

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]

how he set out for Spain. Any account of the Spanish journey must have been short; there is just a possibility that some retrospective reference to it may have been introduced into the body of the book.

The detailed narrative evidently began nearer the writer's own home in Asia. The story of Anchaes is quite likely to have been the first of its kind in the book (it occurs on the ninth page of the manuscript). Then follow Thecla, Hermocrates, the Sidonian and Tyrian episodes, and then the gap. Into this must be fitted the fight with beasts at Ephesus, Paul in the mines¹, Paul at Jerusalem, and then a return westward, which brings Paul to Philippi and to Athens, as I believe (for I still hold to the speech in John of Salisbury as a citation of the *Acta*). Whether this intervened between the prophecy of Cleobius and Myrte and the *Martyrium*, we can hardly tell.

It is quite likely that I have missed some points which would put this theory out of court completely and in a moment. I cannot say that I am a decided supporter of it: I only put forward the suggestion of its possibility, and ask that it may be entertained along with others. I should like to add an expression of the warm admiration which I, in common with all students, feel for the way in which Dr Carl Schmidt has brought order out of chaos in dealing with the mass of fragments to which his manuscript had been reduced.

M. R. JAMES.

PROLEGOMENA TO THE *TESTIMONIA* OF ST CYPRIAN.

ON two points there can be no division of opinion among patristic students: the importance of the evidence of St Cyprian and especially of his book of 'Testimonies' to the earliest form of the Latin Bible, and the unsatisfactory nature of the only critical edition, that of Hartel (A. D. 1868) in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*.

Hartel used for the *Testimonia* only five MSS, A (Sessorianus Iviii in the library of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme: now 2106 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele), B (Bamberg 476), L (Vienna 962: originally at Lorsch), M (Munich 208), W (Würzburg theol. 145): and of these he pinned his faith predominantly to A, which appeared to him to give the most consistent text, though he carefully guarded himself from

¹ With reference to this story, I should like to suggest the possibility that Frontina is dead, and that the casting down over the precipice was a local mode of burial.

asserting that it was the true one. Subsequent research has proved beyond the shadow of doubt that the biblical text is best preserved in L, worst in some ways in A; and these facts alone would seem to make a new edition imperative. For such an edition preparations have been made, during some time past, under Dr Sanday's direction at Oxford: Dr Mercati has been called into consultation, and has provided us with all the material that can be recovered (and he has recovered a great deal) as to the readings of the lost Verona MS (V), together with rough collations—which he wishes specially to say are not to be considered more than very rough collations—of the two Vatican MSS R (Vat. Reginae 116) and T (Vat. Reg. 118): I myself have recollated A at Rome and L with photographs, and have added a collation of P (Paris lat. 1647 A)¹, a sister MS of L: for the first few chapters of the third book I collated at Troyes Q (Trecensis 581), the sister MS of M, and I have also a good many notes of the Oxford MS O (Bodleianus Add. C 15: for those from the first two Books I am myself responsible, but most of those from the third are due to other hands). The readings of the Morbach-Crawford MS X (now at Manchester, and apparently inaccessible) I derive from my own copy of the collation made by a friend during Lord Crawford's ownership, when the MS was deposited by his kindness at the Bodleian.

Partly because it will be a long time before the Oxford edition appears, and partly because it is useful, before finally deciding on the readings of individual passages, to put something like a general conspectus of parallel cases into shape, I have determined to publish in the *JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* some provisional results, together with the evidence that appears to support them. It must be understood that both these results and the evidence for them are here given quite in the rough, and are liable on maturer reflection and further knowledge to modification: but even with this proviso, they may I hope prove of some assistance to students of the early Latin Bible. The present instalment confines itself entirely to the formulae of quotation.

With regard to the relative importance here attached to the various MSS, it may perhaps be necessary to state that there seems to be some danger of excess in the reaction from Hartel's estimates now generally prevailing. That L gives by far the best biblical text there is, as I have said, no doubt at all: but I believe that the scribe compensated for his faithfulness in that respect to his exemplar by allowing himself some licence of alteration in other respects, and that in particular he is no safe guide in the formulae of quotation. That A gives a systematically revised bible text (especially in the Psalms, and

¹ It should be noted here once for all that P is deficient from near the beginning of *Test.* ii 20 to the end of the preface to Book iii (Hartel 87. 19-101. 19).

also in several other books), there is again no doubt: but in **other** matters, and particularly in the orthography of proper names—**where** Hartel often does not cite its evidence at all—I believe that **is not** infrequently right against all the other MSS put together. Nor is **this** really strange, seeing that, apart from the lost Verona MS, A is in **fact** the earliest of all our MSS (a date between 700 and 750 A.D. cannot be far wrong¹) and except N the only Italian one: LX (and perhaps O) come from the Rhine country, B M W from Germany, P Q R T from France.

The MSS used may be approximately classified according to dates as follows:—

Seventh century: V (probably).

Eighth century: A (first half of the century): W (probably): X: Q (second half of the century).

Ninth century: L: M: R.

Tenth century: O: P: T.

Eleventh century: B.

§ I. FORMULAE OF QUOTATION FOR OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS.

In **Genesi** 51. 22: 67. 7: 68. 11: 74. 9: 83. 7 &c.²

In **Exodo** 38. 22: 67. 14: 80. 2: 83. 13 &c.

In **Leuitico** (**Leuuitico**) 126. 7: 173. 12: 176. 10 [in 173. 17, 19 and 174. 2 the title 'in Leuitico' should be struck out of the text altogether]. The spelling 'in Leuuitico' is constant in A, and is perhaps right: in 173. 12 it is supported also by P.

In **Numeris** 55. 8: 74. 18: 88. 15³.

In **Deuteronomio** 39. 6: 55. 10: 82. 16.

Apud Iesu Nave 45. 15: 82. 17: 86. 7. There can be no doubt that 'Iesu' is the right reading, for it is supported in each place by A L M, in the two former places by O, and in the two latter places by the Erasmian edition and *ex silentio* by V: Hartel with the other MSS reads 'Iesum'. In 45. 15 A has 'Nauae'.

In **libro Iudicium** 39. 7.

With regard to the book of Ruth, it may be noted that it is included under the general title of 'the Law': for in 86. 8-11, 'erat enim in lege,

¹ This was the strong impression left on me as I collated it. Mai dated it in the seventh century: Reifferscheid eighth to ninth. But Reifferscheid as often as not dates pre-Caroline MSS a century too late.

² All references are to the pages and lines of Hartel's edition. For those who do not happen to have that edition at command, it may be mentioned that Book i commences on p. 37, Book ii on p. 60, Book iii on p. 101.

³ From here onwards I content myself, in cases where the reading and spelling is certain, with some three references for each book.

ut quisque nuptias recusaret calciamentum deponeret, calciaretur uero ille qui sponsus futurus esset', the reference is to Ruth iv 7, 8.

In **Basilion** [primo]¹ 50. 17: 53. 9: 83. 17, 20: 117. 2: 142. 14: 146. 4: 157. 2.

In **Basilion** [secundo] 49. 7: 75. 20.

In **Basilion** [tertio] 40. 6: 167. 1: 173. 6.

The reading 'Basilion' in all these cases is indubitably correct: though in all but three of them (83. 17, 20: 167. 1) Hartel reads 'Regnorum'. Substantially he followed the practice of his favourite MS A, which reads 'Basilion' only once (83. 17); 'Regnorum' in full in 40. 6, 49. 7, 75. 20, 117. 2; Regñ in 83. 20, 142. 14, 146. 4, 157. 2; Reg in 50. 17, 53. 9, 173. 6; 'Genesi' in 167. 1 and originally (but the correction is made by the same hand) in 173. 6: it would seem that its exemplar must have used some abbreviation of Regnorum such as RGN, which must have puzzled the scribe and suggested Genesi. 'Basilion' is the invariable reading of the other MSS: the only exception that I have noted is that R has 'regnorum' in 83. 17, 20. T sometimes has the spelling 'Basileon'.

In **Paralipomenon** 142. 3. R spells 'Paralypomenon'.

