

# 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]

Quintilian is discussing certain faults in style :

‘Itaque nec parricidam nequam dixeris hominem nec deditum forte meretrici nefarium ; quod alterum parum alterum nimium est.’<sup>1</sup>

The last example in particular seems to throw some light on the wording of the Apostolic decree : it is not correct to speak of *πορνεία* as a very serious matter.

4. The evidence we have been considering points distinctly to the conclusion that, at least in St Luke’s view, the decree, whatever its exact text, was not merely ethical in character but imposed upon Gentile Christians certain elementary regulations of a ritual kind. And this conclusion is in accordance with various other features in the narrative of the Acts. Thus, according to St Luke’s account, the question of eating was in the forefront of the difficulties raised by the admission of the Gentiles into the Church<sup>2</sup> : and he is at pains to emphasize the conciliatory attitude of St Paul.<sup>3</sup> On both points, it may be added, he has the support of St Paul’s own epistles.<sup>4</sup> His account, indeed, is on the whole consistent, both internally and with such other evidence as we possess. No doubt he elevates a mere conference concerned with a comparatively small area into a kind of general council ; and a temporary regulation drawn up in order to facilitate intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians within that area into a canon of the Church. And yet if regard be had to the importance of the precedent set by the little body of Christians in meeting the critical situation of the moment, we may well hold that the prominence St Luke gives to it is essentially justified.

J. W. HUNKIN.

## ADVERSARIA CRITICA : NOTES ON THE ANTI-DONATIST DOSSIER AND ON OPTATUS, BOOKS I, II.

### 1. *The Letter of Constantine to Aelafius or Ablabius.*

As I am publishing a text of this letter, together with other documents bearing on the Council of Arles (Aug. 1, A. D. 314), in my *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (i 372–416), I may perhaps be allowed to intervene in the discussion upon it which has

<sup>1</sup> On the temptations of the streets, &c., see Daremberg et Saglio *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* iii 2, Art. ‘Meretrices’, especially pp. 1836 ff : and for the low standard of sexual morality generally, see J. Marquardt *La vie privée des Rom.* i p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xi 3.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xvi 3, xxi 26. Cf. also xviii 18, 22, xx 16.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. ii 12 ; 1 Cor. ix 20.

been started in this JOURNAL by Mr Norman Baynes (xxvi 37-44, 404-406) and Prof. Stuart Jones (*ib.* 406-407).

And first, because I think there can be only one solution of this particular problem, about *Urbis Romae episcopi* or *episcopus*.

I am absolutely convinced that nobody ever used such a phrase as 'the bishops of the City of Rome', and that pope Miltiades, and he alone, is referred to by the Latin words cited. Yet for all that I do not (in the ordinary sense) *reject* the reading of the MS, which is not *urbis romae episcopi*, but *urbis romae epī*, and that is not the same thing. It is a commonplace of palaeography that abbreviations by suspension (such as  $\bar{n}$  for *noster*) preceded abbreviations by contraction ( $n\bar{r}$  for *noster*): and most technical words of common occurrence passed through both stages. Where they were used in connexion with proper names, and the proper name not being abbreviated shewed the number and case of the title attached to the name, the prime ground for replacing suspensions by contractions—namely, the ambiguity involved in the former—ceased to operate, and such suspensions held their ground longer.

Suspensions of this kind are specially characteristic of inscriptions: and I begin therefore by citing (from Grossi Gondi's *Trattato di Epigrafia cristiana* p. 143) the third-century epitaphs of the Roman popes, ΠΟΝΤΙΑΝΟC ΕΠΙΚΚ·, ΑΝΤΕΡΩC ΕΠΠ·, ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟC ΕΠΠΚ·; and in Latin CORNELIVS EP·. So of presbyters (*ib.* p. 142) Μακελίμους Πρ.: and at Brescia (p. 134) FL· LATINO EPISCOPO AN· III M· VII· PRAESB· AN· XV· EXORC· AN· XII—Flavius Latinus, that is, was bishop for three years and a half after being presbyter for fifteen years, and before that exorcist for twelve. But though suspensions are specially characteristic of inscriptions, they are by no means confined to them: they are found sporadically in all pre-Carolingian MSS, and especially in common words denoting office, like *episcopus* and *presbyter*. I happen to have collected, in a note appended to the Canons of Sardica (*Ecl. Occid. Mon.* i 534 [unpublished]), the instances of abbreviation by suspension of these two words which I have found in MSS of those canons ranging from the sixth to the ninth century: and I proceed to repeat here the sum of the evidence relating to *episcopus*.

epī (not gen. sing. or nom. pl.) five times in four MSS.

epīs (not dat. or abl. pl.) twelve times in eight MSS.

epiṣc regularly in two MSS, and occasionally in four others.

ep̄s (not nom. sing. or acc. pl.) twelve or thirteen times in eight MSS.

eps̄c once.

