

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

## PATRISTICA.

*Die christliche griechische Litteratur, von OTTO STÄHLIN. (Sonderabdruck aus WILHELM VON CHRIST'S Griechischer Litteraturgeschichte, 5. Aufl., II. Bd., 2. Hälfte, neubearbeitet von W. SCHMID u. O. STÄHLIN.) (Beck, Munich, 1914.)*

THE work of which the title is given is not obtainable separately. It is a portion (344 large octavo pages) of the second volume of the new edition of Wilhelm von Christ's well-known and highly valued history of Greek literature from the earliest times to A.D. 530.<sup>1</sup> Christian literature has claimed an increasing space in the successive editions of the book, and the publishers have done well to entrust this part to a scholar of the eminence of Professor Otto Stählin (now of Erlangen). His three-volume edition of the works of Clement of Alexandria in the great series of the Prussian Academy (see the JOURNAL, vol. vii, pp. 142 f, vol. ix pp. 138 ff) is recognized everywhere as a masterpiece. The same care and thoroughness are here displayed. It is, of course, no light task to give an account of five centuries of literary production, including the New Testament. Professor Stählin shews an astounding acquaintance with the bibliography of his subject, which includes works published in his own country and elsewhere down to the moment of going to press. His book ought to be particularly acceptable to English students, who have always shewn a much greater interest in the Greek than in the Latin Fathers. The general patristic student will still go to Bardenhewer's *Patrologie*, but there is no work on Greek Christian literature by itself to be compared for a moment with that of Stählin. I have given a fuller account of his book elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

*Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers.* By HENRY B. ROBISON. (*Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament: Second Series, Volume ii Part 5.*) (University of Chicago Press: British Agents, Cambridge University Press, 1914.)

THE author, a pupil of Professor Goodspeed, of Chicago, who has done so much for the study of early Christian literature (see the JOURNAL, vol. ix pp. 137 f, xiv p. 152), here essays a minute study of

<sup>1</sup> The price of this volume is M.14.50 (bound M.16.50).

<sup>2</sup> *Review of Theology and Philosophy* for April.

the uses of the participle in the Apostolic Fathers. He began his literary career by collaborating in the *Index Patristicus* of Dr Goodspeed, and the present work is based on the most up-to-date grammatical classification, as might be expected. The method adopted is to quote an example and give references for the rest. Perhaps this procedure was due to want of space, but the work would have had more educational value if several examples had been quoted *in extenso* at the head of each section, instead of one. A bibliography and statistics add to the usefulness of the book. Of interesting results the following may be referred to: 'The martyrdom of Polycarp, which is one twenty-fifth of the whole volume of the Apostolic Fathers, has 31 of the 126 participles in the genitive absolute' (p. 39); 'The participle as a whole occurs not quite as frequently in the New Testament as in the Apostolic Fathers, but the periphrastic verb form occurs more frequently in the New Testament than in the Apostolic Fathers, and the present participle combined with the imperfect indicative occurs nearly four times as frequently in the New Testament as in the Apostolic Fathers' (p. 44); 'The difference from the New Testament, which consists largely of frequency of usage and emphasis, indicates that the Apostolic Fathers are freer from hebraistic influence than the New Testament' (p. 45). There are misprints on pp. 13, 14 (two), 21, 26, 35.

*Eusèbe, Histoire ecclésiastique, livres IX-X, Sur les martyrs de Palestine, texte grec et traduction française avec un index général des deux ouvrages, par ÉMILE GRAPIN. (Picard, Paris, 1913.)*

