

# 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]

## THE ORDER OF THE TREATISES AND LETTERS IN THE MSS OF ST. CYPRIAN.

THE order in which the treatises and letters of St. Cyprian have been handed down to us in the principal MSS has long been recognized as of considerable importance for the classification and genealogy of those MSS. The following note examines the question in some detail. It is, however, only an essay and an attempt to start an inquiry which ought to bring forth great fruit when assisted by further materials, and especially when combined with new and careful study of the readings of the MSS. The subject has a further interest of its own in revealing to us something of the process by which our present body of Cyprianic literature was collected.

The older and more important codices show us distinct and well-defined groups of treatises and letters, though the latter portions of them often degenerate into disorder, the result of borrowing from other MSS which contained letters which they themselves lacked. Later MSS degenerate more and more by the disintegration and mixture of the original groups. We shall consider these groups separately, showing their original contents and their gradual dissolution. We shall thus accumulate evidence with regard to the formation of the collections in the MSS, the relation of the MSS to one another, and their value as witnesses. A certain number only of the MSS is taken into account, those which are simply dependent on known parents being passed over.

Almost all the more comprehensive MSS begin with the treatises, and add immediately to them one or two letters somewhat resembling treatises, and a group of beautiful letters on martyrdom. This seems to be the nucleus to which the other groups and the more loosely connected letters have attached themselves. I will call it

### GROUP A<sup>5</sup>.

I give in the first place a diagram for this primary group of the order found in the principal MSS. The small Roman figures refer to the treatises, the Arabic numerals to the letters, as in Hartel's edition. But 'ii' and 'xiv' I prefer to call *idola* and *sent*, as they do not occur among the other treatises<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> I take the order of S from Mr. Turner's note in *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1902, p. 282 : that of V from Mercati, *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano*, Roma, 1899, p. 12 ; that of the Cheltenham list from *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii, and Harnack's *Altchr. Litt.* i. That of Pem. (= Pembroke Coll., Cambr., Fell's Pem. c. 20, 1935 in Bernard, Schenkl, D 42, fourteenth century ; Benson, *Cypr.* p. 548, calls it early thirteenth century) was sent me by Dom Butler. Many are from



To begin with, let us examine the first ten places. T H h. Pem. give the same order as Pontius, the deacon and biographer of St. Cyprian, for those treatises which they contain, except that they interchange x and xi. M Q give Pontius's order, except that they invert v vii. S W  $\mu$ <sup>1</sup> have it also, only x has wandered<sup>2</sup>. In  $\beta$  it has wandered further still

Hartel's introduction, where descriptions of the MSS will be found ; there are also short accounts in Harnack.

For convenience I subjoin a list of treatises and addresses of letters, numbered according to Hartel's Vienna edition. The letters not written by Cyprian are in italics :

i Ad Donatum	16. Cler. Carth.	53. <i>Maximus</i>
<i>idola</i> Quod id. dii non sint	17. Pleb. Carth.	54. Maximo
iii Testimonia	18-19. Cler. Carth.	55. Antoniano
iv De hab. virg.	20. Cler. Rom.	56. Fortunato
v De cath. eccl. unit.	21. <i>Celerinus Luciano</i>	57. Cornelio
vi De lapsis	22. <i>Lucianus Celerino</i>	58. Plebi Thibari
vii De dom. orat.	23. <i>Confess. Carth.</i>	59-60. Cornelio
viii De mortalitate	24. <i>Caldonius</i>	61. Lucio
ix Ad Fortunatum	25. Caldonio	62. Ianuar. Maxim.
x Ad Demetrianum	26. Cler. Carth.	63. Caecilio
xi De opere et eleemos.	27. Cler. Rom.	64. Fido
xii De bono patien.	28. Moysi Maxim.	65. Epicteto
xiii De zelo et liv.	29. Cler. Carth.	66. Florentio
<i>sent</i> Sententiae episco- porum	30. <i>Cler. Rom.</i>	67. Concil.
1. Presb. Furnens.	31. <i>Moys. et Max.</i>	68. Stephano
2. Eucratio	32. Cler. Carth.	69. Magno
3. Rogatiano	33. Lapsis	70. Concil.
4. Pomponio	34. Cler. Carth.	71. Quinto
5. Cler. Carth.	35. Cler. Rom.	72. Stephano
6. Sergio et Rog.	36. <i>Cler. Rom.</i>	73. Iubaiano
7. Cler. Carth.	37. Moysi et Max.	74. Pompeio
8. <i>Cler. Rom. ad Cler.</i> <i>Carth.</i>	38-40. Cler. Carth.	75. <i>Firmilianus</i>
9. Cler. Rom.	41. Cald. et Hercul.	76. Nemesiano
10. Confess. Carth.	42. <i>Cald. et Hercul.</i>	77. <i>Nemesianus</i> , etc.
11-12. Cler. Carth.	43. Pleb. Carth.	78. <i>Lucius</i> , etc.
13. Rogatiano	44-45. Cornelio	79. <i>Felix</i> , etc.
14. Cler. Carth.	46. Maximo et Nicost.	80. Successo
15. Confess. Carth.	47-48. Cornelio	81. Cler. Carth.
	49-50. <i>Cornelius</i>	
	51-52. Cornelio	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. H. Turner has pointed out that Dr. Sanday, in *Studia Biblica*, has omitted x from O, and O, by mistake (*Classical Review*, May 1892, p. 207, note). With this correction they have the same order as  $\mu$  for the treatises.

<sup>2</sup> I have given xii xiii for S, instead of Mr. Turner's xiii xii, which is unparalleled in the best MSS, while xii xiii gives the same order as W  $\mu$ , etc. My reason is the following. The whole gathering R (fol. 91-98) has the headline *de zelo et livore* instead of *de bono patientia*. Mr. Turner explains this by supposing that the page containing the *explicit* of xiii *de zelo et livore* and the *incipit* of xii *de bono pat.* was lost in the archetype. A simpler explanation would be that the gathering R,

The common parent of all these is obviously the order of Pontius. The same is true of the more disturbed sequences. In B it is evident that vii and xiii have been displaced. If we replace vii in its usual position after v and put xiii last, we get i iv vi v vii viii x xi xii xiii, that is to say, the order of Pontius with another new position for x. In L, xii xiii come too early. If we put them last we again get i iv vi v vii viii x xi xii xiii, so that L and B had probably a common parent, so far as the first ten treatises are concerned, though the affinity goes no further than this. The order of L is reflected in the curious MS 'K' (Leyden, Voss. lat. f<sup>o</sup> 40, 10th cent.) and in Brussels 918 (11th cent.). The latter has i 13 iv *Pudicit* vi v *idola* xii xiii viii x ix vii 63 11 *Novat* 58 xi, of which K omits 13 *idola* vii 63 58. Brussels 922 (16th cent.) has nearly the same sequence. I am inclined to think that the order of V is derived (by wilful, not accidental rearrangement) from that of B, for if in B we move xi and xiii into the place of vi, and insert vi after xii, we have V. The late place of vii suggests that Chelt. may be connected with this family; but it is not certain that the order given in the stichometry is really the exact order of any MS.

Z is apparently a corruption of SW  $\mu$ . Dr. Mercati has pointed out to me that the MS Vat. Reg. 275 (15th cent.) has preserved to us nearly the same order as the lost MS of Bec (see Turner, in *Stud. Bibl.* iii, p. 310). Nearly the same is found in two sixteenth-cent. MSS at Brussels, 919 and 920, and in  $\rho$  and i (both twelfth or thirteenth cent. Paris 1659 and 1654).

*Beccens.* i x ix xiii xii viii iv v vi *Rufin. symb.* iii a b  
*Regin.* 275 i x xi ix xiii xii viii iv vii v vi 63 63 58 *Rufin. symb.* iii a

This seems to be certainly from SW  $\mu$ , copied in reverse order from ix; iv is out of place, and xi x ought to be before xii xiii, 63 is given twice.

