

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

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE EDITIONS AND MANUSCRIPTS OF EUSEBIUS :

PART I.

THE following notes are intended to summarise all the work that up to the present date has been done on the text of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, so as to serve as a draft of Prolegomena to a projected edition. I should be very glad, therefore, to receive any suggestions or corrections that readers of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES may be able to make. It is mainly with this object in view that notes, which must obviously be only tentative and imperfect, have been published.

I. EDITIONS¹.

The following are the editions of the Greek text which have been hitherto published.

- (1) Stephanus. Paris, 1544.
- (2) „ Geneva, 1612.
- (3) Valesius. Paris, 1659.
- (4) „ Mainz, 1672.
- (5) „ Paris, 1677.
- (6) „ Amsterdam, 1695.
- (7) „ ed. Reading. Cambridge, 1720.
- (8) „ „ Turin, 1746.
- (9) „ ed. Migne. Paris, 1857.
- (10) Stroth. Halle, 1779.
- (11) Zimmermann. Frankfort, 1822.
- (12) Heinichen, ed. 1 (quoted as Heinichen¹). Leipzig, 1827.
- (13) Burton. Oxford, 1838.
- (14) „ Oxford, 1845. 1856.
- (15) „ ed. Bright. Oxford, 1872. 1881.
- (16) Schwegler. Tübingen, 1852.
- (17) Laemmer. Schaffhausen, 1862.
- (18) Heinichen, ed. 2 (quoted as Heinichen²). Leipzig, 1868.
- (19) Dindorf. Leipzig, 1871.

¹ For accounts of these see Stroth, pp. xxii-xxxii; Laemmer, pp. 856-70; Heinichen², pp. xviii-xxix.

(1) The *Editio Princeps* of the Greek text of Eusebius (the Latin of Rufinus had been printed long before) was that of ROBERT STEPHANUS¹ (Robert Estienne, 1503-1559), published at Paris in 1544. It was based apparently on two MSS, both still preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris: one described as Codex Regius, which is now Paris Graec. 1437, a thirteenth-century MS; the other as Codex Medicaeus, now Paris Gr. 1434, a sixteenth-century MS. In his text Stephanus followed mainly the Codex Regius, admitting occasional readings from the Medicaeus; in his division of the chapters he followed the Medicaeus; when he deserted both, he probably had recourse to conjecture. The few various readings which he gives have been quoted as *Manuscriptus Stephani* (MSt.), but they are of no value, being drawn entirely from the MSS mentioned.

(2) The second edition², published at Geneva in 1612, in which the Greek text was only a reprint of that of Stephanus, is interesting because it contains the Latin version made by JOHN CHRISTOPHERSON. He was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1553; Dean of Norwich, 1554; Bishop of Chichester, 1557. He died in 1558, shortly after he had been imprisoned by Elizabeth. He was chief of the pioneers of Greek learning at Cambridge, and had devoted very considerable labour to his translation of Eusebius, collecting various readings and emendations from many different sources. This Latin version was published first after his death by Edward Godsalf, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge: '*Edwardo Godsalfo Anglo curante ac in prefatione in protestantes debacchante.*' This preface, addressed to Trinity College, is dated Cisteriae, 1559, and has suggested an edition in that year; another note dated at Antwerp, 1568, has suggested an edition of that year also; but there does not appear to be any trace of either, and the known editions are Louvain, 1570, Cologne, 1570, 1581, 1612, and this of Geneva, 1612. The editor of this Geneva edition adds to

¹ *Ecclesiasticae historiae Eusebii Pamphili lib. X. Eiusdem de vita Constantini lib. V. Socratis lib. VII. Theodoriti episcopi Cyrensis lib. V. Collectaneorum ex historia eccles. Theodori Lectoris lib. II. Hermii Sozomeni lib. IX. Evagrii lib. VI. Lutetiae Parisiorum ex officina Roberti Stephani typographi Regii, Regiis typis 1544.* On this edition see Valesius, Pref.; Stroth, p. xxii; Laemmer, p. 857; Heinichen², p. xviii.

