

This Homily of Jacob of Serúgh is of importance in two respects: it shews the freedom with which Tatian sometimes handled the Gospel narratives; and it suggests considerable caution in the use of the Arabic version. The Syriac recension from which that version was made was evidently one in which the original Harmony had received a certain amount of castigation other than merely textual. In the present case a narrative in which two Gospel incidents were combined has been rejected, and the two incidents have been given separately. The same thing may have occurred elsewhere,¹ with the possible result that the Arabic Harmony is a much larger volume than the original Diatessaron of Tatian.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

CURIOSITIES OF LATIN INTERPRETATION OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

CONSIDERING the natural pitfalls in the way, and the scanty equipment which many of the earliest rolls of New Testament books will have possessed in matters of accents, breathings, and punctuation, it is perhaps wonderful that blunders of translation and interpretation were not more numerous. But it may not be without interest if I jot down the details of three cases which I happen to have lit upon in the course of my own reading of the Latin fathers; and doubtless other scholars would be able to furnish their quota.

1. Jo. i 18.

μονογενῆς θεός [οὐ ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός] ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

The difficulty of the construction of *ἐξηγήσατο*, without an object following it, is manifest enough: and one branch of the Old Latin text—not perhaps the African, but certainly the earliest known European text—as represented by Tertullian, Novatian, and the codex Vercellensis, *a*, of the Old Latin Gospels, attempted to solve the difficulty by making *κόλπον* accusative after the verb. Sabatier has quoted none of the following passages save two from Tertullian, and of one of these he has given an unrevised text. Mr Fausset's note in his edition of Novatian in the *Cambridge Patristic Texts* is the starting-point of my list: but I have added some new references.

¹ I believe the original Diatessaron contained only one miracle of feeding the multitudes, whereas the Arabic has both (see *J. T. S.* vol. viii p. 573 ff).

a 'nisi unicus filius solus sinum patris ipse enarravit'.

Tert. *adv. Praxean* 8 (ed. Kroymann *C. S. E. L.* vol. xlvii p. 238. 6) 'solus filius patrem novit et sinum patris ipse exposuit'.

ib. 15 (254. 20, 23) 'deum nemo vidit umquam . . . quem deum? scilicet patrem, apud quem deus erat sermo, unigenitus filius qui sinum patris ipse disseruit'.

ib. 21 (264. 8) 'hic unus sinum patris disseruit, non sinum suum pater' [the MSS have 'unius': Pamelius conjectured 'unus', Kroymann accepts from Engelbrecht 'unicus'].

Novatian *de Trinitate* 18 (ed. Fausset p. 68. 5) 'Ioannes hunc eundem qui sinum exponit patris, verbum dicit carnem factum esse, ut sinum patris posset exponere'.

ib. 28 (101. 16) 'cum nondum sinum patris Christus exposuisset'.

Ps.-Origen *Tractatus* ix (ed. Batiffol, 102. 16) 'manducabitis caput et pedes et quae sunt interiora . . . caput enim Christi pater est, interiora vero ipse sermo divinus qui sinum patris enarravit'.

But if these authorities, or the version which lies behind them, took *κόλπον* as the object of *ἐξηγήσατο*, they only avoided one difficulty at the expense of falling, as it would seem, into another and a worse one; for how could they now construe the previous words *ὁ ὧν εἰς*?

I believe that the answer is that they read the Greek as though it were not *ὁ ὧν εἰς* but *ὁ ὧν εἶς*. Hence the 'solus' in *a* and in *adv. Praxean* 8; hence also the 'unus', if that be (and I think it is) the true reading, in *adv. Praxean* 21.

2. Rom. iii 27.

ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη.

Tyconius, the African Donatist, in his Third Rule for the understanding of Scripture (p. 19. 13 of Prof. Burkitt's edition) understood his Latin Bible at this point to say 'ubi ergo gloriatio exclusa est?', putting the interrogation after 'exclusa est' and not after 'gloriatio'. He is thus driven to explain that 'excludi' has the meaning 'exprimi, produci, effici', so that he translates 'whence then is glory extracted? by what law? of works? no: but by the law of faith'.

It is true that Prof. Burkitt retains the ordinary punctuation of the verse. But I think that the context is quite decisive in favour of the rather odd interpretation that I have adopted. Tyconius has been arguing that faith is as old as the law, and that the righteous of Israel when they came to Christ were called from faith into the same faith: and so the idea of 'glory' comes in because of the apposite parallel in

2 Cor. iii 18 'we all with unveiled face beholding the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image' *a claritate in claritatem*. 'The Apostle asserts both that there was a glory before the Passion of Christ and that it could not be extracted, that is produced, by the Law, so that it must clearly have been by faith'. 'We have passed into glory from the same glory, and this original glory was not from the Law' or from works, but by faith and the grace of God. The 'gloriatio' of Rom. iii 27 is thus identical with the 'gloria' or 'claritas' of 2 Cor. iii 18: it was something desirable, and it came not from works but from faith.

This complete inversion of the turn of the particular phrase may however, I suspect, be due rather to Tyconius himself than to the translator of his Latin Bible. The Latin translation would be as innocent of punctuation as its Greek original; and Tyconius blundered because he read 'ubi ergo gloriatio exclusa est' as one clause instead of two.

3. Rom. vii 13 b.

ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς.

St Augustine in numerous passages quotes this verse in the rendering 'ut fiat supra modum peccator aut peccatum per mandatum'. Sabatier adduces at least a dozen references: it may suffice to cite particularly *ep.* lxxxii § 20 and *contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* i 14—the first because we have of the letters a critical text by A. Goldbacher in the Vienna Corpus (vol. xxxiv p. 372. 5), the second because I found in the Bibliothèque Nationale an early fragment of two guard leaves (*nouv. acq.* 2199), from a MS of the *contra duas epist. Pelag.* which contains the quotation. The explanation of 'peccator aut peccatum' is of course that the translator was rendering not ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία, but ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία.

C. H. TURNER.

OSSIUS (HOSIUS) OF CORDOVA.

It is a curious coincidence that neither for bishop Hosius himself, nor for the council of Sardica at which he presided, do we use the form of name familiar to the Latins of the fourth century. The Greeks spelt the two words Σαρδική and Ὁσσιος, and it is I suppose ultimately from Greek influence that Latins came to say Sardica and Hosius: but the bishop's contemporaries called him Ossius, and the council (and the town where it was held) Serdica. The latter fact is well enough known,