P is from  $\beta$ , as is seen from the sequences x ix and v vii viii xi xii

which contains the middle of *de bono pat.*, was bound by mistake between the beginning and the end of *de zelo et liv.*, the scribe having signed the gathering with R by mistake for Q, before the headings of the pages were added. In this case one of the lost gatherings, Q or S, will have been a quire of five. The diagram will make this clear. The lost quires are bracketed:

1. pp. 83-90	O x	<i>ad Demetr.</i>	p. 352.17-363.8	293 lines	
2.	[P {	"	p. 363.8 — <i>expl.</i>	198	} 306]
		xii <i>de bono pat.</i>	<i>incip.</i> —401.6	108	
3. pp. 91-98	R	"	p. 401.6 —412.4	295	
4.	[Q {	"	p. 412.4 — <i>expl.</i>	97	} 673
		xiii <i>de zelo et liv.</i>	<i>incip.</i> —...	} 347	
		"	... — <i>expl.</i>		
5.	[S {	"	... — <i>expl.</i>	} 229	} 588
		ix <i>ad Fortunatum</i>	<i>incip.</i> —325.4		
6. pp. 101-108	T	"	p. 325.4 — <i>expl.</i>		
7. pp. 109-116	V	"	<i>incip. ad Caec.</i>		

xiii<sup>1</sup>. O<sub>1</sub> (10th cent.) and Vat. Pal. lat. 159 (15th cent.) have i x ix vi xi viii xii vii 63 iv xiii v *idola* 58 76 58 *bis* 55 iii 66 30 2 64 *sent.* The order i x ix and the late place of iv shows connexion with P. R is also from β, by the removal of xiii xi to an earlier place.

Thus we have the following five families: T H h.Pem.—M Q—S W μ Z *Bec*—B L K V—and β P O, R, each descending from a progenitor which differed from Pontius's order in only one particular. Therefore the order of Pontius is clearly the parent order of all our existing MSS.

In all the chief MSS, except h and Z, the treatise ix *ad Fortunatum* follows, and then at once iii *Testimonia ad Quirinum*, except in S W (which stops here) β Chelt. Then follow usually 55 (a long treatise on Novatianism *ad Antonianum*), 63 (on the mixed chalice *ad Caecilium*) and a collection of seven letters on the subject of martyrdom, with the addition of 58 on the same subject *plebi Thibari consistenti*. Occasionally *laud* and *idola* appear. The order of the seven letters 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 is invariable. The omissions in H β B N P are unimportant, as these MSS are in the habit of dropping out letters without any reason, often adding them in at the end or even the beginning of the codex. In h.Pem. Z C R the seven occur without any interruption. The other MSS insert 58 or *laud* or (absurdly) 55, which last is sometimes before, sometimes after 63; while 58, usually at the end, occurs before iii in L and before ix in Z, whence R has transferred it into the middle of the treatises. *Laud* also occurs in M Q with two other *spuria* at the end of the group, and in β before iii.

With these facts in view, the order of h.Pem. is startling. It includes all the fixed stars and none of the planets.

Now Pontius appears at first sight to mention (c. 7) twelve treatises. The first eleven are generally considered certain, the eleventh being ix *ad Fortunatum*, described by Pontius thus:

*Quis martyres tantos exhortatione divini sermonis erigeret?*

The position of ix in most MSS suggests this identification, and the fact that the treatise consists of a collection of passages of Scripture on subjects connected with martyrdom has appeared to make it certain. The twelfth and last description of Pontius runs thus:

*Quis denique tot confessores frontium notatarum secunda inscriptione signatos, et ad exemplum martyrii superstites reservatos incentivo tubae caelestis animaret?*

This has been taken to mean the spurious treatise *de laude martyrii*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The treatises have the order of P in Vat. Reg. 117 (11th cent.) and in Vat. 199, φ, and 200, both 15th cent. The rest of these three MSS is variously connected with o, μ and, I think, T.

<sup>2</sup> I see that Mr. Turner (*Class. Rev.* l. c.) suggested that this twelfth question might refer to the letters on martyrdom, thus partly anticipating my present thesis.

The obvious objection was that Pontius (of whose truthfulness in describing his intimate relations with St. Cyprian there need surely be no doubt) could hardly have attributed a spurious work to his bishop. To get out of the difficulty by declaring it to be genuine, with Götz, would be as uncritical as to deny the authenticity of the *Life* by Pontius.

But as a fact the words of Pontius do not describe the *de laude martyrii* in the least. It is not addressed to confessors, but to *fratres*; it is not an exhortation to martyrdom, but an encomium of it, probably delivered after the persecution was over. It is African probably, it is Cyprianesque certainly, but it is neither by Cyprian, nor referred to by his biographer.

Returning to ix, we find that a similar difficulty awaits us. *Ad Fortunatum* is not a treatise, but, like iii, a collection of texts of Scripture strung together and addressed to a layman. St. Cyprian says he has provided *non tractatum, sed materiam tractantibus*. As iii is omitted by Pontius, so might ix well be omitted also. It is true that its sub-title *de exhortatione martyrii*, together with its scriptural character, exactly fits the words of Pontius *exhortatione divini sermonis*. But it is not addressed to *tanti martyres*, but to a layman, and its exhortations are intended for the people. It is not so much meant to encourage martyrs, as to prevent lapse. It speaks of the absurdity and iniquity of idolatry, and how the Christian for the love of Christ must not fall back to heathenism, and how persecutions and sufferings will be rewarded in the life to come.

If we suppose that Pontius had before him simply the collection of h. Pem., the invariable portion of our first group, the difficulties vanish.

The letters 6 10 28 37 are exhortations to the confessors imprisoned at Carthage and at Rome, many of whom died as martyrs, including 'those famous martyrs,' *tantos martyres*, Sergius and Rogatian (Ep. 6, perhaps Mappalicus was still alive when this letter was sent), Moses and Maximus (Ep. 28, 37<sup>1</sup>), and others (Ep. 10) well known when Pontius wrote. That they are full of Holy Scripture goes without saying.

The letters 38 and 39 are concerned not with martyrs who died in torments or in prison, but precisely with confessors who have 'twice over had their foreheads signed' with the sign of the Lamb, and have been preserved as a model to their brethren. Of Aurelius Cyprian says (Ep. 38) '*Gemino hic agone certavit, bis confessus et bis confessionis suae victoria gloriosus,*' and of Celerinus (Ep. 39) '*non brevi compendio vulnerum victor, sed adhaerentibus diu et permanentibus paenis longae conluctationis miraculo triumphator.*' In the Apuleian lingo of Pontius this

<sup>1</sup> 37 is called by Q *aepistola secunda*.

becomes '*confessores frontium notatarum secunda inscriptione signatos.*' Again Pontius has '*et ad exemplum martyrii superstites reservatos*'; and Cyprian says of Aurelius, Ep. 38, '*Ita et dignitate excelsus est et humilitate summissus, ut appareat illum divinitus reservatum, qui ad ecclesiasticam disciplinam ceteris esset exemplo, quomodo servi Dei in confessione virtutibus vincerent, post confessionem moribus eminent*'; and of Celerinus, Ep. 39, he says that he is to be set up in the pulpit as an example to all who see him and hear him read that Gospel which he has so nobly put in practice, and he adds of both: '*In talibus servis laetatur Dominus, in eiusmodi confessoribus gloriatur, quorum secta et conversatio sic proficit ad praeconium gloriae, ut magisterium ceteris praebeat disciplinae. Ad hoc eos Christus esse hic in ecclesia diu voluit, ad hoc de media morte subtractos quadam dixerim resurrectione circa eos facta incolumes reservavit, ut dum nihil in honore sublimius, nihil in humilitate summissius a fratribus cernitur, hoc eosdem fraternitas sectata comitetur.*' It is inevitable that Pontius is echoing the very words of these two letters.

