

PATRISTICA.

Die Apostolischen Väter, von F. X. FUNK. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellschriften als Grundlage für Seminariübungen, herausgegeben unter Leitung von Professor D. G. KRÜGER. Zweite Reihe, Erstes Heft.) (Mohr, Tübingen, 1906.)

AMONG the cheaper issues of the Apostolic Fathers the smaller edition of Funk has taken an honourable place. His larger edition, in two volumes, appeared in 1901. The present volume is a second edition of his smaller edition, and has profited by recent research in the subject, which is copiously referred to both in the general and in the special introductions. Scripture parallels are given in the footnotes, but hardly with sufficient fullness; for example, no parallels are given for *τρέμων τοὺς λόγους* in *Didache* iii 8, *οὐκ ἐπέεις ἴδια εἶναι* *Did.* iv 8, *ὑμεῖς δὲ <οἱ> δοῦλοι ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν* *Did.* iv 11, and several other passages. At the end is an index of scripture passages arranged according to treatises. The edition is most useful and extraordinarily cheap.¹

Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum ex editione minore Gebhardt Harnack Zahn lectionibus editionum minorum Funk et Lightfoot admissis composuit EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, Ph. D. (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1907.)

THE only bad thing about this book is the principal part of its title: it would have been less cumbersome and misleading in some such form as *Index in Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*. The idea and the execution of the work are so good that it is strange it did not appear long ago. Dr Goodspeed, the distinguished papyrologist of the University of Chicago, was impressed by the necessity for such a work as the present, when studying the vocabulary of the Greek New Testament under Dr E. D. Burton. He began the book more than five years ago, taking as his model—and a very good model too—the *Index Homericus* of Gehring. He has himself collected the material from the Fragments of Papias and part of the Epistles of Ignatius. The remainder of the work has been done by pupils under his controlling direction. The text used for the compilation was the third smaller edition of Von Gebhardt, Harnack, and Von Zahn, printed in 1900, but the fourth edition, that of 1905, has not been neglected; the fifth edition, that of 1906, appeared too late to be used. Material not printed in these issues, the Remains of the Presbyters and the fragment of Quadratus, is not indexed, but the readings of Funk (not, of course,

¹ Dr. Funk died in February of the present year.

the 1906 edition noticed above) and Lightfoot, where they differ from those of the German triumvirate, are recorded. A comparative table of the sections of the editors, where they differ, is provided in the preface. The index is an absolutely complete one of all the words and their occurrences in the Apostolic Fathers. I have tested it in scores of places and have found neither an omission nor a false reference. Its completeness may be illustrated by the fact that every *καί*, every *δέ*, every case of the article is indexed. It may be questioned whether it was necessary to include these. It is certain that it would take less time to read through all the Apostolic Fathers than to discover a passage by the help of the fact that one of the commonest words occurred in it. Yet there are advantages for the grammarian in this scrupulous completeness: it is remarkable, for instance, that *καίτοι* occurs but once in the whole range of the Apostolic Fathers, *Diog.* 8, 3. Parts of nouns, adjectives, and verbs are kept by themselves: thus, all cases of the genitive singular of a word are given together, the treatises quoted coming in a constant order; the same is the case with the varied forms of verbs. Further, in adjectives, where the genitive plural, for example, has the same form throughout, the instances of the masculine are given by themselves, followed by the instances of the feminine, and then by the neuter. It would be impossible to exaggerate the value which the present work has for the serious student, not only of the Apostolic Fathers, but of the Greek New Testament itself. Students of vocabulary, grammar, and theology will find it equally precious, and it deserves a hearty welcome from all such. It may be mentioned that a Latin index is provided of all such words as are not extant in the original Greek.

Clemens Alexandrinus: Zweiter Band, Stromata, Bücher I-VI, 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 15]. (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1906.)

