

## PATRISTICA.

*Patrology: The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church:* by OTTO BARDENHEWER. Translated from the second edition by THOMAS J. SHAHAN. (Herder, Freiburg i. Br. and St Louis, 1908.)

THE *Patrologie* of Bardenhewer, first published in 1894, and then in an enlarged and improved form in 1901, has been the indispensable companion of the patristic student. It is strange that it has had to wait so long for an English translation, because it has no rival in any language. There has been no English work to which one could recommend the student after he had worked through Dr Swete's *Patristic Study*, and there is no more advanced work than Bardenhewer, at least for the Post-Nicene period, that is at all up to date. A French translation of the first edition of Bardenhewer appeared in 1898-1899, and an Italian translation of the second in 1903. The latter contains additions to the bibliography of the original. This additional material has been incorporated in the present English translation, and has also to a great extent been brought up to date. I have noted, for instance, some items belonging to as late a period as the early part of 1907. What is particularly gratifying is that the contributions of this JOURNAL to the study of the Fathers are chronicled in their proper places with almost absolute fullness. Possessors of the German would in fact do well to purchase the English also, to which, apart from the bibliography, the author has contributed fresh matter. There are some signs of haste in the translation. For 'Hicklin' (p. 157) read 'Nicklin'; for 'Novitian' (p. 223) read 'Novatian'; anglicize 'Steiermark', 'Ezechiel', and 'Habacuc' on p. 227; correct 'Onamasticon' on p. 252, and, on the same page, for 'Demonstratio' read 'Praeparatio', for 'C. H. Gifford' read 'E. H. Gifford', and for 'London' read 'Oxford': on pp. 255 and 261 correct 'Ommaney'; the last item of § 63, 10 was already given in § 63, 9; anglicize 'Peschitto' on pp. 389, 393, also 'Phöbadius' on p. 399: the work of Manucci referred to on p. 410 has, if I mistake not, nothing to do with Hilary, but is an edition of Irenaeus: on p. 418 for 'E. A. Burn' read 'A. E. Burn': anglicize 'Josue' on p. 419 and 'Joasaph' on p. 587; the date of publication of Zimmer's *Pelagius in Irland* (p. 504) was '1901', not '1902'; on p. 612 for '1869' read '1896'; on p. 646 for 'Bonnett' read 'Bonnet'. Considerations of space prevent reference to the statements and opinions of the book itself. An exception may, however, be made in one case. It is no longer correct to say that Cassiodorus's commentary on the Epistle

to the Romans has perished (p. 636). It has been indisputably proved to be that which is in print under the name of Primasius (Migne *P. L.* lxxviii).

*Les Pères Apostoliques I-II, Doctrine des Apôtres, Épître de Barnabé*; texte grec, traduction française, introduction et index: par H. HEMMER, G. OGER, et A. LAURENT. (Picard, Paris, 1907.)

THIS volume is one of a series, in which four volumes, none of which the present chronicler has seen, have already appeared, namely Justin *Apologies*, Eusèbe *Histoire ecclésiastique* I-IV, Tertullien *De poenitentia* (sic) et *de pudicitia*, and Tertullien *De praescriptione haereticorum*. The sixth and seventh volumes, containing select works of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, fall to be noticed below. The published programme includes a large number of important writings, many of which have never appeared in handy editions before. The whole series is under the competent editorship of Hippolyte Hemmer and Paul Lejay. The latter is not only one of the best Latin scholars in France, but one of the greatest patristic scholars in the world. His erudite reviews of patristic works in the *Revue Critique* are unsurpassed,<sup>1</sup> and his name is a guarantee that the series will display the best philological scholarship of France. It will also prove a dangerous rival to our own Cambridge series. The Cambridge series is better in printing and get-up, and more useful in having the explanatory notes below the text. The Paris series is, however, cheaper, and includes a French translation on the opposite page. It deserves the heartiest welcome from all patristic students, and is a gratifying sign that there is a powerful 'lay school of ecclesiastical philology'<sup>2</sup> in France.

The present edition is admirable in every respect. The introductions and notes, which occupy half the book, tell the reader everything that is necessary. Two valuable features are the practically exhaustive bibliography which is provided at the end of each section of the introduction, and the reprint of the rather inaccessible Latin fragment of the *Didache*. It would appear by its Latinity to be not earlier than the fifth century. Misprints have been noted on pages xxxix, xlii, lxiv, lxxvii, cx, cxii, 22, 47. In *Didache* 13, 3 it would have been better to desert the MS and read *γεννημάτων*, reserving *γεννημάτων* for animals,

<sup>1</sup> May I refer in particular to one, sent me by the author's kindness, on Brewer's *Kommodian von Gaza*, in the *R. C.* for Sept. 16, 1907, which ought to be read as expressing the opposite view to that advocated in this *JOURNAL* vol. ix [1907-1908] pp. 143-147!

<sup>2</sup> The words are borrowed from Prof. John E. B. Mayor's *Latin Heptateuch*, p. lviii.

according to the rule. On p. lxi for 'Tertullien *de cibus hebraicis*' read 'Novatien *de cibus iudaicis*': it is true of course that the MS attributes the work to Tertullian: on p. lxx read 'Sinope', not 'Synope': on p. cxi the example of *διάσταλα* from Clement of Alexandria should not have been referred to, as it occurs there only in a citation of this very passage (Barn. x 11)! At Barn. xxi 2 and 8 read surely *ἐλλέπητε*, not *ἐλλείπητε*, and at xxi 5 the optative *δῶη*, not the subjunctive *δώη*.

*Die Versio Latina des Barnabasbriefes und ihr Verhältnis zur altlateinischen Bibel erstmals untersucht, nebst Ausgabe und Glossar des griechischen und lateinischen Textes: von J. M. HEER. Mit einer Tafel. (Herder, Freiburg i. Br., 1908.)*

THIS important work is fairly enough described in its title, and through it Dr Heer will be heartily welcomed to the thin ranks of the scientific students of the Latin Bible. The first part of the Prolegomena is devoted to the relation of the Latin version of Barnabas to the Old-Latin Bible, and is divided into five sections concerning respectively: (a) The history of the text of the Latin version, (b) its relation to the Canon and its purpose, (c) Barn. lat. as a witness to an Old-Latin translation of the Bible, (d) the person of the translator, (e) the age and home of the version: its language. The conclusion the author expresses is:—'Although it cannot be certainly decided where the translation of the letter originated, an African provenance is at least probable, especially on account of the agreement with Tertullian, Cyprian, and the other Africans in the form of the Biblical citations, and—seeing the idea that Novatian was the translator must be rejected—Africa is at least the only province, in favour of which grounds can be produced. The date of origin is to be placed before Cyprian, and on account of the knowledge of the Theodotion translation of Daniel, probably after Tertullian: whether we have a Montanist work before us is uncertain.' The second part of the Prolegomena is concerned with the text of the letter, and in it are considered the authorities for the text and their relative value. Then follows the text of the Latin version as it is in the sole Corbie MS, as diplomatically exact as ordinary type can make it. This is a very interesting feature of the book, and might profitably be imitated elsewhere. There is also an excellent photograph of the first page. After this comes the text in Greek and Latin in parallel columns, with critical apparatus immediately below the text, and a Biblical apparatus immediately below that. This last consists of a *résumé* of all the Old-Latin evidence for the text of the Scripture quotations occurring in Barnabas. The extra part of the letter, extant only in Greek, is given at the end. The Testimonia to the Letter in Fathers, &c.,

follow, then an index of the Scripture passages quoted, and the work ends with Graeco-Latin and Latino-Greek glossaries.