THIS is volume seventeen of the now well-known and valued series, 'Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du Christianisme, publiés sous la direction de Hippolyte Hemmer et Paul Lejay', and the concluding volume of the edition of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* in that series. The character of the series in general and of the preceding volume of Eusebius in particular has been sufficiently described already in the JOURNAL (vol. xiii pp. 145-148). Two features of the concluding part of the edition must be specially singled out for mention. One is the valuable introduction, extending to eighty-six pages; and the other, the equally if not more valuable general index, which occupies just over two hundred pages, double columns. The classical article 'Eusebios von Caesarea' in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, by Eduard Schwartz, is not accessible to many students of Eusebius, and it is important that its results should be made known in an edition like the present. At the same time the editor is no slavish adherent of the opinions of Schwartz. One or two slight matters have been noted: on p. viii, l. 16 't. iv (Stuttgart, 1907)' should be 't. vi (Stuttgart, 1909)'

or 'Halb-Band xi (Stuttgart, 1907)'; p. xv n. 2 'E. Burn' should be 'A. E. Burn'; p. 150, l. 7, wrong accentuation; on p. 318, why not give Prof. W. M. Calder the credit of his rediscovery of the epitaph of Eugenius, and why select for mention among the various articles to which the discovery has given rise the rather jejune one of Mgr Batiffol? The last decade has been singularly fruitful for the student of the *Ecclesiastical History*. For the critical student of the text there is the large three-volume edition by Schwartz (including Rufinus's translation edited by Mommsen) in the Berlin series of the Greek Fathers, for the student who desires a text merely with selected critical notes there is the smaller Schwartz, which has recently come out in a second edition, but for the vast majority of students the most useful edition is that of M. Grapin, three volumes at the price of fifteen francs, which ought to become the favourite in all theological seminaries.

*Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae: Pars ii: Epistulae LXXI-CXX.*  
 Recensuit ISIDORUS HILBERG. [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. lv.]  
 (F. Tempsky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1912.)

THE first volume of Jerome's letters in this new edition was reviewed at length in the JOURNAL (vol. xiii pp. 148-151), and the strong recommendation of it there given is equally, if not more, applicable to this volume. A notable external difference between the two at once strikes the eye. In the new volume, for the first time in the history of the Vienna series, which has now about reached its jubilee, a slightly smaller type is employed, and the words and the lines are printed more closely together. The result is, of course, that more is contained in the volume than in one of the same number of pages of the old style, and, as the price of a volume is still determined by the number of pages and not by the number of words it contains, purchasers gain by the change.

Without further ado, I may proceed to add some notes which have occurred to me on reading through the volume. The biblical allusions are much more exhaustively recorded than in the preceding volume, but some are naturally unnoticed. Page 2, l. 5, cf. Ps. ciii 26, &c.; p. 33, 23 *audaciter* (with some MSS), but p. 35, 15 *audacter* (with all MSS); p. 34, 16 give also 1 Pet. v 5; p. 38, 6 cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii 2, 20; p. 41, 22 *alius* I take as nominative, Jerome having written carelessly, or thought of the other name *Ninus*, or desired harmony with the other clauses; p. 43, 16 certainly *Eleazaro* (cf. JOURNAL vol. xiii p. 151, and add the title of a sermon of Augustine in a Petersburg MS referred to in Staerk's facsimiles); p. 44, 17 cf. Eccles. i 18; p. 45, 16 perhaps cf. Lucan viii 318-319; p. 48, 17 cf. Eph. vi 12; p. 92, 3 perhaps read *(sit) ista*; p. 93, 18 cf. Sap. 4, 13; p. 99, 1 cf. Gal. v 17; p. 99, 16 add