THE second volume of the Berlin Clement follows the first after a very brief interval, considering the magnitude of the task which Dr Stählin has undertaken. The general features of the present volume are those of the first. There is one difference in the printing. In the first volume the numbers of Sylburg's and Potter's pages were given in the same type as those indicating the sections and subsections of the text. In this the sections and subsections are numbered in a thicker type, and are thus easily distinguished from the numbers referring to the pages of the earlier editors. The *Stromateis* of Clement is an excellent example of the paucity of manuscript authority for constituting

the texts of the Greek Fathers, especially as compared with the generally abundant authority for those of the Latin Fathers. There is but one MS of the *Stromateis*, Laur. v 3, of the eleventh century, preserved at Florence: Paris B. N. Suppl. Graec. 250 (saec. xvi) is merely a copy of L. It is unfortunate that, owing to the loss of a leaf at the beginning of the MS, we do not now possess the opening paragraphs of the work: there are some leaves lost at the end also. L and M (= Mutinensis [saec. x-xi], containing the *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*) were together in one library in the eleventh or twelfth century. The scribe of L wrote a part of M. This same scribe also wrote Urbinas 124, a MS of Dio Chrysostom. The greater part both of M and Urbinas was copied from MSS belonging to Arethas of Cappadocia. So it is natural to conjecture that we owe to him also the *Stromateis* of Clement.¹ To him we are further beholden for the Oxford 'Clarkianus' of Plato and 'Dorvillianus' of Euclid, as well as for the best MS of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius.² Our manuscript is very carelessly written, and Dr Kenyon, as the result of a study of its errors, has come to the conclusion that it was copied from a papyrus MS, which contained numerous abbreviations, and was damaged besides. The text bristles with errors, both in Clement's words and those of the authors he quotes. There is therefore a tempting field for conjecture, which has not been overlooked even by classical scholars. The present edition forms a reliable basis for further conjecture. The reports of the MS readings must be practically faultless, as besides the editio princeps, which was printed from this MS, the editor has been able to compare the collations made by G. Müller (for Dindorf), T. Heyse, and himself. The scribe has been guilty of omissions, but there appear to be no long interpolations. The editor gives a selection, about three pages long, of the errors in Dindorf's reports of the readings of L. The present edition is an admirable piece of work. In spite of the awkward textual situation the text has been made very readable. It has attained this excellence partly through the editor's own unsurpassed knowledge of Clement, partly by the help of conjectures from some of the most eminent Greek and patristic scholars of Europe, Professors J. B. Mayor, who also sent Jeremiah Markland's conjectures on Book I, R. Münzel, C. Weyman, E. Schwartz, and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. In spite of all this help the editor has wisely obelized the text from time to time (for example, p. 24 l. 1, p. 25 l. 6, p. 28 ll. 11-12, p. 29 l. 12, p. 70 l. 6). The sources of the quotations are given with a fullness which will provide much valuable

¹ I take these facts from Stählin's first volume pp. xxxix to xlii; as he has there fully described L, he dispenses with a description in the present volume.

² See Gifford's edition of the last I p. viii.

material for the future commentator on the *Stromateis*; here the hand of the master Weyman has been at work, and it is unlikely that much has escaped him. On p. 25 l. 17 (I vii 38, 5), Ioh. 7, 17 is to be compared. The whole character of this book makes one long for the indexes, especially those of scripture quotations and of words. There is great need for a special lexicon to Clement; there is also a need for further study of Clement's scripture quotations (outside the Gospels). We may hope that Dr Stählin will not keep us waiting long for the rest of his epoch-making edition.

Λόγος Σωτηρίας πρὸς τὴν Παρθένον (*De Virginitate*): eine echte Schrift des Athanasius, von Lic. EDUARD FREIHERRN VON DER GOLTZ. Privatdocent an der Universität Berlin. (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1905.) [*Texte und Untersuchungen u.s.w.* N.F. xiv 2 a.]

THE present work is divided into three parts, preceded by an introduction and followed by indexes. The first part is occupied with the manuscripts of the *De Virginitate*, as it is commonly called, and their classification: a critically revised text is then provided complete. The second part discusses the contents and character of the work in general, the spiritual (*geistige*) relationship with the world of ideas of the Egyptian ascetics, the circumstances of life presupposed by the tract, its literary connexions, and finally the question as to the author. The final part is entitled 'Die Bedeutung des Traktats für unsere Kenntnis der Geschichte des christlichen Lebens'. In the study of the MSS the editor has profited greatly, as he fully acknowledges, by the articles of Bp Wallis in this JOURNAL (vol. iii, 1901-1902, pp. 97-109, 245-255), and has had the good fortune to find a much older MS of the *De Virginitate* than any hitherto known, one of the tenth or eleventh century, belonging to the Monastery of St John in Patmos. He has also examined, or had examined for him, far more manuscripts than any previous editor. His introduction, in which four groups of Athanasius MSS are distinguished, will be useful to future editors of Athanasius. His conclusion with regard to the present tract is that its text is best preserved in the Patmos MS, and that four other MSS (Basel [saec. xiv]; Oxford [saec. xv]; Venice [saec. xii (?)] ; London [saec. xiii]) are independent of it, and sometimes give a better reading, although they represent various stages of intentional alteration. Perhaps the most important discovery he has made is that the liturgical passages, which were suspected, are the work of M (at Munich, saec. xvi) and G (at Geneva, saec. xvi), from the latter of which the *editio princeps* was printed. We are grateful for the new text, both for its own sake and for the sake of the passages of scripture quoted, some of them rather long, which are thus brought nearer the form in which the author of