A difficulty remains. Pontius says that Cyprian encouraged these confessors 'with the sound of the celestial trumpet.' On the contrary, these letters are not addressed to them at all, but to the clergy and people of Carthage, to inform them that he has ordained Aurelius and Celerinus to the office of *lector*. The explanation seems to be that Pontius deals with the seven letters as a group, and speaks of all as exhortations, though he distinguishes the martyrs from the confessors. It was in fact impossible for him to mention that the real subject of 38 and 39 was nothing but the intimation to the clergy and people of two clerical appointments. The point of the twelve rhetorical questions which give the order of the treatises is simply: 'Who, if Cyprian had died in the first persecution instead of retiring into a hiding-place, would have written this or that?' Obviously any one could have announced the appointment of two *lectores*!

Of Ep. 11 I have said nothing. It is rightly described by the Cheltenham list as '*de precando Deo.*' St. Cyprian has been warned by a vision that the persecution is a punishment of the sins of Christians, and that they are above all to pray. 'Even the confessors,' he says, 'do not keep discipline'; yet suddenly, while they boast of their confessorship, there bursts upon them the ingenious fury of the torturer. Prayer alone offered up for them, and unanimous prayer, will enable any to stand. And he concludes with a magnificent enumeration of the objects for which they should pray, an echo perhaps of the style in which he daily offered the great prayer of the Mass, already commencing possibly to crystallize into a Canon. I cannot but connect the '*incentivo tubae caelestis animaret*' with this letter. '*Tuba caelestis*' is clearly not



Holy Scripture, but those *ostensiones* which so often moved Cyprian to act or write, and of which Pontius makes much elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. But if this is true, it can apply only to letter 11.

If this identification be right, when Pontius wrote, a few years at most after Cyprian's death, he had before him the earliest collection of Cyprianic writings, consisting of i iv vi v vii x viii xi xii xiii 6 10 28 37 11 38 39, a collection which only h. and Pem. have preserved to us without interpolation<sup>2</sup>. It was formed at Carthage. The first two letters were addressed to the Carthaginian prisons, the last three to the Carthaginian clergy. The two remaining letters were indeed sent to Rome. But St. Cyprian himself tells us (Ep. 32) that he sent a copy of 28 (and also of 27, 30, 31) to the clergy of Carthage. It cannot be doubted that he must have communicated to the Carthaginian confessors the beautiful and elaborate Ep. 37 which he addressed to the martyrs at Rome. A member of the Carthaginian clergy probably put the letters together, perhaps Pontius, or the secretary of whom Paulus of Concordia spoke to St. Jerome. They were letters which will have been especially prized. To collect business letters (so to speak) about the lapsed, or the factions at Carthage, or Novatus and Novatian, was not yet thought of—still less about the happily dormant baptismal controversy. A large edition would be dispersed in Africa. The pious laymen, Fortunatus and Quirinus<sup>3</sup>, would send the treatises addressed to them (ix, iii) to swell the rolls, or perhaps already the codex. Next we presume that Bishop Antonian communicated the long treatise-letter against Novatian (55), and the aged Caecilius that on the mixed chalice (63). These were naturally added between the treatises and the letters. Next the Bishop of Thibarisis would send the letter on martyrdom, 58, which was appended to the seven letters, as connected with their subject, or placed after 6 as still more closely belonging to the first three. That in T L N P 55 appears in this place, I can only explain by the suggestion that the scribe had been told to put 58 there, and 55 at the end, and that he reversed the order by mistake<sup>4</sup>. These MSS

<sup>1</sup> St. Cyprian uses this metaphor of his own voice: '*classico nostrae vocis,*' Ep. 55 4, and *ad Fort.* 1; of the 'divine precepts' of Scripture also, *ibid.* 4, '*illa sint militaris tubae hortamenta, illa pugnantis classica.*' Novatian writes to Cyprian of the lapsed: '*resumant precum suarum tubam,*' Ep. 30 6.

<sup>2</sup> We shall see that h. Pem. have preserved the next collection, that of the letters to Cornelius, without addition, omission, or disarrangement.

<sup>3</sup> They would presumably be alive, as the date of *ad Fort.* according to Benson was during the year of exile which closed the Saint's life, and Quirinus is repeatedly mentioned in the last letters (Ep. 77. 3, 78. 3).

<sup>4</sup> Can we go back behind this first collection? Perhaps we may have a right to guess that in St. Cyprian's own time his works were to be bought in twos or threes, i v vi; v vii; xii xiii; while x, viii and xi, were either in separate rolls, or differently arranged in various copies, if in one roll. The collection from the rolls would be

may be related, so far as the letters in this group are concerned. T and H h.Pem. must have separated soon after St. Cyprian's death. The readings in h and T show a close connexion in the treatises and in the letters of this first group. In B<sup>s</sup> they seem to be independent of each other. But the rest of h is simply borrowed from an ancestor of T. I have myself been able to collate what was necessary of h, by the kindness of the keeper of MSS at Leyden, M. Molhuysen.

T and M Q appear to be quite independent for Group A<sup>1</sup>.  $\mu$  gives another slightly different version, and adds *laud* to the martyr letters after 6. Chelt. and  $\beta$  may be connected with it. This appears to be a rather later arrangement than that of M Q and T for (1) *laud* is spurious; (2) the order of  $\mu$  is further on not quite so good as that of T; and especially (3) because in M Q *laud* is an addition with *Jud*, *aleat*, and makes a stop<sup>2</sup>. It is therefore a later arrival than the 'planet' letters. In T it comes only after four more groups. The place it occupies is, however, witnessed to by Lucifer of Cagliari, who quotes in one treatise (*Moriend. pro Dei Filio*, A. D. 360-1), 6 10 37 55 and *laud*, and by the list of 359. The order is not later than the first half of the fourth century. We may assume that the collection of four more groups in T is earlier than this. The difference between M Q and T will go back then to the third century.

The parent of M Q I will henceforth call (M Q); (T) will mean the parent of T, and so forth<sup>3</sup>.

The order of V is peculiar. Dr. Mercati<sup>4</sup> has shown that it gives the letters in well-arranged groups, and he argues that these represent the primitive collections. If this were so, V would be a sort of archetype for the other MSS, and their varying arrangements would be varying degrees of corruption of V's order. Nothing could be further from the truth. The order of V is not reflected in any MSS. The very carefulness of its arrangement shows that it is due to some learned editor, such as those who flourished between the middle of the fourth and the end of the sixth centuries<sup>5</sup>. It follows that Hartel's judgement that it represents a wilful recension, and does not in its peculiarities testify to

in the new-fangled book form, which may have been introduced by that time (Sanday, *Stud. Bibl.* iii. pp. 233-6).

<sup>1</sup> This is verified by internal evidence of the readings, so far as I have been able to compare them.

<sup>2</sup> We shall see how often the addition of *spuria* indicates a break in the process of formation of a collection.

<sup>3</sup> The position of 58 and *idola* in Z suggests that for the first group it may exhibit an independent arrangement of the early fourth century, though Z is certainly a corruption of ( $\mu$ ) further on.

<sup>4</sup> *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi*, etc., pp. 12 seq.

<sup>5</sup> As Dr. Sanday points out *Studia Bibl.* iii. p. 297.

the original readings, is less likely to be unsound than Dr. Mercati thinks. It is interesting to notice that the editor of V had our group A<sup>s</sup> before him. He leaves 63 with the treatises, which he has rearranged. He removes 55 to a collection of letters to suffragans which he has made up. He places 58 with the letters to martyrs 6 10 28 37, adds 13 and 76, and leaves this as the first group. The three remaining letters, 11 38 39, remain in their place, but become the nucleus of a new group of eighteen letters to the clergy of Carthage. In the remainder of his groups we can also trace occasional snatches of the order of the MS from which he selected them<sup>1</sup>.

