the *editio princeps* of Huet, bishop of Avranches, down

¹ The last not certainly. Only one or two notes have been taken of it, and it was not among the MSS examined by Mr Lake in 1899.

to the edition of Mr Brooke, the value of whose work is everywhere acknowledged by him. A chapter on the *catenae* follows; they are numerous, and some of the MSS are as old as the ninth century. The editor has taken the trouble to classify them, and gives two *stemmata codicum*, which ought to be valuable in the interests of other authors also, such as Chrysostom. The literary and historical introduction is occupied with the following subjects—the occasion, date and place of the Commentary, the exegesis of Origen and its sources, the biblical texts of Origen, and Heracleon and his notes on St John's Gospel. The Commentary was written at the instance of his 'taskmaster', the rich Ambrosius. It seems certain that this man, who provided Origen with secretaries and shorthand-writers, paid him for his work. The first five books were written and the sixth begun in Alexandria, before the quarrel with Demetrius drove Origen in flight to Caesarea in Palestine in the year 231. The rest of the work was written after 232. The date of composition of the first book was probably 218–219, and the second to the fifth were written at intervals during the next ten years. The work was never completed, and does not go beyond the thirteenth chapter of St John. Origen's method is exhaustive, going minutely into the exact signification of each word, and marked a great advance on anything that had been done before his date. He does not conceal the differences between the various Gospel accounts, and does not attempt to reconcile them. He is careful of the grammatical and historical interpretation, and he visited some sites of the Gospels to arrive at certainty between opposing views. But withal he employs the traditional allegorical method. The form of Origen's citations from Scripture is such a large subject that it cannot be treated in the thirteen pages which Preuschen has devoted to it. Nevertheless, these pages are of great value. They contain, amongst others, the important principle: 'where Origen marks a citation as word for word, it is with few exceptions accurately cited.' Some light is also thrown on the method of Origen's stenographers. To them quotations appear to have been left, and sometimes they have been neglectful (cf. p. lxxxix). A special object of Origen's Commentary was to quote and refute interpretations of the Gnostic Heracleon, and he has thus rescued an interesting monument which would otherwise have perished.

The text itself is the result of three collations of the Munich MS, which is very difficult to read. In spite of his care Dr Koetschau is not satisfied with the reports of its readings, and has published, under the title of *Beiträge zur Text-Kritik von Origenes' Johannescommentar (Texte und Untersuchungen, N. F. xiii 2)*, a number of corrections as well as a number of interesting notes on the text, which will be valued as coming from so great an authority on Origen. Whether Preuschen

or Koetschau is right can be decided only by inspection of the MS, if at all. Readers of Preuschen are recommended to spend three shillings more on Koetschau. The apparatus of Preuschen is enriched by valuable notes from Wendland and Wilamowitz, and the book is highly to be recommended. There are misprints on pp. xxxii, cii, 455.

DANIEL SERRUYS *Anastasiana*. I. Antiquorum patrum doctrina de Verbi incarnatione; II. Les Signes critiques d'Origène; III. La Stichométrie de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament. (Extrait des *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, publiés par l'École française de Rome, T. xxii. Rome, Cuggiani; 1902. 53 pp. and two photographs of MS leaves.)

THE present work, as the title indicates, is in three parts, of which the first is the longest, and demands most of our attention. In 1823 Angelo Mai published, in the seventh volume of his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, portions of a work to which he gave the Latin title quoted above. The work is, however, in Greek, was referred to repeatedly while still in MS by Sirmond, Muratori, and other eminent patristic scholars, and is of considerable importance. Though it contains many patristic extracts and Monophysite fragments, it has not yet been published complete. The collection has been attributed to various authors, to Anastasius the priest (Sirmond, Hardouin, Muratori), to Anastasius of Sinai (Lequien), and to Sophronius of Jerusalem (Loofs). The last-named scholar has alone published a serious study of the work. M. Serruys has been able to add to the three manuscripts already known a fourth which exceeds them in importance. Mai used the Vaticano-Columnensis (Vaticanus 2200, Columnensis 39) of the ninth century and the Vaticanus 1102 of the fifteenth century, but rather carelessly. The third MS, which was not used by Mai, has had a chequered history. Once the property of the Jesuit College of Clermont, where it was seen by Labbe, Sirmond, and others, it passed through the hands of Meerman, and now rests in the Bodleian (gr. misc. 184). M. Serruys states that it passed into the Bodleian through Sir Thomas Phillipps's hands, like the Meerman collection now at Berlin. This is not so. It was bought at the Meerman sale in 1824 by Dr Gaisford for the Bodleian, where it has been ever since. The fourth and best manuscript belongs to Vatopedi (Athos), where it bears the number 507 (saec. xi-xii). From its special characteristics M. Serruys has been able to prove that the author of the *Λόγοι πατέρων ἤγον ἐκλογὴ χρήσεων δι' ὧν τὴν ὅλην τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας δόξαν σαφῶς διδασκόμεθα*, as the Greek title has it, is Anastasius Sinaita, Patriarch of Antioch. We are furnished with many extracts of interest from the MSS, some published by Mai and now published much more correctly, while others appear for the first time in print. These ex-

