

been uttered in the month October–November. That they afterwards received and were capable of receiving a wider application does not invalidate their original restriction to a particular period and special circumstances.

ADOLF BÜCHLER.

## NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ORIGEN'S COMMENTARY ON I CORINTHIANS.

I DO not think that the *Journal of Theological Studies*, in the nine years of its existence, has published any contribution to theological learning more solid and more valuable than the edition of the fragments of Origen on St Paul's epistles to Ephesus and Corinth. We owe, indeed, to Cramer's *Catena* our first introduction to the greater part of these fragments: but the copyists whom Cramer employed were capable of quite phenomenal blunders, and to Mr Gregg and Mr Jenkins belonged in effect, in each case, both the labour and the merit of an *editio princeps*.

Certain it is that these commentaries contain many interesting things which appear so far to have escaped the notice of Church historians. A reference to the inconsistencies between the duty of a Christian and the duty of a soldier (on I Cor. v 11) has escaped even Harnack's encyclopaedic knowledge of early Christian literature. The summary of the Eucharistic service as the 'invocation of the name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit' over the elements (on I Cor. vii 5) is absent from Mr Brightman's collection of liturgical passages from the Egyptian fathers. And I myself, when writing on Patristic commentaries on St Paul (in the supplementary volume to Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* p. 489), ought to have cited Origen's distinct allusions to a predecessor or predecessors in the exegesis of the same epistle: *οἱ λοιποὶ ἐρμηνευταὶ . . . φασὶν* (on I Cor. vii 24), *τινὲς ἐξήγησαν τίς ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν νόμον παρὰ τοῦς Ἰουδαίους* (on I Cor. ix 20). Note further the information about Ophites (on xii 3), about Montanists (on xiv 34), about heretics who used the Creed (on xv 20), about parts of the Old Testament unsuitable for Church lessons (on xiv 7, 8), about a Pauline citation found in Aquila and the other interpreters but not in the LXX text (on xiv 21), about Apollos being bishop of Corinth (on xvi 12).

Any fragments of the original Greek of Origen's work on the New Testament are worth all that we can devote to them of loving and

patient study: and it is in the spirit of sincere gratitude for Mr Jenkins's services to this subject that I call attention to some difficulties and offer some suggestions of my own. It is only by the successive contributions of many scholars that a final result will be attained.

§ xxxvii l. 19. For *πάλιν οὐ καλόν ἐστι* read *πάλιν οὐκ ἄ(τοπ)όν ἐστι*. The two clauses, ll. 16-18, 19-22, appear to be exactly parallel, each referring to one half of the verse 1 Cor. vii 18: *οὐκ ἄτοπὸν ἐστὶ τῷ ῥητῷ χρῆσασθαι ποτε πρὸς τοὺς οἰομένους μετὰ τὴν πίστιν δεῖν περιτέμνεσθαι ἐξ εὐλαβείας . . . πάλιν οὐκ ἄ(τοπ)όν ἐστι διὰ τινος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύοντας καὶ οἰομένους αἰσχύνην φέρειν αὐτοῖς τὴν περιτομήν, καὶ βουλομένους ἀκροβυστίαν (ἐπι)σπᾶσθαι [so I suppose we must read for *περισπᾶσθαι*], χρῆσθαι ῥητῷ τῷ λέγοντι . . .*

§ xxxix l. 6. *ἄκουε γάρ, φησίν, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάσκοντος ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ λέγοντος . . .* A comma is necessary after *εὐαγγελίου*.