In **Hesdra** 40. 11: 166. 8. So spelt in 40. 11 by ALPBV, in 166. 8 by LPT: the evidence in the former instance seems conclusive, but in the latter 'Esdra' may be right. The first passage comes from Nehemiah ix 26 [= 2 Esdras xix 26]: the second apparently is a reference to Ezra (= 2 Esdras) x 3².

In **Machabeis** 117. 6: 128. 9: 151. 2: 155. 15. In 117. 6 A has the striking variant, not noted by Hartel, 'in Macchabeorum', which would bring the formula of quotation for these books into line with 'in Basilion' 'in Paralipomenon': but it is quite unsupported either by the other MSS, or by A itself in other places, and I have not ventured to adopt it. In 151. 2 Hartel has followed WM in reading 'in Daniele': but ALPVROTX all cite the Maccabees, and in fact the words that follow are not a general allusion to the book of Daniel, but a definite quotation of 1 Macc. ii 59 'Annianus Azarias Misahel credentes³ liberati sunt de flamma'. As between the forms 'Macchabeis' 'Machabeis' 'Macchabaeis' 'Machabaeis' it is not easy to decide, for no one of our leading MSS appears to be consistent. V leans to the double c, ALO to the single c: with regard to the penultimate syllable, a is inserted in one (but only one) of the four quotations by AOPV respectively. Probably -eis is right, rather than -aeis: but as between Macchabeis and Machabeis the choice can only be provisional.

¹ For a discussion of the genuineness of the further references to the individual books, 'primo' 'secundo' 'tertio', see below in § 5 of these Prolegomena.

² Or perhaps the equivalent passages in 1 Esdras, viii 90, ix 36.

³ Hartel is in error in saying that L adds 'deo' after 'credentes'.

{ **Apud Tobiam** 109. 4: 166. 4: in both cases without variant.
 { **In Tobia** 53. 16: 119. 21. In the first of these two instances there is no variant; and in the second, though there are several variants in the minor MSS ('ad Tobiam' O, 'in Tobiam' B, 'in Tobian' M R), there can be no doubt as to the true reading.

{ **Apud Iob** 108. 24¹: 118. 21: 127. 3: 156. 6: 182. 5.
 { **In Iob** 173. 7. The only variant is W* 'in Iobus'.

In psalmo 1, &c.²

Apud Solomonem 41. 17 (Prov.): [53. 21 (Wisdom)]: 118. 15 (Ecclus.): 122. 12 (Eccl.): 125. 19 (Ecclus.): 143. 16 (Eccl.): 181. 21 (Ecclus.). In the latter passage there may be some doubt of the reading, since L P T omit the words 'apud Solomonem': but they are found in A W B M O R V X, and are perhaps genuine.

item apud eundem 155. 10 (from Wisdom to Proverbs): 155. 11 (to Ecclesiastes)³: 155. 12 (to Ecclus.).

apud Solomonem in paroemiis 62. 3: 64. 8: 120. 9: 154. 4: 168. 9: 173. 9: 176. 17: 179. 15: 180. 15: 181. 2. Also **apud eundem in paroemiis** 110. 3.

apud Solomonem in ecclesiaste 174. 6. So L T² (T* ecclesiastes, W ecclesiasten), and this is probably right, for the quotation actually comes from Eccl. x 9, 10. Omission of the two words 'in ecclesiaste' would be attractive, but is supported by X alone: and X towards the end of Book iii systematically omits anything after 'apud Solomonem'. A B M O P R V read 'in ecclesiastico'.

apud Solomonem in ecclesiastico 147. 18: 154. 11: 164. 17: 177. 7: 178. 2: 181. 5. Also **apud eundem in ecclesiastico** 62. 14: 176. 18. Of these 164. 17 really belongs to Ecclesiastes (v 9).

apud Solomonem in sapientia 109. 20: 155. 9. The former of these two quotations comes from Prov. xix 17, and accordingly W B M Q T read 'apud Solomonem in paroemiis': but L P O R X read 'apud Salomonem in sapientia' (sapientiam R), and this is borne out by A 'in sapientia Solomonis'. V appears to read 'apud Solomonem' without addition.

in sapientia Solomonis 79. 11: 119. 22: 128. 2: 128. 13: 134. 4: 156. 17: 158. 21: 160. 7. Oddly enough, no less than three of these eight quotations (119. 22: 128. 13: 156. 17) belong really to the Book of Proverbs; not to mention the doubt as to what passage is meant to be cited in 134. 4.

¹ A has 'in Iob'; but the substitution of 'in' for 'apud' is one of its commonest errors, see p. 259 below, and it is quite unsupported here.

² For the quotations from the Psalms see further in § 4 of these Prolegomena, p. 264.

³ 'item apud eundem' is the reading here of L (Hartel gives the reading of L wrongly) P R T W X, and is undoubtedly right.

in sapientia 168. 18. This is the right reading, given by L P V R O T W B: 'apud Solomonem in paroemiis' occurs earlier in the chapter (168. 10), but two citations from the Psalms intervene. The instances next following will shew that, where the name of Solomon has preceded without interval, such a formula is not uncommon.

in ecclesiastico 181. 10 (in 181. 13, 16, the same words recur in Hartel's text, following A, but are not genuine), after 'apud Solomonem in ecclesiastico'.

item in paroemiis 164. 18 (after 'apud Solomonem in ecclesiastico'). Similarly in **paroemiis eiusdem** 134. 6 (after 'in sapientia Solomonis'): V B O omit eiusdem.

item in ecclesiastico 110. 8 (after 'item in paroemiis', see just above): 176. 19 (after 'apud eundem in ecclesiastico').

In regard to orthography, the spelling Solomon is universal in A, with I think only one exception 128. 13 'in sapientia Salomonis'. On 53. 21 Hartel notes that W regularly gives Solomon: and the same is, I think, true of P. L (always) and X (usually) give Salomon: but the evidence of the latter is *ex silentio*, as Salomon is always given in Hartel's text. As far as we can gather from Latini's procedure, V must have consistently given Solomon. For orthographical purposes the evidence of A V W P far outweighs that of L X, and I have no hesitation in giving 'Solomon' as St Cyprian's reading throughout.

'Paroemiis' is the form I have printed above as St Cyprian's equivalent for Παροιμίαις. A deserts us here, as it regularly substitutes 'prouerbiis': from the fact that Hartel in the later chapters of book iii gives no variant in his apparatus, it must not be deduced that the other MSS begin to agree with A, but only that Hartel tired of recording their difference. Outside of A there is absolutely no early evidence in the MSS of St Cyprian for 'in prouerbiis', except that Latini records it in his marginal notes on several occasions from 164. 18 onwards: and it is possible that the erratic MS V, which tried one variant 'in parabolis' in 154. 4, and omitted the word altogether in 120. 9 and 176. 17, experimented also on 'in prouerbiis': but Dr Mercati thinks it likely that Latini was here drawing on a secondary MS of his which agreed in its type of text with A.

Unfortunately the defection of A makes the decision in the question of orthography sensibly more difficult. V perhaps gave in general paroemiis, as Latini has noted no variant: and perhaps Hartel's apparatus may be trusted as evidence that W uses the same spelling. R too has paroemiis, except on one or two occasions (62. 3: 173. 9), where it gives paroemis: O is divided about equally between the two forms paroemiis and paroemis. Our other MSS all introduce the aspirate: P invariably reads parhoemiis (and this is the form given

in the Quirinian fragment, on which see just below, in 134. 6), L as invariably parhoemis: the first hand of T generally agrees with L, the second invariably with P. The Crawford MS, X, finds the word particularly puzzling, and rings various changes, until it solves the problem by omitting the word: 62. 3 parhemis X* paranomis X²; 64. 8 parohemis: 110. 3 paremiis X*, paroemiis X²: 134. 6 proemiis: 154. 4 parohemis: 164. 18 p̄remis: 168. 9, and always from this point onwards, X omits.

Apud Esaïam 40. 16, &c. 'Esaïam' appears to be the regular spelling of the MSS, though R commonly writes 'Esaian' or (towards the end of the third book) 'Isaian', and T* in the first two books 'Aeseian': and the final n may possibly be original. The Quirinian fragment of portions of chapters 16-20 of Book III of the *Testimonia*, Hartel 132. 4-135. 21, 136. 28-138. 6 (discovered by Dr Mercati at Brescia and published by him in his *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano*, Rome, A. D. 1899, pp. 49-54) gives 'Eseiā' in 134. 7.