tracts are indispensable to all students of this work, and we hope they may lead to a satisfactory edition of the whole. Amongst the writers quoted are Cyril (on Hebrews), Apollinaris, Severus, Ebion, Paul of Samosata, and Nestorius. The second part of M. Serruys' work has reference to the critical signs used by Origen in his *Hexapla*. To the testimony of Epiphanius and Isidore of Seville he adds a third from the thirty-second chapter of Anastasius's book of extracts. This extract is in agreement with the known evidence as to the asterisk and obelus, and clears up the obscurity of our accounts of the lemniscus and hypolemniscus by the following definitions:—(1) ὁ λυμνίσκος δηλοῖ ὡς μία συζυγή δύο τῶν ἐρμηνευτῶν ἰδιά τινα εἶπον ἢ ἐνηλλαγμένως ἔθηκαν τὸ ῥητόν; (2) ὁ ὑπολυμνίσκος δὲ καὶ οὗτος δηλοῖ ἐγκείμενος ὡς μία συζυγή τῶν ἐρμηνευτῶν παραλλαγμένως τὴν λέξιν εἶπεν. In other words, both names indicate alterations made by a group of two translators; but while the former refers to alterations which affect the thought, the latter has to do only with those which affect the expression. Further, the alterations of the former class have been made either by the translators themselves personally, or have been got from manuscript sources. M. Serruys deserves to be congratulated on his discovery. The third part of the treatise contains a new stichometry from the Vatopedi codex. For purposes of comparison the author has drawn on Mr C. H. Turner's *Freising Stichometry* (see *J. T. S.* ii (1901) p. 236 ff) and others, and printed a number of them in parallel columns. The list, which comprises all the books of Scripture, contains also some patristic works; for example, 'The Life of Antony'. The numbers do not harmonize entirely with any known list, but there is a more serious difference in the order of the books of the Old Testament. The major prophets, the minor prophets, and the books of Solomon, Esther, Tobit, and Judith are found in an unexpected order. For instance, the minor prophets come after the major. The significance of these facts may become clear later.

GIOVANNI MERCATI *Un preteso Scritto di San Pietro, Vescovo d'Alessandria e martire, sulla Bestemmia e Filone l'istoriografo.* (Estratto dalla *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche*, Anno I, Fasc. iii Roma (1905), pp. 21.)

THE *Reliquiae Sacrae* of the veteran President of Magdalen remains a standard work after half a century. What is now required is that scholars should revise it in the light of our vastly increased manuscript sources. Routh had often to depend on few manuscripts, and of these the collations made for him by friends were not always exact. One of the best examples of the modern advance on Routh is to be found in Mr Gregg's restoration of Origen's Commentary on *Ephesians*, published some years ago in this JOURNAL. Another is the above-named tractate,