the tract published them. One of the most important tasks for the textual criticism of the New Testament is to obtain the quotations of the Greek Fathers in the period 300-375 in as accurate a form as possible. The question whether the present tract is a genuine work of Athanasius or not is one which has long been disputed, and the present chronicler is in no way qualified to decide it. The manuscripts are unanimous in favour of the attribution, but it is a commonplace of Christian history that great names become attached to the works of those with whose activity they are sometimes contemporaneous. The tract must belong to Egypt and probably to the fourth century. Dr Von der Goltz might have compared the style and language of the tract in detail with that of the admittedly genuine works of Athanasius. How far, for instance, are the methods of citation of scripture enumerated on pages 88 and 93 to be found in his works? With this qualification it may be said that the editor has done everything that can be done to strengthen the case for Athanasius's authorship (pp. 114 ff). The value of his work is, however, in no way dependent on this theory of authorship. He gives us out of his stores of learning many valuable parallels to the statements of the tract on the life of virgins.

Ἐπὶ Ἱερωσύνης (*De Sacerdotio*) of St John Chrysostom; edited by
J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN. (Cambridge University Press, 1906.)
[Cambridge Patristic Texts: General Editor—A. J. Mason, D.D.]

IT is an event of importance when a classical scholar of the calibre of Dr Nairn turns his attention to patristic scholarship and produces an edition of a Father's masterpiece. I may be permitted to express the hope that this is the first of many contributions to the subject from him. Patristic scholarship will benefit greatly by highly-trained faculties like his. The introduction occupies rather more than a quarter of the book, and deals with several subjects. The first is the character, date, and genuineness of the *De Sacerdotio*. On the question of date Dr Nairn takes the view that the work belongs neither to Chrysostom's diaconate (381-386), nor to a still earlier period, but that it was written after 386, and probably before 390. In support of this he produces a previously unused argument from a sermon of Chrysostom preached at Antioch, one of the *Homilies on Uzziah*, in which he refers to a work on 'priesthood' which he is to publish at a future date. Now, deacons did not preach at Antioch, and Chrysostom did not become a presbyter till 386. Therefore the treatise on the duties of a bishop is later than 386. The second part of the introduction is concerned with several points of Chrysostom's teaching illustrated by the *De Sacerdotio*: (a) the dignity of the priestly office, (b) the doctrine of the

Holy Eucharist, (c) penitence, confession, and absolution, (d) persecution of heretics, (e) the office of the Bishop. All this is admirable both in its brevity and arrangement, and full of interest. Some interesting illustrations of some of the points mentioned are afforded by the Christian inscriptions of Lycaonia which have been collected and will be published together. The third part of the introduction is devoted to other ancient treatises on pastoral theology, and the fourth to the style of the *De Sacerdotio*. Room might have been found somewhere for mention of the fact that Dr Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, in his *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* praises and quotes Chrysostom's treatise (pp. 66 ff of the first edition, published in 1692). The identity of the Basil of the *De Sacerdotio* forms the subject of the fifth part of the introduction: he adopts the prevailing view that he was the Bishop of Raphanea, near Antioch. The sixth, and longest, part of the introduction discusses the history of the text. There the most important editions are named and passed under review, and Montfaucon gets his *coup de grâce*. (In addition to the Gaume and Migne editions of Chrysostom, yet another complete edition appeared in France last century, in the sixties. The edition contains a translation, and bears the name of an abbé as the editor, but I cannot recollect anything further of the book. It is not mentioned by Dr Nairn nor by Bardenhewer in his *Patrologie*: it must therefore be a rare book.) Of manuscripts we are given a long list, and thirty have been used for this edition: on p. li, l. 3 from foot, for *Olio* read *Oliv*; and on p. lii, n. 1, correct the curious error 'Baudin' to 'Bandini'. They are classified into four groups, and the best appears to be Cod. monac. gr. 354 (saec. xi): some MSS which may be of importance it has not been possible to examine. The Syriac and Latin versions are next referred to. The British Museum MSS of the former are enumerated, but no others, and of the old Latin version no MSS are mentioned. It is very possible that MSS of the latter still exist, as Chrysostom was a valued teacher in the Western Church early in the ninth century and earlier still.¹ The introduction concludes with a useful bibliography. The critical notes and explanatory notes are printed at the foot of the page according to the plan of the series. The critical apparatus is clearly arranged, and the explanatory notes are short and pithy. Many of the latter consist of translations of difficult words. This is as it ought to be, for the Greek Fathers receive much the same cold neglect at the hands of lexicographers as the Latin. The edition