Apud Hieremiam 39. 20: 41. 7: 42. 14: 45. 9: 46. 19: 48. 21: 55. 15: 69. 5: 74. 17: 80. 17: 85. 13: 87. 17: 91. 6: 121. 2: 121. 19: 144. 3: 146. 20: 156. 18: 168. 8: 182. 13. 'Apud Hieremiam' is invariable in A L¹: X, except in the latter half of the third book, consistently gives 'Ieremiam', and this is also not uncommon in P. R T again have predominantly a final n 'apud Hieremian' ('Ieremian' V in 41. 7, M in 85. 13, T* in 69. 5, 87. 17).

{ **Apud Ezechielem** 48. 17: 153. 12: 158. 15.

{ **Apud Ezechiel** 55. 11: 90. 6.

The double form, with and without case-ending, is surprising in so consistent a writer as St Cyprian: but the evidence appears to point unmistakably to it. At any rate no single MS gives the same form in all the five instances: while A L P W X supports the readings adopted above. The insertion of the aspirate (Ezechihelem, Ezechihel) receives no support from our earliest MSS.

48. 17 Ezechielem A P X Ezechihelem L B: Ezechielum *Latini* (and therefore probably V, see on 90. 6): Ezechiel M O T Ezechihel R.

55. 11 Ezechiel A V P X W M B O T Ezechihel L: Ezechielum R.

90. 6 Ezechiel A W M B O T X Ezechihel L R: Ezechielum V.

153. 12 Ezechielem A L P O T W X: Ezechielum R: Ezechiel M: Ezechiam B.

158. 15 Ezechielem A L P M² W O R T X: Ezechielum *Latini* (and so probably V) M*: Ezechihel B.

It will be noted that three times out of five V seems to have read 'Ezechielum': and it is conceivable that this should be restored in all

¹ Except, of course, where A wrongly substitutes the ablative 'in Hieremia'; on which see below at the end of their section.

cases, and that the variants 'Ezechielem', 'Ezechiele' represent two separate attempts to get rid of an unfamiliar form. This solution would bring the use for Ezekiel into harmony with that for Daniel, where I have with some hesitation adopted Danihelum throughout.

Apud Danihelum 42. 14: 84. 5: 92. 17: 121. 13. Here (unlike the last name) the extra aspirate in the middle of the word is well supported, by A ⁴/₄, L ³/₄, W ²/₃, R ⁴/₄. With regard to the termination, only once (84. 5) is there any real evidence for the indeclinable form: 'Danihelum' (Danielem) can claim good authority in the other three instances: while 'Danihelum' (Danielum) has each time a small but weighty group in its favour, consisting generally of AM*R and Latini, i. e. probably V.

42. 14 Danihelum AR Danielum *Latini*: Danihelum T Danielem LPMBOX.

84. 5 Danihelum AM*R Danielum *Latini*: Danihelum OP: Danihel LB Daniel X.

92. 17 Danihelum R Danielum M* *Latini*: Danihelum ALOWX Danielem T: Daniel B.

121. 13 Danihelum R (in Danihelo A) Danielum M*: Danihelum LPWMBO Danielem TX.

Apud Osee 51. 24: 69. 15: 92. 6: 110. 19: 152. 13. In spite of the defection of A, this should probably be accepted as the right form of the name, as the following table will shew:

51. 24 Osee LPOR T: Osee WM: Ossee A: Ossee X.

69. 15 Osee VLP MOR* T WX: Osee A: Osee R*.

92. 6 Osee MT WX: Osee ALO: Osee R.

110. 19 Osee MPTW: Osee LO: Ossee A: Osee X (R in this and the following passage has Esaiam).

152. 13 Osee LPMOT WX: Osee A.

Apud Amos 91. 3.

Apud Micheam 46. 10: 77. 4. The final n is given in both places by the first hands of M and T.

Apud Iohel 85. 10. V reads Ioelem, and R Loth **.

Apud Ambacum 43. 16: 89. 3: 151. 1. Besides the LXX form 'Ambacum' and the Vulgate form 'Abbacuc', almost every possible combination of the two forms finds a place in the Cyprianic MSS.

43. 16 Ambacum VMPT* O*: Abbacum A: Abacum L: Ambacum R*: Abacum R*X: Abbacum O*.

89. 3 Ambacum VM* T* WX: Abacum *ut uid* O*: Abbacum A: Ambacum RT*: Abacum L.

151. 1 Ambacum VLP* XM* TW: Abbacum A: Abbacum R: *om* O.

Apud Sofoniam 153. 5: 165. 2: 180. 10. This, the regular spelling of AP(T)X, must be preferred to the Sophoniam of L.

Apud Zachariam 69. 9 : 78. 16 : 82. 13 : 88. 12 : 96. 15. Apart from minor variants (Zacchariam A in 96. 15 : Iachariam P in 69. 9), the only point to note is the final n, which appears in 69. 9 T*, 82. 13 R T*, 88. 12 T*, 96. 15 W M R T*.

Apud Malachiam 50. 7 : 94. 22 : 97. 3 : 114. 16 : 157. 15. For Malachian the authorities are in 94. 22 and 97. 3 M T* R (and in 114. 16 Q). In 94. 22 W reads Malachym. Much more interesting is the variant Malachiel. But in spite of the sporadic occurrence of this form in early writers (Commodian, Lactantius, the Latin Irenaeus, the biblical catalogues of the council of Damasus in 382 and of the codex Claromontanus, the Speculum), it is not genuine in the *Testimonia*. Of the five passages above enumerated, it is found only once and that in one of our later MSS, 97. 3 B: significantly enough, the passages where it does occur in good MSS—68. 3 A W M T and 138. 19 W—are interpolations, though doubtless very early ones¹. On the other hand, in the *de dominica oratione* ch. 35 the name Malachi occurs in the nominative, and the authorities in Hartel's apparatus are divided between Malachin (S W) and Malachiel (V G). Whichever of the two is correct, we have here a curious diversity of usage between the *Testimonia* and the other treatises.

Taking the passages from the prophets as a whole, two general cautions must be given with regard to Hartel's edition. (1) The addition 'prophetam' frequently found there ('apud Esaïam prophetam' 'apud Hieremiam prophetam', and so on) is in no case genuine, but is one of the peculiarities of the text of A. (2) Similarly the readings 'in Esaïa' 'in Hieremia', &c., found often in Hartel in the latter part of the *Testimonia*, are another freak of A. The rule is absolute for the Prophets that 'apud' with the accusative introduces the quotation: just as, on the other hand, for quotations from books which have no personal title, the invariable preposition is 'in', 'in Genesi' 'in Exodo' 'in Sapientia' 'in Ecclesiastico' 'in libro Iudicum'; or with libro omitted 'in Basilion' 'in Paralipomenon'. The combination of the two prepositions where both personal and impersonal title are given is illustrated by the phrases 'apud Solomonem in paroemiis' 'apud Solomonem in sapientia'. Difficulty in applying the principle only arises with books that are historical in character but bear a personal name for their title: and in these cases St Cyprian's practice is not wholly consistent. The book of Joshua is always 'apud Iesu Naue': but the books of Ezra and the Maccabees are 'in Hesdra' 'in Machabeis'. Job is generally 'apud Iob', but once 'in Job' (173. 7), probably by a slip of the pen: for Tobit 'apud Tobiam' and 'in Tobia' are each found twice.

¹ The passage 68. 3 is not found in L P [V] R B O X: the other is found only in W.

The instances are very rare where the author of the book is cited in the nominative, 'dicit' or 'dixit' following:—

Moyses dicit 45. 13.

Sofonias dixit 88. 9. (Soffonias A).

§ 2. FORMULAE OF QUOTATION FOR NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

In *euangelio* 43. 3: 43. 13: 44. 13: 44. 20 (Hartel's reading 'in euangelio suo' has no MS authority that I know of: A L P [V] R X read simply 'in euangelio'): 46. 7: 49. 15: 58. 15: 67. 22: 73. 8: 75. 10: 77. 7: 80. 3: 88. 16: 91. 9: 92. 10: 93. 19: 94. 3: 99. 21: 157. 17: 173. 8: 178. 16: 178. 17 (where 'item in euangelio' is right, rather than Hartel's 'item illic'). In the first two Books of the *Testimonia* this formula is almost as common as references to the individual Gospels by name. It is a distinct difference between these two Books and the third, that in the latter the formula occurs only four times (of which three are quite at the end of the Book): and the transition from the one method of quoting to the other is perhaps characteristic of St Cyprian's generation.

