

clamat? ait enim "uenite, manducate de meis panibus et bibite unum quod miscui"? The two last of these commentators have retained, within the limits of their short comments, the figure of the One who was God and Christ and Sophia, who also mingled the cup, and called to others to partake in the words of Prov. ix 1 ff. Origen knew Christ as the Sophia, for in commenting on Prov. ix 3<sup>1</sup> he says: 'if Paul the apostle is a slave of Christ, and Christ is the Sophia, then Paul the apostle is a slave of the Sophia.' Hippolytus<sup>2</sup> names Christ ἡ Σοφία in his exposition of the Proverbs passage. The Cyprianic *Testimonia* affirm that Figure and His deeds. The heading to ii 2 is *Quod sapientia Dei Christus, et de Sacramento Incarnationis eius et Passionis et Calicis et Altaris et Apostolorum, qui missi praedicaverunt*,<sup>3</sup> and the only testimonium under it is Prov. ix 1 sq. The succeeding chapters in the Cyprianic writing exhibit Him as *Deus*. This is He who in primitive Christology cried 'uenite, edite de meis panibus et bibite unum quod miscui uobis' (ii 2). The Spanish scholar, Isidore,<sup>4</sup> knows of course this testimonium; but he completes the turning of the early Christological references into later ecclesiastical values when he writes: 'Dei ergo sapientia Christus construit sibi domum sacrosanctam ecclesiam, in qua mactavit sui corporis hostias, in qua miscuit vinum sui sanguinis in calice sacramenti divini' &c. Thus *As. Is.* v 13 is another witness to the integral place of the *Testimonia* in its own literary and religious composition.

VACHER BURCH.

### PSALM LXXIII 10.

THE Massoretic text of this verse runs as follows:—

לָבֵן יָשִׁיב (Qri. יָשִׁיב) עֲמֹ הָאֵם  
 וַיִּמְי קִלְא יִמְצוּ לָמוּ:

'Therefore will he cause his people to return (Qri. 'his people will return') hither,

And water of a full one shall be drained for them.'

This is intolerable as regards both sense and metre. Commentators are agreed that the verse is corrupt. The context demands here some

<sup>1</sup> *P. G.* xvii 185 C.

<sup>2</sup> *P. G.* x 628 B.

<sup>3</sup> This heading originally can only have been composed of the opening words: 'Quod Sapientia Dei Christus', and perhaps a reference to His *Concernationis*. This second feature appears to be wanted by the earliest exegesis of Prov. ix.

<sup>4</sup> *P. L.* lxxxiii 536 A-B.

reference to the satisfaction of the appetite of the wicked mentioned in the preceding verse. This is in part provided by the emendation of the first half of verse 10, approved by Houbigant Lagarde and Wellhausen (see *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* p. 240), לָבֵן יִשְׁבִיעֵמוּ לֶחֶם. If their suggestion be correct, it would seem to follow as a matter of course that the second half of verse 10 was originally לֶחֶם לֹא יִמְעָטוּ לָמוּ. Sense and metre are then restored, and the whole verse might be translated—

‘So he gives them bread in abundance  
And water is never scarce for them.’

The corruption in 10 *b* would appear to have arisen thus. First the *y* and *ט* of *ימעטו* were transposed and the word read *ימטעו*; next, by haplography, the *ט* following the very similar letter *מ* was omitted; then, by a common scribal error, *y* was changed into *צ*.

At this stage the meaning of the line would be the exact opposite of that required by the context, and the final corruption which turned *לֹא יִמְעָטוּ* into *לֶחֶם לֹא יִמְעָטוּ* would appear to be a clumsy attempt to get rid of the negative.

F. S. MARSH.

### MACARIUS OF EGYPT.

MR G. L. MARRIOTT has deserved so well of those who care for the devotional literature of the early church that it is with some hesitation that I write to point out a mistake in his communication to *J.T.S.* of January last with regard to Macarius of Egypt. He says on p. 178 that the two British MSS containing his Homilies ‘before the fiftieth Homily . . . read’ words which describe it as *ἐπιστολή πρώτη*. I surmise that Mr Marriott writes from notes which he made when the MSS were before him, and has misread a ‘1’ (one) as an ‘l’ (fifty). There is no such note as he describes in either MS before Homily L, though, as Mr Marriott says, that Homily at its close describes either itself or the collection in which it stands as being a letter. The note of which Mr Marriott speaks is prefixed not to Homily L, but to Homily I, at least in the Holkham MS. In the Bodleian MS the words are hard to make out. Mr Marriott had stated the case more accurately in his Harvard Press edition of the *Seven Later Homilies* p. 13.

The point is that the MS evidence, such as it is, instead of connecting Homily LI with Homily L alone, as Mr Marriott now says, connects Homily LI with the whole set of Homilies I–L, as Mr Marriott, rightly following Thomas Haywood, said before.

A. J. MASON.