¹ Cassiodorus in the sixth century valued him. He was used by Zmaragdus for his 'Expositio Libri Comitis', and is indicated by the marginal symbol $\bar{\omega}$ in his MSS. There are at least four ninth-century MSS of Chrysostom-Mucianus on *Hebrews*.

will be found admirably fitted for its purpose. An appendix is added on 'the bearing of the scriptural quotations in the *De Sacerdotio* on the textual criticism of the New Testament'. An examination of these is seen to bear out, as might be expected, the conclusion of Dr Hort as to the 'Syrian' character of Chrysostom's readings. Those interested in this question must now consult the second part of the first volume of Von Soden's great edition of the Greek New Testament, published somewhat after Dr Nairn's book, in which a much wider induction is used, also on the basis of the best MSS. Von Soden is of opinion that Chrysostom was himself the author of the earliest recension of what he calls the K (= *κοινή*) form of text. The present book is provided with useful indexes of subjects, scripture texts, and Greek words.

Kommodian von Gaza: ein Arelatensischer Laiendichter aus der Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts, von HEINRICH BREWER, S. J. Phil. Dr. (Schöningh, Paderborn, 1906.) [*Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, herausgegeben von Dr A. EHRHARD und Dr J. P. KIRSCH, VI Band, 1 und 2 Heft.]

FATHER BREWER, professor in the Feldkirch 'Stella Matutina', the Eton of Austria, has made a reputation as an authority on ancient Athenian law, but is equally at home in the history and theology of the early centuries of the Church. His edition of the commentaries of 'Ambrosiaster' on the Epistles of St Paul, now in preparation, will, it is fair to prophesy, be one of the most noteworthy editions of any Latin work that have ever appeared. Meantime he has issued the present work on Commodian, which demands our attention. This the title at once arrests, as it sets forth in brief the striking thesis which the author proceeds to maintain. Commodian is not mentioned by Jerome in his *De Viris Illustribus*, but appears in the supplement to that work written by Gennadius between 467 and 469. The natural inference from this fact is that he is posterior to Jerome in date. Yet the fashionable opinion among scholars for a long time has been that he is our earliest Latin poet and belongs to the middle of the third century. Brewer begins his book by giving a full account of the history of modern opinion about Commodian's life and circumstances. The prevailing view is he was a resident in Africa, and that he became a bishop. Now, it is a safe canon that a Christian Latin work, written prior to Jerome's time and unmentioned in his list of biographies, must have been omitted for some good reason. But these critics have given no valid reason. It will not do to say that Jerome was ignorant of the existence of the work; the evidence tends to shew that he was ignorant of nothing in the realm of earlier Christian Latin literature.

