

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1928

NOTES AND STUDIES

PROLEGOMENA TO THE *TESTIMONIA* AND
AD FORTUNATUM OF ST CYPRIAN.¹

III

THE PRINTED TEXT AND PRINCIPAL
MSS OF ST CYPRIAN.

i. *The edition of Hartel.*

FOR the purposes of these notes no more than one edition need be taken into account: it will suffice to enumerate the older editions at the foot of the page.² That does not in the least mean that the text

¹ The two previous instalments of these *Prolegomena* appeared as long ago as January 1905 (*J. T. S.* vi 246-270) and October 1907 (ix 62-87). They bore the title *Prolegomena* to the *Testimonia* only of St Cyprian: but I have now added the name of the other book which is also made up, if not quite so exclusively as the *Testimonia*, of Biblical citations, the *ad Fortunatum de exhortatione martyrii*. I had never given up the hope of editing the *Testimonia*, for which Dr Sanday's Seminar on the Western text had begun, quite thirty years ago, to collect material. But the immediate impetus for a continuation of these studies was given by my appointment in 1925 to be Grinfield Lecturer on the LXX at Oxford, for I took as the subject of the last four of my six terminal lectures St Cyprian's text of the LXX. The present instalment is an expansion and recasting of the lecture given in Trinity Term 1926.

² The following is a rough list of the principal editions between 1471 and 1726—no work of importance was done on St Cyprian's text between 1726 and the appearance of Hartel's edition, a century and a half later. I have marked with an asterisk those of which copies are in my possession. *Editio princeps*, Rome, Sweynheym and Pannartz, 1471: *Venice, Vindelinius Spirensis, 1471: [Cologne, according to Brunet], A. Kunne de Duderstadt Memmingensis *s. l. et a.* [circa 1477]: [Deventer], R. Paffroet, *s. l. et a.* [circa 1477]: *Venice, Lucas Venetus, 1483: Paris, Jehan Petit, 1500: *Paris, B. Rembolt, 1512: *Basle, Froben, 1520. This last; the edition of Erasmus, went through several editions. Then come *Rome, Paulus Manutius, 1563—for Latini's connexion with it see p. 117: Paris, 1564, edited by Morel: *Antwerp, 1568, edited by Pamelius, and often reprinted (my copy is of Paris, 1574): *Paris, 1648, edited by Rigalt (my edition bears the date 1666): *Oxford, 1682, edited by bishop Fell, with 'Annales Cyprianici' by bishop Pearson—to this edition we owe the present order of the Epistles of St Cyprian: *Paris, 1726, edited by Baluze and published after his death by dom Maran.

given by the edition in question, that of W. von Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* iii, 1871, is better than the texts given in the older editions: in many respects, especially in the Biblical citations of which the *Testimonia* and *ad Fortunatum* mainly consist, it is definitely worse. But it is the only edition with any modern critical apparatus, the only edition of portable size, the only edition with even relatively complete information about the MSS: and it is in consequence the indispensable starting-point of further enquiry.

Hartel inspected far more manuscripts than any of his predecessors, and we owe to him the first attempt to describe them and estimate their value and group them into families.¹ Unfortunately he never for any of the treatises constructed his apparatus out of more than five MSS: unfortunately, also, both in the *Testimonia* and in the *ad Fortunatum* he paid undue deference to a single MS, because in each case it happened to be the oldest, A of the *Testimonia* (Sessorianus LVIII, now Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele 2106) and S of the (greater part of the) *ad Fortunatum* (Seguierianus, Paris 10592).²

That A gives a recension of the *Testimonia*, adapted throughout to a later Biblical text, was perhaps suspected by Hartel himself (p. xxv), was demonstrated from a consideration of the evidence of the codex Bobiensis (k) of the Gospels by Dr Sanday in 1886 (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts* II xlvi-lxvii), and is now universally admitted: cf. Hans von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Africa zur Zeit Cyprian's*, 1909 (Texte und Untersuchungen vol. xxxiii), pp. 33 ff. By a happy chance Hartel had himself provided in his apparatus the antidote to his own text, for he had in his own library of Vienna (Vindob. 962) a Lorsch MS L, whose unique excellence in the *Testimonia* is now as much a common-place in Cyprianic criticism as the comparative worthlessness of A.

S is the oldest of all extant MSS of Cyprian, but it is Gallic, and few general rules are more sound than that, of pre-Carolingian MSS, those copied in Italy are better than those copied in Gaul. So when Hartel writes (p. v) 'hunc optimum librum ducem ita adhibui, ut nisi ratio repugnaret aut manifestis ille inquinaretur mendis, contra reliquos libros omnes huius scripturas in textum reciperem', suspicion is at once aroused. And suspicion is more than justified. Sanday could still

¹ Manuscripts altogether unknown to him are X O U and Angers 148 (see the description of these MSS, below, pp. 127-130), none of them later than the tenth century, while of V (Veronensis) his knowledge was very defective.

² It may be as well here to give the caution that an older MS, however depraved its text, may be of supreme value in its orthography. Both A and S are illustrations of this; and if Hartel had followed their spellings his text would have been signally improved. He has in fact followed them where their guidance misled him and neglected them just where they could have put him right.

say (*op. cit.* p. xlv) of S, 'the leading authority for the text of Cyprian wherever it is extant': but von Soden (*op. cit.* p. 41) already saw that in the Biblical citations of *ad Fort.* it was demonstrably inferior to the other MSS whose readings are recorded side by side with it in Hartel's apparatus.

But the drawbacks of Hartel's edition do not end here. No scholar who has had experience in collating MSS, and combining the collations into an apparatus, and passing the apparatus through the press, will pass severe judgement on occasional error. But after re-collating A and L for the *Testimonia* and S for *ad Fort.*, I feel entitled to say that, after all allowances are made, the proportion of errors is considerably greater than it ought to have been.

Some such result might have been expected by any one who took the trouble to test the edition in those respects where testing is available for all of us, namely, in the Biblical references attached to the text and in the index of Biblical passages contained on pp. 327-372 of vol. iii: it may be noted in passing that the index does not extend to forty-six pages but to sixteen, for pp. 337-366 are non-existent, and (a more serious blunder) that all the references for the two sheets pp. 273-304 of vol. i, *de dominica oratione* § 10-*de mortalitate* § 12, are entirely omitted from the index. I have added in an appendix to this paper a revised index to St Cyprian's citations from the Octateuch and historical books of O. T., as a specimen of what needs to be done to bring his edition up to the proper standard: and I proceed to catalogue here such errors and omissions as I have noted in Hartel's apparatus of Biblical references as given at the foot of the page in his edition of the *Testimonia* and of the *ad Fortunatum*.

In the *Testimonia*:

39. 11. no reference] it should be Iud. 10. 6.
 40. 11. Nehem. 9. 26] add = 2 Esdr. 19. 26.
 44. 14. Matt. 23. 37 sq] read Luc. 13. 34, 35; the readings 'gallina' without a verb, 'noluistis' (LPQRVX), 'domus uestra' without 'deserta' (L*PVX) shew by comparison with *e* that Cyprian is quoting Luke not Matthew.
 49. 15 and 17. Matt. 24. 2, Marc. 14. 58] read Marc. 13. 2; it is all one quotation, and the connecting 'et' is part of the quotation.
 52. 1. Hosea 2. 25, 1. 10] read Rom. 9. 25, 26, for Cypr. is quoting Hosea through St Paul: von Soden has not noticed this. Read dilectam *bis* with ALPVRQTUX.
 53. 1, 4, 15, 17-19, 21] add cf. Gen. 29. 17, 1 Reg. 1. 2, Tobit 12. 15 (N text), Zach. 4. 10, 3. 9, Prov. 9. 1.