*ib.* ll. 38-41. *οὐκοῦν δεδεμένον μὲν εἶπεν τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν γεγαμηκότα· εἰ δὲ περίστασις ἐστὶ τὸ δεδέσθαι, καὶ δεῖ φεύγειν τὰς περιστάσεις ὅση δύναμις. καὶ τὸ δεδέσθαι γυναικὶ μὴ ζῆτει λύειν, ὃ δὲ μὴ δεδεμένος ὀφείλει φυλάττεσθαι ἵνα μὴ δεθῇ.* This punctuation is unsatisfactory: it does not offer any proper antithesis between *μὲν* and *δέ*, and it makes the clause *καὶ δεῖ φεύγειν . . . δύναμις* the apodosis to *εἰ δὲ . . . δεδέσθαι*, which is extraordinarily harsh. The sense must I think be 'On the one hand he calls the husband "in bonds": but even if it is a calamity to be in bonds, and we must avoid calamities to the best of our power, yet do not seek to loose the bonds binding you to a wife. On the other hand he that is not in bonds ought to guard himself against them'. The comma and full stop after *δύναμις* and *λύειν* might therefore be interchanged. But even this is unsatisfactory: Dr Swete suggests that we should read *ζητεῖν*—so that *καὶ τὸ . . . μὴ ζητεῖν λύειν* would be still part of the protasis—and suppose something lost.

§ xl l. 16. *ἵνα μὴ τῇ προφάσει αὐτοῦ ἄλλοι ἀπολλύωνται.* Rom. xiv 15.

§ xlii ll. 13, 14. *οὗτος οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ μισθός, ἵνα ὅπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχω μὴ ποιήσω.* Origen is commenting on 1 Cor. ix 17 *εἰ γὰρ ἐκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω· εἰ δὲ ἄκων . . .*, and his point is that we can only claim reward for what we do without being forced to it, when we might have left it undone. Read therefore *ἵνα ὅπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχω μὴ (ποιῆσαι) ποιήσω.*

§ xliii l. 24. *ἅμα δὲ τηρεῖ καὶ τὸ ἀκριβὲς αὐτοῦ.* Read certainly *τήρει* in the imperative [suggested tentatively by Mr Jenkins in his apparatus].

l. 26. *Ἰουδαῖος γὰρ ἦν ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, οὐκέτι ἐν τῷ φανερωῷ.* Rom. ii 28, 29.

§ xliv l. 6. Delete comma after *σωζόμενοι*.

*ib.* ll. 6-9. *ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ οὖν πάντες τρέχουσιν, ὅσοι πρὸς δόγμα πολι-*

τεύονται· καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων πρὸς δόγμα πολιτεύονται, καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι τάχα, καὶ οἱ τὰ Ἑλλήνων πρὸς δόγμα πολιτεύονται φιλοσοφούντες. καὶ οὗτοι εἰσὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες. Read in both instances οἱ for οἷ, and print the last πάντες in thick type. Origen is not dividing heretics and philosophers into the two classes of those who had a rule of life and those who had not, but he means that heresy, and Judaism, and Gentile philosophy, had each some rule of life and conduct. The 'one that receives the prize' is the Church: the 'all who run' are the religions outside the Church, all that have a rule of life: 'even the heretics have a rule of life; and Jews may be, and those who follow Gentile philosophy, have a rule of life.'

§ xlvii ll. 10, 11. εἰδὼς κινδυνεύειν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ δοκιμάζειν ἢ ἀποδοκιμάζειν. I suspect we ought to read τό for τῷ, 'knowing that he may have to accept or reject.'

ιβ. ll. 15-17. οὐ μόνον οὖν εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ τὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, οὗτος ἀγνοεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ λέγων πνεύματι θείῳ (καὶ) λέγει ὅτι μὴ πνεύματι θεοῦ λέγει, ἀγνοεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Here the meaning of the two balanced clauses ought to be that the 'ignorance' which results in being 'ignored' by God is not only that which takes the true to be false but also that which takes the false to be true. Read therefore in the second clause ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ λέγων 'Πνεύματι θείῳ λέγει' ὁ τι [οἱ ὅτε] μὴ πνεύματι θείῳ λέγει, κτλ. [This and the preceding sentence ought I think to be run on with the last paragraph, and the new paragraph should begin at *ἔοικε δέ.*]

§ xlviii l. 4. ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου ῥητοῦ ἀναφωνεῖ ὅτι κτλ. I suggest ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου ῥητοῦ ἀναφαίνει ὅτι κτλ., referring to *δευτερον προφήτας* of 1 Cor. xii 28.

