

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]

Winckler (a historian), and Jeremias (a theologian). It is a reaction against too narrow specialization—the study of a subject for its own sake—and is part of the persistent desire to co-ordinate and unify. The conclusions and methods of application may appear as extravagant as did the all-explaining systems of the past; but they rest upon a larger body of material and appeal more persuasively to accepted data. The exponents take a natural position—they ask for refutation or a better explanation of their evidence. The works are of great value in that they collect evidence from all quarters and place it at the reader's disposal; but they make comparisons which often seem irrelevant or useless, and draw conclusions which appear paradoxical. Their fundamental weakness appears to be that they deal with different bodies of thought or ideas without taking sufficient account of their complexity and variation, and that they confuse organic connexions of ideas with those that are more casual. Dr Warren's book is throughout extremely interesting and suggestive, and it is an urgent reminder in this age of 'reconstruction' how little we know of the features of the growth, spread, and adjustment of groups of ideas. This is true whether such groups are the object of research (e. g. ancient cosmologies) or the system of research itself, and it is through this that it is possible for writers to argue that the refutation of, e. g., Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* would be the overthrow of Old Testament criticism, or that the latter is 'based' upon Hegelianism. There seems to be need for a special department of research to deal with the masses of objective data which as yet are merely 'compared', and that in a fashion too often promiscuous and superficial.

STANLEY A. COOK.

PATRISTICA.

Patrologie, von O. BARDENHEWER. Dritte, grossenteils neu bearbeitete Auflage. (Herder, Freiburg i. Br., 1910.)

THE fame of this invaluable companion to the student of the Fathers has been so great that it has had to be translated into French, Italian, English, and Spanish. The English translation, published in 1908, was welcomed in the *JOURNAL* for October 1909 (vol. xi pp. 135 f). We have now to record the appearance of a third edition of the original, in great part rewritten. The author speaks very modestly of his increasing consciousness of the defects of his book. In the present edition the Greek authors of the fourth century receive entirely fresh treatment,

but the improvement is not confined to this part of the book, as hardly a page has remained unaltered. The work contains more than before, but an improved arrangement has reduced its size by fifteen pages. We bespeak for it a yet wider public than before; it has no real rival in any language.

One of the most valuable parts of this book is its running bibliography, to which Dr Bardenhewer's colleague, Professor Carl Weyman, has once more contributed richly from his unrivalled stores. Many a useful book or article is mentioned here which our British booksellers never tempt us to buy. The following, however, ought to be added in a new edition: § 6, 4 Dr Bartlet in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v; § 39, 3 Clement of Alexandria *Miscellanies* Book viii, ed. F. J. A. Hort and J. B. Mayor (London 1902); § 50, 3 *Theologische Literaturzeitung* xxviii (1903) 645; *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. viii pp. 297-300; P. Henen *Musée Belge* 1909, p. 99 ff; § 51, 2 L. Bayard *Le Latin de Saint Cyprien* (Paris 1902); § 61, 12 De Bruyne in *Revue Bénédictine* xxvi (1909) 93 ff; § 80, 2 K. Lake in *Studia Biblica* v (1903) 172; § 93, 2 J. E. B. Mayor *The Latin Heptateuch* (Cambridge 1889); § 99, 12 Aug. *Sermones Inediti* ed. M. Denis (Vindob. fol. 1792); § 119, 2 Perugi's edition of Arator (Venice 1909); § 121, 5 Morin in *Revue Bénédictine* xxii (1905) 166 f. Of works published before the close of 1909 these are practically all that I can add. There is, however, some evidence of curtailment in the bibliography as compared with that in the English translation; so that it is possible that Dr Bardenhewer may be acquainted with some or all of these works, though he does not think fit to mention them.

To pass to a few matters of a different nature. No mention is made of the *Monita* of Porcarius abbas, edited by Wilmart in the *Revue Bénédictine* xxvi (1909) 475-480. In § 19 (p. 53) three manuscripts of the so-called Theophilus of Antioch on St Matthew's Gospel are mentioned, but a fourth exists at Reims (no. 427 [saec. xi]); cf. *Revue Bénédictine* for 1907, p. 107). In § 53 it would have been well to mention that Lactantius's name was probably Lucius Caelius Firmianus qui et Lactantius. Commodian's date is hardly satisfactorily treated in § 57, 1: see below, in the notice of Brewer's later book. In the section on Victorinus of Pettau (§ 58), the spelling 'Poetouio' has been omitted, and it is hardly satisfactory to say that perhaps the *Anonymi Chiliastae in Matthaicum fragmenta*, published in this JOURNAL vol. v 218-241, are the work of Victorinus, without saying at the same time that the present chronicler argued for Ambrosiaster and has been supported by Zahn,¹ and—what is more important—that Haussleiter decisively rejects the

¹ Both Mercati (privately) and Turner (publicly) have wavered in their original attribution to Victorinus.