one of the most recent contributions of the indefatigable Monsignor Mercati to the study of early Church literature. A fragment on Blasphemy, purporting to be by the martyr-bishop Peter of Alexandria, was first edited from some *scholia* on the margin of a Paris (Coisl. 268, saec. xiv) manuscript. Routh doubted the attribution, and his doubts are shared by Bardenhewer and Bonwetsch. A new complexion was put upon the question by the publication in 1891 of a new work of Anastasius of Sinai, entitled *κεφάλαια διάφορα καὶ πᾶν ὠφέλιμα*, from a Jerusalem MS of the ninth century (Sabbaitic. 408). It was edited by Papadopoulos Kerameus, a prolific scholar, and contains the Peter fragment. This little work of Anastasius is preserved in other MSS as well—Barocc. (saec. xi), Mosq. 416 ($\frac{378}{\text{CCCCV}}$) (saec. xiii), Angelicograec. 52 (saec. xi), Iveron on Athos (saec. xvi), Barber. gr. 522 (V, 18) (saec. xi-xii), Vat. gr. 662 (saec. xiii). The Barberini MS gives the work without the author's name; the others attribute it to Anastasius, but with various titles. Mercati describes the MSS and discusses the differences of title, and the character of the work. He then gives a revised text of the last part of the little treatise, containing the Peter fragment, with variants from the Jerusalem, Vatican, Coisl. and Angelican MSS. From this passage it appears that our fragment is quoted by Anastasius from a book of Philo the historian (*Φίλων ὁ ἱστοριογράφος*), in which Peter was represented as *speaking* the words of the fragment to one of the fathers from Scetis, who was disputing with him. It is natural to suspect from the evidence now before us that the words are really apocryphal; all the more as, in this speech, Peter himself quotes a certain servant of God and confessor Pafnutius, and another saint named Pambo. Having shewn the slender basis on which the fragment really rests, Mercati goes on to discuss the reference to Philo the historian. His conclusion is that the notice about Peter has no historical value. As Peter died in 311 and the historical Pambo about 373-374, it will readily be seen that the statements break down in chronology. Space will not allow us to follow Dr Mercati through the special discussion of Philo and Anastasius, the former of whom is identified by a scholiast with the bishop of Carpasia (Cyprus), who died in 393 or 394, or through his edition of a second portion of Anastasius, this time from the *De Dignitate Sacerdotali*, which contains a quotation from 'the ecclesiastical history of Philo the philosopher'. This short work is an example of the best kind of destructive criticism, full of learning and insight.

Le Latin de saint Cyprien : par l'abbé L. BAYARD (Paris : Hachette. 1902). The first sight of this substantial work of some four hundred

and fifty octavo pages raised the question of the reason for its existence. Professor E. W. Watson's work, *The Style and Language of St. Cyprian*, is perhaps the most perfect work of its kind, and little has been done since it was published (1896) to increase our knowledge of Cyprian's latinity. But a little reflexion will shew that there is a *raison d'être* for Dr Bayard's work. Mr Watson's study cannot be obtained separately, but only as a part of the fourth volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, which contains much matter of a diverse character. Premising that I think Dr Bayard might have made a reference to Mr. Watson's work in the 'Avant-propos' as well as elsewhere (for example, p. xii, n. 3), seeing it was published three years before he himself began to work on Cyprian, I may go on to discuss the book itself. The preface, which contains acknowledgements to Goelzer, Martha, and a MS study of Cyprian by M. Noël Valois, is followed by a bibliographical index of works mainly connected with Latin syntax. The following improvements can be made:—the date of Hartel's Cyprian is not '1871', but '1868-1871'; Dombart's, and not Ludwig's, edition of Commodian should have been referred to; the date of Monceaux's *Tertullien et les origines* is 1901, not 1902; the third edition of Neue's *Formenlehre* as far as published, and not the 1875 edition, should have been used; trouble would have been saved by using the collected articles of Paucker (A-L) and Benoist-Goelzer's *Dictionnaire* instead of two separate articles: for 'Woodam' read 'Woodham' (as on p. xxxv), and for 'Rivingstons' read 'Rivingtons'. The bibliography, though good, is in some respects peculiar. In the introduction Dr Bayard discusses amongst other matters the authenticity of the *Quod Idola*, which he regards as genuine and as the earliest work of Cyprian, being a compilation from Tertullian *Apol.* and Minucius Felix. There is a looseness about some of the remarks in this introduction, which is disappointing. 'Saint Cyprien est un Africain' (p. xiv): what does he mean by 'Africain'? Is it 'a native of Africa' or 'a Carthaginian Semite' or 'an aboriginal'? And how inexact is the following statement: 'l'empereur Septime-Sévère le [i.e. Punic] parlait bien, au commencement du même siècle [as Cyprian], et saint Augustin un siècle après.' We have no evidence that Augustine spoke the language well, though it is true he once or twice quotes a Punic word in his writings. Other topics of the introduction, well treated, are the education and authenticity and date of the several writings of Cyprian. The book proper is divided into three parts—Phonétique, Sémantique, and Style. The first part is subdivided into four books—Orthographe et Prononciation, Dérivation, Composition, and Flexion; the second into two books—Vocabulaire and Syntaxe; the third consists of an introduction, and two chapters on 'Les procédés d'école' and 'La personnalité de l'écrivain'. The book ends with