#### GROUP B<sup>s</sup>.

Next follows in T h.Pem. a collection of eight letters to Pope Cornelius, 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51. M Q, after the three *spuria*, give the same<sup>2</sup>. In L N P the first letter (60) of the Cornelian group is given, then follows C<sup>2</sup> (= Bapt. group), then part of D<sup>s</sup>, and B<sup>s</sup> mixed with it, thus: 52 (1 56 3) 47 45 48 44 (61 46) 57 59. L and N add 51 in an appendix. In (L N P) it was doubtless after 44. What is principally noticeable is that 48 has appeared, thus making the collection of letters to Cornelius quite complete. Chelt. gives the letters to Cornelius as 9, but the St. Gall MS gives 8, so that 48 was probably absent.  $\mu$  gives B<sup>s</sup> after C<sup>s</sup>, thus: 60 57 59 52 45 47 44 51; the transposition of 45 47 is accidental, and doubtless recent, if not a misprint of Hartel's. 48 appears as an extra at what we shall see is the end of a stage in the development of  $\mu$ . Like  $\mu$ , Z gives B<sup>s</sup> after C<sup>s</sup>. It has lost 60 and 52, but possesses 48. The order is 57 59 47 45 44 (49 50 54) 48 51. The omission of 60 is accidental; 49 50 are replies of Cornelius. 48 is not in the same position as in L N P, and has been taken from the later place in ( $\mu$ ). 51 is followed immediately by D<sup>s</sup> as in  $\mu$ . C R depend on (Z). They give after C<sup>s</sup> 57 59 60 52 (C om. 52) 47 45 44 (49 50) followed by D<sup>s</sup>. Here 60 52 are transposed, while Z omits them altogether. They were therefore doubtless in their proper place in the parent of Z C R. C R omit 51. B has 59 52 47 45 44 51<sup>3</sup> 60 57 after fragments of C<sup>s</sup>. H  $\beta$  give 60 57 59 52 47 45 44, and have 51 at the end of the MS. The fragments called F have . . . 57 52 47 45 44 . . . ; r has after C<sup>s</sup> 60 59 45 44 51, and supplies 52 47 57 earlier.

<sup>1</sup> The order of V (Mercati l. c.) is: i iv xi xiii v viii x xii vi ix vii iii 63 || 6 13 10 76 28 37 58 || 11 38 39 43 12 40 32 81 7 5 14 16 15 17 18 29 26 34 || 9 20 27 35 33 || 45 60 48 44 57 59 47 46 52 51 54 || 25 41 61 55 69 a 69 b 65 67 72 sent 68 74 73 71 70 2 64 3 1 || (miscellaneous) *idola* 66 4 62 65 || (Rescripts) 77 78 53 49 50 36.

<sup>2</sup> The complete enumeration of the contents of the MSS here mentioned will be given later.

<sup>3</sup> B calls 51 the 6th letter.

Evidently B, H  $\beta$ , F, r give merely disarrangements of the true order. None but L N P  $\mu$  Z V (Chelt. ?) have 48, and its varying position appears to prove that it was not an original member of the group, which is therefore given correctly by T M Q, h.Pem. and  $\mu$ <sup>1</sup>.

The collection must have been made at Rome. It contains no letters to the Roman clergy or martyrs, so that it would seem not to have been the result of a general investigation made by some Carthaginian at Rome, but to have been simply drawn from the Papal archives, or from the private papers of St. Cornelius. The too notorious relations of St. Cyprian with Pope Stephen would be a sufficient reason why neither of the letters to that Pope should be given. We shall see that there is no reason for connecting any other group with Rome<sup>2</sup>.

GROUP C $\delta$ .

This group I take next because in  $\mu$  Z H  $\beta$  C R Chelt., &c., it comes in the second place, and also in L N P, but for the introduction of 60 (the first letter of B $\delta$ ) before it. In T M Q it comes fourth of the groups. It does not occur in h.Pem.

T L N P	76 73 71 70 sent 74 69 67 64 2
Chelt.	73 71 70 sent 74 72 64 69 67 2
$\mu$	76 73 71 70 sent 74 69 (40) 67 64 2
Z	(14) 76 71 70 (16) 69 (40) 64 2
C R	(14) 76 70 (16 15 40) 64 2
B	73 71 70 sent 72 74 69 64 2
H $\beta$	73 71 70 (63) 76 74 69 (40) 67 64 2

M Q have sent 69 67 64 2, and add 71 73 and 76 70 afterwards. H  $\beta$  show their dependence on ( $\mu$ ) by the introduction of 40, which has nothing to do with the rest<sup>3</sup>. Z and C R show two stages of the

<sup>1</sup> T introduces Ep. 60 as *ad Cornelium i* (and so also at the end of the letter), and at the end of 51 has *ad Cornelium epistolae numero .viii. explicit*. T does not number the intermediate letters. Q numbers all but the first, and M gives the correct numbers to 52 45 44. F gives the right numbers for 47 45 44.

C R number the letters as they stand in their list: 57 59 (ii, R), 60 (iii, C R), 52 (iv, R), 47 (v, R), 45 (vi, C R), 44 (vii, C R). Next come the two letters from Cornelius 49 (viii, R *sic*), 50 (viii, C; viii, R).

Of Z's numbers Hartel gives only that for 48, viz. viii at the beginning, viii at the end of the letter. Either is correct, according as we count or omit the interloper 54. Of  $\mu$  I only know that it numbers 48 xi. This is arrived at by adding 49 50 to the original eight letters, thus 48 becomes the eleventh.

L N P begin to number from 47 (i, P), 45 (ii, L P), 48 (iii, L P), 44 (iv, L P). They do not number 57 59. 48 is numbered iii in o i  $\rho$ . This shows that o took 48 from P.

<sup>2</sup> I venture to suggest that the eight letters were put together and published soon after the death of St. Cyprian by Pope Dionysius, 258-268.

<sup>3</sup> H  $\beta$  have dropped *sent*, probably as being tiresome. They have put 63, which has fallen out of A $\delta$ , in its place.

corruption of ( $\mu$ ) by interpolation and omission<sup>1</sup>. B is strange. It gives C<sup>s</sup> after B<sup>s</sup> and fragments of other groups. It omits 76 here like Chelt. because it has already given it, like T, in F<sup>s</sup>. But its dependence on  $\mu$  is shown by 40 67 together just before the group, from which they have dropped out. The introduction of 72, the letter to Stephen on baptism, is paralleled by Chelt. only, and appears to show that the doubts of Harnack and Turner as to 72, and not 68, being intended by Chelt. are unfounded.

The group is obviously African. 70 *sent* are councils; 73 71 74 69 are letters on the subject of heretical baptism. 67 is the letter of a council in answer to the legation from two Spanish churches. 64 is a council on infant baptism. 2 is a letter to Eucratius, probably Bishop of Theneae, on the impossibility of a Christian being allowed to train actors. 76 is a letter to the nine bishops and clergy and laity confined in the mines in the last year of Cyprian's life. It is a collection of more or less official documents. Four out of ten are councils. 73 71 69 were probably communicated to the bishops of the province. Doubtless the angry 74 was also widely published. 76 is addressed to a group of bishops and a very large number of clergy and lay sufferers. 2 may have been looked upon as a sort of legal decision by the great Primate<sup>2</sup>.

#### GROUP D<sup>s</sup>.

Between B<sup>s</sup> and C<sup>s</sup> in T are found 13 (to the martyrs—exhortation), 43 (to the people of Carthage against Felicissimus), 65 (to the bishop and people of Assuras, about their former lapsed bishop), 1 (to the people of Furni, on clerical guardians), 61 (to Pope Lucius on his return from exile), 46 (to Maximus, Nicostratus and the other Roman confessors, to beg them to leave the party of Novatian), 66 (to Florentius Puppianus, a vigorous reply to a personal attack), 54 (to Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius and the other Roman confessors, congratulating them on their return to Cornelius from Novatianism, and recommending the perusal of his own *de lapsis* and *de Unitate*).