No doubt it is more surprising to find an abbreviation by suspension,

like *epī* for *episcopus*, as late as the eleventh century, the date of the Paris MS which contains the letter to Aelafius. But there can be little doubt that this unique MS of the 'dossier de Donatisme' was copied direct from a very much older MS at parts mutilated or illegible. And I do not feel any hesitation in saying that the hypothesis of the survival of an abbreviation by suspension is infinitely easier than either of the three suggested alternatives, namely,

(a) that it means the 'suburbicarian' bishops, i. e. the bishops of the (secular) 'diocese' of the City of Rome ;

(b) that it means the bishops consecrated in Rome ;

(c) that it means Miltiades, the actual pope, and Marcus, the next pope but one—on the ground of the superscription of the Greek version of Constantine's letter to pope Miltiades summoning the council at Rome *Μιλτιάδη ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Μάρκῳ*. I should suggest that *Μάρκῳ* is a misrendering or corruption of 'Merocli', and that Meroles of Milan, the new capital in North Italy, is the bishop meant. There was to be a small group from Gaul, and larger groups from the spheres of northern Italy, and of central and southern Italy, respectively.

I proceed to submit some other suggestions on points raised in Mr Baynes's most interesting papers.

*Sed et septem eiusdem communionis.* The real difficulty of these words does not seem to have been detected. The bishops of Gaul and Italy are called in to judge the dispute which had broken out in Africa, precisely because they were not committed to either side. Both Caecilian and his opponents claimed at this stage to be Catholics, and to be recognized as the only true African Catholics by the rest of the Catholic world. These words 'seven of the same communion' [or rather 'of the same bishop's communion'] are meaningless except in relation to the divided communion of Africa. Transpose them therefore a few lines higher up, and read 'ut ad Urbem Romam tam Caecilianus Carthaginiensis episcopus, contra quem uel maxime uniuersi<sup>1</sup> saepe me conuenerant, *sed et septem eiusdem communionis*, quam etiam aliqui ex his qui ei quaedam obicienda crediderant, praesentiam sui exhiberent'. This makes good sense: and it fills a lacuna that needs filling, for the letter of Constantine to Miltiades says—as we should expect it would say—that Caecilian was to be accompanied from Africa by a group of the bishops who criticized him and by a similar group of his supporters. It is true that the number of each group is fixed in that letter at ten: but it is quite easy to suppose that some modi-

<sup>1</sup> Read 'diuersi' for 'uniuersi', comparing Constantine's letter to Miltiades *παρά τινων κολλήγων*. I make the converse change in the letter of pope Anastasius to John of Jerusalem (Schwartz *Acta Concil. Oecum.* V i p. 3) where for 'per diuersum orbem' I would read 'per uniuersum orbem'.

fication of the numbers was made between the dates of the two documents.

*Adeo ut istud post iudicium habitum Africam ipsos remeasse prohiberent.* I do not know what *istud* is supposed to mean: the MS in fact reads *istum*, and I propose to correct that to *istinc*, 'hence'—this use of *istic*, &c., is common in the Cyprianic letters—i.e. in this case 'from Rome'. *Prohiberent* is rightly objected to by von Soden, for it is quite out of the question to suppose that bishops at that day claimed or exercised secular jurisdiction: and the correction to *prohiberem* (which is as old as Dupin's edition) is, I think, clearly right.

Prof. Stuart Jones (p. 407) alludes to a 'difficult and corrupt' phrase in the companion document of the Paris MS, the letter of the Council of Arles to pope Silvester, *Placuit etiam antequam ante qui maiores diocheseos tenes per te potissimum omnibus insinuari*. The Council wishes the pope to make its decisions publicly and generally known: so much is clear. But what of the words *antequam ante qui maiores diocheseos tenes*, for which the Cologne MS ccxii (K: written about A.D. 600) has only *antiqui diocisis*? The Paris MS has the better text: but from its *diocheseos* and the Cologne *diocisis* we can at least get so far as to restore *dioceses*. I believe further that *antiqui* of K and *ante quam ante qui* of the Paris MS both represent an original *ante qui*, *ante quam* being a scribe's mistake corrected in the exemplar of the Paris MS to *ante qui*. But before we can deal with *ante qui*, we must go on to consider *dioceses*: and I want to raise the question whether it is even conceivable that in the year A.D. 314 that word could be used with any but a secular meaning. The 'diocese' was an invention of Diocletian's to denote a group of provinces. The Greek term *διοίκησις* does indeed occur in the Canons of Constantinople of A.D. 381, but still in the secular sense, and only because at that moment in the East the secular 'diocese' had become more or less represented in the ecclesiastical system: and the Latin versions of those canons generally transliterate 'diocesis', though they also use 'parrocias', 'gubernatio', 'prouinciae uel regiones'. But I think I could defy any one to produce a fourth-century example of the use of *diocesis* in any vernacular Latin document in an ecclesiastical connexion. I am driven therefore to refer 'the greater dioceses' to the secular government, and to conclude that we have here a reference to Constantine. Remember that bishops were in the awkward position of being for the first time in intimate connexion with the civil power. A council had been arranged by, and was being held in dependence on, the Emperor. We cannot wonder, however much we may deplore, that the bishops accepted the situation. But it was not yet an easy thing to say in plain language that the Emperor suggested the method