'Conclusions générales'. This method of subdivision is clear and good, and as the work is provided with a good index, it is easy to use. I think it premature to discuss the orthography and pronunciation of Cyprian's Latin, because we have yet to receive exact reports of the orthography of the best MSS, and when we have received them it will be necessary to find out which, if any, represent the actual orthography of Cyprian. Many of Dr Bayard's results may have to be discounted. For example, it seems certain that *ingemesco* (p. 3), *linimenta*, *calciare* (p. 4) are the correct spellings for all authors: *spiritualis* is probably not older than the eleventh or twelfth century A.D.; it was hardly necessary to mention *tentare*, as *temptare* and *temtare* are the only good spellings; on *afluere* (p. 13) reference should have been made to Nettle-ship's classical article in *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*. On pp. 18 and 21 the author begs the question as to the date of the Latin Irenaeus, apparently never having heard of the view, held by Hort and others, that the translation was made in the fourth century. When discussing words in *-bundus* he might have mentioned Livy's fondness for such words. It would be easy to add parallel citations from other authors to those which the author has given, but space forbids. The 'semantic' part of the book is excellent and ought to be most useful to those beginning the study of the later Latin authors. In the discussion of the equivalence of *hic* and *is* (p. 132), account ought to have been taken of the forms *hii* and *hiis* in MSS. It is time some one told us whether these forms are wrong or right, whether they are for *hi* and *his* or for *ii* and *iis*. Twenty-one pages are devoted to the prepositions, a part of the subject intentionally omitted by Mr Watson. The words *remissa* (plur.) and *Satanas* (p. 202) should have been mentioned: in the index s.v. *remissa* correct 197 to 190. The syntactical part is excellent. I should call special attention to the part dealing with *quod*, *quia*, and *quoniam* after verbs of statement. The portion on the personality of Cyprian is able and interesting. The proposed emendations in the text are based on a minute knowledge of the author's style and merit attention. Space forbids detailed reference to these and to misprints I have noticed.

Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung; Geschichte ihrer Entstehung und Überlieferung: von HANS FREIHERR VON SODEN. (Leipzig: 1904.)

IT is a pleasure to welcome this part of *Texte und Untersuchungen*. It is the work of a very young man, whose father and grandfather are living scholars of repute, and shews qualities from which we may expect further valuable contributions to theology in the future. The main purpose of the book is to examine all the MSS of Cyprian in existence, with special reference to the order in which the epistles are given

by them, so as to discover the precise stages in the growth of the collection, the chronological order of the letters, and the authorities likely to be most valuable in the effort to arrive at their true text. The author has visited many libraries in connexion with the forthcoming Greek New Testament of his father, and has examined all Cyprianic MSS which came within his reach; about others he has received reports from the never-failing courtesy of librarians. It is not too much to say that, next to the biblical MSS themselves, it is of importance that we should know accurately what Cyprianic MSS have to tell us, and this work of von Soden's must form the basis of any future edition of Cyprian. (It is no disparagement to Hartel to say that the lapse of thirty-four years has shewn the necessity for a new edition.) The greater part of the book is taken up with the detailed classification of MSS according to their contents, and the disentanglement of various archetypes. The results cannot be described here. Further valuable features of the book are the collection of ancient *testimonia* to Cyprian's letters, a description of the contents of all the printed editions, notes on the manuscript tradition of the *libelli*, lists of MSS of the *spuria*, mention of MSS not properly Cyprianic, which yet contain works of Cyprian, a list of manuscript translations and commentaries on Cyprian's works, a bibliography of Cyprian with 120 items (eight to the credit of Mr Turner), lists of the MSS of Cyprian arranged according to countries, etc., and three larger tables, in which the contents of MSS are made evident at a glance. A few notes may not be out of place: the Rylands MS (pp. 153 f, 250, etc.) is actually of the eighth century; at least one of the Bodleian (Bodleian, p. 250) MSS (Laud 105) is dated too low (p. 62); it is of interest that the Bodleian MS of Augustine *De Baptismo contra Donatistas* (Laud. 130, saec. x) often offers a text agreeing with the *sententiae episcoporum* as they are given by Cyprian against the Benedictine text of Augustine which Hartel quotes (p. 179 f); add to the MSS of the *De singularitate clericorum* known to Harnack and von Soden, Reims 369 (saec. ix) and 374 (saec. x), both of which attribute it to Origen (p. 224); no. 26 of the bibliography should be struck out, as it has reference to Question 102 of Ambrosiaster (p. 242); Smith made a catalogue only of the Caius College Library, not of all the Cambridge College Libraries, and its lack of dates will be remedied in the forthcoming scientific catalogue of Dr M. R. James (p. 250, n. 1); for 'Middlehill' read 'Thirlestaine House' (p. 250); there is, I believe, only one Manchester MS of Cyprian, the Rylands (formerly Crawford) MS (saec. viii), and Mr Guppy is not Lord Crawford's librarian (p. 250); for 'Auranches' read 'Avranches' (pp. 251, 257). This work is indispensable to every serious student of Cyprian, and I would re-echo the author's wish that its publication may lead to the desirable and possible new edition of Cyprian,

where the readings of archetypes, as in Lindsay's edition of Martial, and not those of individual MSS, shall be quoted.