This is a scratch collection, if it is really a collection. 13 43 60 together, as sent to Carthage from exile. 65 1 66 are addressed to Africans, 61 46 54 to Romans. In M Q 66 is omitted. The three Roman letters then come side by side. It is tempting to imagine that

<sup>1</sup> C R supply 69 later from V, and C gives *sent* (68) 74 73 71 70 1 in appendix, from V, as the order shows.

<sup>2</sup> A sub-group is formed by 73 71 70. To 73 in L is prefixed: *Incipit ad Iuvaianum de hereticis baptisandis epistolas numero tres*. To 70 in P is prefixed: *Incipit ad Iuvaianum liber secundus*. T has before 73: *Incipit ad Urbanum de hereticis baptisandis epistola iii*; before 71: *Item incipit ad Quintum epistola ii de his ipsis* (and at the end *explicit epistola iii*), and before 70: *ad Iubaianum de hereticis baptisandis epistola, n. iii*.

this was the original arrangement. Nevertheless, there are many proofs that (MQ), from the three *spuria* after A<sup>s</sup> onwards, was merely a copy of (T). The original order of (T) was what T gives us now. This is shown not only by the witness of T's own perfect preservation of the other groups, but the witness of  $\mu$  Z B H  $\beta$ , which all insert 66 where T places it.  $\mu$  gives after B<sup>s</sup> 13 43 65 (78 79 77=F<sup>s</sup>) 1 61 46 66 54. Z, after 51, the last of B<sup>s</sup>, has 13 43 1 61 46 66. Thus Z omits 65. C R have only 13 after 51. B has 43 65 (C<sup>s</sup>) 1 61 54 66. H  $\beta$  (after B<sup>s</sup>) has 13 43 65 66 (4 3 72) 61 1 46 (56) 54. The fragment of F gives us 61 1 46 (56) 54. h.Pem. give after B<sup>s</sup>, 61 46 (78) 13 43 (76 77 *idola*) 66 54, the last two in Pem. only. L N P give (after C<sup>s</sup>) 13 *laud* 43 65 (52) 1, and later 61 46<sup>1</sup>. Then in an Appendix L has *idola* 66 40 (4 72 51) 54 E<sup>s</sup>; N has (40 and 6 others) 54 (E<sup>s</sup> *idola*) 66. In M Q 66 is supplied next before 40<sup>2</sup>. Chelt. gives 40 66. It may be noticed that M Q connect *idola* 4, and V has *idola* 66 4.

GROUP E<sup>s</sup>.

In T after C<sup>s</sup> we find 32 20 12<sup>3</sup>, in M Q the same occur after D<sup>s</sup>, before C<sup>s</sup>. A little further on in T come 30 31, and in M Q 31 30<sup>4</sup>. In  $\mu$  these have been made one group. 12 and 32 are to the Carthaginian clergy, 20 is to the Roman clergy. 30 and 31 are from the Roman clergy, and were sent with 32 (and with 28, as already mentioned, and with 27, which occurs much later) by Cyprian to Carthage. As 20 is a reply to the strictures sent by the Roman clergy to the Carthaginian clergy on the bishop's cowardice in flying from martyrdom, it is certain that Cyprian must have communicated it to the Carthaginian clergy. The collection is therefore African, by the clergy of Carthage.

Z gives only 12 20, C R none. L gives in appendix 32 20 12 30, N gives 20 12 30—the omission of 32 is accidental. Chelt. has 12 32 20 30. B also has 32 20, but no 31; 12 and 30 are scattered; the latter comes (as we have seen) after 6 in the A<sup>s</sup> group. H  $\beta$  have 20 30 31 12 (77 78 79) 32. F had 20 30 31 12 (evidently 12 not 32).

It is noticeable that 30 31 are the first letters to Cyprian we have

<sup>1</sup> P omits *laud* here, and gives 66 *idola* 40 *laud*.

<sup>2</sup> O, from M Q E, is described by Hartel, p. xxxviii note, as giving 13 43 65 1 60 46 54. I presume that 60 is a misprint for 61. 60 has occurred in its right place in B<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> M Q prefix to 32: *Incipit ad Romanos epistula prima*. Q has before 20: *Incipit eiusdem secunda*.

<sup>4</sup> These form part of the lost nine letters in M Q, which are vouched for by the index of M. Hartel, p. xxxiv, gives 31 36. The index has lxiv *pbri et diac urbis roman ad Cyprianum*, which ought to mean 36, I admit. But it certainly refers to 30. Maximus and Nicostratus were Priests. *Diac.* is a mistake for *confessores*.

yet come across. Till now only his own letters, and the councils, had been collected. These two letters from Rome appear here simply because they were enclosures in St. Cyprian's letter 32 to Carthage. But this accident seems to have suggested the completion of his correspondence by adding to it any letters addressed to him that turned up.

#### GROUP F<sup>s</sup>.

In T there comes next, after *laud* 40, a group of four letters 78 79 76 77. 76 (to the bishops, clergy and laity in the mines) had already been given in the baptismal group. 77 78 79 are three replies to it.  $\mu$  omits 76, having given it already, and places 78 79 77 after the first three letters of D<sup>s</sup>. They do not occur in L N P, nor in Z C R. In B we find 76 79 78 77 after A<sup>s</sup>, with two stray letters intervening. In H B 77 78 79 are at the end, and  $\mu$  also repeats them at the end in this order. In Chelt. Turner restores 78 79 after C<sup>s</sup>. Mommsen and Harnack substitute (I think wrongly) 56 for the two. V has 77 78 only, omitting 79 and 76, though the latter was in two collections. M Q has placed 78 after E<sup>s</sup>, before *sent* and the remainder of C<sup>s</sup>. 76 with 70 at the end is obviously a fragment of C<sup>s</sup>.

#### GROUP G<sup>s</sup>.

After some sporadic letters, T gives 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29, and M Q has exactly the same. 53 is from Maximus and the confessors at Rome. It may or may not belong to the group. The rest are all addressed to Carthage, to the martyrs, clergy, laity, or to Bishop Caldonius, except 9, which is a reply to the Roman clergy. It is a Carthaginian collection. It does not occur in Chelt. L N P or H  $\beta$  B. E o  $\rho$  have the whole from M Q.  $\mu$  has dispersed the collection, if it was a collection, into 17 18; 16 15 29; 26 25; but it omits 53, 19 and 9. Z has taken and scattered from ( $\mu$ ) 25 17 18 26 29, and has inserted 14 and 16 into C<sup>s</sup>, as we saw. It has added at the end from V 14 16 15 18 29, of which 14 and 16 are duplicates<sup>1</sup>. V has all but 53 15 19. In O<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>5</sub> the group is perfect.

#### GROUP H<sup>s</sup>.

The remainder of T may be considered as one group for convenience: 27 23 24 21 22 8 35 36 33 49 50 34 41 42 80; after these come ten spurious treatises of which I take no account. Of these letters, M Q have not one. Except the last, 80, they are a fairly homogeneous group—mostly rather early letters. They no doubt represent the last gleaning of the African efforts to collect all that remained of the Cyprianic correspondence. 27 35 are to the Roman clergy; 33 is

<sup>1</sup> The duplicates at the end of Z are quoted by Hartel as z.

a notice about the lapsed; 34 is to the clergy of Carthage; 41 is to five bishops who represented St. Cyprian in Carthage during his concealment; 80 is the intimation to Successus of the publication of Valerian's edict. The remaining nine are none of them Cyprian's; 21 22 8 are not even addressed to him, and the last of these insults him. It was doubtless only when great interest had been aroused in the Saint's magnificent letters, that these letters connected with him were thought worth publishing.  $\mu$  has of these 49 50 and 27 35 41, and separately 33, then 23 24 22 8, at the end of all. 80 81 come probably from an independent source. Z has not 23 24 22 8, so that they were apparently not yet in ( $\mu$ ). But it gives 49 50 27 35 41 scattered, and also 34 which was no doubt in ( $\mu$ ). At the end it gives 33 from  $\mu$  or V, and 34 *dis* certainly from V. Z has also 80 81, and gives 81 in duplicate from V. V has 27 35 41 33 34, the same as Z ( $\mu$ ), but in a new order. It has 81 and not 80, while T has 80 and not 81. V has at the end 49 50, the only two of the group in C R.

#### THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE MSS.

WE have seen that in the treatises T h. Pem. give the same order, while in the whole group T has added ix iii 63 55 58; h therefore represents the parent of T. The order of (M Q) has, like T, only one point of difference from Pontius. The same is true of S W  $\mu$ , while L has two. There is no reason why these differences should be placed later than the third century. I have said the same with regard to the place of iii ix 65 55 58 in (T), (M Q), (L N P), respectively, while the early position of *laud* in M Q  $\mu$  Chelt. is before the middle of the fourth century, as we learn from Lucifer.

At the end of the first group (M Q) stopped, and added three *spuria*, probably not so very long after the appearance of those treatises. (T) and (h) added the eight letters to Cornelius, I think, independently. (T) added the eight letters of group D<sup>s</sup> and the baptismal group C<sup>r</sup>. (h) took only a part of D<sup>s</sup>, and a little later, for it took also a part of F<sup>s</sup> (viz. 78 79) *idola* and E<sup>s</sup> from (T), and stopped. (T) received E<sup>s</sup> (viz. 32 20 12), then *laud* and stopped; at least a spurious treatise usually implies the completion of a stage. (T) gives its collections so completely that it must have taken them early as they appeared. It had probably already got to this stage when *laud* was inserted in ( $\mu$ ) and Chelt., which had as yet only A<sup>s</sup>.

M Q are by their readings shown to be closely connected with T',

<sup>1</sup> The order of T (from Hartel, p. xxxix) is i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii ix iii 63 6 57 10 28 37 11 38 39 58 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 66 54 || 76 73 71 70 *sent* 74 69 67 64 2 || 32 20 12 || *laud* 40 || 78 79 76 77 || *idola* 30 31 || 70 5 7 14 4 || 56 3 72 12 || 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || 27 23 24 21 22 8 35 36 33 49



but in the letters only. Hartel thought their common parent had the order given in the index of M. We have seen already that T has preserved the groups far better than M Q. For instance, M Q have lost 66 out of D<sup>s</sup>, and have dropped the first four letters of C<sup>s</sup>, giving them later in pairs. They also separate 78 from the rest of F<sup>s</sup>. It is clear that the index of M is the index of the immediate parent of M Q, but that the archetype of M Q T had the order of T. The parent of M Q was a very old codex even when M (eighth to ninth century) copied it, as it had lost nine letters, viz. many sheets. It was probably much older than 700, the date suggested as the latest by Hartel. Justinus, who corrected letters 28 38 39 at Rome, probably had before him only the first stage of (M Q), as he corrects no farther. If his date was, as Dr. Sanday suggests, between the end of the fourth century and the middle of the sixth, this may give the earlier limit to the age of the complete (M Q).

This codex or type of codex (for there must often have been a whole 'edition' of a type, whether of three or four copies or of fifty) having reached its first halt *laud*, appears to have copied all its remaining contents from a MS (T)\*, which contained everything that T now contains, as far as H<sup>s</sup>, with the exception of the small group 70 *bis* 5 7 14 4. A careful examination will show that (M Q) has omitted nothing. It has copied 12 twice as in (T), but 76 and 70 only once. It has 66 40 together. It adds 75, the letter of Firmilian, which is found in no MSS but E and I, which are apographs of Q. Doubtless Hartel is right that (T) had 75, but that T omitted it as disedifying.

We may consider  $\mu$  next<sup>1</sup>. Taken as far as *idola*, it has exactly the

50 34 41 42 80 *Jud alcat ii mont. ad Vigil. vita resurrec. caena oratio oratio ii Passio* (T = tenth cent.). t (Paris 1648, thirteenth cent.) has almost the same.

The order of M Q (from Hartel, p. xxxiv) is i iv vi vii v x viii xi xii xiii ix iii 55 63 6 58 10 28 37 11 38 39 || *Jud alcat laud* || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 54 || 32 20 12 || 78 || *sent* 69 67 64 2 || 3 72 12 || (71 73 74 || 66 40 || 77 79 || 31 30 [Hartel calls it 36]) 75 || 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || 56 7 76 70 *idola* 4 *ii mont Pascha Oratio ii caena Passio*. The nine letters in brackets are wanting in M Q and their derivatives, but are given from the index of M. The sign || is introduced to mark the divisions of groups, or fragments of groups (M = ninth cent., Q eighth to ninth).

The original order of (h. Pem.) was as follows: i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 61 46 || 78 || 13 43 || 76 77 || *idola* 66 54 || 32 20 30. At present h (tenth cent.) breaks off in the middle of *idola*, and 30 is missing in Pem. (thirteenth-fourteenth cent.). But the Vatican MSS  $\gamma$  (lat. 201) and  $\delta$  (lat. 5099) and the Bologna MS 2572, all fifteenth cent., have 30.  $\delta$  adds a quantity more, from some other source. For this information I have to thank Dr. Mercati of the Vatican and the librarians of the Universities of Bologna (Dr. L. Frati) and Leyden. H (Paris, 15,282) as far as xiii is of the same family, and must have branched off from (h) before 500. See *Revue Bénéd.* for this month.

<sup>1</sup> The order of  $\mu$  (Hartel, p. xlvi) is as follows: i iv vi v vii viii xi x xii xiii ix iii 63 55 6 *laud* 10 28 37 11 38 39 58 || 76 73 71 70 *sent* 74 69 40 67 64 2 || 60 57 59 53

same contents as T taken up to *idola* 30 31, only that  $\mu$  has added 4, and does not give 76 in F<sup>s</sup> as well as in C<sup>s</sup>. Apparently  $\mu$  is not a descendant of T, but a brother; for though it has altered the order of the groups, it has not disturbed the order within each group. This could hardly be so, unless  $\mu$  and T both dealt with the groups as units out of which they independently formed their collections. Their close connexion with each other is shown by the fact that they received precisely the same groups, their independence by their receiving them in a different order. That  $\mu$  divides D<sup>s</sup> in two parts by inserting F<sup>s</sup> may be an indication that D<sup>s</sup> was not a single whole when ( $\mu$ ) and (T) took it. The inferiority of  $\mu$  is only apparent so far as this in the insertion of *laud* in A<sup>s</sup> and of 40 in C<sup>s</sup><sup>1</sup>.

$\mu$  continues by receiving 56 3 72 (rejecting 12, which it had already in E<sup>s</sup>). This confirms the restoration given above of (T)\*, a conjectured parent of M Q, which we assumed to similarly pass over 5 7 14 4.  $\mu$  has then 49 50 (from Cornelius), which occur near the end of T, then 48 (the ninth letter to Cornelius), and 62 (to Stephen), neither of which are possessed by T, and comes to a stop with two *spuria*. Last of all it adds a quantity of letters, all of which (except 81) are in T, and which represent apparently a part of the material out of which (T) formed its completer collection. 80 81 are probably from a different source, and also the repetition of F<sup>s</sup> (77 78 79). The conclusion is a flock of *spuria*.

Z has a far more corrupt order<sup>2</sup>. I have already said that the treatises seem to show a corruption all its own, and the omission of *laud* seems to indicate independence of ( $\mu$ ). But dependence on ( $\mu$ ) is proved in C<sup>s</sup> by the insertion of 40, and is suggested also by the presence of 48. The remainder seems to consist of *disiecta membra* of MSS such as ( $\mu$ ) and others. 7 and 34 are not in  $\mu$ ; the latter was perhaps in ( $\mu$ ). The additional nine letters at the end 81 36 14 16 15 18 29 34 43 are evidently all from V, as the order of some of them shows, and so are the preceding letters 67 *sent* 68 74, and doubtless others. All

45 47 44 51 || 13 43 65 || 78 79 77 || I 61 46 66 54 || 32 12 20 || 30 31 4 *idola* || 56 3 72 || 49 50 48 62 *spect. Turass.* 9 27 35 41 25 5 14 17 18 26 33 80 81 12 16 15 29 31 || 77 78 79 || 23 24 22 8 *vita ii mont ad Vigil. versiculi de caena (?) caena.* ( $\mu$  = fifteenth cent.). The same is found in Vat. lat. 197 and 198, and Palat. lat. 158, all fifteenth cent., and part in Vat. lat. 202, twelfth cent.