by which the decisions of the council should be recommended to general acceptance: and so they expressed their statement of fact in somewhat roundabout language. I believe that we shall not be far wrong if for 'ante qui maiores dioceses tenes' we restore 'an[*nuen*]te qui maiores dioceses tener'. That gives an intelligible and indeed, I think, excellent sense: and it is very much nearer to the MS tradition than any of the alternative emendations known to me.

I am tempted, having begun to write on this subject, to submit to the judgement of scholars other corrections which I should propose to make whether in Ziwsa's text of Constantine's letter in the appendix to his edition of Optatus (vol. xxvi of the Vienna Corpus of Latin Fathers, A. D. 1893) or in that of the Paris MS.

p. 204 l. 29 illi qui cum hisdem cognoscerent. Read 'alii' for illi.

p. 205 l. 2 in praesentiarum eorum: Ziwsa wrongly cites the MS as giving in praesententiarum. It has inpraesentiarum, a good if late Latin idiom with which none of the editors appears to have been familiar. But I think Ziwsa changes the MS when it is right, and follows it when it is wrong, more often than either Sirmond<sup>1</sup> or Dupin; while he does not put on record in his apparatus the credit which belongs to them for those of their emendations which he accepts.

l. 9 contentionibus quae aliis hominibus uidebantur subito commotae: so the MS and Ziwsa; Sirmond made the certain improvement 'ab iis' for aliis. In the next line another certain correction of Sirmond's, 'impositus' for impetus of the MS, is adopted by Ziwsa, but without acknowledgement.

l. 11 dictationis tuae scripta. I have no idea what the editors suppose dictatio tua to mean, and I am sure we should read 'Dicationis tuae', comparing two contemporary documents, the report of Anulinus to Constantine, see Aug. *ep.* 88 (ed. Goldbacher 408. 11) and cod. Theodos. XI xxx 1. It means 'Your Excellency'.

l. 12 simulationibus. Read, I think, 'simultatibus'.

l. 24 respondendum aestimauerunt quod enim omnis causa non fuisset audita. Sirmond's 'eorum' for enim may be right.

l. 29 in iudicium eorum qui contra Caecilianum sentiunt. Read perhaps 'indicium' for iudicium, and 'quae' for qui. And in the next line for consensumque debent, which I find untranslatable, the best I can suggest is 'consensum dederint'.

l. 33 Numidiarum. The Laterculus of Verona bears out the two Numidiae of the Paris MS against all other authorities.

<sup>1</sup> Ziwsa (p. xiii of his preface) does not seem even to be aware that Sirmond edited the document in his *Concilia Galliae* (i pp. 1, 593).

l. 34 et prouintiis singulis MS. Read, I think, 'singulos', and omit et.

p. 206 l. 7 disciplina competens habeatur *edd*: disciplinae competens habeatur MS. I suggest 'disciplinae competens cura habeatur'.

2. *Notes on the text of books I and II of St Optatus.*

Having commenced these notes, I should like to go on and offer some critical remarks upon the text of the first two books of Optatus, especially because the editor does not give nearly enough weight to the readings of the earliest of all his MSS, the Corbie-Petrograd MS which he cites as P. No doubt it is not always right, and some of his criticisms on its readings are just: but it is right far more often than he allows.