ιβ. ll. 7-11. ὥστε εἶναι τινὰ μὲν προφητείαν ὑπερβεβηκυῖαν τινὰ δὲ προφητείαν ἀναβεβηκυῖαν. τὴν μὲν γὰρ καθολικωτέραν καὶ μιμουμένην τὰς προφητείας Ἡσαίου καὶ Ἰερεμίου δευτέραν τάξιν μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν ἐρεῖ, ταύτην δὲ τὴν τελευταίαν τεταγμένην τάξιν μετὰ τὰ εἰρημένα χαρίσματα τῆς αὐτῆς οὖσαν κτλ. This ought to mean 'at the top of the list', 'at the bottom of the list', but I cannot get that sense out of the two words. The next sentence, too, I cannot translate as it stands, and would prefer to run it on with what precedes and govern it still by εἶναι of l. 7, omitting γὰρ and in l. 10 substituting ἐκεῖ, ταύτη δέ 'in that passage, and in this' for ἐρεῖ, ταύτην δέ.

ll. 22-25. ὅρα εἰ δύνamai ἐτι παραστήσαι σαφέστερον τὸ λεγόμενον Ὁ θεός κτλ. According to this punctuation Origen is trying 'to give a clearer proof' of the whole verse 1 Cor. xii 28. But the words can only mean a clearer proof than that which he has just given, i.e. of the dual form of prophecy, and we must put a full stop after *λεγόμενον*. Then follows this 'clearer' proof: 'not all are apostles,' 'not all are

prophets' in the sense of xii 28: whereas in the other sense of prophecy, xiv 24, 'all' may prophesy.

§ xlix l. 41. A comma, not colon, is wanted after *ἔστι διάλεκτος*.

*ib.* l. 45. *ἄσημον δίδωσι φωνήν*. I Cor. xiv 8, 9.

*ib.* l. 48. *οὐδὲν γὰρ ποιεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἦτοι τῶν ἀγγέλων τρανὴ καὶ σαφὴ, ὡς ἡ ἀγάπη*. I suppose we must understand (*τὴν*) *γλώσσαν* from the line before.

§ li ll. 9, 10. *μαχόμενον πράγμα ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν, τὸ ζηλοῦν*. Possibly *μαχόμενον πράγμα ἐστὶ τῷ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ζηλοῦν*.

l. 17. *οἷον μήτηρ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν υἱὸν ἢ πατὴρ οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἴδια ὡς τὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ*. Read *τῷ ἀγαπᾶν*: 'as a mother or father through loving the child seek not their own so much as the things of the child.'

§ liv l. 5. *ἑαυτῷ λαλεῖ καὶ τῷ θεῷ*. I Cor. xiv 28.

§ lvi ll. 8-11. *τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς θεωρίας δόγματα αὐτὸν καὶ κιθάραν εἶπεν ὡς μηδὲν ἐμφαίνοντα ἠθικόν, τοὺς δὲ ἐπ' ἀρετὴν προτροπομένους σάλπιγγ(α)· διὰ τοῦδε (ἔστιν) εἰπεῖν ὅτι τὰ ἀσαφῆ τῆς γραφῆς . . . οὐ δεῖ ἀναγινώσκειν*. The MS gives *σάλπιγγι διὰ τοῦ δε εἰπεῖν*. A simpler change than that adopted would perhaps be *τοὺς δὲ ἐπ' ἀρετὴν προτροπομένους σάλπιγγα διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν, ὅτι κτλ.*: but I rather think that the corruption is more extensive, and that *διὰ τοῦ δε εἰπεῖν* introduced a citation of the words *καὶ ὑμεῖς . . . ἐὰν μὴ εὖσημον λόγον δώτε*, followed by some such verb as *ἐσήμηνεν* or *ὑπέδειξεν*. This latter suggestion has the sanction of Dr Swete.