The whole history of modern opinion on this subject shews an abject submission to views promulgated as recently as the seventeenth century. These views were based on wrong readings and wrong interpretations of the text of the *Instructiones*. The work was attributed to the period of Constantine till the *Dissertatio* of Dodwell appeared in 1698. It is with him that the modern view takes its rise. For the slight fluctuations in that view the reader must be referred to Brewer's book. His own conclusion is that Commodian wrote his poems between 458 and 466, and that his home was South Gaul. A brief account of his arguments must here be given, but the reasoning is so close that justice cannot be done to them in the space at my disposal. *Apol.* 805-822 shews that the author was acquainted with the occurrences at the capture of Rome by Alaric in 410 A. D. His description is in accord with what the ancient historians tell us of these events. *Instructiones* ii 10 shews knowledge of an affair decided by Pope Leo in 458. The references to martyrdom in the poems are rightly referred to the treatment Christians received from the Vandals in South Gaul. Here and elsewhere in the argument the author makes the most striking and convincing use of the canons of fifth-century Councils in Gaul. *Apol.* 808 is referred to the crossing of the Danube by the Huns in 466, and this part of the poem is the latest in date of all the extant works of Commodian. (The erased word at the end of the MS of the *carmen* is expanded to *antichristo*, and the only objection I can think of to this view is that the *-christo* would probably be represented $\overline{\chi\rho\sigma}$, and there is thus too much space for *antichristo*.) Further, *Instructiones* ii 27 was composed about the year 462 and refers to circumstances in Gaul. *Instructiones* ii 28 is directly complimentary to Pope Hilarus (461-468), *Instructiones* i 32 is against Arvandus praefectus praetorio of South Gaul. There are many general considerations which confirm the dates just mentioned. The second chapter of the book discusses the circumstances of Commodian's life. The use of the word *ostare* (*Instructiones* ii 18, 15) = *ôter*, which has passed into no other Romance language, points to Gaul: so does the use of the Gallic liturgy in *Instructiones* ii 35. The river referred to in *Instructiones* ii 9, 10 must be the Rhône, and a consideration of the reference to it indicates Arles as the place of his home. There he came into contact with the luxury of the place and with the deeds of Arvandus. There, and there only, outside Rome, could he acquire his knowledge of the canons of Gallic Councils and other official documents of the Church. But though his home was at Arles, he was a native of Gaza in Syria, from which country there were many residents in Gaul at the time. The internal evidence of the poems proves him to have been a layman at the time they were written, and one of the ascetics that lived 'in the world'. He was also at the

time of writing advanced in years, but had probably come from Syria to Gaul in early life, and had there received a good education to fit him for public life. In earlier manhood he lived an evil life, and entered Christianity probably through Judaism. Brewer next shews that Sabellianism, though somewhat changed from its earlier character, lasted into the fifth century, and that the so-called 'apologeticum carmen' is really misnamed, being not an apologetic, but a catechetical work. An able chapter follows on the religious views of Commodian, in which his dependence on Lactantius (and through him on the Book of Enoch), Hippolytus *Περὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ Ἀντιχρίστου*, Pseudo-Hippolytus *Περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου*, the *Apocalypse*, and the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, &c., is clearly shewn. The subjects particularly discussed are demons and the last things. The fourth chapter is devoted to the models and imitators of the poet. It is pointed out in connexion with the Bible that Commodian is not entirely dependent on Cyprian's *Testimonia* for his quotations. The *Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani* (date about 430) was known to our author and used by him. The Old Latin character of Commodian's New Testament quotations is illustrated. Borrowings from, among others, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, Cyprian, *Disticha Catonis* (very striking) are pointed out. Naturally not all parallels are equally cogent. The final argument is a linguistic one. It seeks to shew that the author's language proves him a fifth-century writer. This chapter must have cost the author great trouble, as there is still no comprehensive guide to the study of the later Latin, and every new explorer must hack down the tangled growth which surrounds him and impedes his progress. This part of the proof is quadruple. First, words and meanings of words are produced in Commodian that cannot be paralleled before the beginning of the fourth century. Then the phonetics, the forms of words and syntactical forms are successively illustrated, and support the conclusion. Some fresh illustrations are given below to strengthen the argument. I have nothing to offer against it. The work ends with a good index, which will be useful to students of fourth- and fifth-century literature in general.