Book I (Ziwsa p. 1 l. 3) filium dei dominum. Read with P 'filium dei deum'; cf. l. 12 where dei is used without qualification of Christ.

l. 8 christianis nobis omnibus storiā per apostolos pacem dereliquit. Z. cites in support of 'storiā' a passage of Commodian where, as Dombart has shewn, that writer uses 'storias' (= 'storeas', 'mats'), in the sense of 'protective coverings', when paraphrasing Eph. vi 13 'the whole armour of God'. But in this stately opening passage of Optatus, with its panegyric on peace as the parting gift of Christ to His Church, the word and meaning are alike intolerable. P has 'christianis omnibus itoriā pacem per apostolos dereliquit', its late consort G 'uictricem' for itoriā. Combining the data of both MSS, I suggest very tentatively 'uictor iam', which at least makes sense. Alternatively, I should neglect the testimony of G, and, comparing the first words of the next chapter 'quae pax si, ut data erat, sic integra inuiolataque mansisset', read 'integram per apostolos pacem'. But I prefer the first suggestion.

p. 4 l. 8 uelamenta. But 'uelamen' of P G is shewn to be right by l. 12 'uae facientibus uelamen'.

l. 11 per Ezechielem prophetam. Read 'Ezechielum' with P (so too 40. 18, 61. 13): see my *Prolegomena to the Testimonia of St Cyprian II*, *J. T. S.* ix 65.

l. 18 ne quis dicat. Read with P G 'ne qui dicat'. In 9. 14 all MSS have 'qui sit peccator', Ziwsa 'quis sit'. In 36. 9 'qui et ubi' P R B for the editor's 'quis et ubi'. In 38. 20 read 'ut aliqui hinc . . . mitteretur' with P. In 43. 16 read 'qui spiritus esse potest . . .?' with P G B: in 62. 9 'tu qui es qui . . . iudices' with P B.

p. 9 l. 23 nihil [inter]esset inter fideles et Ziwsa. P is the sole authority for 'inter', which must be right: for fideles it has 'credentes' which is probably, as the rarer word than fideles, right also: cf. 10. 7 'unusquisque credens'.

p. 10 l. 10 in remissam peccatorum Ziwsa : 'in remissa peccatorum' the MSS, and the neuter plural remissa has good authority in cod. *e* (*ἀφεσις* does not occur in *k*), in Iren. lat. (Acts ii 38), in Ambrosiaster (Souter *Study of Ambrosiaster* p. 136), and in an early commentary on the Nicene Creed printed in my *Eccl. Occid. Mon. Jur. Ant.* (i 356).

l. 12 demersam. Read 'mersam' with P, comparing l. 14 'ita mersus sit', l. 16 'mersa a te dici non debuit': Ziwsa has accepted mersam from P in 9. 19.

p. 13 l. 15. Correct the editor's punctuation as follows: 'in te enim conuertisti sententiae gladium, dum aestimas quia alteros adpetebas, et non adtendisti inter scismaticos et haereticos quam sit magna distantia'.

l. 20 catholicam facit simplex et uerus intellectus intellegere. I do not wonder that Casaubon, with only this reading before him, doubted whether intellegere should not be expunged. But P offers 'in lege' for intellegere, which is a very different thing, and is certainly right, though Ziwsa has not accepted it. Compare 35. 14 'numquid pagani extralegales [cf. 166. 5] possunt aut cantare deo aut laudare nomen domini, et non sola ecclesia quae in lege est?'

p. 14 l. 22 uobis uero scismaticis, quamuis in catholica non sitis, haec negari non possunt, quia nobiscum uera et communia sacramenta traxistis. I do not know how the editor (or any one else) proposes to translate nobiscum: but all the time he had before him in his apparatus the correct reading, given by P alone, 'uobiscum'. 'Heretics have no true sacraments, as you rightly affirm: but for our part we don't deny that you, schismatics though you be, have them; for when you left the Church you took with you the true sacraments you share with us.'

p. 15 l. 18 quid [commemorem] ministros plurimos? Optatus uses neither subdiaconus nor hypodiaconus, yet subdeacons existed in Africa as far back as St Cyprian<sup>1</sup>; and when we find ministri here between laici on the one side, and deacons, presbyters, bishops on the other, it is impossible not to think that subdeacons are meant. The same four grades, or with the laity five, recur in 48. 19, 49. 3-5 (though in 61. 10 we have only bishops, presbyters, deacons, faithful), and it seems certain that ministri is being used in the precise sense of a single office.

p. 16 l. 19 non sine causa dimissum fuisse nisi quia tradiderat. P adds 'sic' before dimissum, to the improvement of the sentence.

l. 20 iam omnes erecti coeperant murmurare. The editor takes

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian calls them 'hypodiaconi'; but they are already 'subdiaconi' in Circa at the beginning of the fourth century, see the *Gesta apud Zenophilum*, Ziwsa, 187. 2.