It would be difficult to speak too highly of the value of this book. It will be increasingly appreciated, the more it is used. As an edition of the letter it is indispensable, but its main importance lies in the light which is thrown on the history of the Old-Latin Bible. The interest Dr Heer has in this part of the subject gives one confidence that his editions of portions of Augustine in the Vienna *Corpus* will represent the Biblical quotations with the desirable accuracy. As to the date of the manuscript of the Latin Barnabas, I should entirely agree with my master Holder that it is of the tenth century, but it is well to mention that Traube considered it to belong to the ninth. One of the most important observations made by Heer is that the Latin translator of Barnabas sometimes took the form of the Biblical quotations from his own Latin Bible, instead of simply translating them in the form that they have in the Greek Barnabas. This is, of course, a most valuable argument for the date of the version. The fact, too, that the translator does not know the word *saluare*, as the Latin equivalent of  $\sigma\psi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ , is certainly in favour of a date not later than Cyprian and very probably earlier. Again, the use of a Latin version of Daniel, based (not like Tertullian's, on the LXX, but) on Theodotion, suggests that we are dealing with a work later than Tertullian. The text of the Psalms, too, is close to Tertullian's and Cyprian's, and I see no reason to disagree with the author's conclusion as expressed above.<sup>1</sup> The glossaries at the end of the work are luxurious and will be a great boon to other workers. Something of the kind has already been compiled for Irenaeus in Oxford, and may yet be published. These investigations into Latin renderings of Greek words will be increasingly fruitful. The present chronicler has sometimes wondered whether the early Latin translators of Scripture used Graeco-Latin glossaries. Certainly, with marked differences in rendering there co-exists a remarkable homogeneity.

Some notes may profitably follow. There are misprints on pp. xlvii (two), liii, 21 (two), 41, 53, 66, 76, 118, 132. On p. xix Funk's two small editions of the Apostolic Fathers might have been mentioned. On p. xx the Pseudo-Origenian *Tractatus* should have been added to Tertullian and Filastrius, as another authority which quotes Hebrews as Barnabas. Thielmann's dictum, quoted on p. xxi, n. 14, is so far true; the older Gospel MSS, for instance, translate  $\pi\pi\epsilon\rho\upsilon\gamma\iota\upsilon\upsilon$  by *fastigium*, a good Latin word, but the later render by the exactly literal *pinna*,

<sup>1</sup> The isolated cases of *parabola* (rather than *similitudo*) and *quia* (rather than *quoniam*) hardly weigh against Africanism in so short a work.

*pinnaculum*. To the authorities for the omission of the second *in* in Lc. 2, 34 (p. xxvii) add *Quaest.*  $\frac{1}{2}$ . The remarks with regard to the Epistle of James on p. xli, n. 32 appear mistaken. It may well be that it is a case of the use of First Clement and Hermas by the writer of James, and not the reverse; certainly the Western Church appears to have no knowledge of James before the second half of the fourth century: a reference should have been made to Wordsworth in *Studia Biblica* i p. 129. At p. xlv, n. 36, add a reference to Watson in *Studia Biblica* iv pp. 196, 248. On p. xlvii *parabola* would appear to be later than *similitudo* of *k*, and *profeta* would appear to be later in origin than *prophetes*: perhaps we ought to read the latter in Barnabas, as it occurs in Tert. Cypr. Iren., and even in Jerome. *Tinguo* occurs twice in the Pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones* (see my index), and also thrice in Aug. *de bapt.* V ix 11 (cf. *praetinguo*) (p. xlix). The same confusion as to degrees of comparison as is illustrated on p. lvii occurs also in the Latin Irenaeus. Thielmann is certainly right (p. lvii) in regarding *nequam* as characteristic of 'African' documents. On p. lx it ought to have been remarked that cases of *homo* and *omnis* are often confused in MSS. On p. lxiii for 'W. Burgon' read 'J. W. Burgon', and some reference ought to have been made to the prevailing view, based on steadily accumulating evidence, that B and  $\aleph$  belong to Egypt. On p. lxxv it is a better explanation to suppose that the indeclinable <sup>1</sup>  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma$  was in the scribe's mind, and that ΠΑΗΡΗΞΗΜΕΝ was developed out of ΠΑΗΡΗΞΕΜΕΝ. On p. lxxvi it is not enough to remark that the confusion between O and Ω occurs soonest in uncials; there is a constant confusion between the two in MSS from phonetic causes: already by the fourth century they were no longer distinct in pronunciation (see Moulton's *Grammar* i p. 35). The preference for the perfect subjunctive, &c. (p. lxxv), is itself an Africanism, as Dr Sanday pointed out in his edition of *k*. The use of ἤμελλεν for ἐμελλεν (p. lxxvii) is not infrequent in MSS: cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 12, 3, Blass, § 15, 3.

The word *exhilaro* (p. 18) would appear to have been an African favourite: I have seven examples from Aug. On p. 19, l. 15 surely we ought to read *adproperaui*, seeing that *adpropiaui* means 'approached', not 'hastened', which is the meaning required. The evidence of the Pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones* is not given with absolute fullness or accuracy in the Biblical apparatus, the fault of Sabatier probably rather than of Heer: p. 22, 10 add *mandau* for *praeepti*, l. 11 add *Quaest.* to *Iren.*, l. 12 prefix *Quaest.* to *Vulg.*, l. 13 add 'de holocaustis et sacrificiis *Quaest.*'; p. 23, 9 add *Quaest.* after *Iren.* (pr.) and *Quaest.*  $\frac{2}{4}$

<sup>1</sup> For which see C. H. Turner in this JOURNAL vol. i pp. 120 ff, 561 f; Moulton *Grammar of N. T. Greek* vol. i pp. 50, 244.