² *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Scriptores Graeci: nempe Eusebii cognomento Pamphili Caesareae episcopi historiae ecclesiasticae libri X, Eiusdem de vita Constantini Magni, libri IV, Constantini Magni oratio ad sanctorum coetum, Eiusdem Eusebii oratio in laudem Constantini Magni, ad trigesimum illius Imperii annum ex bibliotheca Palatina nunc primum graece in lucem missa, &c. . . Graeco-latine nunc primum editi ex interpretatione IOANNIS CHRISTOPHORSONI Angli Cicestrensis quondam Episcopi, et recognitione SUFFRIDI PETRI Icti clarissimi. . . Coloniae Allobrogum. Excudebat Petrus de la Rouiere. 1612.* See Stroth, p. xxiii; Laemmer, p. 858; Heinichen², p. xix.

the Greek text a considerable number of various readings. These are quoted by later editors under the following titles:—

Christophorsonus (Cph.): variants drawn partly from different MSS which he had examined, partly from MSS of the different authors quoted by Eusebius.

Curterius (Curt.): only cited twice.

Margo Genevensis Editionis (MG): those variations to which no particular name is attached; these are almost always the same as the *Manuscriptus Stephani*.

Gruterus or *Codex Gruteri* (Grut.): these seem to have been drawn from a MS in the Palatine, now in the Vatican, Library.

Bongarsius (Bong.): their source is not known.

Editio Genevensis (Genev.): applies to any of the above.

None of these variants are now of any value.

(3) The first step towards a critical text was made by HENRICUS VALESIVS¹ (Henri de Valois, 1603–1675), who in 1659 published at Paris an edition with a new Latin Translation, a much improved text, and copious annotations. He collated four MSS, and had other material supplied him.

Codex Regius (Reg.): saec. xiii = Paris Gr. 1437.

Codex Mazarinaeus (Maz.): saec. x = Paris Gr. 1430.

Codex Medicaeus (Med.): saec. xvi = Paris Gr. 1434.

Codex Fuketianus (Fuk.): saec. xvi = Paris Gr. 1435.

Codex Savilianus (Sav.). This was a copy of Stephanus's edition, in which Sir Henry Savile had given the variants of a MS in his possession (now in the Bodleian), mixed, however, with variants of Christopherson.

Schedae Regiae (Sched.): saec. xvi, now Paris Gr. 414. Some loose sheets containing the first book of the *Ecclesiastical History*.

Codex Turnebi (Turneb.): a copy of Stephanus' edition sent to Valesius by Hadrian Turnebus (Adrien Turnèbe, 1512–1565), with various readings in the margin.

Codex Moraei (Mor.): a similar copy given to Valesius by Renatus Moraeus (Renatus Moreau, †1656), containing readings of Vulcobius of no value.

The text of Valesius was reprinted at (4) Mainz² in 1672, a reprint

¹ *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem. Eiusdem de vita Imp. Constantini libri IV. Quibus subicitur oratio Constantini ad sanctos et Panegyricus Eusebii.* Henricus Valesius Graecum textum collatis IV MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit et adnotationibus illustravit. Parisiis. Excudebat Antonius Vitre, Regis et Cleri Gallicani Typographus. 1659. See Stroth, p. xxiv; Laemmer, p. 863; Heinichen², p. xix.

² *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem, Eiusdem de vita Imp. Constantini libri IV, quibus subiicitur oratio Constantini ad sanctos et panegyricus Eusebii.*

which is said to be deficient in accuracy, at (5) Paris¹, 1677, after the death of Valesius, with his corrections, and at (6) Amsterdam, 1695².

(7) In 1720 appeared the edition at Cambridge of WILLIAM READING³. He was Librarian of Sion College, 1708-1744. His edition simply reprints the text of Valesius, but he added a large number of notes collected from the works of various scholars, and also a few various readings which have been cited as follows:—

Codex Jonesianus (Jon.): a copy of the edition of Stephanus which had formerly been in the possession of Meric Casaubon and afterwards of an Englishman of the name of John Jones. All its various readings seem to have been taken from the margin of the Geneva edition, with the exception of a few conjectures due to Casaubon.

Codex Castellanus (Cast.). Said to have been of greater value, and to have contained readings from the same Vatican MS which Gruter had used.

This edition was reprinted at (8) Turin⁴, 1744-1748, and that of Valesius (9) by MIGNE⁵ at Paris, 1857.