A few notes may here be added. Page 45, note 2, add a reference to Mommsen and Meyer's *Codex Theodosianus* ii p. 90; page 76, note 1, for 'quaerulos' read 'querulos'; page 93, note 3, for 'catholica' = 'catholica ecclesia', compare also C. H. Turner's *Monumenta* fasc. i page 15¹; page 98, note 1, for 'rector' = *bishop*, compare C. H. Turner in this JOURNAL vii (1905-1906) pp. 282 f; page 161, note 5, on 'Cod. Albig. 2' cf. C. H. Turner in this JOURNAL ii (1900-1901) p. 266 ff; page 221, a much fuller account of MSS of Gennadius's *Liber Ecclesiasti-*

¹ I have noted Ambst in 1 Cor. iii 15 (Migne xvii p. 211 c); Aug. *de bapt. c. Don.* several times.

corum Dogmatum was given by C. H. Turner in this JOURNAL vii (1905-1906) pp. 81-88 and viii pp. 103-114; page 281, note 1, compare *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti cxxvii*, qu. 76 § 1 *saluator . . . nuptiarum uota . . . poculis honestavit*, 106 § 16, 115 § 50; page 293, on the text of Matth. v 22, add Cod. Bob.; page 294, on the text of Matth. xiii 24-30, add Codd. Bob. Monac. German.; Corbei. is dated by some saec. v; while, strictly, Cyprian's rendering is unknown, it may safely be assumed to have been identical with that of Bob. (cf. also p. 643, 17 H.); *lolium* and *auenae* together in Prosper may be due to imitation of Virgil's line (*Ecl.* v 37); page 295, on John xx 28, Vercellensis may be added to Colbertinus; page 311, compare *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test. cxxvii* quaest. 114 § 31; page 324, Dr Sanday's article in *Studia Biblica* vol. i makes it pretty certain that the Pseudo-Theophilus commentary is the borrower; pages 328-329, the references Caesarius makes to chattering in church are frequent; add Ps.-Aug. *serm.* 265, 3 *in ecclesia stantes nolite uerbosari*; . . . *qui enim in ecclesia uerbosari uoluerit . . .*; 283, 1; 286, 5. 6; there are doubtless others in the many unpublished sermons Dom Morin has discovered; page 332, note 3 for 'Aetheria' we should probably substitute 'Eucheria'; pages 333 foll., the references are unfortunately to the sixth and not the seventh edition of Georges' *Handwörterbuch*—Benoist-Goelzer's *Dictionnaire* would have been better still—and not all the published parts of the new *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* appear to have been accessible to the author; for instance, he could have added greatly to the examples of *adesse* = *esse*, and strengthened his argument; page 334 *besteus*, the *Thesaurus* is without Brewer's example from Gregory of Tours, but has instances from the *Acts of Peter* and the veterinary writer Chiron; page 337, add a reference to Watson in *Studia Biblica* iv p. 255; pages 339-340 *inspector cordis* is a translation of *καρδιογνώστης* (Ac. xv 8), found in Iren. III xii 14, *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 75 (79) § 2, 126 § 9, Aug. *Gen. ad Litt.* xi 34, *serm.* 91 § 5, 291 § 5, 352 § 5, Ps.-Aug. *serm.* 79 § 1 (cf. *conscientiae inspector* Ps.-Aug. *serm.* 62 § 10); page 341, *paupera* (fem.) occurs *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 124 § 1; of *pausare*, intransitive, I have the following examples: inser. in Cabrol and Leclercq *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica* I 1 p. ciii (of date prior to 325), which would appear to be the earliest instance discovered, Theodore Priscian (ed. Rose), index, *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 127 § 4, [Orig.] tract. (ed. Batiffol) p. 210, 10, Migne *P.L.* lxxvii 1036 B; page 343, *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* has also got both *septimana* and *hebdomas*; page 346, note 1, Ambrosiaster also occasionally uses *diaco* (-onis),¹ e. g. *Quaest.* 101 § 4, and, if my memory serves me right, Pelagius

¹ For *διάκων* in Greek, compare Ramsay *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* inser. 672 (of the third or fourth century).

too: there can be little doubt that collation of better MSS will often restore it where editors have altered it; page 350, the similar sounds of *x* and *s* may be illustrated from MS *f*² of the Gospels, see Buchanan in this JOURNAL vii (1905-1906) pp. 112, 116; page 351 *adulscens* is not infrequent in MSS; e.g. *adulscentas* is the reading of the (best) Metz MS in *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 127 § 34. It is surprising to find that the author has not availed himself of the numerous illustrations of metrical points on page 35 afforded by the *Heptateuch* of Cyprian of Toulon (ed. Peiper). There are misprints on pages 2, 23, 153, 160, 207, 263, 315, 323, 325, 340, 347. The index might have been fuller with advantage: for instance, the following references could have been added under 'Ambrosiaster': 82, 85 f, 98, 136, 150 f: and 'Predigten 182' and 'Regnum 48 n. 1' were worth inserting. The binder must be a rather out-of-date person, as the book falls to pieces when cut open.