An Hippolytus Fragment and a Word on the 'Tractatus Origenis', by
DOM E. C. BUTLER, O.S.B. (reprinted from *Zeitschr. f. d. neuest. Wissenschaft* IV (1903), pp. 79-87).

DOM BUTLER has made several contributions to the question of the authorship of the so-called *Tractatus Origenis*, which Mgr Batiffol published some years ago, the most considerable of them being the masterly article which appeared in the last number of this JOURNAL. I cannot help thinking that if half the time and trouble devoted to a discussion of this collection had been devoted to one of Origen's genuine commentaries, it would have been better employed. It is strange how some scholars seem blind to literature already printed, while they rush eagerly to discuss the latest *anecdote*. Dom Butler cannot be accused of this unhealthy excitement, and in my opinion has taken the correct view of this collection, that it is a compilation of the fifth century. It recalls the discussion about a commentary on the Gospels which was confidently attributed to Theophilus of Antioch till a MS was discovered which proved it to be a compilation of the seventh century (see the interesting account by Dr Sanday in *Studia Biblica* vol. i). In the above-named paper Dom Butler examines Tractate XI in the most skilful manner. It is an allegorical treatment of the story of the spies sent to the Promised Land (Num. xiii 24), and is almost identical with a homily of Caesarius discovered by Dom Morin, the editor of the forthcoming Vienna edition of that writer. Dom Butler, with practical certainty, considers Hippolytus to have been the ultimate source from which both (as well as Maximus of Turin) drew this elaborate allegorical interpretation. In the same paper also he prints passages from Tract. III and Origen-Rufinus Hom. VII in Gen., which prove conclusively that the latter was a source of the former¹. I cannot do better than quote Dom Butler's opinion of the collection: 'though the new *Tractatus Origenis* probably contain embedded in them morsels of interesting old material, still in their extant form they must be regarded as the handiwork of an unknown compiler or redactor, who probably made use of some remains of Origen and Hippolytus, and certainly pillaged freely the writings of Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Novatian, the *de Bono Pudicitiae*, Hilary, Rufinus, and probably others' (amongst them Gaudentius of Brescia, as Morin has shewn). I think it probable that the compilation was made in Gaul.

¹ Cf. *J. T. S.* vol. ii (Oct. 1900).

Die Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians; eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung, von HERMANN JORDAN, Lic. Theol. (Leipzig: Deichert. 1902.)

It is unnecessary that much should be said here of this work, in view of the fact that Dom Butler in the last number of the *JOURNAL* has made known its characteristics at sufficient length. The author, a pupil of Haussleiter, can hardly be blamed for adopting the Weyman-Zahn-Haussleiter hypothesis that the *Tractatus Origenis* is a work of Novatian; but believing as I do in Dom Butler's view of the character of that compilation, it seems to me unfortunate that the author should have rushed into print so soon with a work of the above title. His aim is to expound the theology of Novatian from that author's works (including the new *Tractatus*). In as far as his book deals with those works which all allow to be by Novatian, it lacks neither interest nor usefulness. The introduction of seventy pages, comprising an account of all that was written on the homilies up to the time of publication and an epitome of the contents of each homily, with an enumeration of sources, is of great service. The rest of the book (pp. 71-224), in which the theology is treated in detail, will be valuable to the student of the theology of the Latin Church. It is divided up into six chapters, with the following subjects—God, Christ, the Spirit, the Trinity, the Relation of the Homilies to the Fundamental Ideas of the Novatian Schism, and the Parallels with Earlier Christian Literature, etc. This part of the work must have cost great trouble, for it is carried out with thoroughness. It is only occasionally that the author is uncritical, as, for example, when he ejects as interpolations those passages in which *ingenitus* (unborn) occurs, because Novatian in the admitted works uses only the other word *inogenitus* (inborn) (pp. 54 ff, 77). The fifth and sixth chapters are, as might be expected, the weakest. The sixth contains an interesting list of parallels between the homilies and (the Latin) Origen's homilies on Genesis, etc., Hippolytus, and others. An excursus gives a list of those scripture passages quoted both by Novatian and by the homilies. Jordan (p. 12) is sure that the biblical citations prove identity of authorship; Ammundsen is sure they do not. This very important question must be left to others (see the above paper of Dom Butler, p. 87 note, whose examination of a number of texts leads him to agree with Ammundsen). A new edition of the homilies, with the sources indicated, would be a benefit.

A. SOUTER.