(10) The next edition of the *Ecclesiastical History* was that of STROTH⁶, published in 1779. This editor made a very full digest

HENRICUS VALESIIUS graecum textum collatis IV MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit, et adnotationibus illustravit. Iuxta exemplum quod antea Parisiis excudebat Antonius Vitre, nunc vero verbotenus et correctius edebant Moguntiae Christian Gerlach et Simon Beckenstein. 1672.

¹ Parisiis, typis Petri le Petit, 1677.

² *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Scriptores Graeci: Eusebius Pamphilus, Socrates Scholasticus, Hermias Sozomenus, Theodoretus episcopus Cyri, Evagrius Scholasticus, cum excerptis ex historiis Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris.* Graece et latine ex interpretatione HENRICI VALESII cum eiusdem annotationibus ad postremas editiones Parisienses castigatissime recusi. Prostant Amstelodami apud Henricum Wetstenium, 1695.

³ *Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Scholastici, Hermiae Sozomeni, Theodreti, et Evagrii, item Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris quae extant Historiae Ecclesiasticae graecae et latine, in tres tomos distributae.* HENRICUS VALESIIUS graecum textum ex MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit, et annotationibus illustravit. GULIELMUS READING novae elucidationes, praesertim chronologicas, in hac editione adiecit. Cantabrigiae, Typis Academicis, 1720.

⁴ The title of Eusebius's History is as follows: *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem, Eiusdem de vita imp. Constantini libri quatuor, quibus subiicitur oratio Constantini ad sanctos et panegyricus Eusebii.* HENRICUS VALESIIUS graecum textum collatis IV MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit et adnotationibus illustravit. Accesserunt criticae plurimum eruditorum observationes, variantes lectiones et tabulae geographicae, quibus GULIELMUS READING editionem suam Cantabrigiensem locupletavit. Augustae Taurinorum, 1746.

⁵ *Eusebii Pamphili opera omnia quae exstant.* Collegit et denuo recognovit I. P. MIGNE. Paris, 1857. Tom. II. Historia Ecclesiastica.

⁶ *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri X, Eiusdem de vita Constantini libri IV.* Textum recensuit FREDERICUS ANDREAS STROTH, illustri. Gymnas. Quedl.

of all the various readings which previous editors had amassed, and employed also in the composition of his work some readings from a Venice MS, which he quotes as Venet. (Codex Venetus), the Ecclesiastical History of Nicephorus Callistus (Nic.), and the Latin Version of Rufinus, besides quotations of Eusebius in the Chronicles, &c. His edition is chiefly remarkable for the theory he propounded, that Eusebius had published two editions of his history—one represented by the version of Rufinus, one by the Greek MSS. The latter he divided into three recensions: one represented by the Codex Regius (Paris 1437, which he incorrectly designates 1436), the second by Codex Mediceus and allied MSS, the third, the mixed traditions of the marginal readings of Christopherson and Gruter. His chief merits seem to be that he first recognised the value of Rufinus as an old witness to the text, although his theory of recensions cannot be maintained.

The edition of (11) ZIMMERMANN¹ (1822) does not seem to have added much to the materials for the text. In the main, he followed Valesius.

The first edition of (12) HEINICHEN² (1827) in three volumes, did the same, while his description of MSS was taken from that of Stroth. Appended to Vol. III (pp. iii-xvi) was a letter from GERSDORF³, containing a description of the Dresden MS with a collation of a few chapters. In 1840 Heinichen published his *Supplementa notarum ad Eus. H. E.*⁴, which contained a digest of all the various readings collected by Burton and a collation of the Dresden MS.

(13) The edition of BURTON⁵ suffered by being left unfinished at his

Rector ac in eodem Theol. Professor: Volumen I. Halae ad Salam, 1779 (only 1 vol. published). See Laemmer, pp. 866-868; Heinichen², pp. xxi-xxii.

¹ *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem, Eiusdem de vita Constantini libri IV, necnon Constantini oratio ad sanctos et panegyricus Eusebii.* Graece et latine edidit ERNESTUS ZIMMERMANNUS SS. Theologiae Doctor. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1822.

² *Eusebii historiae ecclesiasticae libri X.* Edidit FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS HEINICHEN Rev. Min. candidatus societatis historiae-theologicae Lipsiensis sodalis ordinarius. Lipsiae, 1827, 1828.