65. 7. Apoc. 19. 11 et 19] read Apoc. 19. 11 et 13.
 83. 7, 8, 13, 17, 20, 25] add cf. Gen. 28. 11-13, 18, 1 Cor. 11. 3, Exod. 17. 10, 12, 1 Reg. 6. 14, 17. 49, 7. 12 (84. 1, 2 is a verbal citation of 1 Reg. 7. 12).
 85. 14. Hier. 16. 9] read Hier. 7. 34.
 86. 9. *in lege*] cf. Ruth 4. 7, 8.
 92. 8 (it should be 92. 10). Matt. 16. 4] read Matt. 12. 39, 40.
 94. 18. 1 Io. 2. 32] read 1 Io. 2. 23.
 109. 23. Prov. 16. 6] add (= 15. 27).
 121. 10. Ps. 117. 6 sq] read 121. 10 Ps. 117. 6; 121. 11 Ps. 117. 8, 9.
 130. 13. Apoc. 6. 7 sq] read Apoc. 6. 9-11.
 131. 14. Apoc. 2. 10 et 16. 5] read Apoc. 2. 10 et 16. 15.
 134. 5. no reference] supply Sirac. 1. 14 (16).
 141. 7. Matt. 3. 10] perhaps rather Matt. 7. 19.
 144. 4. Hier. 48. 10] add (= 31. 10).
 151. 2. Abac. 2. 4] read 151. 1 Abac. 2. 4; 151. 2 (for 'in Daniele' read 'in Machabaeis' with A L P T U X) 1 Macc. 2. 59.
 154. 22. Deut. 30, 19] read Deut. 30. 15, 19.
 155. 14. Es. 3. 9] read Es. 5. 21.
 157. 16 (it should be 157. 17). Matt. 5. 26] add = Luc. 12. 59 (cf. *e*).
 162. 19. Hier. 28. 15-18] read Hier. 10. 12-15.
 166. 6, 8] add cf. Gen. 24. 2, 4; 2 Esdr. 10. 3 or 1 Esdr. 8. 90, 9. 36.
 170. 8. 1 Cor. 3. 18 sq] read 1 Cor. 3. 18-20, and in l. 11 'et iterum' (for 'item illic') with L P R T U V W and Gr. *καὶ πάλιν*.
 173. 6. 1 Reg. 11. 23] read perhaps 3 Reg. 11. 14 (*v.* 23 is absent from cod. B of LXX: *v.* 14 is in both A and B).
 15. Deut. 18. 10] read (with the lemma of 173. 12 'In Leuitico') Lev. 19. 26.
 17. Lev. 19. 26, 27] read 173. 17 Lev. 19. 27 *a*; 173. 19 Lev. 19. 27 *b*.
 174. 9. Ps. 13. 21] read Ps. 132. 1.
 178. 17. Io. 2. 16 = Matt. 21. 13] omit the equation to Matt. For the omission of the negative see Sabatier *ad loc.*
 180. 7. Deut. 32. 35] read (with the lemma 'apud Solomonem in Parhoemiis') Prov. 20. 12 (22).
 9. Rom. 12. 19] but the lemma 'Item alibi' suggests that Cypr. is quoting O.T. through St Paul but does not know the exact source of the 'scripture'. In fact it is Deut. 32. 35 according to the Hebrew, but not according to LXX.

In the *ad Fortunatum* :

322. 23. Deut. 6. 13] read Matt. 4. 10 = Luc. 4. 8. 'Scriptum est' is part of the quotation.

322. 24. Exod. 20. 3] read (with the lemma 'In Deuteronomio')
Deut. 5. 7 according to codd. AF of the LXX.
323. 11. Marc. 12. 29, 12 Matt. 22. 37 sq] Hartel is wrong in separating two quotations, for the 'et' of l. 12 is part of the Biblical text. It is probable that the quotation is wholly Marcan.
326. 5] add cf. 1 Macc. 2. 24.
337. 6] add cf. Matt. 23. 35.
338. 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 17, 25] add Tobit 12. 15 (N text); Apoc. 1. 12;
Prov. 9. 1; 1 Reg. 2. 5; Is. 4. 1; Matt. 16. 18;
2 Macc. 7. 1, 3, 4.
341. 20-342. 3] add 2 Macc. 6. 18 sqq.

ii. *The principal MSS containing the Testimonia and the ad Fortunatum.*

(1) V. Of this MS there is more to say than of any other, not merely on account of its antiquity, in which it probably surpassed all other MSS that here concern us, with the possible exception of S, but because it is now lost, and its text and characteristics have to be painfully restored from a minute examination of the use made of it in the sixteenth century before it mysteriously disappeared.

As its name Veronensis implies, it was the property of the Chapter Library of Verona; and as all the evidence suggests that it was very ancient, there is some presumption that it belonged, like most of the other ancient MSS of the church of Verona, to the sixth century.¹ In the middle of the sixteenth century the illustrious scholar Latino Latini made extensive use of it, as will appear farther on. But not long after that, the Chapter presented the MS to San Carlo Borromeo, the great archbishop of Milan²: and from then onwards all trace of it is lost.

Latini's collation of V was originally made for the purpose of Manutius's edition of 1563, and was largely employed in the construction of its text. But the edition contained none of the critical notes which Latini had prepared, and so he would not permit his name to be mentioned anywhere, whether on the title-page or in the preface. Our

¹ They are for the most part in semi-uncial writing: so apparently was V (Mercati [see p. 119 below], p. 5 n. 5).

² It was already his property, it would seem, in 1561, when Manutius published his *Orthographia*: for under the word *culcita* Manutius cites its authority and mentions that it was now by the gift of the Canons in the library of the illustrious 'Cardinal Charles Borromaeus, sister's son of Pope Pius IV'. San Carlo became archbishop in 1560 and died in 1584. The MS would naturally have passed into the Ambrosiana at Milan, founded by San Carlo's nephew and successor: but it is probable that it never got as far as Milan at all.

detailed knowledge of the readings of V as recorded by Latini was acquired from other sources, primarily from his *Observationes* published by C. Magri *Bibliotheca sacra et profana* 1677—and from a series of *Variae Lectiones* recorded in a copy of the Manutian edition. It is ultimately from this latter source that more recent editors, Rigalt, Fell, Baluze, and Hartel himself, have derived their knowledge of V. But the information is defective: and that is the only possible excuse for Hartel's unfavourable judgement of V: *in crisi nihil valet*.

Now, however, owing to the researches of Mgr G. Mercati, the present prefect of the Vatican Library, we are placed in a very different position, for he has discovered two copies of different editions of St Cyprian, each containing autograph collations of V. In the Brancacci collection at Naples, now incorporated in the library of the University, is preserved (under the press-mark 4 A. 38) a copy of the Gryphius edition of 1537 belonging to Latino Latini, containing the whole apparatus criticus collected by him for the edition of Manutius: the MS date attached to his list of symbols, 16 April 1559, presumably represents the date at which the apparatus was commenced. The symbol V here signifies the Veronensis. Further, in the Chapter Library at Viterbo (under the press-mark N 149) is a copy of the Roman edition (i.e. Manutius) of 1563, also belonging to Latini, also containing *inter alia* a collation of V, in this case under the symbol *Ver*. Many readings of V are here attested which do not appear in the Brancacci Gryphius, for the simple reason that they were the readings of the Gryphius text. Between the two collations we have, in Mercati's judgement, a fairly precise record of the readings of the Verona MS. [There is also in the Vatican a copy of the Gryphius edition of 1535, the property of a friend of Latini's, J. B. Bandini, the notes in which Mercati originally thought to be in Latini's handwriting: but the notes are not free from errors in so far as they refer to extant MSS and it is therefore satisfactory to learn that he is now convinced that the hand is Bandini's own, see p. 136.]

It must be some thirty years ago or nearly that Dr Mercati made for Dr Sanday an exhaustive collation, with Hartel's edition of the *Testimonia* and *ad Fortunatum*, of all the variant readings explicitly attested by Latini himself, marking the Brancacci variants in red ink, the Bandini variants in violet ink, and the Viterbo variants in blue pencil: he suggested that, when our edition should appear, the three sources should be distinguished, where distinction is necessary, as V^b, V^d, V^v. The volume is now in my possession, and I am glad to have the opportunity of making the fact publicly known, should I never be able to produce the edition of the two treatises which was planned by Dr Sanday a generation ago.

Obviously then we have now at disposal a far more exact knowledge

of V than was possible to Hartel, and his unfavourable verdict is, on our new material, open to revision.