On two occasions, however, the vagueness of the general reference 'in euangelio' is qualified by the addition of further defining words 'post resurrectionem' 43. 3, 93. 19: which appear to be intended, in the absence of chapter-divisions, as a sort of time-mark indicating roughly what part of the Gospel is being cited. This seems to me to be a simpler and more probable interpretation than to attach any dogmatic meaning to the words.

The absence of the name of the particular Gospel cited adds, of course, sometimes an element of uncertainty in the identification of the passages. In 92. 10 indeed—where Matt. xvi 4 should be Matt. xii 39, 40—Hartel's error would not have been avoided, since it does not overstep the limits of the one Gospel. But in 49. 15 the two references Matt. xxiv 2, Marc. xiv 58, should both be struck out, and the single text Marc. xiii 2 substituted, as the evidence of *k* (*codex Bobiensis*) shews. In 44. 13 the two Synoptic texts Matt. xxiii 37, Luc. xiii 34, 35 resemble one another so closely that it is difficult to say which is meant. But the caution may be given that Hartel has made one mistake in the collation of A, which reads 'quotiens' not 'quoties', and two crucial mistakes in the collation of L. 'Noluitis' in fact is the reading of V L P B R X: and 'deserta' is omitted by V L * P B O X. The concluding words should therefore run 'et noluitis ecce remittetur uobis domus uestra'.

In *euangelio cata Mattheum* 46. 14, &c.

In *euangelio cata Marcum* does not happen to occur.

In euangelio cata Lucanum 76. 10: 113. 1: 114. 1: 139. 2: 153. 19: 154. 12: 155. 2: 165. 5: 182. 21.

In euangelio cata Iohannem 51. 13, &c.

[item] cata Mattheum 72. 13: 123. 9: 129. 15: 133. 16, 19: 153. 21: 177. 13.

[item] cata Marcum 139. 16: 142. 11: 150. 19.

[item] cata Lucanum 72. 18: 87. 7: 117. 18: 123, 5: 126. 16: 130. 6: 133. 22: 144. 20: 160. 1.

[item] cata Iohannem 47. 19: 63. 9: 96. 7: 98. 18: 142. 19: 160. 4.

These two sets of phrases vary according to a fixed rule: the first is employed when a quotation from the Gospels follows on a quotation from some other part of the Bible; the second indicates that the immediately preceding quotation or quotations are also from the Gospels. The only exception I have noted is 63. 9, where 'item cata Iohannem' follows a quotation from the Psalms.

The rule is absolute in the *Testimonia* that the name of the evangelist is preceded by the preposition 'cata' ('kata' apparently often in TR); Hartel follows A in substituting 'secundum' throughout (in 51. 12 both A and Hartel retain 'cata').

(1) The spelling 'Mattheum' rather than 'Matthaeum' rests on as strong evidence for St Cyprian as for the Vulgate. St Jerome appears to have systematically re-introduced the Greek orthography into the proper names of the Gospels: but the name of the evangelist was too securely established to admit of change, and 'Mattheus' therefore remained one of the few exceptions to the rule. As between 'cata Mattheum' and 'cata Matheum', the former has the better attestation: L consistently gives the double t, and Q R are on the same side¹; T and X prefer the single t; P wavers, but more often has the two than the one; A varies between an abbreviated form of the name with one t (Matĥ), and the full form with double t.

(2) For 'Marcum' there is, so far as I know, no alternative reading.

(3) The Gospel of St Luke is quoted by name in the following passages: 72. 18: 76. 11: 87. 7: 113. 1: 114. 1: 117. 18: 123. 5: 126. 16: 130. 6: 133. 22: 139. 2: 144. 20: 153. 19: 154. 12: 155. 2: 160. 2: 165. 5: 182. 21. The following is the evidence in support of the form 'Lucanum,' which I have ventured to restore to St Cyprian's text: the Crawford MS X, without a single exception: P, the sister MS of L, also without a single exception save that in 153. 19, 182. 21, the abbreviation Lucañ is given²: R, a collateral descendant of V, with no exception until the last three passages are reached, 160. 2, 165. 5,

¹ So, too, Mercati's Quirinian fragment of the fifth century, 133. 4, 16, 19.

² L P X (in fact the whole L group) omit altogether the Lucan quotation 72. 18-21.

182. 21, in all of which it has *Lucan*. Besides these, Hartel records *W* for *Lucanum* in 126. 16: and the Oxford MS *O* reads *Lucanum* in 72. 18, 76. 11, 87. 7, 113. 1. Indirectly the authorities in favour of 'Lucan' may perhaps not unjustly be claimed as representing a stage of transition between a primitive 'Lucanum' and a later 'Lucam': and 'Lucan' is supported by Mercati's Quirinian fragment (133. 22), by *Q* wherever I know of its readings (113. 1, 114. 1, 117. 18), and, from 114. 1 onwards, generally by *O*.

That 'Lucam' should be the correct reading in St Cyprian the testimony of the other authorities for the Old Latin Gospels seems to me to render exceedingly improbable. I have so far in these notes abstained from citing evidence outside of the MSS of the *Testimonia*, as there was (it seemed) a distinct advantage in isolating the book and discussing it on its own basis alone: but the special interest attaching to the unfamiliar form 'Lucanum' will excuse a departure from this general rule.

Speaking generally then the witness of the Old Latin MSS is divided between 'Lucanum' and 'Lucan', and gives little support to 'Lucam'. *a, b e f g* have *Lucan*: *d* begins the Gospel with 'incipit euangelium sec luanum', but ends it with 'euang. secund. lucam explicit'. On the other hand the Vercelli MS, *a* (saec. iv or v) has 'incipit secundum luanum' 'euangelium secundum luanum explicit': the Paris Corbie Gospels, *ff*² (not saec. vii, as Gregory would have us believe, but saec. v) 'incipit euangelium secundum luanum' 'explicit secundum luanum': the Bobbio fragments *s* (Milan Ambros. c. 73 inf.: saec. vi) have the running headline 'secundum luanum'. Among the Latin fathers, Lucifer and Optatus apparently offer no evidence on either side: Tyconius has *Lucas*, *Lucan*. Tertullian, if we may trust the extant form of his writings, spoke of the evangelist as 'Lucas': but in the first place the MS tradition of Tertullian is at best imperfect; in the second, Tertullian was too much accustomed to translate for himself direct from the Greek to be quite a competent witness to Latin usage; and in the third, there seems ground for suspecting that a quotation from the Gospel might be made in the terms 'cata Lucanum' or 'secundum Lucanum' by writers who would yet speak of the evangelist himself as 'Lucas'. Such inconsistency is, as a matter of fact, represented by the unique fifth-century MS of Priscillian: *tract.* iii (ed. Schepss. 47. 4) he gives 'in euangelio cata Lucanum', while later on (53. 7) he uses the words 'Lucae euangelistae testimonium'.

It would be difficult, in view of this conspectus of the evidence, to think that St Cyprian's bible did not employ one or other of the forms *Lucanum*, *Lucan*: and as between these two, the MSS of the *Testimonia* give decidedly more support to *Lucanum*. And the representation of *Λουκᾶς* by its classical Roman equivalent or rather original *Lucanus* seems to me to be an echo of the freedom of the earliest biblical

interpreters. I confidently claim it as the true reading of the 'African' Gospels—if we must still use that misleading geographical term, for which for my part I should prefer to substitute 'Roman.'

(4) *Iohannen*, not *Iohannem*, is the reading of R pretty regularly, of O nearly always in the second half of the Third Book, of Q wherever I have record of its readings, and at least occasionally of M, the sister MS of Q: nor can we be sure that Hartel (on whose text I depend for M, as well as for W B) has always recorded a variant of this kind. As with some of the Old Testament books, so here, I cannot help suspecting that the form in -n is more original than the form in -m: but the MS authority is not yet perhaps sufficient to warrant its introduction into the text.