<sup>1</sup> The importance of  $\mu$  in its first stage is emphasized by its identity shown above with our best MS S, and with the excellent MS W; also with O<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>5</sub>.

<sup>2</sup> The order of Z (Hartel, p. xlvi) is as follows: i iv xi x viii v xii xiii vi vii 58 ix *idola* iii 63 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 14 76 71 70 16 69 40 64 2 || 57 59 47 45 44 49 50 54 48 51 || 13 43 I 61 46 66 || 41 25 27 80 81 5 17 ii *mont.* 7 12 20 18 26 4 || 73 71 70 || 29 34 72 9 35 56 55 *Ep. sp.* 57 *spect.* 32 27 33 67 *sent* 68 74 *Turass. ad Vigil. de pudic.* 81 36 14 16 15 18 29 34 43 (Z = fourteenth to fifteenth cent.).

but 36 and 15 are repetitions. It cannot be doubted that at the same time the whole MS was corrected according to the readings of V.

C R simply depend on (Z) for A<sup>s</sup> C<sup>s</sup> B<sup>s</sup> 13, i. e. as far as 13<sup>1</sup>. It would appear that (Z) possessed 15 and 60 52. The four letters 55 69 65 67 are of course copied from V. C adds *sent* 68 74 73 71 70 1 from V. Evidently (C R) was a copy made from (Z) about the time of its correction by V. The value of Z C R was always small, if their readings are as much corrupted as their order. The value of their testimony to V is now diminished, since Latini's collation of that lost MS has been discovered in the Vatican by Dr. G. Mercati. A copy of Latini's collation used by Fell is in the Bodleian<sup>2</sup>. The readings of Z C R are hardly likely to preserve any genuine variants not to be found in better MSS, except possibly in A<sup>s</sup>.

L N P<sup>3</sup>, called the first family by Hartel, appear to be another collection of the first four groups, but somewhat mixed. The order was given by Dom Ramsay in *J.T.S.*, July, 1902. Hartel thinks the additions in L N are from a corrupt member of the M Q T family. He notes that P has supplied 10 37 38 (probably ix also?) from a very interpolated MS, 58 from a better one, 69 from a codex of the C R type.

o simply depends on E (from M Q), P and C R, as shown in the foot-note<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The contents of C R (Hartel, p. 1) are as follows: [i iv xiii xi vi 58 v vii viii xii x ix] *idola* iii 63 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 14 76 70 16 15 40 64 2 || 57 59 60 [52] 47 45 44 49 50 || 13 || 55 69 65 67. R adds 4 *versus passio*. C omits all in brackets and adds *sent* 68 74 73 71 70 1 (C R both ninth cent.).

<sup>2</sup> I found it last year in the margin of Rigaltius's Cyprian, shelf-mark T 12 11 Jur. It was made at Rome by a Mr. Rigby.

<sup>3</sup> The contents of L N P are A<sup>s</sup>, B<sup>s</sup> + 48-51, C<sup>s</sup>, D<sup>s</sup>-54, with 56 3 *idola* 40 (L = ninth cent., N = tenth, P = ninth).

The MS X which belonged to Lord Crawford (Rylands Library, Manchester) is of the L N P family, independent of all three. It has (so Mr. Turner informs me) 39 67 10 69 b || iii 63 6 55 28 37 11 38 || 76 73 71 70 *sent* 3 74 69 a 64 2 || 72 || 12 32 20 || 13 43 65 52 1 56 3 *bis* || 47 45 44 || 61 46 || 40 4 || 57 59 || 48 51 54 60 *idola*. The four letters 39 67 10 69 b at the beginning, and 48 60 *idola* at the end, are obviously additions to supply omissions. Of these omissions some are peculiar to X, some are paralleled by L, N, or P. E<sup>s</sup> and 72 appear earlier than in L N, and so do 40 4. The rest is identical with (L N P), except the accidental insertion of 3 in C<sup>s</sup>, at a point where 67 and 69 b have got left out, and 69 a and 74 are incomplete, owing perhaps to some disturbance of gatherings or loss of sheets in the parent. Vat. lat. 203, twelfth cent., contains vii viii x xi xiii and parts of v. This seems to be a fragment of the order of L.

<sup>4</sup> The order of o (Hartel, p. xxxviii) is: [i x ix 37 38 10 v vii viii xi xii iv vi] || 30 || [60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 60 (so Hartel for 61 1) 46 54 || 32 20 12 || 78 || 67 64 2 || 3] [14 49 50 68] [75 (beginning only) 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 56 7 76 *idola* 4 ii *mons*] [6 55 28 39 58 69 b 48 66 40 63]. Hartel remarks

The Cheltenham list<sup>1</sup> is compared with LNP by Harnack, and with  $\mu$  by Turner. It is closely connected with both of them.

B has got much disarranged<sup>2</sup>. The connexion of 40 with 67 as a fragment of C<sup>s</sup> shows connexion with  $\mu$ . But the presence of 76 with F<sup>s</sup> instead of C<sup>s</sup> is against dependence on  $\mu$ . The contents are A<sup>s</sup> B<sup>s</sup> C<sup>s</sup> D<sup>s</sup>, with a few omissions, but all the groups more or less shattered, and the vagrant letters 30, 40 (in C<sup>s</sup>), 72, 4 (with *idola*, as  $\mu$  M Q), and 56 3 at the end, which connect themselves with 72 and 4. It therefore contains none of the later groups. It may possibly be a corruption of an independent collection of the groups it contains. The loss of 55 recalls H B or C R, and the position of 72 is a parallel to its probable place in Chelt.

H and  $\beta$ <sup>3</sup> differ only in the treatises, H having copied (h), while  $\beta$  appears to retain the order of the parent. The contents are A<sup>s</sup>

that o in copying E has omitted *nescio quo casu* 69 72 12 70 and part of 75. The omission of 12 is easily accounted for, as T M Q E give it twice, o only once. Probably o thought 75 disedifying, and stopped in the middle. Hartel adds that o took 14 48 49 50 68 69b from a CR codex. No doubt he is right about 14 49 50 68. But 48 is not in C R at all! And o numbers it iii as L does. The position of 69 suggests that it is not from C R. Hartel says that the treatises are from P, *immutato ordine* (which means obviously 'in unchanged order,' though the word *immutatus* is ambiguous), and also the letters 6 28 39 55 58 63. I assume that i-vi and 6-63 = P; 60-3, 75-ii *mont* = E; 14-68 = C R, as bracketed above.

<sup>1</sup> The Cheltenham list is restored by Mommsen and Harnack from the Cheltenham MS (I have lost a note made at Cheltenham some years ago, but I think the MS is now at Brussels), and from one at St. Gall, thus: i iv vi xi x v xiii viii xii ix vii iii 55 63 6 *laud* 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 73 71 70 *sent* 74 72 (or 68) 64 69 67 2 || 56 40 66 || 12 32 20 30 *Jud. viij epist. ad Corn. vita.* C. H. Turner (*Stud. Bibl.* vol. iii) gave 78 79 instead of 56, and 54 for 12. The latter change is certainly wrong, the former is perhaps right, but I cannot discuss the question here. (A. D. 359.)