'erecti' in a literal physical sense 'qui surgebant et in alteram partem transibant': see his Index p. 272. This is a great deal to get out of one word. Does it not rather mean 'erecti' as opposed to 'lapsi'—equivalent in fact to Cyprian's use of 'stantes'—'those who had not fallen' in the persecution?

p. 17 ll. 3-7 *consulti sunt . . . et sederunt*. This is a quotation from the Acts of the Synod of Circa, and should be marked as such.

p. 18 l. 9 *in uno cum fratribus manere*. This rather curious use of 'in uno' is borne out by 170. 25 '*omnes discipulos suos uoluit in uno esse*'.

l. 16 *cum correptionem archidiaconi Caeciliani Lucilla ferre non posset*. Something is wrong: the sentence is not complete: the nominative *Lucilla* is not wanted again after l. 13, and is removed by two editors: nor does Optatus use the title 'archidiaconus' elsewhere. I cannot help suspecting that a marginal summary of some early MS has ousted words from the text.

p. 19 l. 2 *persecutionis innata tempestas*. 'Innata' is very odd, but is borne out by 123. 2 '*non leue certamen innatum est*', and 63. 14 '*tanta fames innata est*', though there P has 'nata'.

p. 21 l. 4 *Purpurius . . . sic ait: 'exeat huc', quasi inponatur illi manus in episcopatu et quassetur illi caput de paenitentia*. The quotation-marks should, as the whole context shews, extend as far as *paenitentia*: for the mere words 'exeat huc' would not account for Optatus's assertion that this was of a piece with Purpurius's record of murder (16. 3-6). Purpurius, with his usual frank brutality, met Caecilian's offer to submit to a new ordination to the episcopate, by the council of his opponents then sitting in Carthage, with the answer 'Let him leave his friends and come here: we will lay hands on him to make him a bishop and then break his head for a penance'. quasi, I think, has come in by error from the line before '*quasi et Caecilianus*'.

l. 12 *Cyprianus [Carpophorius] Lucianus et ceteri*. An important indication of names of successors of Cyprian in the see of Carthage, thus given in P '*Cyprianus, Carpoforius, Lucilianus et ceteri*'. The testimony of the oldest and best MS should be followed.

l. 23 *in ordinatorem Caeciliani deriuandum: i. e. 'to be turned aside into a fresh channel'*.

p. 23 l. 3 *caecus caecum si duxerit, utrique in foueam cadunt*. A palmary example of the results of neglecting P, which has '*caecus caecum ducens uterque in foueam cadunt*'. Cyprian has twice '*caecus caecum ducens*' (*eccl. unit.* 17 [225. 23], *ep.* 43. 5 [594. 13]); and so (with a variant) *Auctor de promissionibus* according to Sabatier *ad loc.*, who also quotes '*uterque in foueam cadunt*' from ff<sub>1</sub>: *uterque* with the third person plural has plenty of authority in Latin, Cicero excepted.

l. 12 haec tria iussio diuina prohibuit: non occides, non ibis post deos alienos, et in capitibus mandatorum: non facies scisma. Now P omits 'et in capitibus mandatorum', and the run of the sentence almost demands that Optatus should have put his three statements one after the other under the common heading 'iussio diuina prohibuit'. So I think that the reading of P is original, and that an editor (whether Optatus himself or another) or glossator inserted the authority for 'non facies scisma' as the 'capita mandatorum'. Ziwsa can only say 'cf. 1 Cor. i 10', which is unsatisfying in itself, and does not account for the 'capita mandatorum'. The words οὐ ποιήσεις σχίσμα are found in *Didache* iv 3 and in Barnabas xix 12, and Optatus may have taken all three statements, or at any rate the third, from some form of the 'Two Ways' known as 'Mandata'.

l. 15 (cf. 24. 10) parricidium. The application of parricidium to fratricide was by the fourth century quite regular.

p. 24 l. 1 aaron. P aharon, and similarly 60. 7: the same form is found in Lucifer also. See *Prolegomena to the Testimonia of St Cyprian* II, *J. T. S.* ix 69.

p. 25 ll. 3-5 prima peccata ad exemplum praesens poena conpressit, secunda iudicio reseruabit. P rightly 'reseruauit'. After the perfect tense 'conpressit', 'reseruabit' would be needlessly harsh.

l. 11 quae cum ueritate confabulent. So rightly Ziwsa, following P alone: confabulent the other MSS, confabulentur the early editors. The genius of Casaubon nearly anticipated the reading of P with 'confabulentur'.

ll. 15, 16 si nota est nosse reges, uos tota perfundit inuidia. P, much more pointedly, 'si nota est nosse reges, uos nota ista perfundit'. If acquaintance with monarchs is a mark of shame, you are covered with it from top to toe.

p. 26 l. 7 petitis a me in saeculo iudicium cum ego ipse Christi iudicium expectem. But in P 'petitis a me episcopi iudicium et ego ipse Christi iudicium expectem' [I suspect P really has expecto], and that is much more like Constantine's style; we have in fact his paraphrase of his own words (209. 22) 'meum iudicium postulant qui ipse iudicium Christi expecto'.