Towards that revision Dr Mercati made a notable contribution in his important treatise *D'alcuni niuvi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano*, published at Rome as long ago as 1899. He there based his high estimate of V on three capital facts :

(i) The completeness of the collection of genuine Cyprianic writings, and the simple and intelligible order of their arrangement: treatises, letters to the confessors and martyrs, letters to the clergy and people of Carthage, letters to Rome, letters to African bishops with the letters on the Rebaptism controversy, miscellaneous letters: and finally a few letters addressed to Cyprian in answer to letters from him.

(ii) The accurate preservation of the African numeration of the Psalms. Just as the ordinary Greek and Latin numeration is lower by one, from Psalms x to cxlvi, than that in the Hebrew (and English) texts, so the African Bible numbered Psalms ii to (at least) cxi by one cipher less than did the corresponding Greek and (apart from Africa) Latin texts. V preserves this exceptional feature more faithfully than any extant MS.¹

(iii) The *Sententiæ Episcoporum* preserved in many of our MSS give us the votes of Cyprian and eighty-six other African bishops at the Rebaptism Council of A. D. 256. In V (and in lesser measure in the related but inferior MS C, Paris. 12126) most of the bishops' names are equipped with one or other of the titles *Confessor* (twenty-four), *Martyr* (four), *Confessor et Martyr* (seven), *Martyr et de schismaticis* (one: no. 70), *In pace* (thirty-three). That leaves only some thirteen unaccounted for: one here and there may have lost his title by accident, but the natural presumption is that most of this remainder were still living when the titles were added to the list. At the most not more than one bishop in six survived, and the series of notes may therefore have been drawn up some twenty-five or thirty years after the event. We should be quite safe in saying that the details must have been collected somewhere in the last twenty years of the third century. And they can have been collected nowhere but in Africa.

We find then at this point in V definite traces of an African editor of the end of the third century. With that conclusion the other *data* entirely agree. The peculiar numeration of the Psalms was characteristically African at any rate after A. D. 300: in the fourth century Lactantius and Optatus shew traces of it; European writers do not. The systematic arrangement of the Cyprianic writings in V betrays the conscious work

¹ See *J. T. S.* vi 264 (Jan. 1905), where I repeated Dr Mercati's list with the addition of the testimony of four or five additional MSS. Of these the Oxford MS O and the Manchester MS X (see below, pp. 128, 129) are, next to V, the most faithful to the primitive numeration: both of them surpass L.

of an editor: the completeness of the collection and the absence of spurious elements argues an editor working under the most favourable conditions, that is to say, in Africa and probably in Carthage.

But if V is no haphazard aggregation of smaller collections and disparate material, but represents the work of a single editor, early in date and unusually well equipped in his circumstances, it will, just because it descends from a consciously made edition, be liable to certain dangers that affect its text. An editor, whether of the New Testament writings or of the writings of St Cyprian, very likely got rid of a good many corrupt readings that were beginning to disfigure the text of his author, but he was almost sure, at some point or another, to subject the text to rules or principles or idiosyncrasies of his own. V is no exception to this truth, and perhaps it is its Biblical text that has suffered most. At a later point in our enquiry it will be shewn that in certain cases, where Cyprian's text of the Bible shews differences as between the *Testimonia* and the *ad Fortunatum*, V has assimilated either the one to the other or one of them to a text of its own. But if the latter explanation be correct, it is at least certain that V's Bible text was very near indeed in general type to that of Cyprian. It is African, and of a date not far removed from Cyprian's own.

All this entirely harmonizes with the presumptions suggested by Dr Mercati's arguments. So far from being, as Hartel supposes, a degenerate descendant of his second group (p. li), V presents us with a very early African edition of St Cyprian's collected works. That by reason of its editorial element it occasionally offers a text inferior to that of the best among the other MSS is a striking testimony to the faithful transmission of an author whose writings ranked in the West, at the close of the age of persecutions, as second only to the Scriptures themselves.

(2) R, cod. Vat. Reg. 116, saec. ix: before it came into the hands of queen Christina, the property of Peter Daniel of Orleans, and perhaps therefore a Fleury book; at any rate Gallic of the Carolingian age. I mention it at this point, in the first place because it belongs definitely to the V family, in the second place because I attribute to its text a very much greater value than does Hartel. Probably it is a good way inferior to V, but in view of the lacunae of our knowledge of V its evidence is always worth considering, and it is possible that it may sometimes represent the tradition of the V family better than V itself. As illustrating the contribution which V R or V or R can offer to the improvement of Hartel's text, I cite from Hartel's apparatus the following readings in *ep.* 4 (Hartel pp. 472. 9-478. 7):

473. 2 statum suum continenter et firmiter tenere: *read* in statu suo esse (instituisse R) et continentiam firmiter tenere V R.

473. 8 nostris: non R, *shewing that it was copied from an ancient MS which gave ·N̄· for nostris (cf. 474. 4 zabulo).*
- 13 instruit: *read* admonet et instruit R (*cf. admonet et instruat L*).
474. 11 conscientia grauissima cohaeserunt: glutino conscientiae cohaeserint R, *cf. 231. 9 concordiae glutino copulata.*
- 15 pudicae et castae sine ulla fabula perseuerent, ita fortes . . . expectent: pudicae et castae et sine ulla fabula perseuerent, et fortes . . . expectent V (R). *Cf. 201. 16.*
475. 8 per zeli dolorem: per zeli liuorem V R, *cf. the treatise De zelo et liuore.*
476. 5-9 si autem de eis aliqua corrupta fuerit deprehensa, agat paenitentiam . . . ad ecclesiam redeat: *read plural all through with R, and so all MSS in the next sentence, 9-14.*
- 14 quicumque fecerit superbiam: quicumque fecerit in superbia R *with the Greek, and so Cyprian elsewhere (469. 18, 596. 17, etc.).*
- 18 agit: agent R, *and so Cyprian 469. 21, 670. 23, 728. 19.*
- 19 iudicii sui tempus constituit non oboedientibus: iudicibus a se ad tempus constitutis non oboedientes R (*with support from L Q*). *The idea of future judgement is quite alien from the passage.*
477. 2 circumcisio spiritalis esse ad fideles seruos Dei: *apud for ad V R.*
- 2, 3 spiritali gladio superbi et contumaces necantur, dum de ecclesia eiciuntur: *insert sic before superbi R (with Q).*
- 12 arta et angusta est uia per quam ingredimur ad uitam: gradimur *for* ingredimur V R, *cf. 202. 9-12 arta et angusta est uia . . . per hunc uiae limitem . . . iusti quique gradiuntur. You 'enter' by a gate: but along a 'road' you 'walk'.*
- 15 nec sacerdotes Dei * * aut per ecclesiam scandalo se et fratribus offerant *Hartel, conjecturing 'offendant uel tale quid' where he has marked a lacuna: nec sacerdotes Dei aut [ad R (V?)] ecclesiam scandalo suae prauitatis offendant R V, making excellent sense.*
- 18 ergo ego inimicus factus sum uerum praedicans uobis: ergo inimicus uobis factus sum uerum dicens uobis R. *It is possible that ergo after ergo is wrongly omitted by RW: it is certain that R Q are right in inserting uobis after inimicus.*
- 19 quod si obtemperauerint, nobis gratissimum est; stantes eos ad salutem dignatione nostri sermonis firmauimus: quod

si obtemperauerint nobis [uobis *wrongly* R W*], lucrati sumus fratres et eos ad salutem pariter et dignationem nostro sermone firmauimus R *with some support from L. This is, of all the cases quoted, the most brilliant testimony to the excellence of R. The allusion to Matt. xviii 15 is clear, while dignatio 'is not used of human action' in Cyprian (Watson Style and Language of St Cyprian p. 248), and R is the only MS here which refers it to God, connecting it with salus—salus as Christians, dignatio as virgins.*

478. 2 secundum eundem apostolum dicentem *Hartel, with no construction to the sentence: sequamur eundem apostolum dicentem R.*

It is all but incredible that an editor should have printed so depraved a text as Hartel has given us of this epistle, with the testimony of R staring him in the face at the foot of the page. The only explanation that can be given is that he was obsessed by the conviction that a MS related to V could not conceivably preserve the true text against all or nearly all of the rest. That his conviction in this respect was radically unsound the evidence just accumulated is sufficient to demonstrate.