theory of Victorinus's authorship in his article in Herzog-Hauck's *Real Encyclopädie*. In § 61, 4 (p. 213) for 'Ommaney' read 'Ommanney'. The very considerable additions to the papyrus of Cyril of Alexandria's *De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate*, reported by Serruys in the *Revue de Philologie* for 1910, were probably announced too late to be mentioned by Dr Bardenheuer (§ 66, 4, p. 235). There are misprints at the foot of p. 301. In § 92, 8 for 'Caius' read 'Gaius', as is done in § 93, 1. In § 94, 3 the fresh tractate of Priscillian, discovered by Turner, and published by Morin in the *Revue Benedictine* for July 1909, is overlooked. In § 95, 10 Turner's review of Burn's *Niceta* in this JOURNAL vol. vii 203 ff, should also have been mentioned. On p. 441, l. 23 surely '1885' is a mistake for '1895'. It is with real reluctance that I have to refer again¹ to the fact that the statement that Cassiodorus's 'Auslegung des Römerbriefes, welche namentlich auch den Pelagianismus bekämpfte' is lost (p. 547), is over four years out of date at least, and to point out that it is none other than that published long since under the name of Primasius. No scholar has questioned the correctness of this view, so far as I know, which Mr Turner first suggested in this JOURNAL in October 1902, in a review of Zimmer's *Pelagius in Irland*, and which it was my good fortune to establish by irrefutable reasoning in my tractate on *The Commentary of Pelagius* (London 1907) p. 20. In accordance with this fact § 121, 7 can be made more explicit.

Les Pères Apostoliques II, Clément de Rome, Épître aux Corinthiens, Homélie du I^{er} Siècle . . . par HIPPOLYTE HEMMER. (Picard, Paris, 1909.)

Les Pères Apostoliques III, Ignace d'Antioche et Polycarpe de Smyrne, Épîtres, Martyre de Polycarpe . . . par AUGUSTE LELONG. (Picard, Paris, 1910.)

Justin, Dialogue avec Tryphon . . . par GEORGES ARCHAMBAULT, 2 Tomes. (Picard, Paris, 1909.)

Eusèbe, Histoire Ecclésiastique, Livres V-VIII . . . par ÉMILE GRAPIN. (Picard, Paris, 1911.)

THESE five volumes all belong to the admirable series, 'Textes et Documents pour l'étude historique du Christianisme, publiés sous la direction de Hippolyte Hemmer et Paul Lejay'. In my 'Chronicle' for October 1909 I took occasion to point out the excellence of this collection, and it is by this time, I hope, well known to readers of the JOURNAL. The features of the series are texts with complete translations in French, adequate introductions and commentary, and good indexes, at a very moderate price. The work is thoroughly scientific and worthy of the best French traditions. Having thus commended the series most heartily to all who have begun, or think of beginning,

¹ See the JOURNAL vol. xi (1909-10) pp. 135 f.

patristic study, I can now proceed to add some supplementary notes, which may prove of some use for new editions.

The edition of the two Clementine works deserves especial commendation, and is doubtless the handiest in existence. It is the first in which the recently discovered Coptic version of First Clement has been used. I miss references to Neumann's *Der römische Staat- und die allgemeine Kirche* and Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire* on page ix, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford 1905), on p. xlii; reference would now be made to Burkitt's article on *Codex Alexandrinus* (in the JOURNAL xi (1909-10) 603 ff) on pp. liv, lix; *Florinensis* (p. lvi) should rather be, I fancy, *Florenensis*; on p. lxxi Dr Bartlet's article, attributing 'Second Clement' to Alexandria (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* vii (1906) 123 ff; Proceedings of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology for 1905-6) has been overlooked. On page 33 *léger* is rather a free translation for τὴν τυχοῦσαν. The Pauline ὑπερεκπερισσῶς (xx 11) is wanting from the index. There are misprints in the following places:—γραγῆν (p. xxiv), *Maredsoliana* (p. lvii), τὸν (p. 8, l. 7), κήρυξ (p. 16, l. 3), εὐλογοῦσαν (p. 34, l. 14), 'Ἡλίαν (p. 40, l. 7).

The volume containing the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp, if, perhaps, not of such striking erudition, is none the less a thoroughly competent piece of work. The translation of Ignatius, almost of necessity, is more paraphrastic than that of other writers, on account of the obscurity of his style. On page xv the exact reference to the *phrase célèbre* might have been given, namely iv 1: on page lxxix for 'Randel' read 'Randell'; on page 15 '*Astron.*' is not a proper abbreviation for the *Mathesis* of Firmicus, and on p. 157 correct 'Caius' twice to 'Gaius'.