the full stop; p. 106, 7 cf. Rom. ii 15, ix 1; p. 108, 11 cf. Hor. *Carm.* iv 2, 27-28; p. 111, 7 cf. Eph. vi 4; p. 112, 10 cf. 2 Tim. iii 15; p. 119, 5 cf. Matt. x 40; p. 121, 9 cf. 1 Pet. ii 23; p. 122, 11 cf. Tert. *Apol.* 21, p. 133, 3 O; p. 124, 1 cf. also Anecdota Maredsolana iii 3, 103 ff; p. 125, 14 read *synhodus*; p. 128, 7 possibly *emendemus* (intrans.); p. 148, 1 cf. Rom. xii 16; p. 149, 17 cf. Heb. ii 14; p. 153, 17 *suberrantes* should surely be *oberrantes*, as only one other example of *suberro* is known and that in a literal sense; p. 159, 3 cf. 1 Cor. ii 8; p. 160, 19 cf. Phil. ii 7; p. 167, 27 cf. 1 Pet. iii 18; p. 168, 21 probably read *Eseia* with the oldest MS; p. 171, 1 cf. Luc. i 2; p. 171, 15 cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii 2, 20 and 1 Tim. vi 20; p. 175, 16 cf. Eph. i 14; p. 177, 21 give the better spelling *futilis*, which suits the MS tradition better also; p. 181, 17 cf. 1 Cor. xvi 20, 2 Cor. xiii 12, Phil. iv 21, &c.; p. 206, 10 cf. Iac. ii 20, &c.; p. 206, 16 cf. Matt. xii 36, Rom. ii 15; p. 208, 22 cf. Ioh. iii 11; p. 210, 25 cf. 1 Cor. xvi 20, 2 Cor. xiii 12, Phil. iv 21, &c.; p. 218, 19 cf. 2 Cor. iii 18; p. 224, 3 cf. Gal. i 4; p. 224, 19 cf. Phil. ii 7; p. 231, 21 cf. Matt. v 44 &c.; p. 232, 1 cf. 1 Cor. xvi 20, 2 Cor. xiii 12, Phil. iv 21, &c.; p. 232, 5 read *Apolline* and p. 232, 7 *Apellen*; p. 262, 8 in the references should be 262, 9; p. 291, 9-10 is from Tert. *Apol.* 18; p. 296, 9-10 cf. Matt. xiii 46; p. 296, 22 read *quo*, as there are other instances of this Ciceronian idiom in Jerome; p. 305, 10 read *balbutientia* (cf. JOURNAL vol. xiii p. 151, and cf. p. 291, 3 of this volume); p. 312, 12 read *Hadriatico*; p. 315, 1 read *Hadriano*; p. 323, 21 cf. Heb. xi 32, &c.; p. 330, 2 cf. Act. v 41; p. 340, 4 correct a printer's error; p. 340, 14 read *cluderentur*; p. 345, 13 see note on p. 305, 10; p. 346, 10 compared with p. 431, 10 shews that *matulam* should be read; p. 393, 23 correct the printing; p. 394, 2 Apoc. xviii 2 should be added; p. 420, 15 *παλινοδίαν* should undoubtedly be printed as Latin, whether with *-m* or *-n*, as in Ammian and Macrobius, though in Aug. *Epist.* 40, 7 it is possibly Greek; p. 428, 11 read *consobrina*, as *consubrina* is probably at best colloquial, even if it be not merely a perversion like the constant *subrius* for *sobrius*, under the influence of *sub*; p. 438, 6 read *sanitate*, as it is hardly credible that Jerome would use the accusative with *fruo*; p. 440, 15 cf. 1 Tim. ii 4; p. 441, 14 cf. Rom. xii 13; p. 441, 20 cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii 2, 20; p. 453, 10 cf. Apoc. xi 15 without which reference the passage is unintelligible; p. 456, 18 cf. 1 Joh. v 16; p. 465, 23 cf. Matt. xi 27, not Luc. vii 24; p. 467, 24 refer rather to Resch *Agrapha* 2. Aufl. (Leipzig, 1906) pp. 112 ff; p. 477, 16-17 cf. 1 Tim. v 4; p. 498, 6 read *quo*, comparing p. 296, 22; p. 499, 12 cf. Matt. xxviii 19; p. 500, 20 ff cf. Tert. *Apol.* 47; p. 509, 8 cf. 2 Cor. xi 23-27; p. 509, 13 ff cf. 2 Cor. ii 15; p. 509, 15 cf. Eccli. xv 14.

*Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi in Hieremiam Prophetam Libri Sex.*  
 Recensuit SIGOLFREDUS REITER. [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. lix.]  
 (Æ. Tempisky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1913.)

THE Commentary on Jeremiah, the latest of its author's works, left unfinished at his death, appears in the edition of Vallarsi to be one of the best parts of that editor's work. But it has not been difficult for the new editor, Prof. Siegfried Reiter, of Prague, to make a substantial improvement on the edition of his predecessor. He has had much better critical materials to work with, he has known how to classify the authorities at his disposal, and he has produced in consequence what one may call a final edition of the text. But he has done much more than this. In his prolegomena, covering about a hundred and twenty pages, he has discussed every possible topic connected with the commentary with a fullness and accuracy that leave nothing to be desired. The volume is moreover complete in itself, as it contains the list of scripture passages quoted, a copious list of parallel passages from other Fathers as well as from Jerome himself, of whose works the editor displays an entire mastery, and a considerable list of parallels from non-Christian writers. There are also the index of names and matters, and the index of words and expressions, which last forms at once a supplement and a valuable corrective to the monographs of Pancker and Goelzer.

The oldest and most important manuscript is at Lyons, numbered 468, and was written at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century in half-uncial script. This manuscript contains only the first three books and about half of the fourth, but by the greatest good fortune most of the rest of it turned up at the sale of a nobleman's library in 1895, and was secured for the Bibliothèque Nationale,<sup>1</sup> where it is numbered Nouv. acq. lat. 602. Its text is vitiated by the bad spellings of its time and locality, but when these and other slight errors are eliminated, we have the work substantially as Jerome wrote it. In nothing is the excellence of this copy more apparent than in the transcription of Greek words. In close relationship to this MS and next in value to it, is a Laud MS in the Bodleian (Misc. 417, saec. ix-x, formerly of Lorsch), which becomes the chief authority for the parts lost from the Lyons manuscript. The editor knows also five other manuscripts of the same family but of inferior value. Two of these, however, are available to supply a lacuna which exists in the other members of the best family, namely Lyons 448 (saec. ix) and Florence Laur. St. Mark's 607 (saec. xi). In addition to these seven representatives of the best family there are two other independent classes, one with five,

<sup>1</sup> I had the pleasure of pointing this fact out to the editor, till then unaware of it.

and the other with two representatives. In the constitution of the text as a whole the editor follows especially the Lyons-Paris MS, an Orléans fragment 192 (169) (saec. vii), Paris *B.N.* 1820 (saec. viii), Valenciennes 59 (52) (saec. ix in.), Vercelli cix (55) (saec. x), Paris *B.N.* 9528 (saec. ix). With his judgement as to the relative value of his authorities I must express my entire concurrence.

The introduction is, as has been said, of the very highest value. Among the topics discussed in an illuminating fashion are the date and size of the work, the text of Jeremiah employed by Jerome as the basis of his comments, the use of the Septuagint and the old Latin version in the course of the commentary, as well as the references to the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the citations from other parts of the Old Testament and from the New Testament, and finally the manuscripts and editions of the Commentary itself. It is not too much to say that each of these sections is epoch-making. No student of the text or ancient versions of Jeremiah dare neglect this work. To mention one point only, it was his own Vulgate that Jerome chose as the basis of his comments, and Reiter has shewn that the printed text of the Vulgate can be repeatedly corrected from the text provided by this commentary. One need only remember that the copy of the text used by Jerome can only have been at most a few years later than the archetype, to understand how simple this is. All points connected with the Greek and Latin texts of Jeremiah are treated with a fullness and insight that must have cost the editor immense labour, and will be greatly appreciated by the Biblical student. One can only hope that the editors of the other Jerome commentaries on the Prophets will take Reiter's work as the model to be followed.