³ *Epistola critica ERNESTI GOTTHELFI GERSDORFII ad Fredericum Adolphum Heinichen.*

⁴ *Supplementa notarum ad Eusebii historiam ecclesiasticam et excerpta ex editione Burtoniana, cum eiusdem ac Schoedelii vindiciarum Flavianarum censura et cum collatione codicis Dresdensis.* Edidit FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS HEINICHEN Phil. Dr. Gymnasii Annaemontani Prorektor societatis historico-theologiae Lipsiensis sodalis. Lipsiae, 1840.

⁵ *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri decem.* Ad codices manuscriptos recensuit EDVARDUS BURTON S.T.P. SS. Theologiae nuper Professor Regius. Tomi II. Oxonii e typographeo Academico, 1838. See Laemmer, p. 869; Heinichen², p. xxiii.

death. He had made considerable collations, had digested the various readings, and had proceeded some way at any rate towards the construction of a text, but left no prolegomena or descriptions of MSS. His edition was published by the Clarendon Press, with a short preface including a list of the MSS cited.

The following MSS were made use of for the first time :—

E. Codex Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis 1431.

G. Codex olim Regiae Societatis, nunc vero Musei Britannici. Collated by Burton himself.

H. Codex Venetus 338, saec. x. This collation is described by Laemmer and Hollenberg (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1858, I p. 123) as being very inaccurate.

I. } Duo codices Florentini Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae,
K. } Plut. lxx 7 and 20.

Fresh collations were procured of the following :—

C. Codex Mazarinaeus Parisiensis 1430, first collated by Valesius.

F. Codex apud Valesium Savilianus, in Bibliotheca Bodleiana hodie servatus n. 2278 (Auct. E i 9). Collated by Burton himself.

Codex Regius of Valesius, which Burton denotes A, is incorrectly stated to be Paris 1436, a mistake for which Stroth, who had been servilely copied by Heinichen, was responsible. Owing to this confusion Burton had a collation made of Paris 1437, which was published at the end of Volume II; a very cursory examination will show that this is the same as the MS cited in the body of the work as A. This unfortunate mistake has led to the neglect of Paris 1436 which (as will be seen) has a very interesting text. The editor of the volume also had a second collation made by J. Gronovius of the two Florentine MSS, which was placed at his disposal by Dr. Routh. He had purchased them at the sale of the Bibliotheca Te Waterana (*Catal. lib. manusc.*, p. 36, n. 52). In the place of prolegomena, the preface of Heinichen's first edition and his Notitia MSS (taken from Stroth) were reprinted. The majority of Burton's collations which he owed to other hands are unfortunately inaccurate. For instance Paris Gr. 1430 is quoted at the beginning of the first book, where it is defective: the collator seems to have had Gr. 1430 and 1431 open before him at the same time and to have omitted the same variants in both. Nor is the collation of the Venice MS to be trusted. On the other hand both the collations of the Florence MSS are good, that of Gronovius being somewhat the better of the two, and very much superior to the collations given by Laemmer and Heinichen. This text was reprinted in 1845 and 1856, without notes, and again with a preface by Dr. Bright, in 1872.

(16) The edition of SCHWEGLER¹ (1852) was the first which made

¹ *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri X.* Recognovit ALBERTVS

use of the collations supplied by Burton, and the first to attempt anything like a scientific study of the MSS. Schwegler divided them into three families, the first containing the three Paris MSS 1430, 1434, and 1435, with the Bodleian MS, the second the two Florence MSS, and the third the two Paris MSS 1431 and 1437 (the latter as usual is incorrectly numbered 1436). The Venice MS 338, which he only knew in an inaccurate collation, he considered had a mixed text, but classed it generally with the second group. He based his text for the most part (probably incorrectly) on the first group, and certainly rejected the third much too cursorily. The reason for his preference of the first group was that in his belief the text in the other MSS had been corrected from the various writers Eusebius had quoted, this suggesting that the greater conciseness of the text in the second group was due to the skill of editors rather than to the superiority of the tradition.