§ lx l. 6. *ἐπιδώσομεν*. The aorist subjunctive *ἐπιδώσωμεν* would make better sense, if the form had sufficient authority.

§ lxvi ll. 10, 11. *ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐστὶ τῶν τοιούτων. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ χάρισματα σημεῖα ἐστὶ τοῦ ὄντως εἶναι θεόν, ἐν τίνι ζητητέον*; Transpose the comma from *θεόν* to *τινι*, make the latter word enclitic, and abolish the note of interrogation: 'but we must enquire whether the other charismata as well (as prophecy) are signs of God's being really in a man.'

§ lxxii ll. 2-4. *πνευματικός ἐστὶν ὁ πάντα λόγον καὶ πάντα νοῦν δυνάμενος βασανίζειν, καὶ διὰ πολλὴν βαθύτητα νοῦ δισδιάγνωστον ὄντα ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀνακρίνεσθαι*. Comparing I Cor. ii 15 and lines 7-9 of § lxxiii, I do not see how we can avoid altering to *δισδιάγνωστος ὢν*.

§ lxxiii l. 15. For colon after *προφήτας* substitute comma: the words *ἐξήτουν τί δήποτε* cover the next two lines. 'I used often to wonder why the false prophets had more influence with the kings than the true, and yet that their books were not copied or preserved while those of the true prophets were.' It was the combination of phenomena which had excited Origen's surprise.

§ lxxv ll. 3-5. *ταύτης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς [sc. that women should keep silence in church] οὐκ ἦσαν οἱ τῶν γυναικῶν μαθηταί, οἱ μαθητευθέντες*

Πρισκίλλη καὶ Μαξιμίλλη, οὐ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τῆς νύμφης. The editor rightly sees two difficulties: the first he meets by suggesting ἀκροαταί after ἐντολῆς, for the other he suggests Χριστῷ τῷ ἀνδρί. I would, in the first case, get the same sense, but by reading οὐκ ἤ(κου)σαν for οὐκ ἦσαν. As regards the second, the placing of the words οἱ . . . Μαξιμίλλη within dashes, as an explanatory parenthesis, would perhaps remove the difficulty.

*ib.* ll. 8, 9. ταῦτα δὲ λύσομεν. πρῶτον μὲν λέγοντες ὅτι Αἱ ἡμέτεραι προεφήτερον, δείξατε τὰ σημεῖα τῆς προφητείας ἐν αὐταῖς· δεύτερον δέ Εἰ καὶ προεφήτερον κτλ. Put comma for full stop after λύσομεν, and read Εἰ αἱ ὑμέτεραι.

*ib.* l. 34. Instead of a colon, a new paragraph should, I think, begin at αἰσχρὸν γὰρ γυναικί.

*ib.* l. 36. Γυνή ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ δηλονότι κατὰ τὸ αἰσχρὸν λέγεται ἐπὶ κατηγορίᾳ τῆς ὅλης ἐκκλησίας. There is something wrong here, either in the text or the punctuation: could we read ἀναρθρον for αἰσχρὸν? and perhaps transfer γυνή to the previous sentence, putting the full stop after instead of before it? ‘“In church”: it is put without the article, clearly in order to apply to the whole church,’ and not to Corinth alone. But I admit that this is violent: and the fault may lie in κατὰ.

*ib.* l. 41. τοῦτο οὖν λέγει ὅτι ἀπέστειλεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Jo. iii 17 (Gal. iv 4).

§ lxxv ll. 3-5. ἵνα . . . ποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατοῦντος πνεύματος πνευματικούς· καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ κρίνειν ποῖα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἢ ποῖα οὐκ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. There is something wrong in ἐπὶ τοῦ: read perhaps ἐπι-τ(ῆδει)ου(s) κρίνειν.