Sedulius Scottus, von S. HELLMANN. (Beck, München, 1906.) [*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, herausgegeben von LUDWIG TRAUBE: Erster Band, Erstes Heft.]

THE present book, which actually appeared before the end of 1905; though it bears date 1906, is the first part of a new series which promises to be of great value and importance. The scheme was the product of the fertile brain of Traube, professor at Munich, whose early death on May 19th of this year is an irreparable loss to scholarship. He lived to see the issue of three parts, which form the first volume, and the completion (all but the indexes) of a fourth part, a valuable work entitled *Nomina Sacra*, by himself. It is to be hoped that the remainder of the attractive programme will be carried out, in spite of the master's removal. The first part comprises an introduction, a new critical edition of Sedulius's *Liber de Rectoribus Christianis*, a complete account of the solitary copy, at Cues on the Mosel, of the collection of extracts from earlier literature made by Sedulius, and finally a study of the use Sedulius made of Pelagius's commentary on the Epistles of Paul in his own commentary on these Epistles. Since this work has been published I have had special opportunities for careful study of it, particularly of the third part. This has only served to confirm the opinion of it I expressed early last year.¹ It is equally learned, accurate, and interesting. Previous editions of the *De Rectoribus* have been based on one MS; this is based on all, and will never probably be superseded. The book itself

¹ In the *English Historical Review* for April, and, for a review of the next book on the list, see the same *Review* for Jan. 1907.

is of great importance in the history of kingship, and has received due attention at the hands of Mr A. J. Carlyle in his *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*. The *Collectaneum* is a remarkable collection which has never been fully described before. It comprises many passages both from Christian and non-Christian literature. The third part of the book is perhaps the most important to readers of the JOURNAL. The author was induced by the fascination of the problem of the transmission of Pelagius's commentary, as treated by Zimmer in his *Pelagius in Irland*,¹ to go on from the discussion of the use of Pelagius made by Sedulius to the wider question of the general transmission of Pelagius's commentary. He is able to go beyond Zimmer, because he has collated the MSS of Sedulius's commentary, and has also studied an authority overlooked by Zimmer, the *Expositio Libri Comitis* of Zmaragdus. The result of his painstaking investigations, carried on in various directions, is to overthrow Zimmer's view that Pelagius is represented in an Irish tradition by his St Gall MS, and in a continental tradition by Pseudo-Primasius and Pseudo-Jerome. Hellmann proves, on the contrary, that the St Gall MS and Pseudo-Jerome belong to one class over against all the other authorities, namely Pseudo-Primasius, Zmaragdus, and Sedulius. He has been unavoidably hampered in his investigations by the terrible state of the printed text of Pseudo-Jerome, and it is all the more to his credit that his vision has pierced through the rubbish accumulated by the successive printers (they cannot be called editors) of Pseudo-Jerome. I have gone over all the passages he quotes in the oldest MSS of Pseudo-Jerome. This has served to shew me in some measure what Pseudo-Jerome really is, and with this knowledge it has been possible to study Hellmann's lists afresh. The total effect has been to bring all the authorities closer together, and to isolate the real differences between the one recension and the other. While the SG—PHI recension is sometimes right against all the other authorities, that recension has throughout suffered from both accidental and intentional corruption, and is on the whole inferior to what can be elicited from the other authorities. The Karlsruhe MS (Aug. cxix—saec. ix) is claimed by me as a touchstone, by which to test all other authorities, and Dr Mercati's timely discovery has proved that this MS represents a commentary existing at least as early as the sixth century.² A personal debt of gratitude is owing to Dr Hellmann for a valued companion in my studies. A reference ought to be made in conclusion to the splendid paper and printing used for the series of which it forms the worthy commencement.

¹ See the review by C. H. Turner in the JOURNAL iv (1902-1903) pp. 132-141.

² See the last number of the JOURNAL (vol. viii p. 529 ff).

Johannes Scottus, von E. K. RAND. (Beck, München, 1906.) [*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, herausgegeben von LUDWIG TRAUBE: Erster Band, Zweites Heft.]