(3) L, cod. Vindobonensis 962, saec. ix: inscribed with the name of the monastery of Lorsch in the Palatinate, and presumably acquired by the Imperial library as part of the spoils of the Thirty Years' War. It contains only the *Testimonia* and a number of the Epistles: and since by a fortunate chance there is extant a tenth-century catalogue of the Lorsch Library, we see that L is one of a pair of MSS of St Cyprian, the sister volume, now lost, having contained eleven treatises and *ep.* 58. It is perhaps worth while to cite the description of the lost MS from G. Becker *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (1885) p. 107: 'Caecilii Cypriani epistolae numero XII in uno codice: I ad Donatum. II de disciplina et habitu virginum. III de lapsis. IV de catholicae ecclesiae unitate. V de bono patientiae. VI de zelo et livore. VII de dominica oratione. VIII de mortalitate. IX ad Demetrianum. X de opere et eleemosynis. XI ad Fortunatum. XII ad Tiburtinum.

We cannot assume that the text of L was as valuable in these treatises as it is in the *Testimonia*. But for the *Testimonia* it (or its family) is beyond question the best witness, and that conclusion is now so universally accepted that it may be assumed here without argument. Only the caution should be given *in limine* that there is one qualification to be made in this general estimate, namely, that the orthography of L is notably inferior to the rest of its text. MSS of the Carolingian age are often copied with the most scrupulous fidelity in other respects, but not uncommonly they do assimilate any archaic spelling of their exemplars

to the standard accepted in their own time. L is an illustration of this rule: its orthography is notably inferior, if our object is to restore the Old-Latin Bible text as used by St Cyprian, to the orthography of A.

Long ago Dr Sanday procured photographs of the text of L for the whole three books of the *Testimonia*, and one set of these has been all along in my possession. From it I re-collated the MS with the printed text and apparatus of Hartel, and I reproduce here the more important corrections which can thus be effected in his record of the readings of L (I have not included spellings, unless they contribute to the improvement of Hartel's text, or are of special interest).

36. 15 legenti H. legentibus L. L has legenti tibi.
37. 1, 2 LIBER PRIMVS. CAPITVLA. om. L: *the only title is as given on p. 35, notes l. 3.*
- 3 dominum. dom̄ L (*so, as H. notes, 56. 11 for domino*).
38. 8 quot: quod A M. L also has quod. *So too 52. 5.*
39. 4 eis: ei L L has eis.
- 10 quae circa illos sunt: om. sunt A. L P also omit sunt.
40. 4 ambulare: ampullare L¹. I see no trace of this.
- 5 eos: om. M. L P also omit.
- 18 agnuit. L* adgnuit.
41. 20 domini: L in ras. L* dn̄m.
42. 3 quotquot: quodquod L². L* quodquod.
- 12 in illa die. om. in L* (*not P*).
- 16 quoad discant. L divides the words quo addiscant.
- 17 item: om. M B L P also omit.
43. 2 conuersus est. L conuersus es (*P conuersi without es*).
44. 10 custodia: custodiarium L M B. L² has custodiarium in ras., *though the correction is m p.*
- cucumerario: cucumeraria L V. L has cuccumeraria.
- 12 sicut A: quasi L M B. L (*with P*) has, *what Hartel does not make clear, quasi for sicut twice in the line.*
- noluisti: non uoluistis L noluistis B V. *But L (with P) has quite clearly noluistis, though there are two dots over -is, as over remittetur, which may indicate doubt in the mind of some later scribe.*
- 17 deserta: om. B V. *But the deserta of L, though by an early hand, is not by the original hand: the mark of a stop after uestra is clearly discernible. P too omits, so that the evidence of the L P family is beyond doubt for omission.*
45. 1 uenientem: ueniens M V. *But uenientem is clearly L², not L*, which apparently gave uenies. P has ueniens, so that again the testimony of the L P family is clear.*

45. 16 ad iesum : *post iesum eras. ue in L. But L* had ad iesu naue, from the previous line, corrected by the first hand to ad iesum.*
46. 1 illud. L* P* illum.
feminis : seminis L L P *have feminis.*
- 6 dices : dicet L L P *have dices.*
- 11 iudicabit. L* iudicauit, and similarly in l. 14 : not P.
- 14 in gentes : *probably a misprint for inter gentes, the reading of A L P etc*
47. 15 in euangelio. L* in euangelium.
- 16 Iohannes : Iohannis A L B. L P *Iohannes with text.*
- 18 calciamenta : calceamenta L M B. L *calciamenta with text.*
48. 3 quare : ad quid L. aut quid L* ad quid L² P (*rightly*).
- 9 discite : scitote L. *Hartel does not make it clear that L (with P) omits a me.*
- 19 eas. *Probably a misprint for eos, which is read by A L P and is demanded by the sense.*
- pascent : pascant L. L *has pascent.*
- 22 cum disciplina : cum disciplinam L. cum disciplina L²
(there is nothing to shew whether the correction is by the first hand or no) P.
49. 16 dissoluatur : dissoluetur L. L *dissoluatur.*
- 22 adipem : pinguamina W L M B. L *pinguamini (P pinguamina).*
50. 12 *add et sacrificium acceptum non habebō ex manibus uestris*
L. *acceptum, however, is added above the line by L² : P omits the whole with the other MSS.*
- 15 genui : generaui V. generaui L P.
51. 17 speratis. L *gives sperastis with Gr. ἡλπικατε.*
52. 10 fige palos : et fige L¹ effige L². *There is no suggestion of effige in L even by m. 2.*
54. 12 filii. filii L*.
- 13 benedictus erit : erit benedictus W M B. erit benedictus
also L P.
- 22 tuae : om. L. L *has tuae.*
55. 6 lauabit : lauauit M*. lauauit *also L*.*
56. 3, 4 item illic . . . configent. L (*not however P*) *omits this quotation.*
57. 4 inuocauit : uocauit A. L P *uocauit.*

Some of these errors (though by no means all of them) are of sufficient importance to affect our decision as to the text : at any rate, they justify the printing of the list of them for Book I, though space forbids a similar treatment of Books II and III.

(4) P, cod. Paris. lat. 1647 A, of the ninth century. Of the same family as L, but independent of it, and therefore valuable as often enabling us to distinguish what are just individual errors in L and not the readings of the archetype of the family. There are also occasional omissions (by homoeoteleuton?) of whole quotations, e. g. 50. 1-4, in L, not shared by P, where P enables us to restore the readings of the family for several lines on end. Where we have both at command, they are in complete agreement for nineteen variations (I should say) among the MSS out of every twenty. Where they differ, it is generally because one or other of them has made some ordinary scribal blunder. But one gets the impression that there is a residuum of cases where L is the more archaic of the two: it preserves perhaps the archaic numeration of the Psalms rather oftener than P (41. 19 ·XXV· L P: 42. 1 ·LXXX· L P: 48. 3 ·I· L P: 50. 1 ·XLVIII· wrongly L P: 50. 6 ·IIII· wrongly L P: 50. 15 ·CVIII· L, ·CVIII· P: 55. 13 ·XVI· L P: 58. 2 ·XXXIII· wrongly L P: in the second book P has the lower number against L in 65. 1, L* against P perhaps in 69. 18, 72. 8, 73. 5, L certainly in 85. 2), but there is not much to choose, and L² changes the right to the wrong number not infrequently. I have collated P throughout the *Testimonia*: its ancestor was defective from 87. 19 to 101. 19.¹

(5) Quir. = Brescia, biblioteca Quiriniana H VI 11, fifth century. Three uncial leaves, guard-leaves to the MS with the above press-mark, were discovered by Mgr Giovanni Mercati in 1894, and were described and examined in his book already named, *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano* (1899) pp. 1-4, 44-67 (transcription on pp. 49-54). A fragment so ancient would be of entrancing interest in any case: what we have in it is surprising almost beyond belief, for, as it happens, seven out of the twelve columns present part of the long interpolation, Hartel 134. 15-138. 21, which so far had been known to us on no ancient authority save that of Hartel's W. It is none the less an interpolation because it is now shewn to go back to at least the fifth century, just as the interpolation of passages from 2 Maccabees by V R, Hartel 132. 11-26, is none the less an interpolation from the *ad Fortunatum* because Mercati has shewn that the recension represented by V goes back to the third century itself.