<sup>2</sup> B has (Hartel, p. lvi): i iv vi v viii x xiii xi xii vii ix iii 63 30 6 28 37 *laud* 10 11 58 || 46 12 || 76 79 78 77 || 32 20 || 59 52 47 45 44 51 60 57 || 55 38 39 || 40 67 || 43 65 || 73 71 70 *sent* 72 74 69 64 2 || 1 61 54 66 || 4 *idola Jud.* 56 3 *caena oratio* (eleventh cent.). A MS at Lincoln Coll. (Fell's Linc.), no. 47, is said to give the same order, and was copied from one 'described by Bandini i 268, viz. MS Laurent. plut. 16 cod. 22,' so Benson, p. 548, on the authority of Bp. John Wordsworth. The Lincoln MS is fifteenth century. Vat. lat. 195 and 196, both fifteenth century, have the same order.

<sup>3</sup> The order of H  $\beta$  (Hartel, p. lvii) is:

H i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii ix iii

$\beta$  i iv vi v vii viii xi xii xiii x ix *laud* iii

H $\beta$ : 55 6 28 37 11 38 39 58 || 73 71 70 63 76 74 69 40 67 64 2 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 || 13 43 65 66 || 4 3 72 || 61 1 46 56 54 || 20 30 31 12 || 77 78 79 || 32 51, H adds *idola* 10 ii *mont Jud* 80 *caena*;  $\beta$  adds *Sp. Ep. Corn. idola* 80 10 81. The placing of 30 31 between 20 and 12, and both immediately after 54, suggests a corruption of  $\mu$ . But this may be accidental, as it was natural to place the replies 30 31 near the letters of Cyprian connected with them. Ottobon 80 (fifteenth cent.) and O<sub>2</sub> have

(-55 10), C<sup>s</sup> (-sent + 40), B<sup>s</sup> (-51), D<sup>s</sup> (complete, but scattered), E<sup>s</sup> (+ 31 32), F<sup>s</sup>, 51 is added at the end,  $\beta$  has supplied 10 in an appendix. 56, 3, 72, 4 are also present. Thus only the earlier groups are given. The position of 4 implies dependence on  $\mu$ .

There is every reason to place the date of the collection in B and H $\beta$  (but not their order) before the gathering up of the last fragments which made up the collections which I have called G<sup>s</sup> and H<sup>s</sup>; but the order has become very much disturbed. The importance of H $\beta$  is greater when we recognize that they are from the same parent as the fragments called F, which are of the fifth or sixth century. Of these I need say nothing, as they were fully described by Mr. Turner in July last.

It is not worth while to discuss the lists of other MSS in detail. I<sup>1</sup> is said by Hartel to have taken 60-51 and 16-76 from E. The order suggests that 46-12 are also from E. The intermediate letters are all in E, and 75 can hardly have come from anywhere else. When Hartel says they are 'from elsewhere,' one must suppose an intermediate MS between E and I, which borrowed readings from elsewhere.

$\rho$  and i<sup>2</sup> depend on o, according to Hartel, from 37 to 40, except for two *spuria*. The additions at the commencement are all to supply omissions, except 69 70 72 which are not in o; therefore it is natural to suppose that they were all taken from some other source.

r<sup>3</sup> is simply a corruption of  $\mu$ , except the treatises, which are in quite random order, but which appear to be taken from an early collection or first volume, possessing neither iii nor ix, probably of B family.

Of the English MSS, as given by Dr. Sanday (*Stud. Bibl.* iii, p. 283, cp. *Old Lat. Bibl. Texts*, vol. ii, app. ii):

O<sub>2</sub> for the treatises =  $\beta$ <sup>4</sup>. The letters are exactly = T. Thus it is exactly the converse of H, whose treatises = T, and whose letters =  $\beta$ . As O<sub>2</sub> is of the same date as T, its readings may be just as valuable,

the treatises in the order of  $\beta$ . Ottobon 600 (fourteenth cent.) is a selection from  $\beta$ . Paris 1650 and 1655 are of the same family. A MS at Caius College has v iv vii viii xi xii xiii ix *laud* x i, from  $\beta$  (no. 114, dated Feb. 21, 1432).

<sup>1</sup> The order of I (twelfth cent., Hartel, p. xxxvii) is as follows: vii i x xiii xii viii xii *abus anac si mont idola carnis pasch* || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 69 70 || 72 75 || *sent* 64 2 || 4 13 3 67 || 65 1 43 46 || 53 54 || 32 20 12 || 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || 56 7 76 || 61 78 *oratio oratio si passio*. The inscription of 12 calls it the first of a series of thirteen letters to the Romans! What this may mean, I cannot guess.

<sup>2</sup> The order of  $\rho$  and i is given by Hartel, p. lvii. The order of the treatises has been already spoken of.

<sup>3</sup> For order of r see Hartel, p. xlvi.

<sup>4</sup> The order of O<sub>2</sub> is as described, except that where T has 5 7 14 4, O<sub>2</sub> has 7 5 4 14. (Fell's Bod. 1; MS Laud Misc. 451.)

and it would be good for some one who can spare the time to examine whether it is brother, son, or father to T.

O<sub>3</sub> gives exactly the order of T for all it contains<sup>1</sup>. There is no reason to connect it with M Q. It is strange that Dr. Sanday should have noticed the likeness of this MS to H, and not to T.

O<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>5</sub><sup>2</sup> give for the treatises the order of μ, next come a few odd letters, including the tail of C<sup>s</sup> as in μ, 40 67 64 2. Then comes B<sup>s</sup> complete, D<sup>s</sup> (-54), 4 *idola* 56 3 72, then most of A<sup>s</sup>, with another fragment of C<sup>s</sup> in the middle of it; then some letters which had been omitted, and E<sup>s</sup> (= 20 32), and G<sup>s</sup> complete, *spuria* and some vagabonds. No trace of H<sup>s</sup>.

Fell's Bod. 3<sup>3</sup> is a corrupt descendant of (M Q); but my own examination of it suggests that it has not come through E, though Mr. Madan told Archbishop Benson that it follows Q as against M.

The preceding inquiry has already reached an inordinate length. It can be pursued further by examining the order in which the *spuria* appear. But it can only have solid value by a combination with the study of the readings of the MSS.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

<sup>1</sup> O<sub>3</sub> (MS Laud 105) end of eleventh cent. (Sanday), tenth or eleventh (Madan). Mr. Madan told Archbp. Benson that it 'seems to be a selection from T M, and to agree with the first corrector of T'; see Benson, p. 207 note, and p. 548. There is no reason to connect it with M Q at all. It contains only i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii ix iii 63 6 58 *laud idola Jud aleat*. Fell calls it Bod. 4.

<sup>2</sup> O<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>5</sub> (= Bodl. cod. 210, Fell's Bod. 2, and New Coll. 130, both twelfth cent.) have the following order (Sanday, *Stud. Bibl.* p. 283); i iv vi v vii viii xi x xii xiii ix iii 55 [74 69] || 40 67 64 2 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 66 || 4 *idola* || 56 3 72 || 58 63 6 || 76 73 (71) *sent* || 28 37 38 39 || 70 *spuria* 79 || 20 32 || 47 *bis* 54 78 75 || 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || *spuria* [31] (47 31 74 69). The treatises = S W μ. The numbers in square brackets are in O<sub>4</sub> only, those in round brackets in O<sub>5</sub> only. The likeness to T (before it got H<sup>s</sup>) seems very close, though A<sup>s</sup> and C<sup>s</sup> have got scattered. I suggest that it descends from the parent of B, and borrowed the end (from 47, or earlier), from (M Q), as the position of 75 next before G<sup>s</sup> suggests. F<sup>s</sup> has lost 77 altogether in its dispersion, unless 47 is a misprint for 77. An MS at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (xxv, fifteenth cent.) has the same order.

<sup>3</sup> MS Laud 217, fifteenth cent., not given in *Stud. Bibl.* It contains vi vii v x viii xi xii xiii ix iii 55 63 6 58 10 28 11 38 39 || *Jud aleat laud* || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 54 || 32 20 12 || 78 || 37 i 69 *idola carmen*. The parent had probably lost the first pages. iv is altogether missing, i is added at the end with 37, which had been overlooked. Brussels 921, sixteenth cent., is also from M Q, in part.