

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

that of WP as to produce the double reading by conflation. In other words, the genesis of the three readings may be

WP	or	B1	but hardly	WP
B1		WP:TA s		TA s
TA s				B1

On either of the hypotheses that seem likely, TA s is derived from B1, so that the latter is not conflated out of TA s and WP.

Thus, in spite of appearances, two of these seemingly conflate readings (2 and 4) are certainly, and a third (5) is possibly, the genuine reading: while not one of the five is in reality conflate.

I should not like it to be supposed that I think what has been brought forward touches in any way the discussion of Conflate Readings in Hort's *Introduction*, or affects the validity of the arguments there developed: there is no parity or analogy in the distribution of the documents in his instances and in those just discussed. But it does seem worth while to point out by means of concrete examples, that it must not simply be taken for granted that readings with the appearance of being conflate, really are such; and also that the breaking asunder of a text into parts is a phenomenon that does occur and must be taken count of in textual work.

E. C. BUTLER.

### THE INTERPOLATIONS IN ST CYPRIAN'S *DE UNITATE ECCLESIAE*.

WHILE I am grateful to Mr. Watson (in *J. T. S.* April 1904 p. 432) for his over-flattering appreciation of my work on Cyprianic questions, I am yet trespassing on the Editor's kindness in order to reply to some criticisms.

I admit that my 'Il serait difficile en Afrique ou même à Rome de trouver quelqu'un qui puisse écrire si bien' was too general. I am sorry.

But I certainly consider that I 'strengthened my case by a minute search for likenesses'. It is very difficult to imagine a forger so clever as to combine harmoniously in one sentence so many of St Cyprian's own expressions as occur in the substituted passage. There is certainly in the pseudo-Cyprianic treatises no passage so Cyprianose in character—witness the *pastores multi, grex unus, una cathedra, primatus, unanimi consensione, super quem fundata est ecclesia*. To me it seems one of those occasional passages where a writer's style is unmistakable. But this may be a matter of feeling.

So far my defence is half-hearted. Not so with the rest. What follows in Mr. Watson's paper is based on a misapprehension of my meaning and of the facts.

St Cyprian wrote to the Roman confessors, as soon as he heard of their secession from Novatian, a letter of congratulation (Ep. 54), to which he appended copies of the *De Lapsis* and the *De Unitate*. 'It was in this copy that Dom Chapman holds the change was made by the author. . . . The first point to strike a student is the importance and the publicity of the transaction.' I am afraid it must be my fault if the student's first impression of my meaning is something I never meant. I tried to shew that the change made by the author in c. 19 made that chapter apply to confessors and only to confessors. It is inconceivable that the person who altered the passage, whether St Cyprian or an anonymous forger, should have wished to publish the passage in this form after the return of the confessors to unity. Still less would the confessors themselves have wished it. My contention was that St Cyprian made the alterations simply to meet the case of Maximus and his companions in a single copy which he sent to them.

But Mr. Watson takes a different view, perhaps forgetting c. 19. 'It was to the credit of the confessors [?] and to the obvious advantage of Cornelius that this budget from Carthage should be circulated as widely as possible.' But Ep. 54 was not sent under cover to Cornelius, as Ep. 46 had been, and he probably never saw the copy of *De Unitate*. 'This authoritative antidote would surely be disseminated by all the means which the world-wide connexions of the Roman Church put at Cornelius's disposal. And we should expect, if the earlier version remained in existence, to find that it had escaped oblivion as narrowly as the African type of the Old Latin Bible has done.' Let us suppose that St Cyprian really meant the correction as 'an authoritative antidote to Novatianism' (though this is not in the least my view); how can Mr. Watson know that corrected copies were not disseminated everywhere by Cornelius? It is certain, let me remind him, that all our very numerous MSS of the treatise on Unity simply go back to the first collection of St Cyprian's writings, which was known to Pontius, and which must have been made in Africa just after (or even just before) St Cyprian's death<sup>1</sup>. The treatises contained in this collection must

<sup>1</sup> This edition contained i, iv, vi, v, vii, x, viii, xi, xii, xiii, 6, 10, 28, 37, 11, 38, 39; I am glad to see that Hans von Soden has independently arrived at the same conclusion, *Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung*, 1904, pp. 52-5. I may mention that this industrious young author considers my thesis as to the interpolations as 'ausreichend begründet' (p. 21, note, and p. 202). Cp. Harnack *Chronol.* ii p. 334-

have had a large circulation before they were thus collected, but we know absolutely nothing about this. The circulation of a 'Roman edition' of the *De Unitate*, such as Mr. Watson supposes, might have been the largest in the world, and yet have left no trace. Pontius, Lucifer, the Cheltenham list, all testify only to the original African collection handed down in our MSS. It would surely be nothing wonderful if this Carthaginian edition had contained the original Carthaginian form of the *De Unitate*, even had a rival form been far more common in the rest of the world. This simple consideration destroys the whole of Mr. Watson's elaborate objection to a conjecture which was, after all, never made by any one.

'Is it not more reasonable to acquiesce in the old-fashioned view that there has really been an interpolation?' I think not, until some reason has been given, some circumstances suggested, for such an ingenious performance. The interpolation in c. 4 is not simply in favour of Papalism; it is against the Novatians or (just conceivably, if it can be so late) the Donatists. But the changes in c. 19 have to be accounted for, and how would Mr. Watson propose to account for them?

JOHN CHAPMAN.

#### NOTE ON THE TEXT OF THE HYMNS OF HILARY.

SINCE my paper on the Hymns of Hilary appeared in the last number of the JOURNAL, I have received a very careful collation of the text of the Arezzo MS from Mr A. S. Walpole, who is preparing a volume on the earliest Latin hymns. I subjoin the principal passages in which Mr Walpole corrects Signor Gamurrini's reading of the MS.

The MS has

- I 32 transformans se, ut est, uiuam in imaginem  
 42 Deusque uerus substitit ex Deo  
 54 alter quae cum sit mixtus in altero  
 57 paret sed genitus Patri  
 63 condensque primum saecula
- II 11 fefellit saeuam Verbum factum te caro  
 13 gaudens pendentem carnis ligno cum crucis
- III 1 Adae carnis gloriam et caduci corporis  
 22 inter turbas, quae frequentes mergebantur, accipit  
 29 quaerit audax tempus quod sit.

A. J. MASON.