A few notes may be added. On page xxxviii it would have been as well to refer to the confusion made possible by the citation of Hier. xxxi (xxxviii) 15 in Matt. ii 18. Other examples exist of the *sū* = *sunt* symbol referred to on p. lxxv, cf. *C.S.E.L.* vol. 1 p. xxx (with n. 3), also *Codex Bezae* (Rendel Harris in *T.S.* ii 1, 121 ff) and the archetype of Cassiodorus (Pseudo-Primasius) in Migne *P.L.* lxxviii p. 587, ll. 44-45. A Grenoble (Grande Chartreuse) MS of the twelfth century, mentioned on p. cxliii, may have some connexion with the library of Cassiodorus, and might repay examination. The lacunae in L might have been indicated in the margin of the apparatus, as has been done in the case of some other volumes of the series. On page 67, 16 the citation from Acts is Vulgate, according to the text of Wordsworth and White, and should not be asterisked. So also with Luc. ii 34 on p. 188, 2. In fact all editors now ought to use Wordsworth and White's *editio minor*, and no longer the Sixto-Clementine, for the Vulgate New Testament. On page 384, 23 should be substituted for 22 among the references to

passages quoted. In the index, *condicio* (*Menschenwerk*) should surely be *conditio* (from *condo*), which we find in Tertullian; the important sense of *infero* on page 402, 3 &c. should be added, in fact a special study of this use of the word is required. The orthographical index at the end of the volume might have included words like *absortus*, *idololatria*, *scisma*, &c.

*Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars Quinta; Expositio Psalmi cxviii.*  
 Recensuit M. PETSCHENIG. [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. lxii.]  
 (F. Tempsky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1913.)

THIS, the latest product of the scholarly zeal of Prof. Petschenig, of Graz, and the seventh volume he has contributed to the Vienna Corpus, is concerned with one of the least read of the works of St Ambrose. The exposition, composed out of homilies, like the commentary on St Luke by the same author, is not, however, devoid of interest. Apart from its homiletical value, it contains a complete Old-Latin text of the psalm, with frequent indications as to the numbers and length of the lines in his copy, an almost complete Old-Latin text and exposition of the Song of Songs, which he saw fit to interweave with the other, and occasional references, probably derived from Origen's *Hexapla*, to the readings of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion.<sup>1</sup> There are also Greek words quoted and various Latin renderings referred to on occasion. Of manuscripts containing the work more than a hundred have survived, but of these only one is as old as the ninth century (Arras 590). Fragments at Milan and Cambridge are older still, of date about A. D. 600 and 800 respectively. In addition to these, seven other manuscripts are cited throughout the apparatus, and three editions, the *editio princeps* (Basle 1492), the Benedictine, and the Ballerini (Milan 1876). Only a rough classification of authorities has been possible, and the editor's task has been one of great difficulty, as in the case of this work the authorities are inferior in value to the manuscripts of Latin patristic works in general.

He would be a bold man who would venture to criticize the textual work of Dr Petschenig, a master of the technique of modern editing and second to no living scholar in his knowledge of the later Latin. All that is left to be desired is a more complete indication of scripture passages quoted or alluded to. No great Latin Christian writer is so unsatisfactory as St Ambrose in his method of using the Bible. He too seldom indulges in a long quotation to give us the chance of classifying his Biblical texts. It is, therefore, perhaps all the more necessary to record

<sup>1</sup> With regard to Ambrose's psalter text the reader will find it interesting to consult *Le Texte du Psautier Latin en Afrique* par Paul Capelle (= *Collectanea Biblica Latina*, vol. iv, Rome 1913) pp. 216-221, reviewed on pages 130-132.