The two volumes containing Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* are particularly welcome, as Otto's edition is a wearisome book to use, and Dr Archambault is a thoroughly competent editor, who has re-collated the sole MS of value. One of the happiest features of this edition is the abundant reference made to up-to-date editions and treatises. One or two errors may be pointed out. The editor has stumbled, like many others, at the name 'Phillipps' (p. xvi and note); on p. lxi note, line 1, it should have been made clear that it is not the third volume of the series, but the third volume of Tertullian in the series (similarly, p. 25, note 7); p. lxxviii, note 1, accent *Mârκε*; p. xcvi, l. 4, read '1902' for '1982', line 5 from foot, '*griechische*' for '*griechischen*'; p. xcvi, read 'Parsons' for 'Parson'; p. 62, l. 6, read σκῦλα. Perhaps πλήρης of the MS ought to be kept (xxvii 2) as the indeclinable use, but compare xxxi 6. There is a misprint on p. 174, first line of notes, as also in the corresponding position on p. 238; p. 245, second last line, read

Abraham for *Abrahamo*; lviii 8 εἰς γῆν of the MS could perhaps be kept, in view of the late use of εἰς = ἐν; p. 322, fifth line from foot, a misprint; lxx 1, I prefer γεγενῆσθαι of the MS; lxxiii 1, note: Ambrosiaster *Quaestiones* should have been given, earlier in date as he is than all those referred to, except Tertullian. In vol. ii p. 16, note, for *CSEL* read *GCS*; lxxxi, 2 Dr Archambault does not appear to have grasped the distinction, substantiated by the papyri, between γενήματα (of the vegetable world) and γεννήματα (of the animal world), or he would not have here deserted the MS; p. 43, notes, l. 1, for 'Horn' read 'Hort'; p. 79, note, l. 2, read *evangelistarum* and cite from the Vienna edition; p. 118, note 1, l. 7, correct *Autolychos*; p. 152, note, l. 14, read *Bruchstücke*; cxix 4, read 'Αράβων; p. 219, l. 2 from foot, read *civitate*; p. 301, note, read *Literat*. In the index the following improvements can be made:—ἀνήρ for ἄνηρ, ἀνθρώπων for ἀνθρώπου, ἀπειλεῖν for ἀπειλεῖν, ἄσβετον for ἀσβέτον, ἀσώματος for ἀσώματος, ἀφθαρτος for ἀφθαρτός, διαδοχή for διαδόχη, add δοξολογεῖν vii 2, read ἐγγράφως for ἐγγραφῶς, Ἐλαιών for Ἐλαίων, ἐλεεῖν for ἐλέειν, πολιτεία for πολιτεία (under ἔννομος), correct misprint on p. 338, col. 1, line 3 from foot. Lack of care in reading in the proofs is, in fact, the only defect of the book which I have observed.

The first volume of Grapin's *Eusèbe, Histoire Ecclésiastique*, containing books i-iv, I have not seen, and it is not accessible to me at the time of writing. I cannot therefore give readers of the *JOURNAL* any account of his Introduction. The text printed is practically that of Schwartz in the Berlin series (1903 to 1908), which is a great advance on its predecessors. I have noted the following inaccuracies: p. 86, § 4, remove the , from Ἀγκύρα to Γαλατίας; p. 192, § 1, l. 4, a comma is absolutely necessary after ἐπιστολὰς; p. 215, § 3, read 'Gaius', and be consistent with p. 329, especially as 'Caius' never had any existence; p. 318, l. 8 from foot, read πειθαρχεῖν; p. 320, § 8, l. 5, read Γαλλιανῶ; p. 352, read THUCYD. The notes are in this case printed at the end of the volume, and fill fifty pages as against two hundred and fifty of text. Of course, a scholar might very well spend a lifetime composing an adequate commentary on the *Ecclesiastical History*, and the notes of such an edition as the present must necessarily be brief. The editor has exercised restraint in this matter, and yet has contrived to refer to a very large number of interesting points, textual and other. References to modern literature, particularly to Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, are frequent. On p. 518, l. 4, a *de* has slipped out before *littérature*. On page 525 I miss a reference to Cantarelli's *La Serie dei Prefetti di Egitto*. On page 528, line 10 from foot, read 'anointing'. Κατὰ Φρύγας (v 16, 1 &c.) deserved a grammatical note. To say (p. 540), 'Le Novat d'Eusèbe est, en réalité, Novatien,' is hardly to say enough.

May not Eusebius be right? Surely the name of the heretics, *Nouatiani*, can only come from *Nouatus*. The secondary name *Nouatianus* (singular) I am disposed to regard as coming from the plural (*Nouatiani*) by a misunderstanding. A full discussion of these words is, however, desirable.

The Apologies of Justin Martyr, edited by A. W. F. BLUNT. (Cambridge University Press, 1911.)

THIS edition deserves a welcome: it is the first published in England for many a long day. The notes suffer somewhat from the editor's ignorance of the edition by the great Greek scholar Gildersleeve, published at New York in 1877, but the book is a careful piece of work and pleasant to use. There is the less necessity for dealing with it at length here, that I have reviewed it in *The Review of Theology and Philosophy* for August. I find Gildersleeve has preceded me in conjecturing ἀναπήρους for the πονηροῦς of *Apol.* i 22 (p. 38, 1). There is an accent wanting on page 40, line 9, and ἀποκόπτονται (p. 45, 10) might have been illustrated from *Gal.* v 12, and p. 51, 12 from *Apoc.* vii 14. A reference to the list of *praefecti Aegypti* in Cantarelli's *La Serie dei Prefetti di Egitto* (Rome 1906) might have been given on *Apol.* i 29 (pp. 1 and 47, 7). Mr Blunt would have discovered, if he had referred to this (standard) work, that the date of Munatius Felix is now narrowed down to A. D. 150-153. In fact, the note on p. 47, l. 7, contains several errors. The title *praefectus Augustalis* was not used till 381-382, the first holder of it being Palladius (cf. Cantarelli, part ii [1911] p. 349); Felix's *praenomen* was Lucius, not Gaius. Also, no papyrus records Felix as prefect of Egypt 'in A. D. 148-154'. It is not the way of papyri to record such things. Further, a number of papyri mention him, and it would have been well to cite them from Cantarelli. Ἐγγύς with the dative (36, 16) deserved a place in the index of Greek words.

Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae: Pars i: Epistulae I-LXX. Recensuit ISIDORUS HILBERG [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. liv]. (F. Tempisky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1910.)

No event in the history of the Vienna Corpus is likely to appeal to so many classes of students as the publication of the letters of St Jerome, of which the first half is now before us. It is the custom to praise Vallarsi's edition of the works of St Jerome, but it will not be uncharitable to say that its excellence is chiefly due to the fact that Italian manuscripts were almost, if not quite, exclusively used in its production. Certainly it will not take the reader very long to discover that Dr Hilberg's recension of the letters is infinitely superior to Vallarsi's. Nor could it be otherwise. As a preparation for the present edition

Dr Hilberg obtained complete and exact information as to the contents of every MS in Europe known to contain any letters of St Jerome. From the information thus obtained, an infinitely wider basis than that at the disposal of all previous editors of Jerome put together, he was able to select the authorities of value for the construction of his recension. No doubt he will tell us later something of the groups in which the letters first appeared, as Dr Hans von Soden did some years ago for the Cypriatic correspondence.

The oldest manuscripts at the disposal of the editor appear to be a sixth-century fragmentary MS at Lyons (no. 600), another at Lyons (602), and a MS at Paris (nouv. acq. lat. 446); the next in age are Verona MS xvii 15 and Naples MS vi D 59, both of the seventh century. The bulk of the MSS are of the eighth and ninth centuries, but the editor descends as far as the fifteenth for his authorities. It is not surprising that the bulk of the large fifteenth-century MSS are rejected as valueless. The most interesting MS of all is probably the well-known Épinal 68, which came there through Moyenmoutier from Murbach.¹ Dr Hilberg does not seem quite to have realized that this MS and the Autun MS 17 A (saec. x) are the best he has got, at least in orthography: he ought to have followed them much more constantly than he has done. The orthography of Épinal 68, in particular, shews that it is directly copied from a fifth- or sixth-century MS.

The immense superiority of this edition over that of Vallarsi can hardly be better shewn than by taking a passage which it occurred to me to look out, when I was studying the *clausula* in Mr A. C. Clark's paper *The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin* (Oxford 1910), published before the appearance of Hilberg's edition. Mr Clark takes a passage of Jerome's *Epistle* xxiii to illustrate Jerome's usage in regard to the *clausula*. The passage he quotes contains only eighty-one continuous words; yet there are eight alterations to be made, some of them quite serious. Before going on to consider one direction in which this new edition is rather defective, I will just pay the deserved tribute to the Latinity of the editor's preface, express some regret that the (approximate) dates are not affixed to each letter, as in Vallarsi (whose order is kept), and call attention to the fact that the symbol ζ (= previous editors?) is not explained. The apparatus is a mine of valuable information to the student of Latin orthography.

Nothing is more important about Jerome than his connexion with

¹ Dr Hilberg might, in fact, have added 'Murbacensis' to its description, just as he has added 'Augiensis' to a Karlsruhe MS and so on. He adds 'Augiensis' also to a Zürich MS. If this means 'of Reichenau', it may stand, as there are some Reichenau MSS in the Rheinau collection at Zürich; but if it means 'of Rheinau', he should have used Rheinaugiensis.