(17) The editor to whom we owe the largest collection of material is HUGO LAEMMER¹ (1859-62). He was educated at Berlin and became a member of the Roman Church. In 1858 he visited the libraries of Dresden, Vienna, Venice, and Munich, in 1859 the Vatican. To him we owe descriptions or collations of the following MSS. The list is the one he himself gives, p. 873, to which his own signs have been appended:—

- (i) Codex Dresdensis A 85. K.
- (ii) Codex Vindobonensis 71 (42). L.
- (iii) Codex Vindobonensis 174 (332). M.
- (iv) Codex Venetus Marcianus 337. N.
- (v) Codex Venetus Marcianus 338. O.
- (vi) Codex Venetus Marcianus 339. P.
- (vii) Codex Venetus Marcianus 452. Q.
- (viii) Codex Patavinus 1291.
- (ix) Codex Mediolanensis D. 95.
- (x) Codex Monacensis 380. R.
- (xi) Codex Vaticanus 399. R^a.
- (xii) Codex Vaticanus 973. R^c.
- (xiii) Codex Vaticanus Palatinus 209.
- (xiv) Codex Vaticanus Ottobonianus 108. R^b.

He took as the basis of his edition the Venetian MS Codex Venetus Marcianus 338, which he designated O, reproducing not only its text,

SCHWEGLER, *Antt. Litt. in Academia Tubingensi Prof. P. E. Accedit brevis adnotatio critica*. Tubingae, 1852. See Heinichen², p. xxiv.

¹ *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri decem . . . Graecum textum . . . recensuit atque emendavit . . . apparatus criticum apposuit HUGO LAEMMER SS. Theologiae et Philosophiae Doctor, Presbyter Varmiensis, Missionarius Apostolicus, in Seminario Episcopali clericorum Brunsbergensi subregens. Scaphusia, 1852. See Heinichen², pp. xxvi-xxviii.*

but also its divisions into chapters, and largely its orthography. Except when otherwise stated he followed this MS, and naturally did not as a rule feel it necessary to quote its readings in the *apparatus criticus*. Heinichen in his second edition has not observed this, and only quotes the readings of O when they are specifically stated, i. e. when they are rejected or when Laemmer has given the readings of a large number of MSS together. This makes Heinichen's apparatus of little value so far as this MS goes. But where O fails Laemmer uses the Vatican MS 399 (R^a), which has a text belonging to quite a different family. The Latin translation is that of Valesius, more or less corrected. The opinion of Laemmer on the MSS is contained in two prefaces printed at the beginning, pp. vii-xxv, and in an appendix pp. 856-886.

In Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, I ii 561 (a section due to Preuschen), the following criticism is passed on Laemmer's collation of O. 'Von Laemmer für seine Ausgabe nach seiner Versicherung "maxima cum ἀκριβείᾳ" verglichen, doch flüchtig: vgl. Hollenberg, *Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissenschaft und christl. Leben*, N. F. iii [1860], p. 79.' This criticism is probably quite justified. Moreover his collations of the two Florence MSS are singularly inadequate, and much inferior to both of the two used in Burton's edition. He makes no distinction between the first and second hands of the older Florence MS (Plut. lxx 7), and thus makes the two MSS appear to have the same text throughout.

(18) The second edition of HEINICHEN¹ is useful as putting together all the information which various editors had collected concerning the text of Eusebius, and as giving all the collations of MSS made up to his time. His material is so far sufficient as to enable us to form a general idea of the groups of MSS, but beyond that not much can be said. The collations were rarely made at all accurately in the first instance, and are in almost all cases very defective. For instance we have compared a collation of Paris 1437 with Heinichen's collation, and have found that he omits nearly 50 per cent. of the variants. Moreover, he often uses collations supplied by others singularly unintelligently; we have seen an instance in the case of Laemmer, and another instance is in the Dresden MS. The collation of Dindorf of the early chapters was made with a copy of Valesius's text. Heinichen quotes the variants of the MS when they are expressly cited in the collation, but in those cases where the MS agrees with Valesius's text but differs from his own, he does not take the trouble to cite it. Again, the very important and obviously correct variant of Paris Gr. 1430 in I xiii 6, in which Abgar

¹ *Eusebii historiae ecclesiasticae libri X. Recensuit cum prolegomenis, apparatu, et annotatione critica, indicibus denuo edidit FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS HEINICHEN.* Lipsiae, 1868.

is called "Αβγαρος οὐχ ἀμα, is omitted, although it had been given by Burton. Moreover, he generally follows Laemmer in ignoring the differences between the two hands of the Florence MS, Plut. lxx 7, giving the corrected reading as that of the original text, and thus making this MS a mere duplicate of the other MS in the same library. These instances are quite sufficient to show how little Heinichen's work can be trusted.

