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

ADOLF BÜCHLER.

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

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

Certain it is that these commentaries contain many interesting things which appear so far to have escaped the notice of Church historians. A reference to the inconsistencies between the duty of a Christian and the duty of a soldier (on 1 Cor. v 11) has escaped even Harnack's encyclopaedic knowledge of early Christian literature. The summary of the Eucharistic service as the 'invocation of the name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit' over the elements (on 1 Cor. vii 5) is absent from Mr Brightman's collection of liturgical passages from the Egyptian fathers. And I myself, when writing on Patristic commentaries on St Paul (in the supplementary volume to Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* p. 489), ought to have cited Origen's distinct allusions to a predecessor or predecessors in the exegesis of the same epistle: οἱ λοιποὶ ἑρμηνευταὶ . . . φασίν (on 1 Cor. vii 24), τινὲς ἐζήτησαν τίς ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον παρὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους (on 1 Cor. ix 20). Note further the information about Ophites (on xii 3), about Montanists (on xiv 34), about heretics who used the Creed (on xv 20), about parts of the Old Testament unsuitable for Church lessons (on xiv 7, 8), about a Pauline citation found in Aquila and the other interpreters but not in the LXX text (on xiv 21), about Apollos being bishop of Corinth (on xvi 12).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ib. l. 45. *ἄσημον δίδωσι φωνήν.* 1 Cor. xiv 8, 9.

ib. l. 48. *οὐδὲν γὰρ ποιεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἤτοι τῶν ἀγγέλων τρανῇ καὶ σαφῇ, ὡς ἡ ἀγάπη.* I suppose we must understand (*τὴν*) *γλῶσσαν* from the line before.

§ li ll. 9, 10. *μαχόμενον πρᾶγμά ἐστι· τὸ ἀγαπᾶν, τὸ ζηλοῦν.* Possibly *μαχόμενον πρᾶγμά ἐστι τῷ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ζηλοῦν.*

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

§ liv l. 5. *ἑαυτῷ λαλεῖ καὶ τῷ θεῷ.* 1 Cor. xiv 28.

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

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

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

§ lxxii ll. 2–4. **πνευματικός** *ἐστιν ὁ πάντα λόγον καὶ πάντα νοῦν δυνάμενος βασανίζειν, καὶ διὰ πολλὴν βαθύτητα νοῦ δυσδιάγνωστον ὄντα ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀνακρίνεσθαι.* Comparing 1 Cor. ii 15 and lines 7–9 of § lxxiii, I do not see how we can avoid altering to *δυσδιάγνωστος ὤν.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

§ lxxv ll. 3–5. ἵνα . . . ποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατοῦντος πνεύματος πνευματικούς· καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ κρίνειν ποῖα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ἢ ποῖα οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. There is something wrong in ἐπὶ τοῦ: read perhaps ἐπιτ⟨ηδεί⟩ου⟨ς⟩ κρίνειν.

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

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

§ lxxxii l. 3. εἰ καὶ ᾔδει τοὺς διαλεκτικοὺς λόγους ὁ Παῦλος, ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς αὐτοῖς ἐχρήσατο. Must we not read εἰ καὶ ⟨μὴ⟩ ᾔδει? 'Even if the apostle had [not] learnt dialectics, yet he argued dialectically by the light of nature.'

§ lxxxiv l. 8. οὐδεὶς δὲ πρωτότοκός ἐστιν ἑτερογενῶς. Read ἑτερογενῶν.

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

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

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

ib. ll. 40, 41. Substitute comma for full stop after τῇ τελειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ: and for τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐνεστηκός, νῦν τὸ παρεστηκός, punctuate τὸ ἐνεστηκὸς νῦν, τὸ παρεστηκός.

ib. l. 45. ἐκ τῆς διασήψεως τοῦ κόκκου τοῦ σίτου στάχυς ἑκατοντ⟨άκις⟩ γίνεται. MS ἑκατοντόχους: read ἑκατοντ⟨ά⟩χους, 'of a hundred measures,' 'yielding fruit a hundredfold.'

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

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

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

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

ib. l. 67. For ὑμᾶς read ἡμᾶς.

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

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

ib. l. 76. For ὁ *κύριος ἡμῖν* read ὁ *κύριος ἡμῶν*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. H. TURNER.