the Latin Bible. It is, therefore, desirable that every echo of Biblical language in his writings should be carefully registered. If Dr Hilberg has not completely succeeded here, it must be remembered that he is primarily a classical scholar—and an eminent one too—and we must not expect too much from an editor whose services to the text itself cannot be overpraised. I seek, then, here, for the sake of the study of Jerome and the Latin Bible, to add certain references to those given in the book.¹ Page 4, 2 cf. Verg. *Aen.* iv 449; p. 15, 1 cf. Hor. *Carm.* ii 17, 5, i 3, 8; p. 15, 12 cf. Ps. cxxv 5; p. 21, 7 cf. 1 Cor. v 3; p. 40, 9 cf. 2 Cor. iv 7; p. 42, 3 add *Iac. iv 6; p. 51, 3, surely a tag from a poet (cf. Verg. *Aen.* i 738–739); p. 55, 9 cf. 1 Cor. ix 13; p. 63, 10 cf. Verg. *Buc.* v 37; Mal. 4, 2 (3, 20); p. 69, 22 cf. 1 Cor. viii 11; p. 85, 1 cf. Ps. xviii 5 (Rom. x 18); p. 124, 5 cf. 1 Cor. viii 11; p. 132, 18 cf. Job xiv 4–5; p. 136, 13–14 cf. Col. i 16; so p. 139, 21; p. 147, 5–6 cf. Ioh. xiv 30; p. 149, 16 cf. 2 Cor. vi 4–5; p. 155, 16–17 bracket Ex. 32, 6 and add 1 Cor. x 7; p. 169, 1–2 cf. Lucr. v 226–227; p. 170, 6 cf. Matt. x 10, Luc. x 4; p. 174, 14 cf. 1 Thess. v 17; l. 15 cf. 1 Cor. vii 3; p. 175, 12–13 cf. 1 Tim. v 21; p. 191, 2 cf. Hebr. xii 17 &c.; p. 201, 9 cf. 1 Thess. v 17; p. 204, 17 cf. Iac. ii 25; p. 210, 15–16 should also be spaced (Apoc. xiv 4); p. 212, 6 cf. 2 Cor. iv 7; p. 215, 8 cf. Gal. i 15 (rather than Eph. i 4); p. 216, 15 cf. Matt. xix 26 &c.; p. 246, 15 cf. 1 Tim. iii 15; p. 247, 4 cf. Phil. i 23, Luc. xx 36; p. 249, 6 cf. Rom. xvi 20; p. 270, 9 cf. Gen. iv 14; p. 276, 4 cf. 1 Cor. ii 13; p. 284, 3 cf. Hebr. ii 15; p. 290, 18 cf. Rom. xiv 8; p. 294, 3 cf. Hor. *Carm.* i 3, 18; p. 297, 14–15 cf. Job i 21; p. 309, 14 cf. Hor. *Carm.* i 3, 18; p. 328, 6 cf. Matt. xii 24 &c.; p. 332, 5 cf. 1 Cor. xv 45; p. 334, 14–16 cf. Hebr. ix 3–5; p. 338, 20 cf. 2 Cor. v 10; p. 340, 1 cf. Verg. *Buc.* i 66; p. 340, 14–15 cf. Matt. xix 30 &c.; p. 346, 22 cf. 1 Cor. xv 8; p. 352, 21 cf. 1 Tim. iv 3; p. 372, 14 cf. Col. i 16; p. 375, 13 cf. Phil. iii 14; p. 387, 1–2 cf. 1 Tim. v 9 &c.; p. 426, 11 cf. Matt. xiii 46; p. 426 in rubric, read 13 for 14; p. 436, 14 cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii 2, 20; p. 439, 12 cf. 1 Tim. v 14; p. 443, 13 cf. (?) Verg. *Buc.* i 66; p. 463, 4 cf. 2 Cor. viii 18; p. 478, 7 cf. Matt. xiii 46; p. 525, 7–8 cf. the well-known proverb; p. 530, 10–14 cf. Ioh. iv 23–24; p. 530, 15–16 cf. Matt. viii 11 &c.; p. 531, 3 cf. Luc. xiv 27 &c.; p. 536, 16 cf. 1 Tim. vi 8; p. 551, 9–10 cf. Rom. vii 6; p. 561, 1–2 cf. 1 Tim. v 2; p. 561, 12 cf. Iuu. xi 154; p. 574, 7 cf. Verg. *Aen.* x 197 &c.; p. 589, 9 cf. Matt. xv 17 &c.; p. 590, 12–13 cf. 1 Tim. vi 8; p. 591, 14 cf. Rom. v 12; p. 592, 1 cf. Apoc. iii 20; p. 592, 13 cf. 1 Tim. v 6; p. 595, 17 cf. Verg. *Aen.* vi 15; p. 597, 19 cf. Hor. *A. P.* 180; p. 612, 1 cf. 2 Tim. ii 2; p. 618, 3 cf. Matt. xii 42 &c.; p. 645, 4 cf. Matt. xxviii 19; p. 684, 19 f cf. 1 Tim. v 11; p. 687, 9–10 cf. C. H. Turner *Ecclesiae Occiden-*

¹ I have also added some references to classical literature.

talis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima I ; p. 693, 22 cf. Hebr. xi 32 &c. ; p. 697, 7 cf. Phil. iv 16 ; p. 704, 11 cf. 2 Tim. iii 15.