THE second part of Traube's series has been written by an American pupil. The number of American philologists in close association with German enterprises is a pleasant and growing feature of international scholarship. One recalls the names of C. H. Moore, J. C. Rolfe, E. B. Lease, A. Gudeman, and to these must now be added the newer names of C. H. Beeson, editor of the *Acta Archelai*, C. U. Clark, future Vienna editor of Gregory the Great, and E. K. Rand. The last is already known favourably for his work on Boethius. He has here provided us with a critical edition of John's commentary on the *Opuscula Sacra* of Boethius, and of the commentary on the same works by Remigius of Auxerre he has printed substantial extracts. Both were previously unpublished. The work is provided with the necessary introductions on the works themselves, their authorship, and the manuscripts in which they are contained. The MSS stretch back almost to the times of the authors; so there is not much question as to the text, and the critical apparatus is of necessity small. The work is welcome both for the sake of Boethius's text,—to which, however, it does not contribute much,—and also as the possible start of a complete edition of the works of John. The last edition, a really excellent piece of work for its time, that of Floss in Migne's *Patrologia* vol. cxxii, does not come up to the requirements of modern scholarship. The commentary of Remigius is not printed *in extenso*, because it seems to be fairly clearly made out that it depends greatly on its near predecessor, the commentary by John. John's commentary is mainly philological, but is interesting from a theological and historical point of view also. Rand shews quite conclusively that it has been unduly neglected, and discusses its contributions to thought at some length. The book is provided with various appendixes. One deals with John's glosses on Martianus Capella, and shews that Remigius quoted John's notes in his own commentary on Martianus. Others treat briefly the glosses of Heiricus of Auxerre on Augustine and Boethius; and John's relation to Pliny's *Natural History*. In connexion with Remigius's notes on Boethius, Rand, in order to prove that Remigius is their author, draws parallels from such Remigian works as the *Commentary on Genesis* and the *Homilies*. But Riggenbach has recently shewn, in Zahn's *Forschungen*, that these works emanate from Haymo, a monk of Auxerre, and that it is through confusion that the name of Remigius has become attached to some of them. It would seem, then, that we must attribute the commentary on Boethius also to this Haymo.¹

¹ Page 90, note 1, or *Parisius* read *Parisios*.

Der Portiunkula-Ablass : eine kritisch-historische Studie, von Dr PETER ANTON KIRSCH. (Laupp, Tübingen, 1906.)

THE present work is a reprint of an article contributed to the first and second numbers of the *Theologische Quartalschrift* for last year. The name of the author and the importance the subject has in connexion with St Francis guarantee it the attention it deserves. Sabatier began by doubting the historical character of this Indulgence, as the Bull conferring it does not exist and it is first attested half a century after its putative date, but he afterwards adopted the contrary opinion. It is not unparalleled for the Holy See to declare an Indulgence to be genuine that can be proved to be unhistorical. Kirsch devotes himself, therefore, to the question whether the Indulgence was granted by Pope Honorius III at the request of St Francis, and at the same time attempts to decide whether it was granted to him in the regular form of a plenary indulgence, or merely as a *toties quoties*. It is impossible for the present chronicler to discuss his treatment of these questions. It must suffice to record his conclusions, at the same time mentioning that original documents are largely quoted *in extenso*: 'as the result of this investigation it therefore follows that none of the testimonies, with which the Portiuncula-Indulgence comes into history, is borne by the authority of a *confrère* or of a contemporary of St Francis. Rather we have to do all through with productions, which appeared in the penultimate or the last decade of the thirteenth century, shewing a misuse of the names of real companions of St Francis or of such persons as perhaps were once actually in relations with the Franciscan convent in Perugia.'¹ He further attempts to shew at what date the Indulgence actually was granted. As a result of a careful argument he places it in the period 1288 to 1295, concludes that it took its rise among the 'Zelanti' (or stricter) branch of the Franciscans, deriving its theological basis from Olivi's book '*An sit conveniens credere, &c.*', that there was a counter-movement against the Portiuncula-Indulgence in the Franciscan order itself, that the 'Breve' of Nicholas IV in favour of the Church of St Francis called the Portiuncula-Indulgence into being, and that a vision which one of the brothers had before entering the Order was at the root of the Indulgence. The treatment is most clear and interesting, and the most important steps in the argument are conveniently indicated by spaced type.

A. SOUTER.

¹ Page 64.