In prece cotidiana ('cotidiana' Quirinian fragment OX: *cottidiana* A L) 133. 18: **in euangelio in prece cotidiana** (cott. A L) 139. 14. This very noteworthy phrase for the Lord's Prayer should be compared with *de dominica oratione* § 12 (275. 3) 'et hoc cottidie deprecamur', § 22 (283. 20) 'cottidie pro peccatis iubetur orare', and with *Didache* viii 3 *τῆς τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτω προσεύχασθε* (where Harnack, to whom I owe the references to *dom. or.*, omits to notice the much clearer evidence of these passages in *Test.*).

In Actis apostolorum 82. 22: 116. 8: 127. 12: 144. 1: 165. 11: 175. 10: 178. 14: 179. 5: 184. 4.

In all these instances Hartel prints 'in Actibus apostolorum', which is certainly wrong: it is only given by A and once or twice by O, and even A deserts it in 179. 5 for 'in Actus apostolorum'. For this latter reading there is more to be said: the inherent difficulty of the accusative makes so far in its favour, for there is no obvious reason for its introduction: and the following MSS support it: A as above in 179. 5, P in 82. 22, 127. 12, R in 82. 22, T in 116. 8, 144. 1, 165. 11, 175. 10, 178. 14, 179. 5, 184. 4. But V appears to go with L X M B (and Q where I have record of its readings) in consistently giving 'in Actis apostolorum': and this form must for the present stand in the text.

In epistula Petri 94. 15: 124. 24.

in epistula Petri ad Ponticos 148. 16: 148. 23: 149. 6.

In three out of five cases Hartel follows A in substituting 'Petrus' for 'Petri', and in four out of five in adding 'apostolus' or 'apostoli' on the same authority, thus giving four different formulae, 'in epistula Petrus apostolus' 'in epistula Petri' 'Petrus apostolus ad Ponticos' 'in epistula Petri apostoli ad Ponticos'. These vagaries of A are quite unsupported: the words 'in epistula Petri' commence the formula without exception in every other MS¹. There remains however one

¹ The reader must not be misled by the absence of any notice of *varia lectio* in the apparatus to 148. 16. Since L P R T (V) X read there 'in epistula Petri ad Ponticos', it may be assumed that W M B do the same, and that Hartel has arbitrarily omitted

substantial variation, in which the testimony of A agrees entirely with the testimony of the other MSS, namely the addition 'ad Ponticos' in the last three cases. It might be tempting to see in this another distinction between the different Books, were it not that 124. 24 belongs to Book III but has the same formula as Book II. As the three instances of 'ad Ponticos' occur close together in the course of a couple of pages, the use of the phrase just there might be regarded as an experiment on the part of the writer, the object being to assimilate the method of quotation to that which was employed for the Pauline epistles. But the parallel use of the phrase in Tertullian *Scorpiae* 12 'Petrus quidem ad Ponticos Quanta enim, inquit, gloria' (1 Pet. ii 20, 21), makes it probable that this title was prefixed to the earliest Latin version of the epistle.

In *epistula Iohannis* 73. 14: 94. 18: 113. 22: 116. 1: 116. 16: 125. 4: 133. 24: 156. 9: 172. 13: 172. 18.

apud Iohannem 122. 3.

The vagaries of the A text are again faithfully followed by Hartel: nor does his apparatus always suffice to correct them, for in two instances, 172. 13, 172. 18, he leaves it to be inferred that his text readings, 'item Iohannes apostolus' 'Iohannes apostolus', are supported by all his MSS, and in a third 94. 18 'in epistula Iohannes apostolus' he notes the omission of 'apostolus' but no variant for 'Iohannes'. As a matter of fact, A seems to be the only authority for any reading other than 'in epistula Iohannis', save in the one case 122. 3 where the 'apud Iohannem' is quite exceptional: and just as the latter was an assimilation to the Pauline epistles, so is the former to be explained as an assimilation to the use for the Old Testament books.

The formulae for the Pauline epistles present a much more complicated problem. On the one hand, if the evidence of the MSS in the instances where they are unanimous, or all but unanimous, is to be accepted, it is clear that St Cyprian employed no one consistent formula. On the other hand there are a large number of instances—and these become progressively more frequent towards the end of the *Testimonia*—in which the MSS appear to be hopelessly divided between two or even three readings. It will therefore be best to begin with the less difficult ones, and to work from them to the more difficult.

Two classes of variations may however first be set aside. I shall attempt in § 5 of these Prolegomena—see p. 268 below—to make it at least probable that St Cyprian in dealing with dual books, i. e. the books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Maccabees in the Old Testament, and the epistles to Corinth, Thessalonica and Timothy in the New¹, to record the fact. For 'ad Ponticos' O on each occasion substitutes 'ad pontifices' or 'ad pontificos'.

¹ There is nothing which suggests that St Cyprian accepted more than one epistle of St Peter, and one of St John.

did not particularize the number of the book from which he was quoting, as 'First' or 'Second': and therefore I shall not deal at this point with the presence or absence of the words 'prima' 'secunda' in the quotations from 1 and 2 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and 1 and 2 Timothy. In the second place I shall give here the general caution that the title 'apostolus' (whether with or without 'Paulus'), which occurs frequently in A and therefore in Hartel, is absolutely unsupported in the other MSS, and consequently cannot claim to be considered genuine. With these premises, I proceed to enumerate those quotations from the Pauline epistles where the text offers no real ground for doubt.

- Paulus ad Romanos** 70. 12 : 178. 10.
Paulus ad Corinthios [I] 63. 20.
Paulus ad Galatas 43. 18.
Paulus ad Efesios 94. 9.
Paulus ad Filippenses 79. 1 : 141. 15 : 149. 11.
Paulus ad Colosenses 45. 18 : 63. 14.
Paulus ad Thessalonicenses [II] 73. 12.
Paulus ad Timotheum [II] 169. 3.
Ad Romanos 94. 12 (after another Pauline quotation): 117. 21 : 118. 1 : 119. 12 : 126. 13 (after another quotation): 132. 1 (after another quotation): 164. 10 (after another quotation): 177. 10 (after another quotation).
Ad Corinthios [I] 115. 6 : 159. 6 (after another Pauline quotation): 166. 14 (after another quotation):
Ad Corinthios [II] 42. 19 (after another Pauline quotation): 119. 8 : 166. 18 (after another quotation).
Ad Galatas 115. 20 (after another Pauline quotation): 124. 7 (after another quotation).
Ad Efesios 124. 19 (after another Pauline quotation).
Ad Filippenses 124. 1 (after another Pauline quotation).
Ad Colosenses 124. 12 (after another Pauline quotation).
Ad Timotheum 124. 9 (after another Pauline quotation): 148. 12 : 152. 6 (after another quotation): 156. 2 (after another quotation): 171. 20 : 172. 5 : 172. 16.
In epistula Pauli ad Corinthios [I] 42. 17 : 75. 13 : 116. 22 : 139. 9 : 145. 5.
In epistula Pauli ad Corinthios [II] 114. 10.
In epistula Pauli ad Efesios 126. 11 : 150. 9.
In epistula Pauli ad Romanos 140. 4 : 149. 3.

The results so far obtained indicate that St Cyprian used three distinct methods of citation from the epistles: but it should be noted that in the first two Books (1) the syncopated form 'ad Romanos' etc. only occurs where the Apostle's name is prefixed to the quotation

immediately preceding, and (2) the longest form 'in epistula Pauli ad . . .' is only used in connexion with the Corinthian epistle. From the end of the Second Book onwards (96. 10 is the earliest instance) we get the constantly recurring variation by which 'Paulus' ('Paulus apostolus' in A) is either substituted for the long form 'in epistula Pauli' or less often prefixed to the short form 'ad Romanos' etc. by a small but important group of MSS, of which A V are the most constant members, reinforced often by R, by B, and in the later chapters of the Third Book (from 155. 6 onwards) generally by X. All three forms are shewn by the list already given to be Cyprianic: and this makes the choice in cases of doubt the more difficult. A fresh element of uncertainty is the additional form found after a certain point, especially in the case of the double epistles to Corinth, Thessalonica and Timothy (141. 3 : 141. 20 : 151. 10 : 152. 4 : 159. 2 : 167. 23 : 169. 10 : 169. 18 : 171. 13 : 175. 15 : 177. 4 : 177. 8), but also in the case of the Roman and Ephesian epistles (133. 7 : 151. 20 : 155. 16 : 170. 14 : 178. 6), in a group of MSS consisting of L, LP, or LPR, 'in epistulis Pauli ad Corinthios' 'in epistulis Pauli ad Romanos' etc.¹

With regard to the orthography of the names of the churches addressed in the various epistles, the following variations are represented in the MSS :—

Romanos is without variant.