There are places in which I do not agree with the editor's conclusions. First, as to text. Page 51, l. 7 I should unhesitatingly read *idololatras* ; a review of a considerable body of evidence has convinced me that the syncopated form was not used till after Jerome's period ; p. 103, 2, 4 read *Sileam* (*Silea*), the regular Old-Latin form (*Study of Ambrosiaster* p. 208) ; p. 115, 13 I should regard simply as an anacoluthon of a kind not unexampled ; p. 123, 4 *idolio* certainly ; Jerome knew the difference, if his scribes did not ; so also with *Betsabee* (159, 12), *Bersabee* being due to scribes, a not unparalleled confusion (cf. Ps.-Aug. *Quaest.* p. 431, 19) ; p. 165, 5 I prefer Engelbrecht's suggestion ; p. 189, 2 read *Beliab* with G d and Pelag. (comm.) ; p. 239, 18 get rid of the barbarous expansion 'octuaginta' and read LXXX ; p. 305, 10 certainly *Melanius*, comparing Abbot Butler's comprehensive notes in his *Lausiac History of Palladius* vol. ii pp. 222 f, and remembering that this form is not only the best attested for Jerome, but the most difficult ; p. 350, 6 undoubtedly read *Apologeticus* (λόγος being understood), again the better attested and the more difficult reading ; p. 365, 9 print *leuitico* with small l, as deacons (or subdeacons) are referred to in contrast to priests ; p. 389, 11 *πνευματόφορος* proparoxyton, as the epithet comes from the Western text of Acts xv 29 ; p. 488, 13 read *esca* with best MSS, and thus, at the same time, be consistent with p. 589, 9, where it is read ; p. 592, 11 omit the *et*, and thus bring closer to the Greek of 1 Pet. ii 9. Second, in illustration of what I have remarked above about orthography, no one who had made a special study of fourth-century orthography would, I fancy, disagree with me that the following forms should be put in the text as genuine forms of Jerome's period ; *Eleazarus* (pp. 171, 19. 301, 10. 303, 5. 551, 15, perhaps elsewhere ; compare Mr C. H. Turner in the *JOURNAL* vol. ii (1900-1901) 600 ff) ; *balbutire* (pp. 188, 14. 549, 8 ; all words of this form are better spelt with double *t*) ; *formonsus* (p. 311, 4. 9) ; *hordiacius* (p. 373, 15) ; *Ambrosi* (p. 374, 7) ; *Ezechiel* (pp. 386, 11. 649, 3 &c.) ; the other is the Vulgate form, introduced into the text by scribes) ; *Isac* (pp. 415, 10. 551, 7) ; *obsetrix* (p. 419, 13, cf. Ambr. *expos. Luc.* iii 20 (ter) ; not *obsetrix*, due to a false etymology : the word is from *ob* and *satum*) ; *subolem* (p. 482, 23) ; *Eseias* (p. 484, 17, a plentifully attested Old-Latin form) ; *i(h)ensaurus* (p. 485, 2) ; *Xerses* (p. 573, 6. 16 ; correct in classical authors also) ; *Istrahel*, &c. (pp. 595, 17. 602, 9. 702, 11). There are misprints in the following places : pp. 128, 16 (read *calciaui*), 208, 14. 361, 1. 401 rubric (transfer bracket from the second to the first line) ; 402, 10. 417, 9. 480, 16 (rubric) ; 586, 13 (rubric, insert 3, the number of the chapter) ; 651, 19 and apparatus (correct the Greek accents) ; 675, 11.

Tyrannii Rufini Orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni Novem Interpretatio, IOHANNIS WROBELII copiis usus edidit et Prolegomena Indicesque adiecit AUGUSTUS ENGELBRECHT. [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. xxxvi.] (F. Tempisky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1910.)

THE delay in the publication of this volume, which, as the reader will see, is number forty-six in the series, is due to the death of the appointed editor, Professor Wrobel, of the University of Czernowitz, Bukowina, in which University Dr Isidor Hilberg, the editor of St Jerome's Epistles, is also a Professor. Certain indications which reveal themselves here and there lead one to conclude that it has been decidedly for the advantage of the edition that Professor Engelbrecht, the supervisor of the *Corpus*, should have seen it through the press. The edition is, in fact, Engelbrecht's work.

Hitherto there have been various difficulties in studying Rufinus. One was the comparative inaccessibility of his works. The present volume, for instance, contains matter which many good patristic scholars can never have seen, for the works have only been twice printed, and the second issue took place nearly four hundred years ago.¹ Rufinus's real greatness, too, has been overshadowed by that of his enemy Jerome. Further, his freedom in translating Greek works is alien to the exact and critical spirit of the present age. It is, therefore, a matter for congratulation that we now have a scientific edition of one section of Rufinus's voluminous works.

A severe sifting of the numerous manuscripts, most of them of respectable age, has left the following only as of adequate merit to be used in constituting a recension: Vaticanus Reginensis 141 (saec. ix), Oxoniensis Laud. Misc. 276 (probably of Bavarian origin) (saec. ix), Atrebatensis 621 (saec. x), Augiensis cxviii (saec. ix-x), and Vindobonensis 759 (saec. xi). The readings of four other MSS are given in the apparatus to Rufinus's preface, to shew what their character really is. The apparatus is very easy to use. The original Greek has been fully taken into account in constituting the text, and the editing is, of course, worthy of the best traditions of the Vienna series.

Valuable features of the present edition are the long and most valuable introduction, and the indexes of scriptural and other passages, of names and things, and of words and expressions.² Engelbrecht felt

¹ First edition by J. A. Mulingus, printed at Strassburg in 1508; the second published edition appeared at Leipzig in 1522.