p. 27 ll. 4-6 a singulis in Donatum sunt hae sententiae latae: quod confessus sit se rebaptizasse et episcopis lapsis manum inposuisse. P has 'a singulis in Donatum sunt dictae sententiae, quod...' Optatus uses both 'dicere' and 'ferre' sententiam: but it is difficult to see any meaning in the 'hae sententiae' of the ordinary text.

l. 15 retinendum merito esse censeo. P omits merito, and the omission at least improves the rhythm.

p. 28 ll. 1, 2 eodem tempore idem Donatus petiit ut ei reuerti licuisset

. . . ad Carthaginem accederet. There is no lacuna in the MSS : P gives 'reueriti licuisset et nec ad Carthaginem accederet', and we take our start from P. What would Donatus want? He would want to go back to his own see, and to retain his nominee in, and keep Caecilian out of, the see of Carthage. All runs smoothly if we can read 'petiit ut ei reueriti licuisset et ne C[aecilianus] ad Carthaginem accederet': though Augustine *Brev. coll.* 38 omits 'nec' altogether.

ll. 4-7 tunc duo episcopi ad Africam missi sunt . . . ut remotis binis unum ordinarent. uenerunt et apud Carthaginem fuerunt per dies quadraginta, ut pronuntiarent ubi esset catholica. A difficult passage, P having 'binis singulos', the other MSS 'duobus unum'. The fundamental point is that the two bishops' mission was not to consecrate a new bishop of Carthage, but to decide which of the existing bishops was the Catholic one. We are safe, I think, in rejecting unum, and in turning P's singulos into 'singula': the emissaries were to 'settle things' in the absence of both claimants. binis is odd for ambobus, but duobus would be worse: 'duo' does not mean 'the two of them'. P G have also 'ut pronuntiaretur', which seems more likely than 'ut pronuntiarent'.

l. 10 Eunomii et Olympii. P 'Eunomi' and 'Olympi'.

l. 16 cum haec fierent. P, more simply, has 'inter haec' only.

p. 29 l. 21-p. 30 l. 9. A quotation from the *Acta purgationis Felicis* as found in the *dossier* of the Paris codex (Ziwsa, p. 204, ll. 4-12), and the superiority of P here stands out clearly. It is far closer than the other MSS of Optatus to the text of the original document.

p. 30 ll. 11-14 iam dudum opinionis incertae et inter caligines, quas liuor et inuidia exhalauerat, latere ueritas uidebatur. sed etiam omnis scriptura memorata et actorum uoluminibus et epistulis commemoratis aut lectis reuelata est. I do not know how the editor proposed to translate his own text: it is beyond me. I turn first to the apparatus, and I find that P reads iam for etiam—a good start, and with altered punctuation and the change of one letter, e for i, sense can be restored: 'iam dudum opiniones incertae, et inter caligines quas liuor et inuidia exhalauerat latere ueritas uidebatur, sed iam omnis [or rather omni] scriptura memorata et . . . reuelata est'.

I must be briefer in my notes on the second book: I have said enough to shew that normally the reading of P is to be followed against the rest.

p. 34 ll. 20-22 [After citing Ps. xlix 1 'God . . . called the earth from the rising of the sun to its setting'] uocata est ergo terra, ut caro fieret, et sicut legitur, facta est, et debet laudes deo creatori suo. The allusion in 'sicut legitur' is clearly to Genesis 1 and to the recurrent phrase καὶ ἐγένετο: and the particular passage bearing on the creation

of earth is *vv.* 9, 10 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν, καὶ ὀφθήτω ἡ ξηρά· καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως . . . καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ξηρὰν γῆν. There is here nothing about God's calling the earth to become flesh, which indeed would be nonsense : but there is repeated mention of *ξηρά* 'arida'. For 'ut caro fieret' read therefore 'ut arefieret'.

p. 36 l. 13 in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam. P 'conlocatam', and that is proved to be right by l. 18 'qui contra singularem cathedram alteram conlocaret'. The meaning then is You must know, as every one else does, that this bishop's 'cathedra', the first mark of the Church, was set up by Peter first, and set up in Rome.

l. 17 sibi quisque defenderent. P 'quique', in the plural.

l. 21-p. 37 l. 11. This is not the place to discuss the papal list, or even to consider in what proportion its blunders are due to Optatus himself and in what proportion to his MSS. But at least one may say that the editor should have followed his MSS in reading Sotero for Soteri and Callistus for the barbarous Calixtus.

p. 39 l. 8 Claudianus Luciano, Lucianus Macrobio, Macrobius Encolpio, Encolpius Bonifatio, Bonifatius Victori successisse uidentur. In this list of the Donatist succession at Rome P omits the first two bishops ; rightly, for 37. 18-38. 7 shews that Macrobius was their bishop when Optatus wrote. The addition of Claudian and Lucian indicates that the other MSS derive from a recension of Optatus made, say, twenty-five or thirty years after the original edition.