¹ Of a third MS of this family, N, cod. Cassinensis 204, I hope to be able some day to record the evidence through the kind offices of Abbot Ramsay of Downside, who possesses a collation of it. Abbot Ramsay (like Prof. E. W. Watson of Christ Church) for many years contemplated an edition of St Cyprian: but his duties, first as head master of the school and now as abbot of the monastery, have left him but scanty leisure. Nevertheless, in spite of the passing of the years, I have not given up the hope that something may still be forthcoming from his pen.

What we have then in Quir. is the same recension of the *Testimonia* as in W, but in a much purer and more ancient form. Some allowance, however, as always in Hartel, must be made for errors in the apparatus criticus: and in fact of the five readings cited by Dr Mercati on p. 60 to illustrate the depravation of the text between Quir. and W, one, the omission of 'et in corda illorum' in 135. 4, is an error not of W but of Baluze's text (cited by Hartel as *v*), one is an entire blunder of Hartel's, for in 137. 18 W has 'accepto faciet' with Quir. (not 'accepto fauet'), and one a partial blunder, 135. 7 'propitius', where W reads not as Hartel reports it, 'proprius', but what is one step nearer to the true text, 'propius'.¹

In the other five columns of Quir. we have matter corresponding to Hartel 132. 4 (omitting of course 132. 11-26)-134. 14. Quir. gives a very good text, as good indeed as any MS but L. Its differences from L (or rather from L P) are the following: (i) 132. 5 in lege Quir. A W B: in uia L P V? R² X, in uis M. (ii) 132. 5 scrutantur Quir.: persecutantur L *cett.* (iii) 132. 8 praemium resurrectionis Quir. benev.: om. resurrectionis L *cett.* (iv) 132. 10 claritatem dei Quir.: om. dei L *cett.* (v) 133. 7 in epistula pauli Quir. W M B X: in epistulis pauli L P² T U. (vi) 133. 8 ab agapen Quir.: ab agape L P V R T U X, a caritate A W M B. (vii) 133. 9 angustia Quir. A W M B: angustiae L P U R T X². (viii) 133. 9 famis Quir. A W: fames L *cett.* (ix) 133. 14 descendi Quir. *cett.*: discendi L A. (x) 133. 20 dicit mihi Quir. M T V? X: mihi dicit L *cett.* (xi) 133. 22 in regno Quir. R*: in regnum L *cett.* (xii) 133. 23 facit uoluntatem Quir.: paruerit uoluntati L *cett.* (xiii) 134. 4 principium Quir. benev. O: initium L *cett.* (xiv) 134. 4 domini Quir. A W M U: dei L P B V R. (xv) 134. 5 solomonis Quir. A: salomonis L *cett.* (xvi) 134. 5 timor domini (cf. timore W, dominum M X) Quir.: timere deum V, metuere deum L *cett.* (xvii) 134. 6 reueretur Quir. benev.: ueretur L *cett.*, metuit A. (xviii) 134. 7 esaiian: esaiian R, esaiam L *cett.*

In spellings like (viii) famis, and (xv) solomonis, Quir. may well be right, but I do not think that any of its unique readings have any claim to be regarded as genuine. What is, however, really important is that in three striking cases, (iii) (xiii) (xvii), Quir. agrees with the Beneventan

¹ I had a morning's work at Würzburg in August 1927 at a MS of Councils: and my travelling companion, Mr J. G. Beevor of New College, Oxford, was good enough to collate for me on the same occasion Hartel's W of St Cyprian for the section 134. 15-138. 21. Besides the two readings mentioned in the text, the following additions or corrections should be made: 135. 1 W does not omit non: 135. 1 eos for eorum W: 135. 6 me scient me (not me scient) W: 135. 20 omni 1° is by the first hand of W: 136. 8 cxliiii] + milia W: 136. 14 manifestate W*: 136. 24 miliagnorum W: 137. 20 fructus W: 137. 20 ueris W* uentris W²: 137. 22 ut ut facias: 137. 24 in the citation from Habakkuk auditum tuum (not auditu tuum) W with Quir.: 138. 6 quomo W: 138. 16 iussus (not ius) W.

MS (*b*) against the rest. Clearly their common stock represents an early Italian edition of the fourth or fifth century.

(6) Q and M. M is a Munich MS, collated by Hartel, of the ninth century: Q, Troyes 581, is a sister MS superior in age, saec. viii-ix, and rather distinctly superior in text. The corrections of Q² are neither very early nor very good. I have collated it as far as the end of the fifth chapter of the third book, the MS having been, by the kindness of the French authorities, transferred to Paris for my use.

I record the divergences of Q from M throughout the whole of Book I:

38. 21 reliquerint Q. 39. 8 fili isrl malignum coram dominum
deum Q. 39. 9 deos gentium Q. 39. 12 contra dominum Q.
39. 19 item quod Q. 40. 2 a uia sua maligna Q. 40. 6 ad
disperdendum uos Q. 40. 11 hesdra Q. 40. 16 (42. 9) eseian Q.
40. 19 meus (*pro me* 2^o) Q. 41. 1 fili Q. 41. 3 intellegitis Q.
41. 4 ingrassauit Q. 41. 14 dicetis Q. 42. 2 iohannem Q.
42. 3 et: *om.* Q. 42. 4 eum: autem Q. 42. 15 danielum Q.
42. 16 quo discant Q. 43. 2 conuersus est Q 43. 5 ad-
inpleri Q. 43. 8 tertio Q. 43. 16 ambacuc Q. 43. 19
est: *om.* Q*. 44. 8 exustae Q. 44. 9 alienigenae Q. 44. 9
desertam Q. 44. 10 cucumeraria Q. 44. 13 similaremus Q.
44. 16 noluistis Q. 45. 4 fili Q. 45. 19 expoliationem Q.
46. 14 inter gentes Q. 46. 19 ueniunt Q. 48. 8 honerati Q.
48. 10 animis Q. 48. 21 dominus dicit: *om.* Q. 49. 5
domum Q. 49. 12 aedificauit Q. 49. 12 in nomine Q.
50. 6 .iiii. Q. 50. 15 dominus Q. 50. 16 paenitebitur Q.
50. 17 helian Q. 51. 6 audire Q. 51. 14 haec Q. 51. 21
nobis: nouis Q. 51. 24 osee Q. 52. 2 non: *om.* Q. 52. 7
(*et* 16) sterilis Q. 52. 9 delata Q. 52. 10 et noli parcere Q.
53. 5 fennanam Q. 53. 11 fili Q. 54. 7-13: *habet* Q.
54. 8 isaac et Q. 54. 12 fili Q. 54. 14 uidit autem Q.
55. 2 mihi fili Q. 55. 8 lacte Q. 55. 13 et: *om.* Q. 55. 14
non noui Q. 55. 15 de hoc ipso Q. 56. 7 uiam maris Q.
56. 13 non cludentur Q*: non concludentur Q². 57. 4 inuocabit Q.
57. 15 iocundabuntur Q. 58. 3 uir est qui Q. 58. 3 in eum Q.
58. 6 iohannem Q. 59. 5 relaxabo Q.

Every now and then M has a better spelling: every now and then Q has some small blunder of its own. But on the whole it is clear that Q is the better representative of the family.

(7) X. We pass now to a series of MSS not known to Hartel, three of them preserved in English libraries, one in France: and of these four the earliest and probably the most important is a MS now in the

Rylands Library at Manchester, which we have called X. It was written in the eighth century, probably at Murbach in Alsace, to which monastery it certainly belonged in the fifteenth century (Traube *Palaeographische Forschungen* iii [1904] 335): it bore the number 298 in the 1859 sale catalogue of Libri MSS. Libri bought it at the sale in 1858 of the Maimbourg MSS at Colmar.¹

By the kindness of Dr E. W. Watson I copied his collation of *Test.* many years ago, and was also able to inspect the MS at Manchester in October 1906. I am also enabled to print here his list of its contents; so far as I am aware, no such list has so far been published. It seems obvious that, just as with L, we have in it the second of a pair of MSS of which the first must have contained the treatises other than the *Testimonia* and the *Quod Idola*.