after *Hartel*); p. 26, 4-9 after *Cyprian* add *Quaest.* (except that the latter omits the clause *et egenos . . . tuam*); p. 42, 4 sq. after [*Sab*] (alt.) add *Quaest.* [*om. est*  $\frac{1}{2}$ ]; p. 62, 11 sq. add *Quaest.* to the other Latin authorities; p. 66, 14-16, and 19 (ult.), add *Quaest.* after *Hilar.*; p. 67, 1, transfer *Quaest.* to after *Sang.*; p. 77, 10 in the citation from *Quaest.* insert 'Moyses' after 'fuit' and 'quadraginta diebus et' after 'monte'; p. 81, 13 sq. insert *Quaest.* before *Aug.* The orthography of the text is susceptible of improvement. Why should the editor follow the MS in reading *hyrcus* and desert it when it reads *styrps*? the one is surely as bad as the other. Again, Ἰσαάκ should have been printed always with S: the best Greek and Latin MSS regularly have one α: cf. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. vi (index) and C. H. Turner in this JOURNAL vol. ix p. 77. *Habraham* also (p. 77, 1) is well attested elsewhere; and we ought to read *heremus*. In 6, 17 the sense seems to require that we should invert the order of μέλιτι and γάλακτι. Despite the fact that *simplitudo* (p. 52, 20) is a perfectly correct formation (compare *amplitudo* from *amplus*), I prefer to suppose a haplography from *simpl<ic>itudo* to adding a new word to the dictionary. On p. 53, l. 4 from foot, for ζύλου read ξύλω. The word *exerro* (p. 62, 17) is a good specimen from the Old-Latin Bible: see Rösensch, and add Ezech. xxxiii 12 ap. *Quaest.* The Biblical note on p. 74, 4-13 could have been improved if the editor had used the larger Cambridge LXX. On p. 126 the mark indicating that the last syllable of *praecordia* is short should be removed.

*Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Baptismo*, edited with an Introduction and Notes by J. M. LUPTON. (Cambridge University Press, 1908.)

MR LUPTON'S volume is the weakest of the series of *Cambridge Patristic Texts*. It is but fair to state that he is himself conscious that he is not qualified for his task, but unfortunately for his modesty the series in which his book appears has gained a high reputation, and deservedly, for the scholarly finish of its contributions. Beside these his own work is decidedly amateurish. The edition is not useless. We are glad to have Dr James's notes of the probable meaning of 'Masburensis' as the name of the religious house from which Leland obtained a MS of the *De Baptismo* for Gelenius; some of the notes are good, and the index of words, pending the appearance of the much desired *Lexicon Tertullianicum*, is welcome. The following defects, however, will sufficiently shew the character of the book. On p. xiv Jerome is quoted by Martianay's edition, instead of Vallarsi's, and thus letter 69, actually cited by that number on p. xxiv, appears as letter 82: also p. 285 of the treatise against Vigilantius is referred to, a reference very difficult to verify, presumably because the page is Martianay's: it would

have been much better to say § 8, at the same time indicating that two clauses are omitted from the quotation. Why refer on p. xxiv to Collombet, which he probably rightly calls 'a disappointing work', when he might have referred to Turmel's *Saint Jérôme* p. 221 ff and Grütz-macher's *Hieronymus* Bd. iii 141 ff? On p. xxv 'Leipoldt' appears as 'Leipold', a carelessness comparable to that by which 'Gomperz' appears some half a dozen times as 'Gompertz'. The suggestion on p. xxvi that Tertullian may have known Hebrew will be scouted by most. The use of the word 'practically' on p. xxxi, l. 4 shews unpardonable ignorance of the state of research into the Latin Bible. On the same page, too, the editor appears quite unaware of the elementary principle that there was no translation from the Hebrew into Latin till Jerome's. On p. xxx *probabilis* and *habilis* should not have been instanced as examples of well-known tendencies of silver Latin, since they occur already in Cicero. On p. xxxv 1880 is given as the date of the first volume of the Vienna Tertullian, but on p. xlv rightly 1890. The bibliography on p. xxxvii ff is long, but is not compiled with discretion. There is no mention there of Rigalt, the most learned editor Tertullian ever had, nor do we find any reference to Prof. J. E. B. Mayor's notes on Tertullian's Apology in the *Journal of Philology* vol. xxi p. 259 ff, though he is probably the greatest living authority on Tertullian. The editor knows only the first edition of Bardenhewer's *Patrologie*. A Cambridge man ought not to have left out J. J. Blunt's *Right Use of the Early Fathers*, and there should have been a special section there devoted to editions, if it had contained little else but references to Schoenemann's *Bibliotheca Patrum* t. i p. 9 ff, and the full bibliography in Mayor's *Bibliographical Clue to Latin Literature* p. 163 ff. Again, in the section on Language, &c., it is absurd to call special attention to Ebert and Koffmane while leaving Hoppe unasterisked. Kaulen's *Handbuch z. Vulgata* appeared in a second edition in 1904, but it was not worth mentioning at all. The note on *Caina haeresi* in chapter i displays little judgement: we must follow the best authorities in reading *Gaiana*, and the one possible explanation of this word is a heresy taught by one Gaius, whether he of Rome or not, *uiderint editores*. There appears to have been a confusion in later authorities with Cain, but until we have a critical edition of Jerome we cannot appeal to his text with confidence. On pp. 3, l. 11, 5 *sed enim* deserved a note; compare Mayor's *Pliny's Letters Bk. III* p. viii and add Stat. ten times (e.g. *silu.* III 1, 123). The account of *tinguo* on p. 3 is unsatisfactory: the editor ought to have told us whether *baptizo* occurs in Tertullian or not. Oehler has no instance in his index, but the *Thesaurus* gives one, in addition to two in quoting 1 Cor. xv 29. Our editor gives fifty examples of *tinguo* in his index. A study of Engelbrecht's chapter on

'Das Nomen *suggestus* in seinen verschiedenen Verwendungen bei Tertullian' in *Wiener Studien* xxviii (1906) pp. 9-17 would have put him right on pages 4 and 6. Harnack's *History of Dogma* is repeatedly referred to as *History of Doctrine*. *Medeor* with the accusative (p. 14, 9) deserved a note. On p. 17, 5 *superuenturo*, &c., are an echo of Luke i 35 or Ac. i. 8. On *agape* (p. 27, 11) a reference to the fact that it is kept in the Cyprianic Bible in 1 Cor. xiii might have been given. On p. 48, 10 for '*altchr.*' (alt.) read '*althkirchl.*' This book is strongest on the doctrinal side, though the teaching of the Ambrosian *De Mysteriis* and *De Sacramentis* should have been referred to in the Introduction, § 4. If the editor consults Resch's *Agrapha*, he will see how wrong he is over p. 56, 7. On p. 57, 4 a reference should have been made to Robinson in *Texts and Studies* vol. i part 2 p. 49. Other defects of this book, of greater or less seriousness, have been noticed. Mr Lupton has failed to realize that the editor of Tertullian requires a severer training than that of any other Latin prose author. He has the requisite interest in his subject. After he has spent several years in rigorous study of the later Latin and of the Latin versions of the Bible, we shall be glad to welcome further work at his hands.

*Pseudo-Augustini Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII: accedit Appendix continens alterius editionis quaestiones selectas* [Corp. Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. L] recensuit ALEX. SOUTER. (Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1908.)

A REVIEW of this work will not be expected from the present chronicler. Those interested will find reviews in the following publications:—*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1908, p. 595 ff (cf. p. 721 f) (A. Jülicher), *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1908, p. 1316 ff (C. Weyman), *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1909, p. 109 f (Z. Garcia), *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1909, p. 183 (G. L[eipold]), *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1909, p. 401 f (J. Wittig), *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1909, p. 99 f (W. Thimme), *Literarische Rundschau*, 1909, p. 168 f (C. Weyman), *Theologisch Tidsskrift*, 1909, p. 187 f (K. Lake), and also in the privately printed magazines, the *Caian*, 1907-1908, p. 196 ff, cf. 1908-1909, p. 24 (H. B. Swete), and *Mansfield College Magazine*, 1908-1909, p. 148 ff (G. B. Gray).