² Rules of the Vienna series have been broken both in this volume and in Hilberg's. According to the plan of the series, each volume of an author's works is intended to contain an index of scripture passages, but other indexes are deferred to the end of the author's works: yet Hilberg's volume contains no index of scripture passages, and Engelbrecht's contains all three indexes, though each is the first published volume of an author's works.

himself bound to make a special study of Rufinus's style and language, as a necessary preliminary to an estimate of the comparative value of the various *codices*. The first part of the introduction, which is absolutely indispensable to all serious students of Rufinus's works, is divided into four parts, concerned respectively with (1) the estimate of Rufinus's translations held by ancient writers; (2) the number of Gregory's discourses translated by Rufinus, and the exclusion of the tractate *De Fide* from this collection; (3) the date of the translation; and (4) the nature and character of the translation. Jerome, Gennadius, Augustine, Leo, &c., all shew the highest esteem for the translation. The manuscripts are easily classified by the number of discourses they contain, because some comprise eight, others nine, while yet a third class exists containing ten. The tenth is the *De Fide*, a native Latin work, now almost unanimously attributed to Gregory of Elvira. The similarity of name explains how in some copies a short tractate got combined with the nine discourses of Gregory of Nazianzus, and the varying position in which it is found in this collection at once convicts it as an interloper. But even Augustine appears already in 413 to have had the *De Fide* in his collection, because in his epistle cxlviii he quotes some words from it as by 'Gregory, an Eastern bishop'. Engelbrecht is, in my judgement, quite right in supposing that Rufinus himself had nothing to do with this insertion. In the matter of the date which he assigns to the translation, early in 399 or 400, he appears to me to have rightly interpreted the evidence. The second part of the introduction discusses the manuscripts thoroughly, and considers some special passages in detail, and the third part the *editio princeps*, and the plan of the present edition.

A few notes may be given: page xii, l. 17 correct *uendidatam*; p. xiv, l. 20 I should prefer *etiam* for *certe*, and *quidem* or *præcipue* for *ipsum*—but Prof. Engelbrecht's Latinity is excellent:—p. xxxix, l. 23 I do not know any authority for 'Lincoloniensis', and should suggest 'Lincolniensis' or 'Lindensis'; p. xlv note, correct the misprint; p. 137, 3 cf. Matt. v 16; p. 170, 6 cf. 1 Pet. v 8.

In every way an epoch-making edition.

S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi Epistulae. Recensuit et Commentario Critico instruxit AL. GOLDBACHER, *Pars iv: Ep. CLXXXV-CCLXX* [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. lvii.] (F. Tempisky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1911.)

WITH this volume Dr Goldbacher has completed the editorial part of what is one of the biggest pieces of critical work on a Latin author achieved in our generation. And it has all been done in a manner which reflects the highest credit on his finished scholarship. Of this consummate edition of the Epistles of St Augustine there remain only

the preface and six indexes, which are promised within a year and a half from now. For those who know the three earlier parts of the work there is no need of any words of commendation.

The manuscripts used range in date from Paris B. N. 11641 (saec. vi) and Bamberg B iv 21 (saec. vi) down to the fifteenth century. The number employed is, of course, very large, and the symbols used for them are given separately at the beginning of the apparatus to each letter. It is needless to say that the improvement on the Maurists' text is not seldom very noticeable. An interesting case, where the Biblical text is involved, is the quotation of Eph. i 15 in *epist.* ccxvii 28, where *dilectione* is proved to be an insertion of the editors, as it is absent from all the MSS.¹ It is but little I have to say by way of criticism about this volume. Page 82, 15 perhaps contains an unrecognized reference to 1 Ioh. iv 20; p. 158, 11-16 recognizes the quotation from Pelagius, but does not supply the reference in *Rom.* v 15. The quotation is reasonably accurate, as are all Augustine's citations from Pelagius, but it is more paraphrastic than the others; the following variants occur: *non est ex traduce* (l. 11); *caro*] add. *ipsa* (l. 11); *sola*] *praem. et ipsa* (l. 12); *ergo* om. (l. 12); *est enim*] *esse dicentes* (l. 13); *quia*] *dicunt etiam* (l. 14); *concedi* (l. 15); *propria*] add. *homini* (l. 15); *remittit* (l. 15); *unum* om. (l. 15); *aliena* (l. 16); pp. 227, 263, misprints; p. 446, 14 read *Mediolanii*, the correct form of the locative, though not of the genitive (cf. *Brundusii* in Ennius); p. 454, 11, cf. Gal. i 22; p. 583, 4 unquestionably *Beliar*, on general grounds, but also because *Belial* is Vulgate, and Augustine did not use the Vulgate of the Pauline Epistles. Some matters of orthography will perhaps be explained in the orthographical index; for example, why the editor prints *haereticus*, *Manichaeus*, instead of *hereticus*, *Manicheus*. On page 536 *ὁμοούσιον* should certainly have been printed as Latin.

Un Anonyme Ancien De Decem Virginibus. D. A. WILMART. (Librairie Lecoffre, Gabalda, Paris, 1911.)