l. 19 uestris praesumptionibus et audaci sacrilegio. I am inclined to suggest 'uesanis' for 'uestris', though I admit that the word, according to Ziwsa's admirably full index, does not appear to be used by Optatus.

p. 40 l. 2 apostolus Paulus. P rightly omits 'Paulus': apostolus, 'the apostle', was the name under which the early Christian writers habitually cited St Paul. So 38. 3 'contra apostolum faciens, qui ait' [Rom. xii 13 is cited], immediately after a mention of St Peter : 180. 7. Addition of 'Paulus' by scribes is much more likely than its omission.

l. 10 posuerunt. P 'posuerant', rightly, with the pluperfects potuissent, deseruerant, potuissent of ll. 9, 11. So in l. 18 'possitis' P (possetis Ziwsa) with defenditis and uoluistis, and in 41. 2 peccauerant P (peccauerunt Ziwsa) with displiceret and redderet.

ll. 12, 13 diuerte . . . et persequere [Ps. xxxiii 15]. P 'deuerte . . . et sequere', with Sabatier's texts *ad loc.* The other MSS follow the Vulgate.

l. 14 sederunt etiam in cathedra pestilentiae. P 'sederunt etiam cathedram', and this is Optatus's habitual construction elsewhere, e. g. 36. 20.

p. 41 l. 2 de admissu suo. P 'admisso': admissus, admissus, appears to be a *vox nihili*.

p. 42 l. 3 quis enim in tot prouinciis quibus nati estis audivit? P has 'qui' for 'quibus', G 'quia'. The relative clause obviously indicates what it was they heard, and has nothing to do with the preceding prouinciis. Hence 'quibus' would be very misleading: and I think Optatus wrote 'quia nati estis', 'heard of your very existence'.

l. 9 esse separatos. P omits 'esse': and the word destroys the grammar of the sentence.

l. 14 uno intellectu suo in corpore ut in manu digiti. A comma is insistently needed after 'corpore': suo in corpore refers to the intimate coherence of all the 'dotes' in the body of the Church.

p. 43 ll. 1, 2 unde uobis angelum, qui apud uos possit fontem mouere? It does not seem to have been noticed that we have here a clear allusion to the interpolated text of Jo. v 4, the moving of the water by the angel. Optatus therefore is to be added to the few Latin fathers who cite the interpolation. On the other hand 68. 23-69. 1, where Ziwsa gives a reference to Jo. v 4, has nothing whatever to do with any text but Isa. xxii 9.

l. 11 nam spiritus deus est. P 'nam deus spiritus est', with which compare Tertullian *de orat.* 28 'deus enim spiritus est'.

ubi uult aspirat et uocem eius audis et nescis uende ueniat et quo eat. There seems no patristic authority for aspirat, and none save Hilary and Ambrosiaster for eat: but *e* has eat, and 'ire' for 'uadere' is a mark of Cyprian's bible.

p. 44 l. 6 inportune a te hoc dictum esse aestimo, quod te iam forte huius dicti paeniteat. P has 'est' for 'esse', and so allows a better punctuation. 'inportune a te hoc dictum est: aestimo quod te iam forte huius dicti paeniteat.'

l. 16 umbilicus tuus ut crater tornatilis [Cant. vii 2]. P has 'ornatus', and its late consort G 'tornatus'. All authorities in Sabatier give 'tornatilis' for the Greek *τορευτός*; but I do not doubt that the variant 'tornatus' is right here.

p. 47 l. 17 quid offers pro tota, qui non es in tota? P 'offeret': the forms taken by this word are always worth noting.

p. 49 l. 7 quem a nobis persecutum esse aut dicere poteris aut probare? quia tibi unitas displicet, hoc si crimen putas *etc.* Must we not assume a lacuna between these two sentences, for the two contexts are not *in pari materia*?

p. 50 ll. 12, 13 [diabolus] illo tempore sub imperatore christiano desertus in idolis tamquam inclusus latebat in templis. Optatus is not a first-rate stylist, but the sentence is intolerably harsh and indeed as it stands untranslatable. The simplest change would perhaps be

'desertis idolis': but comparing 116. 17 'cum clamet deus se desertum esse', it is clear that 'desertus' can mean by itself 'deserted of his worshippers', and I should prefer to write 'in idoliis', and omit 'in templis' as originally a marginal gloss on 'in idoliis'. *Idolium* for an idol-temple does not appear to occur in Optatus, but it is quoted by Koffmane *Geschichte des Kirchenlateins* p. 17 from Tertullian, Jerome, Prudentius, and Sulpicius Severus, besides D<sub>2</sub> Orig-lat. at 1 Cor. viii 10.