The author of the Pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones*, who also wrote the 'Ambrosiaster' commentary on the Pauline Epistles, is now generally identified with Isaac, the erstwhile enemy of Damasus. He first prepared a collection of 150 (151) 'questions', connected mainly with difficult passages of Scripture. This recension exists apparently only in three manuscripts, of which two belong to the fifteenth century, while the third is no older than the twelfth. Comparison with the later set, internal

evidence, and comparison with the complete quotation of one Question under the name of Ambrose in a fifth-century pseudepigraph on the soul-principle (*De Ratione Animae*), printed in editions of St Jerome, shew that this first recension has been very badly preserved. If it had been as well preserved as the second, it would have been the best course to print the two on opposite pages to facilitate comparison, and this is what Jülicher has desiderated. It has seemed better, however, in the circumstances merely to detail important differences in the Prolegomena, and to print as an appendix a critical edition of the Questions withdrawn by the author in his second edition. This second edition is that which appears in the *editio princeps* of 1497, and is from every point of view the most important. It consists of 127 Questions, and was first printed mainly from a fourteenth-century MS of poor quality still at Paris. Succeeding editors down to the Benedictine did little but reprint this edition. It was, therefore, easy for the Vienna editor, with six ninth-century MSS, one tenth-century MS, and one independent thirteenth-century MS at his back, to produce an edition textually much nearer the original autograph. On a rough estimate the edition contains some three thousand improvements on the Benedictine (Migne) text. One or two examples of these may be chosen to illustrate the value of the MSS:—

quaest. 41 pr.

(Migne)

*si uidetur hic errasse in ista sententia, non est accipiendum quod dixit. ideo et a quibusdam spiritus sanctus esse putatur, quia, &c.*

(Vienna)

*si ideo a quibusdam sanctus spiritus putatur, quia, &c.* (the words *uideatur . . . dixit* are proved to be an ancient gloss by their absence from the two leading MSS)

quaest. 101 § 2

(Migne)

*quidam igitur qui nomen habet Falcidii, . . . leuitas sacerdotibus . . . coaequare contendit*

(Vienna)

*quidam igitur, qui nomen habet falsi dei, &c.* (the person referred to is Mercurius: see C. H. Turner in this JOURNAL vol. vii p. 281).

Matt. xiii 47 ap. quaest. 102 § 21.

(Migne)

*simile est regnum caelorum reti misso in mare, quod, &c.*

(Vienna)

*simile est regnum caelorum retiae missae in mari, quae, &c.*

1 Cor. x 1-4 ap. quaest. 127 § 13.

(Migne)

*nolo vos ignorare, fratres, quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt, et omnes per mare trans-*

(Vienna)

*nolo enim uos ignorare, fratres, quia patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt et omnes per mare trans-*

*ierunt, et omnes per Moysen baptizati sunt in nube et in mari, et omnes eandem escam spiritualem manducaverunt, et omnes eundem potum spiritualem biberunt. bibebant autem de potu spirituali consequente eos petra: petra autem erat Christus.*

*ierunt et omnes in Moysen baptizati sunt in nube et in mari et omnes eandem escam spiritalem ederunt et omnes eundem potum spiritalem biberunt. bibebant enim de spiritali sequenti petra: petra autem erat Christus.*

The preface gives *inter alia* an account of a third edition compiled by some mediaeval Frank in South Germany or thereabouts. This was made up mainly from the author's second edition, but partly from the first also. The date, place, character, and author of the work are discussed. Some account also is given of the books he had read and of the later works in which he is quoted or used, and the preface ends with a brief treatment of manuscripts and editions. The text has been for convenience divided into paragraphs. The indexes of scripture and other quotations, names and things, and words and expressions have purposely been made of considerable length because of the undeserved neglect to which this work has been subjected.

Where most has had to be done from the beginning, it is natural that the editor's knowledge should have increased since the publication of the work. I am less doubtful now as to our author's use of Lactantius (p. xxv), after comparing the passages under *inmergo* with Lact. vol. i p. 477, 11. On p. xxvi I ought not to have overlooked the Irish Canons xxxvii 32 *b* (saec. vii) as an early authority using the *Quaestiones*. The Metz MS (p. xxix) may have been brought by Dietrich, and two of the scribes of the MS would appear to be identical with two who wrote the best MS of Liutprand of Cremona's *Chronicon*.<sup>1</sup> Various illustrations from Bardesanes, Tertullian, Cyprian, Novatian, Arnobius, Gregory of Elvira, Augustine and Leo have offered themselves, which it does not seem necessary to set down here. One illustration from Hilary seems too notable to be passed over. Compare *Quaest.* 125 § 1 *inferi natura quid in potiore sit nescit* with Hil. *de syn.* vi 19 *neque enim aliquando inferi natura superioris a se potioris naturae uirtutem consequitur*.

On the question of the exact date of the work several new points have emerged. Can *Quaest.* 2 § 2 be a reference to Maximus and the summer of 383? Jerome, in epist. 123 (not 133), dates the incident referred to in *Quaest.* 115 § 72 as having occurred at the time he was assisting Damasus in Rome (382-384). The famine of *Quaest.* 115

<sup>1</sup> See Becker *Textgesch. Liudpr. v. Crem.* (München, 1908) p. 43 and facss. The inference is my own.

§ 49 may be that of 382 referred to by Symmachus and by Ambrose (*epist.* 18 §§ 21-23). On p. 456, 10 put, after 'fuisset'. In the indexes, besides fresh illustrative matter not here given, the following errors are to be corrected: on p. 482 delete 'Gen. 32, 38 (29) cf. 122, 19' and add '122, 19' before 438, 14 in the preceding line: on p. 483 delete 'Exod. 12, 11 . . . 349, 19' and add '\* 12, 27 . . . 349, 19': on p. 492, at Luc. 22, 36, before '228, 4' add '227, 19': on p. 493 add '\* 3, 6 cf. 98, 7. 185, 5': on p. 494 delete '19, 16 . . . cf. 115, 1': on p. 497 under '2 Cor. iii 7' for '32, 15' read '32, 5-6. 15': on p. 501, l. 2, for '133' read '123'; on p. 547 a, l. 9, for '21' read '29': on p. 560 b, l. 4 from foot, '53, 1' is *nē, quia*: p. 563 for 'paupera' (pr.) read 'pauper': on p. 576, under 'ut, quia' add '29, 22'.

*Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée, . . .* par F. BOULENGER. (Picard, Paris, 1908.)