Corinthios: this is indubitably the correct form, though L generally has *Corintheos*, X varies between *Corinthios* *Corintheos* *Corintios* *Corinteos*, while R is about equally divided between *Corinthios* and *Chorinthios*.

Galatas 43. 19 : 115. 20 : 120. 20 : 124. 7 : 156. 14 : 167. 10. O and T have always *Galathas*, and so A in two or three cases. In 124. 7 W has *Calatas*, and in 120. 20 A has *Calatas* or *Calathas*.

Efesios 94. 10 : 120. 4 : 120. 13 ; 124. 19 : 126. 11 : 150. 9 : 170. 14 : 183. 3 : (in 170. 19, 171. 3, 171. 8, the true text of the *lemma* does not contain the name of the epistle). A has always *Efesios*, except in 94. 10, where it gives *Effesios*. X has generally *Effesios*, but in 94. 10, 124. 19, *Efesios*. L varies between *Ephesios* and *Epheseos*. O P R T give *Ephesios*, except that T* in 94. 10 has *Effesios*. I have followed the orthography of A X in favour of f against ph, as being the two oldest MSS : for I do not think any certain inference can be drawn as to the reading of V in a case like this from the silence of *Latini*.

Filippenses 79. 1 : 124. 1 : 127. 15 : 141. 15 : 149. 11. In this and the next epistle the evidence of A is ranged against that of the other MSS : and it may seem inconsistent to propose to follow it in the one case and not in the other. But it may be noted that in the *Colossian* epistle the rest of the MSS are united on a single alternative reading, while here they are divided between *Filippenses* and

¹ See on this further in § 5 below, p. 269.

Philippines, P R leaning to the former, L O X to the latter reading, while T is divided.

Colossenses 45. 18: 63. 15: 124. 12: 172. 11: 180. 20: 184. 10. L O P R T *X (and apparently M B: W is more doubtful, but is cited for it in 172. 11) give this form only: A on the other hand gives only Colossenses, and it is with some hesitation that I abandon its reading. It is curious that in two out of these six cases the reference to the Colossian epistle ought to be to Titus, 172. 11 (where A O have corrected the mistake and substituted 'Titum') and 180. 20. Does not this suggest that the two epistles followed one another in St Cyprian's codex¹? A similar mistake between 2 Thessalonians and Galatians (73. 13) may have arisen from the same cause.

Tessalonicenses 73. 13: 159. 2: 169. 10: 175. 4 (in 175. 8 the *lemma* should be omitted). A has always Tessalonicenses, X Tesalonicenses: O T are divided between Tesalonicenses and Thesalonicenses: all three forms are represented on one or other occasion by L: P R appear to give as a rule Thessalonicenses. Thus A is supported in the double s by P R, and in the omission of the aspirate by X.

Timotheum. The spelling is constant except in R, which rather more often than not gives 'Thimotheum'.

In Apocalypsi. A has always 'in Apocalipsi', but it seems hardly necessary to adopt its reading in that respect.

§ 3. ADDITIONAL MATTER (BEYOND THE NAMES OF THE BIBLICAL BOOKS) IN THE FORMULAE OF QUOTATION IN BOOKS I AND II.

Attention was called at the beginning of § 2 to one feature of distinction between Books I and II of the *Testimonia* on the one side, and Book III on the other, namely, the frequent use in the two former books of the formula 'in euangelio'. A further distinction—pointing not indeed to diversity of authorship, but to a different date of composition or possibly a different degree of originality in the authorship—is to be found in the additional phrases which under certain circumstances follow on the name of the biblical book in Books I and II, but which never occur in Book III.

Where the words cited, in fact, are not part in a historical book of the narrative, or in a prophetic book are represented as spoken not by the prophet but by God, then—unless the citation itself makes the matter clear—the name of the speaker (and if an individual is addressed, then his name also) is added: in one case, 55. 8, 'In

¹ As no single citation of the epistle to Titus by name occurs in the *Testimonia*, it looks as though the headline of the epistle in St Cyprian's codex had been continued by mistake (as any one acquainted with ancient MSS knows happened not infrequently) from the previous epistle.

Numeris de populo nostro dictum est, an interpretation of the persons meant in the prophecy is given. The following is a list of all these additions, arranged in order of the biblical books to which they refer: all of them, as has been said, come from Books I and II.

In *Genesi ad Abraham* 67. 7.

item illic ad *Iacob* 67. 11.

In *Exodo Deus ad Moysen*¹ 80. 23, 90. 12.

in *Exodo dixit Moyses ad Iesum* 89. 11.

in *Exodo populus ad Aron*¹ 38. 22.

item illic *Moyses ad Dominum* 39. 1.

In *Numeris de populo nostro dictum est* 55. 8.

In *Deuteronomio Deus ad Moysen* 51. 8.

item *Moyses dicit* (without the name of the book: see at the end of § 1: it may be a question here whether Moses is meant as the author of the book or the speaker in the particular passage) 45. 13.

In *Basilion [primo] Deus ad Heli sacerdotem* 50. 17.

In *Basilion [tertio] Helias ad Dominum* 40. 7.

Apud *Osee Deus dicit* 69. 15 (*Dominus* is read by W B M P R (V?): but *Deus* of A L T X is probably right).

Apud *Zachariam Deus dicit* 69. 9 (*Dominus* again W M P R T: *Deus* A L B X).

Apud *Esaïam Dominus dicit* 59. 5.

apud eundem *Dominus dicit* 41. 2.

Apud *Hieremiam Dominus dicit* 39. 20: 41. 7: 48. 20: 55. 15.

apud eundem *Dominus dicit* 41. 11.

Apud *Ezechiel Deus dicit* 90. 6 (*Deus dicit* V W B T X: *dicit Deus* A: *Dominus dicit* L R).

In euangelio *Dominus dicit* 44. 13: 49. 15: 58. 15: 88. 16 (and 93. 19 *Dominus dicit* post resurrectionem, where however *dicit* is omitted by A R T *).

ipse in euangelio *dicit* 67. 21.

in euangelio *Dominus* post resurrectionem 43. 3.

Dominus in euangelio 43. 13.

in euangelio *Gabriel ad Mariam* 75. 10.

In euangelio cata *Mattheum Dominus dicit* 48. 7.

in euangelio cata *Mattheum Iohannes dicit* 47. 15.

item cata *Mattheum Gabriel angelus ad Ioseph* 72. 13.

Item illic [*scilicet* cata *Lucanum*] *angelus ad pastores* 72. 21.

In euangelio cata *Iohannem Dominus dicit* 58. 5: 72. 11.

cata *Iohannem Dominus dicit* 63. 9.

¹ Of the orthography of the proper names used in these formulae (other than those which have been discussed in §§ 1, 2) I shall hope to say something in a future instalment of these Prolegomena.

item cata Iohannem dixit Iesus 98. 18 (in euangelio cata Iohannem W B M T, no doubt erroneously).

item in eodem Dominus ad Thoman, 70. 8.

Christus in euangelio cata Iohannem 51. 12.

ipse in euangelio cata Iohannem, 71. 6.

In Actis apostolorum Petrus 82. 22.

in Actis apostolorum Paulus 57. 4.

Finally it must be noted under this head that in three instances Hartel prints a phrase of this description as part of the formula of quotation (connected with the words that precede), when he ought to have printed it as part of the quotation itself (connected with the words that follow): 57. 13 'Apud Esaiam Sic dicit Dominus Ecce qui seruiunt mihi' (= Is. lxn 13 *τάδε λέγει Κύριος Ἰδοὺ οἱ δουλεύοντές μοι*): 82. 5 'Apud Esaiam Sic dicit Dominus Ecce ego inmitto' (= Is. xxviii 16 *οὕτω λέγει Κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω*): 117. 12 'Apud Esaiam Sic dicit Dominus Deus Caelum mihi thronus' (= Is. lxvi 1 *Οὕτως λέγει Κύριος Ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος*). With the removal of the words in this last case from the category of quotation-formulae, the rule becomes quite absolute that these additional introductory phrases are never found in Book III.