ll. 15, 16 nec paganis licebat exercere sacrilegia. For the last word P has 'sacra sacrilega', a phrase found also in 90. 19, 91. 13, 146. 17. I do not doubt that it should be read here.

l. 19 alius imperator. P has 'alter', a very favourite word with Optatus; the editor accepts it on the authority of P alone in 43. 24, 56. 25 ('unus pharisaeus et alter publicanus', in which P agrees with cod. V of Cyprian *dom. or.* 6), and he should have done so here.

p. 52 l. 4 (and l. 18) diaconi, but P 'diacones'. The latter is the older form, as shewn by Cyprian's usage, and should be restored wherever there is manuscript authority for it.

l. 10 Thenestinam of the text is presumably a misprint, for not only do the MSS practically agree on Theuestinam, but Thebeste is a well-known town in Numidia and is the form given in Ziwsa's index.

p. 53 ll. 3, 4 Formensis . . . Idicrensis. For these two Numidian sees P has 'Forensis . . . Dierensis'.

l. 13 ubi est, quod uulgo dicitur, memoriam custodem habere esse mendacis? P 'debere' for 'habere', surely better. The meaning seems to be 'If you tell a lie, you should stick to it'.

p. 54 ll. 18-20 inter crimina sua et facinora nefanda ab eo comprehensa puella . . . nefarie incestare minime dubitauit. P has 'compressa' for 'comprehensa'. Two things are clear: 'puella' must be emended to 'puellam', and 'comprehensa' or 'compressa' goes with 'facinora'. Possibly we ought to read 'conpressa'.

p. 55. 3-p. 56. 20. P has lost a leaf, and the readings of its companion MS G, late though it no doubt is, have to be considered. Many of them are probably right: one of them is, whether right or (more probably) wrong, of singular importance, 'imperfecti sumus' for 'semiperfecti sumus', 55. 19.

p. 57 l. 21 (and 59. 8) exorcizastis. P 'exorcidiastis', an old spelling (like baptidiare), the converse of zabulus for diabulus (so 50. 17 zabulus P), and probably right.

p. 58 l. 5 sagittas de pharetra pectoris uestri seductionibus praemisistis. For the two last words P has only 'sumsistis'—a simpler reading, and in better accord with the 'parauerunt sagittas' of the quotation following.

l. 8 intenderunt arcum, parauerunt sagittas in pharetra. P has 'tetenderunt' and 'in pharetram', and both changes, especially the first, have good O.L. authority.

l. 10 quid a uobis minus factum est uestris consiliis? sagittati sunt innocentes . . . 'Vestris consiliis' should be transferred to the next sentence (cf. 58. 3), and the interrogation placed after 'factum est'.

p. 59 l. 8 qui iniqua egerit benedicetur [Ps. ix 24]. P has 'gerit' and 'benedicetur': both in accord with the LXX ὁ ἀδικῶν ἐνευλογεῖται, and the former with all, the latter with some, of Sabatier's authorities *ad loc.* 'Gerit' is further guaranteed by l. 3 'iniqua uos gerentes'.

l. 20 quid a uestro populo diabolus potuit amplius facere? i. e. 'what more could the devil do than your people have done?', as 160. 18 'sine dubio dicerent se nihil amplius fecisse a Moyse legis latore'.

p. 61 ll. 16-20. The text has three clauses, each beginning with 'inuenistis', each ending with 'agnoscite uos animas euertisse': the three deal respectively with 'pueros', with 'fideles antiquos', and with 'diaconos presbyteros episcopos'. P G add a fourth 'inuenistis fideles nouos, fecistis cathecuminos: agnoscite uos animas euertisse'. It is a good general rule that, where the omission of a doubtful clause can be explained by homoeoteleuton, that clause is genuine: so I should suppose here, though the proper place of the new clause seems to be before, not after, the last two clauses in the printed text.

p. 62 l. 13 denique uel cum deo iubente uel euentu procurante una eos spelunca concluderet, uenerat in potestatem pueri Dauid Saul qui peccauerat. P has 'et' for the first 'uel': an obvious improvement.

l. 22 poterat bellum per compendium remittere in caedem: et pueri eius et occasio suadebant. All the MSS have 'mittere' without 'in' for 'remittere in': change the punctuation, and their reading gives sense and rhythm, 'poterat bellum per compendium mittere: caedem et pueri eius et occasio suadebant'. 'Mittere' is used in the sense 'to get rid of'.

p. 63 l. 5 uolebat hostem uincere. P 'uolebam', and in both the sentence preceding and the sentence following the first person is used.

C. H. TURNER.