IT was a happy thought to unite in this volume, one of the new Hemmer-Lejay series, two orations illustrating respectively the youthful and the mature style of Gregory. The plan is the same as that of the earlier volume noticed above. The introduction deals very properly at considerable length with the rhetorical framework of the panegyrics and shews in detail how they are constructed according to the approved methods of the rhetorical schools. This will prove very useful to the student to whom modern books on ancient rhetoric are not readily accessible. The editor has not attempted to construct a fresh critical text, but has not merely printed it as it appears in the best edition, that of Clémencet and Caillau, reprinted in Migne. He has studied M. Misier's exhaustive account of portions of the Paris MSS of Gregory, which appeared in the *Revue de Philologie* for 1902 and 1903, and has been led to collate two of them, which appear to be the best, namely 510 (saec. ix) and Coisl. 51 (saec. x). The record of the readings of these MSS makes the present edition worthy the attention of more than the circle for which it is primarily intended. The annotations are valuable, some of them particularly so, such as the lengthy notes on the meanings of *φιλοσοφία*, *οικονομία*, *σύνδοξ* in Greek Fathers, as well as those on the eschatology of Gregory, and on monasteries. The edition certainly justifies its existence. There are misprints on pp. lviii, lxxvi, xciii, xcix, 4, 14. There are places where perhaps the MSS reading should have been put into the text. In the case of a purist like Gregory it is a large question to decide whether one ought to print *ὑγίεια* of the Old Attic days or *ὑγεία*, which seems invariable in papyri of the Christian era: so with *φατρία* and *φατρία* (both p. lxxxiii): a wide induction is wanted. On p. xcv the *libelli* discovered by Grenfell and Hunt deserved

mention as well as that which Dr Krebs found. Are the authorities for the variants at the beginning of *Bas.* 40, 2 rightly given? both there and at 48, 3 I prefer ἀθαδίω to ἀθαδιάω. Is it quite certain that εἰς τὸ παντελής (*Caes.* 16, 4) is *tout à fait*? Sometimes at least the expression would appear to be temporal, e. g. in British Museum *Pap.* 1164 more than once we have ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὸ παντελής. The question is of some interest to N. T. students, as the expression occurs in Luke and Hebrews. *Μαυσόλου* (p. 188) is bad: no MS can be trusted as between ω and ο; read *Μαυσόλου* or better still *Μαυσόλλου*. We are grateful for the index, but it is a little difficult to see on what principle it has been constructed. Many common words have been included, but no room has been found for rarer words, like *διαπύρωσ* (*Caes.* 11, 2), *δουλοπρεπῶσ* (*Caes.* 11, 5).

*Grégoire de Nysse, Discours catéchétique . . .*: par L. MÉRIDIER. (Picard, Paris, 1908.)

A SERIES of the comprehensiveness of that edited by Hemmer and Lejay was bound to contain an edition of Gregory's masterpiece. In this instance the editor's task has been made much easier by the previous publication of Dr Srawley's model edition in 1903. To this work Dr Méridier is under very great obligations, which are fully acknowledged. Not only does he reproduce Srawley's text, but he draws very freely on his introduction and notes. In the circumstances it is not so necessary to refer to this useful edition at length. On prol. 3 the approved form of text in John i 18 should have been quoted: in chap. 31 it was hardly necessary to refer to the intransitive *καταρθῶν*, as it is familiar to readers of classical Greek. The introduction occupies fifty-seven pages, the critical and explanatory notes only twenty-seven, and the text and translation together two hundred.

ΧΡΥCOCTOMIKA: *Studi e Ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo, a cura del comitato per il xv<sup>o</sup> centenario della sua morte: 407-1907. Fascicolo I.* (Roma, 1908.)

THE fifteen-hundredth anniversary of the death of St John Chrysostom was fittingly celebrated in Rome and elsewhere in 1907, but the honour paid to his memory was not merely that of outward ceremonial.<sup>1</sup> In that year appeared a notable work by a young Austrian scholar, Dom Chrysostom Baur, entitled *S. Jean Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*, which was reviewed by Dr Nairn in the January number of the JOURNAL. This and smaller contributions in the *Revue Bénédictine* and elsewhere lead us to welcome in him that Chrysostom

<sup>1</sup> See *Compte rendu des fêtes du quinzième centenaire de la mort de S. J. C.*, par P. C. Charon.

specialist for whom we have been waiting. Now from Rome itself comes the first part of a beautiful work, which is intended to comprise three parts. The first is literary and historical in character, the second liturgical, and the third is concerned with the hœortology, the relics, and the artistic representations of St John Chrysostom. The authors and subjects of the first part are :—N. Turchi, 'La figura morale di S. Giov. Cris.'; E. C. Butler, 'Authorship of the *Dialogus De Vita Chrysostomi*'; A. M. Amelli, 'S. Giov. Cris. anello provvidenziale tra Costantinopoli e Roma'; F. Sabatini, 'L'opera sociale di S. Giov. Cris.'; A. Naegele, 'Chrysostomos und Libanios'; G. Aucher, 'S. Giov. Cris. nella letteratura armena'; C. Bacha, 'S. Jean Chrys. dans la littérature arabe'; A. Palmieri, 'S. Giov. Cris. nella letteratura russa'; M. Tamarati, 'S. Jean Chrys. dans la littérature géorgienne'; S. Haidacher, 'Chrysostomus-Fragmente'; C. Baur, 'Der ursprüngliche Umfang des Kommentars des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus zu den Psalmen'.

Considerations of space and a very slender knowledge of Italian alike prevent me from dealing with this volume in detail. The names of the authors and the subjects they respectively treat will make it clear at once that it is a work no serious student of Chrysostom dare neglect. In fact it is of the highest importance, as well as a very worthy memorial of the recent celebrations. Abbot Butler appears to me to have proved his point that the *Dialogus* is by the same Palladius as wrote the *Historia Lausiaca*<sup>1</sup>. His investigation into this question is a model of what such things should be. Dr Naegele's paper is much the longest in the book, occupying as it does rather more than a quarter of it. It is a very thorough study of the relations between Libanios and Chrysostom, and of the influence exerted by the teacher on the pupil. On the date of the *De sacerdotio* (p. 97) we miss a reference to Nairn's Introduction. Otherwise we have found Dr Naegele to be a master of the latest literature of the subject. He gives copious references both to ancient and to modern works. The accuracy of the printing of this article leaves something to be desired. The Dean of Winchester appears three times as 'Steffens': there are errors in the German on pp. 89, 125: as the article of 'Tourner' on 'Isidor' in this JOURNAL was not accessible to Naegele (p. 103), we may excuse the double error. Haidacher, who possesses a consummate knowledge of Chrysostom's style, has taught us to expect the publication of Chrysostom *anecdota* from him. In this paper he collects fragments of Chrysostom on the Book of Job, sifting the collection given in Migne *P. G.* lxiv 505-656, shewing that a considerable number are printed in other places in the published works of Chrysostom, while others are spurious, and leaving

<sup>1</sup> I have to thank him and Dom Baur for separate copies of their papers.

a certain number as from works of Chrysostom now lost. He calls attention at the same time to an unpublished commentary on Job by Chrysostom contained in MS Laur. plut. ix cod. 13 (saec. x). In the second part of his paper he elicits several fragments of Chrysostom from the Epistles of St Nilus (Migne *P. G.* lxxix). He incidentally shews that this collection is in need of careful study, being in part at least a compilation from a number of early sources. Some forty-five letters depend on Chrysostom. Dom Baur argues with cogency that we possess all Chrysostom ever wrote on the Psalms. On all accounts this beautiful book with its large type and its generous margins is to be welcomed.