every allusion to scripture. My notes may now follow. Page 6, line 10 cf. Ps. i 2; p. 7, 22 cf. 1 Tim. ii 9; p. 9, 26 cf. 2 Paral. xxxiv 2, &c.; p. 12, 12 cf. Apoc. iii 20; p. 13, 26 perhaps read *Beliab*, as there is a good deal of authority for this form (see my critical apparatus to 2 Cor. vi 15 and add Hier. *codd.* (C.S.E.L. liv p. 189, 2) &c.); p. 15, 22 cf. Iac. ii 10; p. 59, 2 cf. Luc. xii 18; p. 59, 13-14 cf. 1 Cor. vii 33, 40; p. 65, 7 cf. Act. v 41; p. 66, 5-6 cf. Ioh. xix 11; p. 67, 1 cf. Eph. vi 16; p. 73, 5; I prefer *coaceruare* (cf. 347, 1) to the doubtful word *coacerbare*, especially as it is followed by the synonym *exaggerare* (the note should be spaced); p. 85, 20 cf. Eph. i 10; p. 100, 1 cf. 1 Tim. iii 7, 2 Tim. ii 26; p. 104, 24 cf. Luc. xi 1; p. 111, 15 cf. Rom. v 17; p. 115, 21 cf. Rom. x 8; p. 139, 17 cf. Iob xiv 4, 5, Ioh. viii 7; p. 141, 11 cf. Prov. xviii 17: p. 144, 8 cf. Juvenal 10, 22; p. 150, 12 cf. 2 Tim. ii 4; Lucan ii 383; p. 154, 11 is scriptural; p. 154, 26 cf. Luke x 29; p. 154, 28 cf. Ps. xv 5 &c.; p. 155, 5-6 cf. Ps. xv 5, &c.; p. 167, 25 cf. Iob xiv 4, 5; p. 175, 19 cf. Matth. ix 6, &c.; p. 182, 21 cf. Eph. v 14; p. 185, 5 cf. 1 Cor. xii 15; p. 185, 7 cf. 1 Cor. xii 21; p. 185, 14 cf. 1 Cor. xii 27; p. 188, 26 cf. Luke xi 52; p. 193, 23 cr. n. misprint; p. 195, 18 cf. Hebr. xii 11; p. 198, 15 cf. Rom. xii 1; p. 199, 25 cf. Eph. vi 12: p. 203, 20 printer's error; p. 210, 7, 17, 18 cf. Gen. i 26; p. 214, 18 cf. Rom. xiv 18; p. 215, 21 cf. poet. ap. Cic. *Div.* ii 30; p. 241, 6 cf. Col. iii. 5; p. 241, 7 cf. 2 Cor. v 3; p. 242, 10 cf. 1 Cor. xv 49; p. 242, 21 cf. 2 Cor. iv 10; p. 242, 24 add 1 Cor. x 7; p. 244, 6 cf. Iob xiv 1 &c.; p. 248, 9 cf. Act. v 41; p. 249, 14 printer's error; p. 250, 15 cf. Eph. vi 12; p. 250, 28 cf. Rom. vi 2 &c.; p. 253, 9 cf. Resch *Agrapha* (2. Aufl.) (Leipzig, 1906) pp. 112 ff; p. 253, 24 cf. Matth. vi 19 &c.; p. 257, 10 cf. 1 Tim. iii 7, 2 Tim. ii 26; p. 257, 12 cf. Luc. x 18; p. 259, 10 cf. Apoc. iii 20; p. 263, 25 printer's error; p. 264, 1 cf. Matth. v 45; p. 264, 24 cf. Mal. iv 2; p. 265, 17 cf. Eph. v 14; p. 266, 11 cf. Mal. iv 2; p. 268, 11 cf. Eph. ii 2; p. 269, 12 cf. Ps. i 2; p. 276, 6 cf. Esai. v 8; p. 279, 15 cf. Matth. vii 14; p. 282, 23 error of printing; p. 283, 4 error of printing; p. 293, 11 cf. Eph. iv 9; p. 302, 22 read *toto, o* having disappeared through defective printing; p. 305, 1 cf. Eph. v 8; p. 306, 11 cf. Iac. i 24; p. 310, 1 cf. Eph. iv 14; p. 333, 25 cf. Rom. vii 2; p. 337, 10 cf. 1 Petr. ii 2; p. 345, 7-8, 10 cf. Luc. xxii 32; p. 345, 16 cf. Marc. iv 19 &c.; p. 353, 19 *retiam* should be substituted in both places, as the plural *retia* in this and in certain Old-Latin MSS of the Gospel is due to ignorance of the colloquial first declension form; p. 354, 17 cf. 2 Tim. iv 8; p. 359, 14 cf. Rom. x 4; p. 369, 12 cf. Iob xiv 4, 5, Ioh. viii 7; p. 370, 7 cf. Luc. xii 47; p. 376, 10 cf. 1 Petr. iv 8; p. 378, 14 cf. Eph. ii 13; p. 378, 21 read *degluttiiuimus* as the better spelling (so p. 379, 6); p. 380, 5 cf. also Act. vii 3; p. 381, 5 cf.