§ lxxvi ll. 14-16. εἰσόμεθα ὅτι ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὸν εἰκῆ πεπιστευκότα οὕτω πεπιστευκένας ψευδεῖ· ἀλλὰ τὸ πεπιστευκένας μὲν, ἀληθεῖ δέ, ἔργον οὐκ ἐστὶν (ἐν) κρίσει (δὲ) πιστεύειν. This is quite untranslatable, even as emended (the MS is without either ἐν or δέ): the corruption is perhaps deep seated, but part of the reconstructed sentence should probably run οὐ τῷ πεπιστευκένας ψευδεῖ ἀλλὰ τῷ πεπιστευκένας μὲν ἀληθεῖ . . .

§ lxxxi ll. 3, 4. οἱ δέ, οἱ ἑτερόδοξοι, ἀλληγοροῦν θέλουσιν τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνάστασιν· ἀλληγορήτωσαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος. Read εἰ δὲ οἱ ἑτερόδοξοι κτλ., and substitute comma for colon. [It is further pointed out to me that we must alter to ἀλληγορεῖν and ἀλληγορεῖτωσαν.]

§ lxxxii l. 3. εἰ καὶ ἦδει τοὺς διαλεκτικούς λόγους ὁ Παῦλος, ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς αὐτοῖς ἐχρήσατο. Must we not read εἰ καὶ (μὴ) ἦδει? ‘Even if the apostle had [not] learnt dialectics, yet he argued dialectically by the light of nature.’

§ lxxxiv l. 8. οὐδεὶς δὲ πρωτότοκος ἐστὶν ἑτερογενῶς. Read ἑτερογενῶν.

*ib.* ll. 13-17. εἰ δὲ ἐκείνος μὲν ἐφόρεσε σῶμα, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ μετὰ σώματος ἦν ὥστε αὐτὸν καὶ φαγεῖν ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἰωάννην

εὐαγγελίῳ. ἄλλως δὲ ἀνίστανται, ὡς οἴονται οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰρέσεων, οἱ ἀνιστάμενοι τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς τὸν χριστόν. οὐ δύναται παραστήσῃαι πῶς Ἰησοῦς πρωτόκοκός ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. All this, which is divided into three sentences, should be punctuated as one: the first sentence is the one premiss, the second the other premiss, the third the conclusion: 'if on the one hand He wore a body and His resurrection was a bodily resurrection (so that He even ate, as John describes in his gospel), and if on the other hand, as the heretics think, those believers who rise again rise in a different way, without a body; then they cannot shew in what sense Jesus is "firstborn from the dead".'

*ib.* l. 35. ἄνθρωπος ἔσται, μορφωθήσεται, ὅσα ἔσται, ἀπὸ τούτου σάρκες, νεῦρα, φλέβες. Punctuate after τούτου, not after ἔσται: 'from this there shall be bones, flesh, nerves, veins.'

*ib.* ll. 40, 41. Substitute comma for full stop after τῇ τελειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ: and for τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐνεσθηκός, νῦν τὸ παρεσθηκός, punctuate τὸ ἐνεσθηκός νῦν, τὸ παρεσθηκός.

*ib.* l. 45. ἐκ τῆς διασθήσεως τοῦ κόκκου τοῦ σίτου στάχους ἑκατοντ(άκις) γίνεται. MS ἑκατοντόχους: read ἑκατοντ(ά)χους, 'of a hundred measures,' 'yielding fruit a hundredfold.'

*ib.* l. 51. τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τοῦτο τὸ νεκρὸν κόκκος ἐστὶ σίτου τῷ θεῷ ὡς τὸ προανασησόμενον. I cannot translate the last three words: ἀνασησόμενον should be right, comparing lines 46 and 56, but some corruption must lurk in ὡς τὸ προ. I can think of nothing better than ὡς σπορά.

*ib.* l. 55. Substitute comma for full stop after ἄνθρωπος: the next clause is still governed by οὕτως of l. 54, as μὲν . . . δέ shews.

*ib.* l. 57. τὸ ἀπιστον δὲ τῇ ἀναστάσει. Read certainly ἀπιστεῖν [suggested also in the editor's *scr. crit.*].