*Sancti Aureli Augustini Scripta contra Donatistas: Pars I: Psalmus contra Partem Donati, Contra Epistulam Parmeniani Libri Tres, De Baptismo Libri Septem* [Corp. Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. LI] recensuit M. PETSCHENIG. (Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1908.)

AUGUSTINIAN studies have lately been carried on with a most gratifying vigour. Not only has a third edition of the now lamented Dombart's edition of the *De Civitate Dei* appeared (Leipzig, 1905-1909), with a monograph on the early editions (Leipzig, 1908), but the publication of the *Geistesfrüchte* of the deceased Dom Odilo Rottmanner (München, 1908), the greatest authority on Augustine during the past half-century, the *Augustin: Studien zu seiner geistigen Entwicklung* of H. Becker (Leipzig, 1908), the *Augustins geistige Entwicklung in den ersten Jahren nach seiner 'Bekehrung'*, 386-391 of W. Thimme (Berlin, 1908), and the *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin* of K. Adam, in addition to the three works presently to be referred to, deserve mention.

Probably no other living scholar has rendered greater services to the study of the later Latin authors than Prof. Petschenig of Graz. It is now some forty years since he began his literary career with a dissertation on the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, and since that time he has devoted himself with unflinching enthusiasm to the Latin writers of the fourth and succeeding centuries especially. The present book will enhance his reputation. Each of the three works here edited is presented in a form much more accurate than has been previously attained. With regard to the *De Baptismo* it may indeed be said that we now have it practically as it left the hands of the author, thanks to the excellence of two manuscripts, both unknown to the Maurists and their predecessors, a MS in the Escorial of the sixth century (formerly of Spanheim), and Laud. misc. 130 of the ninth or tenth century (formerly of Ebirbach). The latter MS is a copy of a sixth-century

twin of the Escorial MS. This closely related pair bring us close to the times of Augustine himself, and thus no work of his is better preserved. Students of Cyprian will do well to read the *De Baptismo* in this edition. They will find that Petschenig's text again and again comes nearer to the words of the *Sententiae Episcoporum* as recorded in the best Cyprianic tradition. Hartel's apparatus is thus susceptible of improvement. This volume illustrates within itself the diverse fates which the various works of St Augustine have experienced. While the *De Baptismo* has survived in nine manuscripts older than the year 1000, the *Psalmus* is preserved in none older than the twelfth century, and the *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* has no older witnesses than three of the eleventh century. A close study of parallel passages and a cautious use of emendation have done a good deal for the purification of the text of these. The Maurists and their predecessors do not appear to have done their usual justice to the text of this latter work. The consequence is that, despite the comparative lateness of the authorities, a lateness which is somewhat discounted by the good orthography of the best MS (Casinensis 163 saec xi),<sup>1</sup> Dr Petschenig has been able to make some twelve hundred improvements in its text. It seems certain, however, that Augustine wrote *Ezechielum* (pp. 50, 3; 55, 18; 133, 16: cf. C. H. Turner in the JOURNAL vol. vi p. 252; ix 62 ff): *cordis inspector* is rather to be traced to Acts xv 8 than to Prov. xxiv 12 (compare the passages cited in the JOURNAL vol. ix p. 146). There is a good deal to interest the philologist in this volume, in addition to the orthographical matter. On p. 53, 7 there is a new example of *catholica* (= *catholica ecclesia*) to add to Rottmanner's classical article in the *Revue Bénédictine* for 1900, p. 1 ff (reprinted in *Geistesfrüchte* p. 74 ff). Examples of *sedere* with the accusative (p. 64, 13) are not common (see another in ps.-Aug. *Quaest.* p. 272, 4). The unseparated *ne quidem* is a thing grammarians hardly, if at all, know anything about. Yet it occurs very often in the Latin Irenaeus, once in ps.-Aug. *Quaest.*, once or twice in 1 Cor. v 11, as quoted by Priscillian, and four times as quoted in this volume. On p. 116, 13 there is a new word *conperdo* (= *συναπόλλυμι* of LXX) in Ps. 25, 9 as quoted there. In connexion with the *Psalmus*, one of the few surviving examples of Latin doggerel verse, readers are recommended to study Engelbrecht's paper in the *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* for 1908, vii Heft.<sup>2</sup> A few errors in Petschenig's book may be pointed out. There should have been a reference to Rom. ii 4 at p. 216, 14; on p. 311, 7 the words

<sup>1</sup> Illustrated, for example, by the spellings *humilare*, *Beliar*, *distingunt*, *facinerosus*, &c. (cited by Petschenig, p. xi), to which add *absorta* (59, 5).

<sup>2</sup> I owe a *Sonderabdruck* to his kindness.

from *quia* to the end should also have been spaced (see Wordsworth and White on Io. iii 6) as part of the quotation. The asterisk is as usual employed in the index to indicate that a text is quoted in a pre-Vulgate form. Editors should be careful to use this asterisk only where Wordsworth and White's form differs, and not where there is a difference merely from the Sixto-Clementine form. Thus the asterisk should be removed from Matt. 5, 9. On p. 383 b, 'Eph.' should be transferred to line 3; on page 384 b, 'Tit.' should be transferred to line 4. The student of the African Old-Latin Bibles will find much to content him in this volume. A cursory study of some quotations has shewn a signal agreement with  $\aleph$  in the long quotation of Isa. lix 1-8 by Parmenian, and has also revealed that, though  $\tau$  may represent the Augustinian text of the Pauline Epistles, the relationship between  $\tau$  and  $\alpha$  is a close one (cf. Tit. i 7 on p. 215, 24). Two of the MSS at pp. 108, 13; 110, 2 shew an interesting agreement with Ambrosiaster against the Vulgate and against what appears to be Augustine's text. The extreme pleasure with which this volume has been read makes one all the more eager for the second and third volumes of the anti-Donatist tracts, the former of which has already appeared.

*The Confessions of Augustine*: edited by J. GIBB and W. MONTGOMERY.  
(Cambridge University Press, 1908.)