2 Tim. i 10; p. 390, 20 cf. 2 Cor. iii 13; p. 395, 24 cf. Hebr. vii 27; p. 412, 20-21 cf. Hebr. iii 16, 1 Cor. x 5; p. 417, 23 cf. Hebr. x 18; p. 436, 8 cf. Gen. i 26; p. 437, 4, 5 cf. Cant. viii 7; p. 437, 9 cf. Mal. iv 2 (so p. 442, 7); p. 446, 3 cf. Gen. i 26; p. 454, 22 cf. Phil. ii 6, 7; p. 458, 21-22 cf. Eph. ii 13; p. 462, 1 cf. 1 Petr. ii 23; p. 468, 9 cf. 1 Ioh. iv 2; p. 469, 8 cf. Matth. xi 22 &c.; p. 471, 22 cf. Phil. iv 18; p. 472, 1 cf. 2 Cor. iv 18; p. 479, 4 cf. Matth. xi 29; p. 480, 7 cf. 1 Cor. iii 10; p. 492, 15 cf. Ioh. xiv 6 ff; p. 493, 7 ff cf. poet. ap. Cic. *Div.* ii 30; p. 493, 27 cf. Matth. 19, 22; p. 499, 22 cf. Act. 5, 31; p. 502, 18 cf. Iob xiv. 4, 5; p. 503, 4 cf. Ioh. x 1; p. 505, 5 cf. Matth. xiii 52, Gen. i 26.

*Sancti Aureli Augustini De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione et de Baptismo Parvulorum ad Marcellinum libri tres, De Spiritu et Littera liber unus, De Natura et Gratia liber unus, De Natura et Origine Animae libri quattuor, Contra Duas Epistulas Pelagianorum libri quattuor.* Recensuerunt CAROLUS F. VRBA et IOSEPHUS ZYCHA. [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. lx.] (F. Tempsky et G. Freytag, Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1913.)

THIS large volume of over seven hundred and fifty pages is worthy of comparison with the very best volumes in the series. If two points were selected for special mention more than any others, they would be the identification of scripture passages and the index of words and expressions. So far as the present chronicler is able to say, very few passages of Scripture have eluded identification, and the index of words, which has been tested in hundreds of places, seems practically faultless.

The manuscript tradition of the various treatises naturally varies, but of all really old manuscripts survive, and the text can be viewed with the greatest confidence. The only material overlooked by the editors appears to be a (sixth-century?) fragment of the *Contra Duas Epistulas Pelagianorum*, the existence of which was discovered by an eminent English scholar and communicated to me some years ago; and the numerous quotations from the same work quoted in the Cassiodorus (Pseudo-Primasius) commentary on the Epistles of St Paul. There are also portions of all the other treatises in this volume, except the *De Natura et Origine Animae*, borrowed by the same commentary, in every case without acknowledgement.<sup>1</sup> The critical apparatus of Vrba and Zycha has revealed the very interesting fact that the MS most nearly related to the Cassiodorian copy of the *Contra Duas Epistulas* is Grenoble 197 (formerly Grande Chartreuse?) (saec. xii). The whole subject requires investigation, but it would seem that (through Lyons?)