(19) The only edition¹ which remains to be mentioned is that of DINDORF, published in Teubner's series in 1871. He based his text on the Paris MS 1430, of which he had begun, but apparently not completed, a new collation: *Ex quo genere est nova et accuratior Mazarinaei collatio qualem ego nunc turbis bellicis interruptam, sed tempore opportuno recensendam, in annotatione critica exhibebo.* His remarks on the MSS are hasty and valueless. He also publishes the first four chapters of the Syriac version from a communication by Wright.

In a short introduction to an edition of Tatian in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, E. SCHWARTZ² (who is, we believe, engaged on the edition of Eusebius for the Berlin Corpus) gives some account of the results of an inspection of MSS of Eusebius. He states that the editions of Eusebius are all untrustworthy, and that there is no accurate account of the MSS. The following is his account of the MSS which he had himself examined. It is unfortunate that sometimes quite unnecessarily he designates them by different letters from all previous editors.

Parisiensis 1430 [A] ex bibliotheca Cardinalis Mazarinaei, s. xi.

Vaticanus [V] s. xi: the text is similar to Codex Mazarinaeus. Copies of it are Florentinus Abbadiae 196, s. xv; Ottobonianus 108, s. xvi;

Parisiensis 1434, s. xvi: a copy of Florentinus Abbadiae is Paris 1435, s. xvi.

Parisiensis 1436 [E] s. xv.

Marcianus 338 [M] s. x.

Parisiensis 1431 [B] s. xi/xii. Copies of it are Paris 1432 and 1437, s. xiv, and Marcianus 339.

Parisiensis 1433 [D] s. xi/xii.

He also notes that a critical edition of Eusebius will be a difficult matter, that accurate collations of all MSS are necessary, and that the text should not be based on any single MS: the mistake in most editions has been that of relying too exclusively on Paris 1430: probably all the MSS contain mixed texts.

¹ *Eusebii Caesariensis opera.* Recognovit GULIELMUS DINDORFIUS. Vol. iv. *Historiae ecclesiasticae libri I-X.* Lipsiae in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1871.

² *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* von OSCAR VON GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK, IV. Band, Heft I: *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos.* Recensuit EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichsche Buchhandlung, 1888.

The most complete list of the MSS of the Ecclesiastical History as yet published is that given [by PREUSCHEN] in HARNACK *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur* I ii (1893), p. 561, but it is unnecessarily inaccurate, and needs several corrections.

- (a) The Vienna MS (3), Cod. Venet. Marc. 452 (7), Cod. Vatic. 973 (10), Cod. Monac. Gr. 380 (8) are all incorrectly placed in the list of complete MSS, as they only contain extracts.
- (b) Cod. Paris Gr. 1436, following the mistake mentioned above, which began with Stroth, is incorrectly identified with the Codex Regius (Burton's A) of the older editions. Schwartz might have saved him this error.
- (c) He does not seem to be aware that Heinichen had completely collated the Dresden MS, for he only refers to Gersdorf's collations of the early chapters.
- (d) The attempt to group the MSS by the position of the Martyrs of Palestine is not of much value, as it combines together MSS of different types of text.
- (e) The preference shown to the text of the Codex Mazarinaeus is almost certainly hasty.

This review of the existing editions and history of the printed text will make it quite clear that there is no adequate edition, and that almost all the work will have to be done over again. No collations of MSS can be trusted, and very little attempt has been made to construct a text on principles which have any pretence to be called scientific. Since Heinichen's second edition was published, one first-rate MS, the Codex Sinaiticus, has become known, and the Syriac version has been edited. There is not as yet any adequate edition of the Latin text of Rufinus, though the gap will no doubt be filled when Prof. Mommsen's edition, which is announced as in the press, sees the light. The remarks of Schwartz quoted above are for the most part quite justified, although probably only a slight amount of work will suffice for clearing away the great majority of MSS.

A. C. HEADLAM.