§ 4. THE NUMERATION OF THE PSALMS.

The following is a list of the quotations from the Psalms in the *Testimonia*: and it will appear from it that there is good reason for thinking that St Cyprian, like some other African authors, used a Bible in which the Psalms, from the 2nd down to at any rate about the 112th, were reckoned by numbers one less than in the ordinary LXX texts and (from Psalm x onwards) two less than in our English Bibles. The divergence from the LXX texts commences at the very beginning of the book of Psalms, Ps. ii being incorporated as one Psalm with Ps. i, as in the Western (which perhaps is the original) text of Acts xiii 33 *ὡς ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ πρώτῳ Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*.

The merit of having pointed out this feature of the Cyprianic Bible belongs to Dr Mercati, who took occasion to illustrate by reference to it the excellence of the text of V; see pp. 20-22 of his treatise *D' alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano*.

Ps. i ¹	Test. iii 31	Hartel p. 144. 9	
	iii 120	184. 11	
ii	i 13	48. 3	quoted as i by L P V O
	ii 8	73. 5	V R X (L* ?)
	ii 29	97. 5	V R T X
	iii 20	134. 13	V

¹ The numbers of the Psalms in the left-hand columns are those of the ordinary LXX texts.

Ps. ii	iii 66	168. 12		VOX
	iii 112	181. 18		LVRMOX
	iii 119	183. 18		VX
iii	iii 24	91. 16	ii	VRO
iv	i 16	50. 6	iii	VM*OX
v	ii 29	98. 4	iiii	L[V] ¹ ROX (T*?)
vi	iii 114	182. 10	v	VBO(X <i>sexto</i> <i>in ras</i>)
xiv	iii 48	153. 10	xiii	[V]ROX (L <i>quarto deci-</i> <i>mo in ras</i>)
xv	ii 24	91. 13	xiiii	LVRO: xxiii X
xvii	i 21	55. 13	xvi	LPVMB
	iii 95	177. 2		VO
xviii	ii 19	85. 16	xvii	VO
	iii 20	138. 23		V O T X* (L*??):xxiiR
	iii 56	157. 6		VO
xxi	ii 13	78. 11	xx	LPVROX
	ii 20	87. 20		VR (<i>sup. lin.,</i> <i>sed manu</i> <i>prima</i>) X
	ii 29	97. 7		[V]ROTX (L*??)
xxiii	ii 18	85. 2	xxii	ALVROX
	ii 29	97. 10		VR*OX
	iii 79	173. 1		VOX
xxiv	ii 7	72. 8	xxiii	VRTX(L*??)
xxvii	i 3	41. 19	xxvi	VMBOX: <i>om</i> T (uicessi- mo quinto L xxv P)
	ii 24	91. 15	xxviii	VB: <i>om</i> OX
	iii 114	182. 11		AVRWM B OX*
xxxii	ii 3	64. 18	xxx	LPVRBX
xxxiii	i 22	58. 2	xxxii	V: xxxi O

¹ Where the testimony of V is adduced within square brackets, it is deduced either from the silence of Latini (where the edition with which he is collating gave the lower number in the text), or from his first inserting but afterwards deleting the higher number. For the parallels in Lactantius and Optatus the reader may be referred to Dr Mercati's lists, *op. cit.* pp. 20-22.

Ps. xxxiii	iii 5	118. 1		VROTX(L* <i>ut uid</i>)
	iii 6	118. 18		VROX(L*?)
	iii 13	126. 5		[V]OX
	iii 14	127. 10		VROX
	iii 20	138. 21		VROTX
xxxvi	iii 1	110. 12	xxxv	V:xxxiMQR: xxxii O
xl	iii 1	110. 15	xxxviii	V
xliv	ii 3	64. 17	xlili	VRX
	ii 6	69. 18		RX(L*??)
	ii 29	97. 16		L [V] R* X (O*?)
	ii 29	98. 8		VX
xlv	ii 6	70. 2	xlili	L* P V R X : xlvii O
xlix	i 16	50. 1	xlvi	VRBO : xlvii M: <i>def.</i> X
	ii 28	95. 2		VRO
	iii 30	143. 21		L* VMBO*
	iii 66	168. 15		VO
	iii 68	169. 13		VRBPOTX
	iii 107	180. 16		VRPOTB
l	iii 6	118. 16	xlvi	VRO*PT*X* (L* <i>ut uid</i>)
	iii 54	156. 7		VROX*
lii	iii 55	156. 13	li	L* P* RMO
lv	iii 10	121. 7	liii	VWMOPT (L*?): viiiX
lxvii ¹	ii 6	70. 5	lxvi	VRMBO
	ii 28	95. 12		VR
	iii 86	174. 16		LPVRMBO X*
	iii 113	182. 7		BO
lxxi	ii 30	99. 8	lxx	L[V]ROX
	iii 33	146. 17		LP[V]RO* TX
lxxiii	ii 29	98. 12	lxxii	L[V]OX: xliiii R* xliii R*
lxxxi	i 3	42. 1	lxxx	LPVMBO X: xxx R
	ii 6	70. 3		VROP(L*??)
	ii 6	71. 1		ROP(L*??)
	ii 28	96. 3		LVMO

¹ In 121. 8 the true reading is not 'in psalmo lxi' (or 'lx'), but 'item illic'.

Ps. lxxxi	iii 5	118. 12		L* PV RO X
lxxxiii	iii 58	158. 23	lxxxii	V X
lxxxvii	ii 20	88. 13	lxxxvi	A L B O X : lxxv V
lxxxviii	ii 1	63. 2	lxxxvii	V O X
	iii 57	157. 13		V O X : R * lxxxiii <i>uel</i> lxxxvii
xov	iii 59	161. 5	xciiii	V : cxiiii WL
			(lxxxviii)	lxxxiiii MX xliiii P : xciii O
xovi	ii 29	98. 7	xov	[V]OX : lxxv
			(lxxxv)	LB
cvi	ii 3	65. 1	ov	A V P B X : cdccv M : <i>om</i> O
cix	i 17	50. 15	cviii	A L V R O
	ii 26	93. 3		V R O X
cx	iii 20	134. 4	cviii	L* V M O Quirinian fragment ¹ : cxviii X*
cxii	iii 1	110. 17	cx	L* P [V] R X
cxv	iii 16	129. 5	cxiii	none
cxvii	ii 5	68. 2	cxvi	O X : cxlii R none
	ii 16	82. 8		L* X : cxiii O
	iii 10	121. 10		PRMB : cxiii O
	iii 57	157. 12	cxvii	none A M : cxiii O
cxviii	ii 20	88. 7		none : cxvii O
	iii 16	132. 4	cxviii	none : cxvii O
cxv	iii 16	129. 7	cxv	M : cxv B
cxvii	ii 11	76. 8	cxvii	none : cxvii A L P B O
cxviii	iii 86	174. 9	cxviii	none (cxviii B)
cxviiii	iii 59	160. 22	cxviiii	none (cxviii B)
cxl	ii 20	88. 8	cxviiii	none (cxviii B)

The sudden drop in the authorities for the lower numeration towards the end is very striking, and suggests that the Cypriatic bible reunited with the ordinary LXX texts by keeping the two Psalms which our English bibles number as cxiv and cxv distinct—of course under the numbers cxii and cxiii—instead of combining them into one as the LXX does : in this way our Psalm cxvi would be cxiv to both Cyprian

¹ But in 134. 14 the fragment gives 'in psalmo ii', not 'in psalmo i'.

and the LXX. Yet there is fair authority for the lower numeration in three out of the four quotations of Ps. cxvii.

§ 5. ON THE METHOD OF QUOTING FROM DOUBLE BOOKS (KINGS, CHRONICLES, EZRA, MACCABEES, THE EPISTLES TO CORINTH, TO THESSALONICA, TO TIMOTHY).

The suspicion has already been expressed in these Prolegomena (p. 259 above) that the true text of the *Testimonia* only gives the name of the biblical book quoted from, and does not proceed in the case of double books to particularize the number further, as 'first' or 'second'. This suspicion rests on the following grounds.