<sup>1</sup> I will not load this page with references; these places will be indicated in my Vienna edition of the commentary.

the Cassiodorian tradition of various works came to Grande Chartreuse. I may perhaps be permitted to say that as a student of Pelagian texts I have found this volume a perfect Godsend.

Some notes may be added: On pages 4 and 6 add I in headline; page 11, line 15, printer's error; p. 50, 12 surely *adnuntiat*; p. 87, 10 printer's error; p. 95, 4 Cassiodorus also omits *quoque*; p. 104, 9 *santiantium* required an explanatory note, comparing it with *uanitantium*, so common in Aug.; p. 111, 7 &c. *Habrahae* should be read, as unquestionably the best Latin spelling, wherever it is attested; p. 121, 4 cf. 1 Thess. iv 17; p. 122, 23 printer's error; p. 128, 4, 5 cf. 1 Tim. 5, 21; p. 132, 9 the Reichenau MS of Pelagius also reads *accidit*; p. 136, 2 read *Kartagini*; p. 138, 2 cf. Col. ii 17; p. 140, 18 read *epistulam*; p. 141, 12 is Pelagius; p. 144, 1-2 are Pelagius; p. 148, 16 cf. Rom. viii 3; p. 155, 4 cf. Rom. viii 3; p. 155, 16 read *sescenta*; p. 157, 19, 20 printing defective; p. 158 insert II in headline; p. 158, 15 defect of printing; p. 158, 24 cf. Rom. v 5; p. 164, 8, 168, 9 printer's errors; p. 170, 8, 10 the MS tradition clearly shews that the Greek word should be written in Latin letters; p. 186, 29 add Hebr. viii 8-12; p. 193, 10 cf. Rom. ix 6; p. 238, 11 cf. Tit. iii 5; p. 241, 3 read *pedagogo*, is any other spelling ever found? ( $\alpha = \epsilon$ ); p. 263, 19 cf. Matth. i 18; p. 280, 19 cf. Rom. vii 15; p. 287, 18 cf. Matth. v 8; p. 292, 19 cf. Rom. v 5; p. 313, 9 cf. Tit. iii 5; p. 320 insert IV in headline; p. 320, 27 cf. 1 Cor. xv 37; p. 333, 1, 4 cf. Act. xvii 28; p. 333, 21. 351, 27. 375, 26 cf. Tit. iii 5; p. 369, 26 read *Silea*, the Old-Latin spelling; p. 377, 14 cf. 2 Cor. x 8; p. 381, 18 cf. 1 Cor. i 20; p. 397, 5, 12 read *futtillis*, the more correct spelling; p. 398, 2 read *umoris*, the more correct spelling, as on p. 409, 8; p. 401, 13 read *Eleazarum*, a form of the Old-Latin Bible (see above, page 150); p. 410, 11 cf. 1 Cor. xiii 13; p. 416, 22 a defect of printing; p. 433, 25 (below) defect of printing; p. 434, 29 *quia* is read also by Cassiod.; p. 436, 20 (crit. n.) defect of printing; p. 440, 27 printer's error. In the index, add 130, 26 for *bene quod*; under *habitudo* (and *substruo*) the words of Vincentius are not distinguished from those of Augustine as they ought to be; under *increpo*, a defect of printing; *perabsurdus* (tmesis) might have been inserted in its place (p. 272, 26, 27); it would be quite safe to omit *praeualesco*; *prode erit* (p. 25, 7) should have been indexed. Of the MSS *L* (Lugd. 603) has Spanish symptoms, *S* (Salisburg. S. Petri a. viii 29) and *O* (Oxon. Laud Misc. 134) had insular ancestors, while *C* (Casinensis 163) may have had some connexion with Cassiodorus, as it has in a subscription his favourite formula 'contuli ut potui'.

A. SOUTER.