Epp. 39, 67, 10, 69 part ii; *Test.* I, II, III; *Epp.* 63, 6, 55, 28, 37, 11, 38, 76, 73, 71, 70; *Sententiae Episcoporum*; *Epp.* 3, 74, 69 part i, 64, 2, 72, 12, 32, 20, 13, 43, 65, 52, 1, 56, 3 (repeated), 47, 45, 44, 61, 46, 40, 4, 57, 59, 48, 51, 54, 60; *Quod Idola*.

The text of all these documents, whether letters or treatises, is complete, save for *ep.* 69 §§ 1b-6, pp. 749. 13 quominus ipse-755. 16 et maiorem, and *ep.* 74 §§ 8-10, pp. 806. 10 crinibus pullulantes-807. 17 discendi patientiam. It is, however, possible that the order at the commencement of the MS is not original, and that the four letters which precede *Test.* and between them make up two complete gatherings may have got to their present position by some mistake, so that *Test.* would have had the first place in the MS.² It is perhaps in favour of this view that a good deal is illegible in the early part of *Test.* i.

If we apply to X the criterion on which Mercati relies to shew the special excellence, namely, the traces of the antique 'African' numeration of the Psalms (*D'alcuni sussidi* p. 20), we find that X comes midway V and the rest: while V has the old numbering 73 times, X follows suit with 50 or 51, while Hartel's five MSS of the *Testimonia* range from the 22 of L to the 4 of A. In fairness, however, to L P, it should be said that if we revise Mercati's figures by including (1) readings of L* neglected by Hartel, and (2) readings of P where P gives the lower Psalm number though L does not, the total for the family rises from 22 to 37. But X still remains, as far as this test is concerned, decidedly the most faithful witness, after V, to the Cyprilian tradition.

In Books I and II of the *Testimonia* the chapters are numbered with Greek numerals, but in Book III with Latin. Perhaps the courage of the scribe gave way under the prospect of deciphering the higher numbers in the unfamiliar script.

¹ For a second Cyprilian MS in the same Libri catalogue, no. 299, see no. (8) below.

² I cannot now find anything in my notes which would clear up this point.

As one would expect, X is subject to the ordinary disadvantages of an eighth-century MS written before the new standard of Carolingian scholarship had reformed the business of scribes. In comparison for instance with L, it is clumsy and ignorant, and its minor delinquencies if recorded in full would need a large measure of room in any apparatus. But apart from blunders its substantial text is a very good one, not far removed from the L type, and in just those matters where unreformed texts are better than reformed ones its superiority to L is clear. Thus it gives the right reading 'cata Lucanum' in every single case where the Third Gospel is quoted by name. Its age entitles it to collation throughout: but an unsupported reading of X is no more likely to be genuine than it would be in any other Merovingian MS of an ancient author.

(8) O, Bodl. Add. C 15, was curiously enough also purchased at the same Libri sale of 1859: it is in fact the no. 299 referred to on p. 128 n. 1, only it is there attributed to the ninth century, while Dr Sanday, who was the first in recent times to call attention to the need for further examination of the Oxford MSS of Cyprian (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts* II [1886], appendix ii, pp. 122 ff), writes 'ascribed to the early part of the tenth century', so that ix-x will not be far out. It had apparently belonged earlier in the nineteenth century to a Monsieur H. Chauffour of Colmar: and Libri seems to have bought it at the same sale as the MS last described, X.

Of O (Sanday's O₁) I have, in a volume that came on to me from Dr Sanday, a collation of the third book only of the *Testimonia*, I am not sure by whom. Its text appears to be of high interest: in 134. 4 it gives 'Principium' for 'Initium' with Quir. Benev. and in the next line 'timor domini' with Quir.: while the explicit of the *de unitate* is 'Caecili Cypriani de ecclesiae unitate' (without 'catholicae'), a correct and unusual reading.

The contents are the treatises (including *Quod Idola*, all three books of *Testimonia*, and *Sent. Epp.*) and a few of the longer epistles, 63, 58, 76, 58 (again and with an independent text), 55, 66, 30, 2, 64.

(9) U, Bodl. Laud. 105, Sanday's O₃; 'ascribed to the end of the eleventh century', but it is in fact rather of the first half of the tenth. This is the one Oxford MS which I have myself collated in full for the *Testimonia*, partly I suppose because I seemed to trace a relationship to L (compare, e.g., the following: 175. 4 ad] apud L U: 177. 6 pessimae] pessime L U: 182. 2 perimam] peremam L U: 183. 5 spiritalia] spiritalis L U: in all four cases P has the ordinary reading), partly because no collation of it had been made for Dr Sanday.

U has extraordinarily few abbreviations: practically none except the *Nomina Sacra*, and the final- at the end of a line. The spellings are

sometimes very ancient, e. g. 40. 5 manum for manuum, 49. 20 quid, 64. 17 eructua(b)it; the Greek numerals are retained throughout for the chapter headings. U would seem, in fact, to have been copied direct from a primitive exemplar.

(10) Andegavensis (Angers) 148 [140], perhaps of the late ninth century. I have of this MS photographs of foll. 176 a-190 a, containing *Test. i* and *Test. ii* as far as almost the end of chapter 13 (Hartel 79. 8). But I have nothing as yet to say about its text.

I return now to the two oldest extant MSS, Hartel's A of the *Testimonia*, and S of *ad Fortunatum*: and with some fresh details about these two MSS I will bring to an end this section of Prolegomena.

(11) A. The MS was written in the eighth century, probably, as I should judge, in the first half of the century. With the other Sessorian MSS it was annexed by the Italian government in 1880, and transferred to the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele, where it now bears the number 2106: like other old Sessorian MSS, it had been brought to Rome from the monastery of Nonantola in northern Italy, not far from Bologna. On foll. 1 a-154 b it contains the *Speculum* of pseudo-Augustine (in Wehrich's edition in *C. S. E. L.* it is cited as S), on foll. 154 b-225 the *Testimonia*, which commences on the same page as the *Speculum* ends. The whole MS is made up of twenty-nine quaternions (many of them, however, consisting of seven leaves only) and one ternion, foll. 107-112; of which the first fifteen, foll. 1-112, are signed with numbers i-xv, the other fifteen with letters of the alphabet, a to o, the last signature being lost owing to the mutilation of the last two leaves. The writing is uncial, by more than one hand, but the same hand which concludes the *Speculum* also commences the *Testimonia*.

There are corrections by the first hand (or a diorthota); there is also a second hand, itself early, but very easily distinguishable from A*, and of no value. There are not many abbreviations beyond the Sacred Names, and per, pro, prae, and qm̄ = quoniam, and euṅg, or similar forms, for euangelio. There are occasional ligatures: 160. 22 Hartel has misunderstood the ligature -en- in 'argentum' as -om-. A cursive r is occasionally employed to save space: 174. 5 Hartel has wrongly given *secedit* for *recedit* as the reading of A.

I re-collated A in May 1903, and found Hartel's work fairly accurate save in the one respect in which A had its best title to respect, namely, in its orthography. He ought indeed to have put in his text many spellings of A which he has duly noted in his apparatus, e. g. profeta, Istrahel, Mattheus (all three *passim*), Danihelum 84. 5, 121. 13, Or 89. 17: but much ought also to have appeared there on the authority of A which he

has not recorded at all, e. g. Bahal 39. 12 ; Samuhel 53. 9, 84. 1 ; Man-nasse 54. 17 ; Isac 58. 16, 87. 1 ; Oseae 69. 15, 92. 6 ; blasfemat 71. 9 ; Betlem 77. 4, 8 ; facinorosos 80. 16 ; heremo 88. 17 ; Aron 89. 17 ; orfanorum 95. 18 ; eructuauit 97. 16 ; diabulo 100. 16.¹