*ib.* ll. 62, 63. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δὲ ὡς κατὰ τοὺς λέγοντας μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, μηδὲ ζωῆς ὑπαρχούσης κατὰ τὸν βίον τοῦτον, φησὶ κτλ. This punctuation obscures the sense: read μετὰ τὸν βίον [suggested also by the editor], place comma after ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δέ, and remove that after νεκρῶν: 'and in the next verses, too, he assumes that in the view of those who denied the resurrection of the dead there was no life at all after our present state, and says . . .'

*ib.* l. 67. For ὑμᾶς read ἡμᾶς.

*ib.* ll. 73-75. ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος τῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ εἶδομεν ἀπαρχὴ ἀναφέρεται σίτον ὑπὸ τῶν σίτων θερισάντων . . . οὕτως κτλ. For colon after εἶδομεν substitute comma. I find some difficulty in εἶδομεν 'we have seen', for the whole of the passage in which ἀπαρχή might be dealt with seems to have been preserved, and there has been no reference to the firstfruits offered under the law: possibly *διδόμενων* (compare Num. xviii 12 ὅσα ἂν δῶσι τῷ κυρίῳ) 'just as in the parallel

case of the things given under the law an offering is made of corn . . .'

*ib.* l. 76. For  $\delta$  κύριος ἡμῖν read  $\delta$  κύριος ἡμῶν.

*ib.* l. 79. *εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ εἴχομεν λέξιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς, κὰν ἐλέγομεν κτλ.* I cannot translate the protasis as it stands: we seem to want something like *εἰ μὲν οὖν μόνην* (or *μὴ ἑτέραν*) *εἴχομεν λέξιν τῆς ἀπαρχῆς*, 'if we had only got the phrase about firstfruits, we might have understood it as firstfruits of the righteous.'

*ib.* ll. 82-84. *νυνὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· πῶς ἐπὶ τινὰς αὐτὸς λέγει ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντας; ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες κτλ.* I should prefer to punctuate, *πῶς; ἐπὶ τινὰς; αὐτὸς λέγει ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντας.*

§ lxxxvii ll. 2-9. The construction of this sentence would be made clearer if lines 4-7, *καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κιγχαμίδος . . . οὐ καταγελάς*, were printed as a parenthesis.

§ lxxxix l. 3. *ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ—τούτου περὶ οὗ φησι τοιαύτης στάσεως καὶ παραχῆς οὐσης ἐν τῇ Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίᾳ. ὁ θαυμάσιος οὗτος Ἀπολλῶς κτλ.* Clearly the full stop should be after *φησί*, and the clause *τοιαύτης . . . ἐκκλησίᾳ* introduces the new sentence.

*ib.* l. 10. *ἀναγκαίως μετὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πέμπων αὐτὸν παρακατατίθειν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* Read *παρακατατίθεται*: the verb is only used in the middle voice.

*ib.* l. 24. Substitute comma for full stop after *ποιήσω*: lines 23 to 27 form a single sentence, and the *νῦν μὲν* of l. 23 is answered (I suppose) by *ἀλλά* of l. 25.

*ib.* ll. 28, 29. *ἐκδέχομαι οὖν ἀκούων αὐτὸν ἐπανελυσόμενον, ἀπαγγέλλοντά μοι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς.* I do not think this can mean either 'I am waiting to hear that he is coming back' (which is doubtful grammar), or 'I am expecting him, for I hear that he is coming back' (which is untrue to fact): the sentence is complete without *ἀκούων*, and something like *τάχιον* would give better sense. [*ἀκούειν* has been suggested to me, and is certainly a very easy change.]

*ib.* l. 33. *οὐκ ἐπεδικάζετο τοῦτό που, ἀλλὰ παρεχώρησεν.* Read *ἱτοῦ τόπου* [so even Cramer]: 'he did not claim the position [of bishop], but retired.' Possibly the text reading is a misprint.

*ib.* l. 35. For *ἀπιθήσας* read *ἀπειθήσας*.

C. H. TURNER.