THIS brochure is a reprint from two numbers of a learned periodical recently launched, to which the attention of our readers ought to be called. It is called the *Bulletin d'archéologie et de littérature chrétiennes*, and has made an excellent start. The tractate on the Ten Virgins fills only about two and a half pages with apparatus, but Dom Wilmart has provided a full and learned discussion of it in all its bearings, so that the whole article extends to thirty-two pages. The work survives only, as it appears, in the famous Épinal MS 68, above referred to in connexion with the letters of St Jerome, for which it is probably the most valuable

¹ I ought perhaps to refer to my discussion of the significance of the true text of Eph. i 15 in the *Expositor* for August and October.

surviving textual authority, and has only once before been published, namely, by the late Léopold Delisle in 1878. One interest of the tractate lies in the fact that it preserves an Old-Latin text of St Matthew xxv 1-13. The fragment displays the allegorical method in exegesis, and is also interesting from the point of view of Latinity. What, however, will attract most readers is a reference to the Apocalypse of Peter¹ side by side with Daniel, as if it were a canonical work, for the 'river of fire'.¹ Dom Wilmart is no doubt right in regarding the fragment as having formed part of a set of *Quaestiones*, as the title of one following 'Why Zacharias did not believe the angel Gabriel, &c.' suggests. As author he suggests Victorinus of Pettau, and I think the suggestion very probable. If it be accepted, it is certainly fatal to the claims of the 'Anonymus Chiliasta' to be Victorinus,² as the two fragments are certainly not by the same author.

A few notes may be added to this little work of Dom Wilmart's, which is a model of investigation at once learned and neat. On p. 16, note 3, reference might have been made to the fifth and sixth edition (the last) of Jülicher's *Einleitung* (1906); on p. 17 for *Vetus Latinum* I should prefer the usual *Vetus Latina*; p. 18 read *Rehdigeranus*; p. 19 Pseudo-Jerome might have been left out, as the printed text is practically illegible; so far from its being Fortunatian, I should regard it as a mediaeval Irish compilation, based on what is practically a Vulgate text; p. 24, why does Dom Wilmart attribute St Jerome's commentary on Matthew to 387,³ when the authorities are unanimous for 398? On p. 32 he has forgotten Victorinus on the Apocalypse; he would have found there an interesting parallel to the exegesis of our passage; the 'seven women' of Isaiah vi 1-4 are also 'churches'.

Die Frage um das Zeitalter Kommodians, von HEINRICH BREWER (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, herausg. v. A. Ehrhard u. J. P. Kirsch, x. Bd., 5. Heft). (Schöningh, Paderborn, 1910.)

FATHER BREWER, in a work of which a lengthy account was given in the JOURNAL for October 1907, gave a learned and—in the view of the present chronicler—a convincing exposition of his view that Commodian's poems belong to Gaul and to the middle of the fifth century. His view found much support, but also a certain amount of opposition. It was not to be expected that all scholars would consent to be deprived of the 'earliest (African) Christian poet' without a protest. In particular, Lejay in the *Revue Critique* for September 16, 1907, a young

¹ For which see Dr M. R. James in the JOURNAL xii (1910-1911) pp. 41, 43, referred to by Wilmart, p. 32.

² See above, p. 144 (in the notice of Bardenhewer's *Patrologie*).

³ Mr C. H. Turner by a slip in his article in vol. xii (1910-11) p. 99 does the same.

scholar named F. Zeller (*Die Zeit Commodians*, 1909, reprinted from the *Theologische Quartalschrift* of that year), and Zahn (*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* Bd. xxi pp. 228-241) have argued for the older view.¹ Brewer has in the work now under consideration replied to his critics, and has received the support of Dräseke (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, June 10, 1911), and Rauschen (*Literarische Beilage der Kölnischen Volkszeitung*, [March 9, and] April 13, 1911).² What is of more importance even than the assent of these noted patristic scholars, in the eyes of the present writer at least, is the fact that the late Professor J. E. B. Mayor, to whom I sent a copy of Brewer's first book, expressed his 'entire concurrence' with Brewer's view, in what was probably the last article he wrote before his lamented death on December 1 last.³ Probably no one else had Mayor's comprehensive knowledge of Latin literature, joined to sanity of judgement, and I confess that for myself his opinion closes the question. He mentions a point in Brewer's favour, unknown to Brewer himself, namely Maass's 'proof' that Commodian depends on Firmicus Maternus *De errore Profanarum Religionum*. This at once sends Commodian to the second half of the fourth century at the earliest. Incidentally Mayor also solves the mysterious 'gaseus' in the subscription to the MS of Commodian; it has nothing to do with Gaza, as we were inclined to think, but = arcarius gazae, keeper of the church treasure. The present work of Brewer contains eighty pages, and includes both the further assertion of points previously made, and what appears to me a successful refutation of points raised by Lejay and Zeller against the arguments of the previous work. The whole question seems settled in Brewer's favour. The certain emendation *ballatur* (for *bellatur*)⁴ in i 34, 12, gives us another instance of a late Latin word unknown outside Gaul, and confirms the conclusion reached on general grounds.

A. SOUTER.

¹ I have to thank Profs. Lejay and Zahn for copies of their articles.

² I am indebted to Father Brewer's kindness for my knowledge of these two articles which would otherwise have escaped me.

³ *Classical Review*, December 1910.

⁴ P. 69.