(12) S. Paris 10592, of the sixth century, does not contain the *Testimonia* and even of the *ad Fortunatum* its text is not complete, for it begins only near the end of chapter 4 (Hartel 325. 4). About the contents of the MS I wrote a brief paper in the JOURNAL many years ago,² and I will not repeat what I said, as it has no direct bearing on our present purpose. But, as with A, it is important to warn students that Hartel has neglected its evidence just where it would have helped him most. Abbreviations indeed of the *Nomina Sacra* it might be hardly fair to expect any scholar to have recorded, before Traube emphasized their special value: S has consistently d̄m̄s d̄m̄i d̄m̄o, in 325. 6 the accusative dōm̄, and in 343. 11 apparently sp̄s s̄nc for spiritus sanctus. Inquid and euangelio appear consistently. Of proper names he should have noted Amalec 330. 23, 331. 3, 6 ; Aron 331. 1 ; Moysei 331. 2 ; Balam (Alam S*, but the correction is by the first hand) 334. 1 ; and in 325. 22 S has idolatrian, not idolatriam. More important are 326. 16 in caelis est S with R ; 330. 12 fili in both places S ; 333. 21 mugilatum, not mogilalum, S ; 335. 13 sunt *om.* S as well as W R ; 336. 9 S* has porte[ta, S² portenta ; 339. 28 habes for habens S ; 340. 4 martyrii (wrongly of course), not martyri, S ; 341. 1 feliciorum S ; 341. 19 occansione, not occansionem, S ; 341. 23 S has (for se illa) suella, that is, suilla 'swine's flesh', a very interesting reading whether or no it is correct ; 341. 25 nobilitates and fingeret S ; 342. 13 *om.* et S ; 343. 21 persequentium nos adque in | sequentium nos adque in|festantium S*, just repeating one line by *homoeoarcton* ; 344. 19 metunt S ; 345. 1 persecuciones S ; 345. 15 aut fratres *om.* S ; 345. 26 fide S ; 346. 26 meditationis S ; 347. 3 anchristus S.

Enough has been said to shew the imperative need for the super-session of Hartel by a better edition: enough perhaps also to shew that the hope is not an irrational one of restoring, with the use of all the means at disposal, something like the *ipsissima verba* of large portions of St Cyprian's Bible.

¹ I have not pursued this select catalogue of omissions beyond the first two Books.

² *J. T. S.* iii (Jan. 1902) pp. 282-285.

APPENDIX I

Revised list of Biblical references in St Cyprian, from Genesis to the end of the Historical Books of O. T., for Hartel's edition

In Genesi		xix 10, 11	92. 5
i 26	198. 10	15	146. 3
iii 14, 15	74. 9	18	179. 4
16	144. 13: 202. 28	22	723. 10: 736. 1:
17-19	158. 3: 405. 1		777. 5
v 24	158. 11: 311. 17	xx 4	161. 7: 322. 12
xii 1-3	54. 2	7	126. 1
xiv 18	703. 3	12	793. 13
xv 6	43. 17: 150. 13	23	161. 6
xix 24	146. 15	xxii 20 (19)	242. 24: 323.
xxii 1, 2	127. 19		22: 362. 10:
11-13	67. 7: 134. 9		680. 1: 722. 12
xxv 23	51. 22	22-24 (21-23)	181. 23
xxvii 27-29	54. 7	27	126. 4
xxxi 13	67. 12	xxiii 7	80. 3
xxxv 1	68. 11	20, 21	67. 18
xxxvii 19, 20	734. 11	xxviii 39 (43)	723. 12: 736. 3:
xlvi 17-19	54. 13		777. 7
xlix (8-10) 11	705. (2), 7	xxxii 1	38. 22
8-12	54. 21	6	164. 4
		31, 32	39. 2: 250. 24:
			324. 13
In Exodo		In Leuitico	
i 12	332. 23	vii 10 (20)	176. 10: 248. 9
iii 2	179. 12	xi 44 (xix 2, xx 7: cf. 1 Pet.	
2-6	86. 19	1 16)	275. 1: 769. 8
iv 11, 12	333. 21	xix 13, 26, 27 a, 27 b, 32	
xii 3, 5-11	80. 23	173. 12, 15, 17, 19,	
6	714. 16		174. 2
11	122. 14	27 b	259. 10
13	90. 13: 367. 11	xxi 17 (cf. 18, 21)	723. 8:
46	174. 7: 217. 11:		736. 6: 777. 3
	752. 22	xxiv 13, 14	126. 7
xiii 21	67. 14	In Numeris	
xiv 11 b, 12 b, 13, 14	328. 12	viii 5-7 a	761. 22
19	67. 16	xii 3 a	635. 12
xvii 9-14	89. 12		
11-14	330. 21		

xvi 26 <i>b</i>	737. 17: 758. 5	xxxiii 9	272. 23: 327. 13:
40 <i>a</i> (xvii 5 <i>a</i>)	757. 12		386. 2
xvii 10 <i>b</i> (25 <i>b</i>)	127. 11: 303.	Apud Iesu Naue	
	21	i 8	800. 11
xix 9 <i>b</i>	762. 3	ii 18, 19	217. 5: 753. 1
11 <i>b</i> , 12, 13 <i>b</i>	761. 16	v 2	45. 16
22 <i>a</i>	768. 2	13-15	86. 11
xx 25, 26	738. 6	xxiv 26, 27	82. 17
xxiii 19 <i>a</i>	88. 15	In libro Iudicum	
24 <i>a</i>	55. 9	ii 11-13	39. 7
xxiv 7-9	74. 19	x 6	39. 11
17 <i>b</i>	74. 18	In basilion [·I·]	
xxv 10-13	cf. 785. 13, 14	i 13	269. 17
In Deuteronomio		ii 3	117. 2
v 7	322. 24: 355. 1	4	117. 4
vi 5	133. 2	5	53. 10
13 (cf. Matt. iv 10)	121.	25	142. 14: 325. 5
22: 241. 26:	354. 26.	30	274. 17: 429. 18
15	785. 11	35, 36	50. 18
viii 2	304. 1	vii 12	84. 1
xiii 3 <i>b</i> (4 <i>b</i>)	127. 22: 304.	viii 7	470. 12: 670. 24:
	4: 331. 9		728. 20
5 <i>a</i> (6 <i>a</i>)	594. 19	xvi 7	157. 2: 257. 9
6, 8-10 <i>a</i> (7-11 <i>a</i>)	325.	xxi 4	146. 4
	11	In basilion [·II·]	
12, 13 <i>b</i> , 15 <i>a</i> , 16 <i>b</i> , 17 <i>b</i> ,		vii 4, 5, 12-14 <i>a</i> , 16	49. 7:
18 <i>a</i> (13-19 <i>a</i>)	325. 22		75. 20
xvii 12 <i>a</i>	596. 17	In basilion [·III·]	
12 <i>a</i> , 13	469. 18: 476.	xi 4 (3)	167. 2
	14: 670. 19: 728. 15	14 (23)	173. 6: 286. 13
xviii 17 <i>a</i> , 18, 19	51. 8	31, 32, 36 <i>b</i>	216. 3
xxiii 19 <i>a</i> (20 <i>a</i>)	153. 16	xvii 14	386. 27
21, 23 (22, 24)	143. 17	[xviii 21	452. 2]
xxiv 16	646. 1	xix 10	40. 7
xxv 9	cf. 86. 9	In basilion [·III·]	
xxvii 8	82. 16	xvii 20, 21	754. 20
xxviii 44	55. 10	In paralipomenon	
66	87. 19	II Chron. xv 2	142. 4: 329. 7
xxx 6 <i>a</i>	45. 14	xxiv 20	687. 8
15, 19 <i>b</i>	154. 22		
xxxii 17 <i>a</i>	39. 6: 323. 23		
39	322. 25		

In <i>Hesdra</i> (apud <i>Hesdrum</i>) .	In <i>Machabeis</i>
I Esdr. iv 38-40 807. 2	I Macc. ii 52 128. 9
II Esdr. xix 26 (= Neh. ix 26)	59 151. 2
40. 11	60 155. 15
	62, 63 117. 7:669. 3
In <i>Tobia</i> (apud <i>Tobiam</i>)	
ii 2 109. 4	
14 119. 21 : 303. 1	II Macc. vi 30 342. 6 [132. 11]
iv 5-11 (B text) 109. 8 :	vii 9 339. 12 [132. 15]
389. 4	14 339. 21
12 (B text) 166. 4	[132. 17]
xii 8 290. 17	16, 17 339. 28
8, 9 377. 11	[132. 20]
11-15 (N text) 291. 1 :	18 <i>b</i> , 19 340. 12
303. 6 (cf. 53. 14, 338. 2)	[132. 23]
xiii 6 (B text) 337. 23	27-29 341. 2
xiv 9 (N text) 388. 27	ix 12 <i>b</i> 117. 6

APPENDIX II

Dr Mercati's account of his method in regard to the readings of the lost MSS Ver(onensis) and b(eneventanus)

Quanto a Ver. e b(enevent.), mi sono sforzato di darne non solo le lezioni trascritte, ma approssimativamente l'intero testo collazionato da Latini, affinchè i Collegli conoscano di per sè quale variante e quale forma di vocabolo è esplicitamente attestata, e quale invece è soltanto supponibile e probabile fosse nei perduti codici Veronese e Beneventano. Per questo

10] ho collazionato di nuovo coll' Hartel l' ed. Erasm. dell' a. 1521, come nel 1897 collazionai la Grifiana o Lionese del 1537. Quante volte l' Erasm. è uguale a *v* dell' Hartel, ho posto una lineetta sotto il *v*. Quante volte invece la lezione dell' Erasmiana è diversa, ho segnato *e* la lezione dell' Erasmiana. Ciò era necessario premettere, affinchè si sapesse quale era o quale era supponibile fosse la lezione di *b V*, allorchè il Latini non segnò alcuna discordia o variante.