1. In many instances no MS whatever gives the number, so that no doubt at all can attach to the statement that St. Cyprian sometimes, at any rate, acted on the principle suggested. Thus (a) 'in Paralipomenon' is the reading of the single quotation from Chronicles, 142. 3: (b) 'in Hesdra' is the reading of both the references to the books of Esdras, 40. 11, 166. 8: (c) 'in Machabeis' is the reading of all four citations from the books of Maccabees, 117. 6, 128. 9, 151. 2, 155. 15: (d) 'ad Thessalonicenses' without addition is the unanimous reading of all MSS in two out of three citations from the Thessalonian epistles, 159. 2, 169. 10, although they differ widely in the introductory words of the formula, 'Paulus' 'in epistula Pauli' 'in epistulis Pauli': (e) 'ad Timotheum' is similarly the unanimous reading in four out of eleven citations from the epistles to Timothy, 124. 9, 148. 12, 152. 6, 156. 2.

2. In a still larger number of instances one or more of the better MSS omit the number. Thus (a) in the Books of Kings: 'in Basilion' without addition is given in 40. 6 by P, in 50. 17 by M B X, in 53. 9 by M X, in 117. 2 by B, in 142. 14 by A R, in 157. 2 by X, in 167. 1 by W X, in 173. 6 by X¹. And (b) in the Pauline epistles, we have 'ad Corinthios' without 'prima' or 'secunda' given in 42. 17 by M*, in 63. 20 by P R and the edition of Erasmus, in 75. 14 by B, in 96. 10 by L*, in 116. 23 by R W, in 125. 13 by R, in 139. 9 by R, in 141. 3 by L P B O T, in 142. 1 by A L P B O T X, in 145. 5 by A, in 151. 10 by X, in 152. 4 by R, in 155. 6 by W X, in 157. 7 by R X, in 159. 6 by X, in 164. 5 by R W X, in 166. 11 by A B X, in 166. 19 by X, in 167. 4 by A V X, in 167. 23 by X, in 169. 18 by T X, in 174. 12 by A B Erasmus (and L* V?); in 175. 15, and 175. 21, by X; in 176. 4 by A X; and in 176. 12, 177. 4, 177. 9 again by X. (c) 'ad Thessalonicenses' in 175. 4 by O T X Erasmus: in 175. 8 the whole *lemma* is

¹ Note too that in other writings St Cyprian uses the phrases 'in libro Regnorum' 470. 10, 'in libris Regnorum' 754. 18: though it should be added that in 386. 14 'in tertio Regnorum libro' seems to be without variant.

omitted by L P T V W X¹. (d) 'ad Timotheum' in 131. 17 by P, in 165. 15 by T W X, in 169. 3 by R X, in 171. 13 by X Erasmus, in 171. 20 by X, in 172. 5 by B X, in 172. 16 by X: while in 172. 8 none of the three words 'ad Timotheum prima' appears in L P B O R W X.

3. But beyond this it may be urged that the extraordinary diversity of readings in the best MSS in the *lemmata* to the Pauline quotations indicates the existence exactly at this point of deep-seated corruptions of the Cyprianic text, and warrants bolder action than would elsewhere be justifiable in the attempt to recover the lost original. In particular, besides the regularly recurring alternatives 'Paulus' 'Paulus apostolus' 'in epistula Pauli', the three following forms of variant are specially noteworthy.

(a) Cases where some MSS have 'prima' (·i·) others 'secunda' (·ii·). In 96. 10 (2 Cor. v 10) R has ·i·: 115. 6 (1 Cor. iii 1) L* has 'secunda' and T ·ii·: 123. 13 (1 Cor. vi 19) M has 'secunda': 157. 8 (2 Cor. v 10) B has ·i·: 167. 4 (1 Cor. vi 18) W has ·ii·: 169. 18 (1 Cor. i 17) M has ·ii·: 171. 13 (1 Tim. v 3) B has ·ii·: 175. 15 (1 Cor. vii 10) L* R have ·ii·: 176. 13 (1 Cor. xi 27) A has ·ii·: 177. 5 (1 Cor. xv 33) B O R have ·ii·.

(b) Cases where some MSS read 'in epistulis Pauli ad Corinthios' (or 'Thessalonicenses' or 'Timotheum') instead of 'in epistula . . .', for in such cases the addition of 'prima' 'secunda' seems obviously ungrammatical and unoriginal. This is the reading in 141. 3 of L³ P T: in 141. 20 of L P O: in 151. 10 of L P: in 152. 4 of L: in 159. 2 of L P R: in 167. 23 of L P R: in 169. 10 of L P R (O): in 169. 18 of L P R: in 171. 13 of L P R: in 175. 15 of L P R: in 177. 4 of L P R: in 177. 8 of L P R. It is fair, however, to add that the same MSS, or some of them, occasionally have this form in connexion with single epistles, where it is apparently as incorrect as the converse form with double epistles: 'in epistulis Pauli ad Romanos' 133. 7 L P, 151. 20 L, 155. 16 L³ P, 178. 6 L P; 'in epistulis Pauli ad Ephesios' 170. 14 L P R. And it is just possible that the formula is intended to be punctuated after 'Pauli', and to be read thus 'In epistulis Pauli: Ad Romanos'.

(c) Cases like 159. 6 'item ad Corinthios prima', where, though there is no variation in the MSS, the omission of the epithet would clearly improve the grammar of the phrase. The same argument would apply to the numerous cases where A V or A V X give the reading 'Paulus [+apostolus A] ad Corinthios prima' &c., if that reading is original rather than the alternative form 'in epistula Pauli ad Corinthios prima'.

It is not meant to be asserted that the case for the thesis here put forward is established on grounds which are absolutely conclusive: but it is believed that sufficient probability has been shewn in its favour to warrant an editor in enclosing the defining numbers 'prima'

¹ B O insert 'in euangelio', a reading which points also to omission in their archetypes.

'secunda' in all cases within square brackets, as being, if not certainly unauthentic, at least not certainly authentic¹.

C. H. TURNER.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE MSS OF ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM.

THE following notes and indices are the results of a visit to Grotta Ferrata made in accordance with a grant by Magdalen College during the Long Vacation of 1904. They were rendered possible by the kindness of Mr C. H. Turner, who supplied me with many valuable notes on the subject of Isidore's letters. To save space I shall throughout use the following symbols: G = the Grotta Ferrata MS of Isidore; *G* = the archetype of G, the Vatican and Ottobonian MSS; *S* = the original collection of 2,000 letters made by the Sleepless monks of Constantinople.

1. *The order of the letters in G.*

As Mr Turner pointed out in the last number of the JOURNAL, *S* contained 2,000 letters. According to the note in MS Cassin. 2 these were divided into four books of 500 letters each. No extant MS preserves the whole of *S*; but *G*, which can be reconstructed with certainty, must have done so.

There is no reason to doubt that the order of letters 1-1000 in *G* is an accurate presentation of the order in *S*; but the order of the second thousand must be wrong, as the total is three short of the full number. The problem, therefore, is to discover where the errors occur in *G*. The appended *indices* suggest the following places.

1. *G* omits Migne *P. G.* 78 iii 229, 374, iv 143, 144.
2. *G* passes over 1319 and 1377 in numeration.
3. *G* gives 1783 as the number of two consecutive letters.

But as Mr Turner has mentioned, this points to a total of 2,001, and it is necessary to investigate more closely in order to see which of these errors, suggested by a superficial examination, can be substantiated by collateral evidence, and which of them can be shewn to be merely apparent, for *ex hypothesi* one of them must be so in order to give us the number 2,000.

We have the following criteria:—

1. MS Paris Gr. 832 gives the order of Epp. 1-1213.
2. MS Laud Gr. 42 gives the numbers in *S* of thirty-eight letters on the Psalms (see Index C).

¹ As on other occasions, so here again I have to express my warmest thanks to my friend and old pupil, the Rev. C. Jenkins of New College, whose affectionate diligence has verified all references to Hartel's pages or apparatus in the foregoing paper. Where my readings of A or L differ from Hartel's, the difference may be taken to be due to an error or omission of Hartel's in collating these MSS.