Se non che (*a*) purtroppo m' accorsi che l' Erasm. del 1521 e la Lionese del 1537 non sono identiche affatto (cp. pp. 65. 3, 70. 17 etc.), e che l' Erasmiana forse è stata ritoccata, e la Lionese invece non dipende da quella Erasm. del 1521. Inoltre (*b*) se certamente Lat. Latini collazionò il Veron. coll' ed. del 1537, non sono sicuro che l' Agostini collazionasse il Neapol. colla stessa ovvero con altra edizione.

Tanto che il grado di probabilità per la supposta lezione del Benev. forse non è uguale di quello che ha la supposta lezione del Veron.

Io ho notato le differenze fra l' Erasm. e la Grif. dove me ne sono accorto. Fare un intero confronto delle due ed. fra loro nè il tempo nè l' animo m' hanno concesso.

2°] ho copiato tutte le varie lezioni esplicitamente attestate da L. Latini stesso, traendole

(a) dall' esemplare della Grifiana a. 1537, tutto postillato di mano di Latino e ora conservato nell' Universitaria di Napoli nel vecchio fondo Brancacciano. Le lezioni fornite da questo esemplare (che sono le più numerose e si potrebbero segnare V^b) sono riprodotte in inchiostro rosso. Quante volte Lat. segnò solo la lettera o sillaba variante, io ho usato l' inchiostro nero per le lettere rimanenti: così ho usato l' inchiostro nero per le parole precedenti o seguenti ad una lezione esplicitamente attestata.

(b) dall' ed. Grif. a. 1535, già appartenuta a Ioh. Bapt. Bandini, amico del Latini, e ora conservata nella Riserva della Biblioteca Vaticana. Sembra anch' essa postillata da Latini: ma nei libri *ad Quirin.* e *ad Fortun.* presenta poche varianti, che ho designato con inchiostro violetto. Tra questo e il precedente esemplare non v' è sempre concordia. E. g. esso presenta qualche lezione in più, ovvero più precisa, di V (V^d), 49. 12 (?), 66. 6 (erron.), 76. 1, 77. 20, 88. 13, 96. 2 (?), 96. 12, 96. 16, 117. 8 (?), 132. 4, 324. 16; di N, ossia *b*, 59. 13, 64. 17, 77. 20, 86. 20, 115. 13; di P, 64. 21, 179. 1 (ma tutte e due sbagliate, come ho potuto vedere sul cod. stesso). Inoltre viene data anche ad N una lezione di V, pp. 56. 11, 57. 15, 79. 9, 156. 8: e viceversa p. 79. 21, cfr. anche 56. 6. Alle volte dà a N V lezioni che non corrispondono esattamente a nessuno dei due: cfr. 52. 10, 75. 1, 111. 1. Così che conviene andar cauti nell' uso di questa copia: nella quale si badò forse più alla sostanza e al tenore generale della lezione, anzichè alla forma precisa.

(c) dall' ed. rom. a. 1563, già di proprietà *Latini Latinii Viterbiens.* e ora conservata nella Biblioteca Capitolare di Viterbo, alla segnatura N 149. Le postille sono autografe di Latini, che segnò non poche varianti da me indicate con matita (*lapis*) turchina. L' esemplare è prezioso: (i) perchè ci attesta che l' interpretazione da me data del cifrario Latiniano è esatta; e (ii) perchè ci attesta esplicitamente tante lezioni di V N, non trascritte in (a) perchè conformi al testo di quell' edizione grifiana. L' ordine delle sigle è qui come in (b), cioè *Ver. Ben.* e i *Vatic.*; mentre in (a) si usa *b* per N e la forma *V. C.*¹ Da questa copia si vede che L. Latini continuò a collazionare codici anche dopo

¹ Inoltre in (c) non compare P, cioè il cod. di Pietro di Damiano, se non probabilmente sotto la forma di Vat. 1.

(a) e l' ed. rom., giacchè a p. 1 ricorda *Vaticani septem integri non possunt inter vetustos censerì, sed non ideo tamen omnes recentes iudicandi.*

Io non so, ma credo che coll' aiuto di questi tre esemplari, e specie di (a) e (c), si può riguadagnare una cognizione abbastanza precisa di V Benev.

A designare le varianti dei tre esemplari, forse si potrebbero adottare i simboli V^b (brancacc.), V^d (bandin.), V^v (viterb.).

Naturalmente, nell' edizione deve scomparire la maggior parte di quanto ho notato io: ma però non sono pentito d'aver segnato piuttosto troppo che poco. Così, ad es., d'aver notato le lezioni di P o d'altro codice Vaticano, giacchè allora è moralmente certo che V^b non avevano la stessa lezione; altrimenti avrebbe Latini aggiunto anche la sigla di V o B. Ho segnato pure le restituzioni di Latini in (a), anche quando non consta donde le pigliasse. Dapprima avevo pensato che da V, e diffatti talvolta risulta questo; cfr. p. 161. 7: ma altrove certamente no; cfr. p. 142. 23-143. 1.

Di V è a notare (i) gli spostamenti *ad Quirin.* I 21, III 33, e nei capit. del lib. III 21, 20, 98, 97; (ii) le aggiunte II 18, III 17 (cfr. *ad Fortun.* 11), 19, *ad Fortun.* 8 (p. 330. 2), etc.; (iii) le omissioni piccole di 79. 4, 90. 12, 121. 21, etc., e la caduta d' un foglio o due che conteneva circa 40 linee dell' ed. a III 26-29 (p. 141. 4-142. 23).

[NOTE. Mgr Mercati now writes, under date Jan. 18, 1928, that he has come to the conclusion that the collation in Bandini's copy of the Gryphius ed. of 1535, (b) above, is after all not Latini's but Bandini's own. 'La scrittura è davvero somigliante assai, ma avendo veduto in seguito parecchi manoscritti del Bandini e alcune edizioni di Santi Padri con simile note (varianti, citazioni, ecc.) di mano di lui mi sono persuaso che non il Latini ma il Bandini postillò la Grifiana del 1535: così le confusioni e gli errori rimangono spiegati. Il Bandini († 1628), correttore della Tipografia Vaticana antica, attese alle stampe della Volgata Clementina, dei libri liturgici usciti sotto Clemente VIII e Paolo V, dei Concilii, degli Annali del Baronio ecc., e a quelle allora preparate ma non uscite di vari Santi Padri. Interessante la corrispondenza fra lui e Francesco Lucas di Bruges pubblicata dal de Schrevel (cf. H. Höpfl *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata*, Freiburg im Br., 1913, 221 sgg.). Le carte e i libri postillati di lui furono acquistati dalla Vaticana: cf. cod. Vatic. lat. 7762, f. 54-66^r. Di lui ho fatto qualche cenno in *Rassegna Gregoriana* iv (1905) 256; vi (1906) 13 sgg. Parecchi documenti e notizie su lui in P. M. Baumgarten *Neue Kunde von alten Bibeln* I 136 sg., 140, 300 sgg., 320 ecc.; II 141, 50* sg.]