THE appearance of the present volume is a notable event in the history of British scholarship, and it is to be hoped that it will be received as it deserves. There are not wanting signs that this will be the case. A leading (unsigned) article in the *Times Literary Supplement* for August 20, 1908, distinguished alike by grace, insight, and power, has represented its significance and its merits admirably. The writer as truly as boldly declares that 'there is no reason, except an academic convention, to give the language of Cicero a higher value than that of Augustine'. To the present chronicler it seems indisputable that, whether Augustine be the greatest Latin writer or not, he is the greatest man who ever wrote Latin. This anonymous reviewer has earned our thanks, and we hope ere long that no one will be regarded as having had a truly liberal education who has not read the *Confessions* in the original. It is not purposed here to give a long account of the present edition. I have no quarrel with the editors except on two minor points. First, they have adopted P. Knöll's Vienna text of 1896, apparently unaware of the severe criticisms to which it was subjected by competent critics on its appearance; it would have been better on the whole to examine into the validity of these criticisms, and to modify Knöll's text, if necessary, at times. Second, they are weak on the lan-

guage side. The present writer made during the years 1895 to 1900 very full collections on the vocabulary of a third of the works of Augustine, and has always been anxious that these should be accessible to persons interested. Indeed, in the course of a controversy in *The Athenaeum* for 1905 he took the opportunity of publicly offering the use of them to any parties interested. Having had no warning that the present edition was forthcoming, he was unable to offer their use privately to the present editors. To illustrate the usefulness of such collections, take the note on *praenuntiator* (p. 247, 1): 'The word is only cited from this passage and *de Gen. ad Lit.* viii 4, 8.' Quite true; but my collections tell me it occurs also in *Serm.* 163, 11; 288, 2; 288, 4 (see other cases below). Save for these two features, the edition appears to me to shew both adequate learning and a sense of proportion. The student receives every help which he could expect. Some notes may be given. On p. lxxi there appears to be some confusion between the first edition of Augustine's collected works and that of his *Confessions*: the first edition of the latter appeared at Milan in 1475,<sup>1</sup> but of this edition the editors know nothing. It was of course no part of their business to examine the earliest editions of the *Confessions* in the admirable way Dombart has treated those of the *De Civitate Dei* (Texte und Untersuchungen, dritte Reihe, Bd. 2), but it is worth while that some one should undertake the task. On p. lxxii, n. 1, for 'reprobas' read 'reprobos': this note as a whole could have been made clearer: p. 42, 4 on *prodiebat*: these forms completely ousted the classical *prodiat*, &c.; we see the beginning of the tendency in Seneca: p. 50, 14 the word *inuestigabilis* not only might, but sometimes does mean the opposite of 'incomprehensible'; the editors should have noted the existence of *ininuestigabilis* and considered whether it ought not to be read: p. 51, 3 n. for 'decedit' read 'decidet'. The very rare *ex inuicem* (p. 87, 1), elsewhere known only in the Latin Irenaeus, deserved a note. It is incorrect to say that p. 154, 2 is the first occurrence of the word *submurmuro*: it was used already, about thirteen years before, in the *De Ordine* i 15 ppr. *Trahebat* (p. 163, 10) deserved a note. On p. 189, 19 *omnitenens* requires a fuller note, both as to origin (*Wisd.* i 7) and meaning. The note on *contempero* (p. 195, 2) must be corrected in view of the *Thesaurus* article. P. 209, 22 should have a cross-reference to p. 252, 18, and *vice versa*. P. 238, 14 *unde* demanded a full note. On p. 272 b read '*Lexikogr.*', and correct the reference. On p. 305, 23 Knöll's orthography *absorta* should not have been departed from: do the editors know any certain instance of *absorpta* in fourth- or fifth-century authors? So with *coherceo*, *cohercizio*. On p. 317, 11 the explana-

<sup>1</sup> Schoenemann *Bibliotheca Patrum* ii (Lips. 1794) p. 235.

tion of *circumquaque* is no doubt right, but some other examples might have been given, such as *Serm.* 39, 2; 178, 8; 211, 2; 256, 1, one of countless instances where Lewis and Short are hopelessly wrong. The latent reference on p. 328, 2 to 2 Thess. ii 4 might have been noted. It is not correct to say that *morula* is cited only from Aug. (p. 347, 27): Lewis-Short give Apuleius, and Benoist-Goelzer give Cyprian (it should be ap. Cypr.: I have six examples from Aug.: it looks as if it were African). The note on *contuitus* should be corrected (p. 351, 7) by reference to the *Thesaurus* (cf. also 378, 2). On p. 442, 24 it is hardly right to say that *compagino* is rare: in addition to the five examples in Lewis-Short, there are at least six in Ambrosiaster, and at least four in Aug.: the derivative *compaginatio* is about equally common; Severus (ap. Aug. *epist.* cix 3 m) has *compaginabilis*, and *Anecd. Helvet.* has *compaginator*. Though it has been necessary to mention these defects, it is but fair to recognize that even in the linguistic part of this admirable book great care and caution have been shewn.

*St Augustins Schrift De Consensu Evangelistarum unter vornehmlicher Berücksichtigung ihrer harmonistischen Anschauungen: eine biblisch-patristische Studie* von H. J. VOGELS. (Freiburg i. Br., 1908.)

THE present work, which forms a part of that excellent series *Biblische Studien*, appears at a very fitting time, when the synoptic problem is being attacked as it never was before, and when we have recently been provided in Wehrich's Vienna edition with a competent fresh recension of Augustine's work, one of the very earliest attempts to deal with the problem. The introduction deals with the purpose of the *De Consensu*, the opponents against whom it was directed, the date, the gospel text employed in it, investigation of the sources, conspectus of the contents and plan of the work. The main part of the book is in two divisions, first, the presuppositions of the harmonistic (including Augustine's idea of inspiration, the relation of the evangelists to one another), and second, the harmonistic views of Augustine (including preliminary notes, the harmonistic views in case of comparison of the differences in the words and speeches of the Gospels, the harmonistic views which emerge on comparison of differences in the historical parts of the Gospels, the harmonistic views with reference to the chronology in the Gospels). An appendix traces the influence exercised by the *De Consensu* on later writings, and the book ends with indexes of passages discussed and of names.

This is a careful, learned and up-to-date book, and merits every attention. The part that will attract most is that where, *impar congressus Achilli*, he essays to overturn the theory, ably advocated by Burkitt, that in the *De Consensu* Augustine used the Vulgate text. A similar

attack was delivered by J. Denk in the *Biblische Zeitschrift* for 1908. Professor Burkitt is well able to defend himself, and certainly there is no call for the present reviewer to try the part of Patroclus. Vogels's contention is that, while appearances favour Burkitt, they are due to the harmonization of Augustine's real Old-Latin Biblical text with the Vulgate, exactly as happened in the case of certain MSS of the *Speculum*. A critical examination of the evidence adduced by Vogels will certainly not strengthen his case. In the first place he assumes that the Wordsworth-White text must necessarily be the Vulgate as Jerome issued it, and omits to give the contrary evidence of many Vulgate MSS, where their text differs from that preferred by the Oxford scholars. For instance, in Matt. xvii 10 nine Vulgate MSS have *oportet*, and in Matt. xxiv 16 eight Vulgate MSS have *in*. Again, mere matters of orthography are elevated to the honourable position of serious variants: *dispargo* (versus *dispergo*) in Matt. xxvi 31 (a specially unfair case, too, as six Vulgate MSS have the *a*), and the like. The Old-Latin evidence, too, is given with insufficient fullness: for example, the readings of Bobiensis (*k*) seem to have been entirely ignored, and those of Corbeiensis II (*ff*<sup>2</sup>) are not always cited (instances on pp. 26, 27, 37). Sometimes the readings of the latter are incorrectly given: for example, *eam* (Matt. xv 23) and not *illam*, *gedsamani* (Matt. xxvi 36) and not *getsamani*, are the readings of *ff*<sup>2</sup>. So 'monac.' reads *a caiphan* in Io. xviii 28. The writer has the same veneration for Wehrich's admirable edition of the *De Consensu* that he has for Wordsworth and White: otherwise, he could hardly have overlooked the fact that the oldest MS of the *De Consensu* twice reads *iuda scarioth* in Matt. xxvi 14. But few instances are left, in fact, where it is morally certain that Augustine is using an Old-Latin reading which was not retained in the Vulgate; such is the presence of *et* in Matt. xii 40: Marc. xiv 35, Luke iii 16 are other instances. It would appear, then, that Burkitt is right; and the practice of Augustine in other works seems to confirm his view. Take, for instance, the case of Matt. xxv 31-41 quoted in the *De Civitate Dei* xx 25 (Dombart<sup>3</sup> ii p. 414) practically *ad litteram* from the Vulgate. We would not, however, have Dr Vogels judged by his work in textual criticism. In this he will gain by further experience. The rest of his treatise, on which I cannot dwell here, is an excellent piece of work, which will prove valuable to all students of Augustine.

*Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangeliums zum ersten Male herausgegeben und untersucht* von C. F. G. HEINRICI. (Leipzig, 1908.) (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des Neuen Testaments V.)

THE commentary of Peter of Laodicea on St Matthew's Gospel, which

sometimes appears without the author's name in MSS, is found in company with Victor of Antioch's commentary on St Mark and two others on the third and fourth Gospels respectively, but of the four only the commentary on St Mark has been published. This is rather strange, in view of the fact that there is a considerable number of manuscripts as old as the tenth and eleventh centuries. The commentary consists of 272 scholia, which follow the order of the Gospel text, but the comments on each section of the Gospel form a unity. The work is of course in the main a compilation, half being from Origen, three-tenths from Chrysostom, and the remaining fifth from the author himself and unknown sources. The extracts are sometimes copied exactly, sometimes worked up. The Peter commentary itself served as the backbone of a group of catenae on St Matthew. In fact it occupies a sort of middle position between the great exegetical works of the period 200 to 450 and the later works of Theophylact, &c. The chief value of the commentary lies in the fact that a good deal of the lost part of Origen is there represented. The compiler has dropped most of the allegorical parts of Origen, and is a more careful copier than Jerome was. He knew even Clement's *Hypotyposes*, as the manner in which he refers to the legendary tradition about the leper healed by Our Lord shews.<sup>1</sup> The commentary is interesting and written in good Greek.

It would have been impossible to find a better editor for this work than Dr Heinrici, who is the author of a monograph on Peter of Laodicea, as well as a much-valued commentator on the Epistles to the Corinthians. The publishers and printers have not been behindhand. The volume is an elegant quarto beautifully printed on good paper with generous margins. The introduction of about fifty pages contains besides the necessary diplomatic details discussions of the characteristics of the commentary, its sources and the method of its composition, its interest, its theology, its relation to St Matthew's text, finally, its date and its author. The commentary proper fills the upper half of the page while the rest is devoted partly to the critical apparatus, in which scholia from an important Moscow MS are printed, and partly to an indication of the sources of the commentary. These extra scholia are labelled 'Origen', 'Apollinarius', &c. The volume ends with four indexes. The first is of words, the second of proper names, and the third of proper names whose meaning is defined: the fourth is an index of all passages cited from authors in the scholia of the Moscow MS. Dr Heinrici's work is always so accurate as to leave little room for improvement: correct 'Manuscripts' on p. xi, l. 7 to 'Manuscripts', and on l. 24

<sup>1</sup> See Mercati's *Un Frammento delle Ipotiposi di Clemente Alessandrino* (Roma, 1904), and this JOURNAL vol. vii p. 144, where ἀβροῖς and ὑμῖν ought to be transposed, as Prof. Burkitt kindly informed me at the time.

of the same page correct 'Textgeschichte' to 'Textkritik'; on p. xxxii, l. 15, for '17' read '14'; on p. xliii he ought to have referred to Baur's *S. Jean Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire* p. 59, where he would have found earlier examples of the name Chrysostomus applied to St John than Stilling knew. It is good news to learn from the preface that Sickenberger, a leading authority on Catenae, is to publish Peter's commentary on St Luke.

*Textgeschichte Liudprands von Cremona* von J. BECKER, mit zwei Tafeln. (München, 1908.) (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, begründet von L. TRAUBE. Dritter Band, Zweites Heft.)

*Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus, kritische und erklärende Ausgabe* von K. NEFF, mit einer Tafel. (München, 1908.) (Quellen und Untersuchungen u.s.w., Dritter Band, Viertes Heft.)

THESE works do not exactly belong to the province of patristics, and it is the less necessary for me to deal with them here, that I have reviewed them elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> Dr Becker's work is a study of the manuscripts of Liudprand's Chronicle, of which a new edition is imperatively needed. The discussion is interesting and seemingly convincing. The facsimiles of pages of the most important manuscript are very welcome. —Dr Neff's edition of the poems of Paulus, which are of a historical and literary rather than a theological interest, is a real advance on that of Dümmler, and, being equipped with an explanatory commentary in addition to the other helps one expects in such an edition, it is indispensable to the student of mediaeval literature. Further, three previously unpublished poems appear in this edition for the first time. The whole work is worthy of the great master who founded this series.

*W. Capito im Dienste Erzbischof Albrechts von Mainz, Quellen und Forschungen zu den entscheidenden Jahren der Reformation (1519–1523)*: von P. KALKOFF. (Berlin, 1907.) (Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, herausg. v. Bonwetsch u. Seeberg: erstes Stück.)

DR KALKOFF, who is no novice in the study of the Reformation, here provides a valuable addition to Herrmann's *Geschichte der evangelischen Bewegung in Mainz*. Some idea of the scope of the work may be got from the headings of the chapters:—'Capitos Prozess um die Propstei von St Thomas in Strassburg,' 'Capitos Kampf gegen die Vollziehung der Bannbulle auf dem Reichstage von Worms,' 'Capito als Agent Aleanders bei Wilhelm Nesen in Frankfurt,' 'Capito als Vertreter

<sup>1</sup> In the *English Historical Review* for April, 1909.

Aleanders bei Johann Cochläus,' 'Capitos Kampf gegen die Ausführung des Wormser Edikts,' 'Capitos Vermittlung gegenüber Luther und seinen Anhängern,' 'Die Haltung der Kurie und des Erzbischofs gegenüber der lutherischen Bewegung in Erfurt,' 'Albrecht von Mainz und Capito auf dem Reichstage von Nürnberg,' 'Der Umschwung in der kirchenpolitischen Haltung Albrechts und Capitos Rücktritt.' Nine documents are printed in an appendix:—'Albrecht von Mainz an Leo X, 1 September 1520,' 'Capito an Aleander, 29 März 1521,' 'Der päpstliche Sekretär Bombasio an Capito, 13 April 1521,' 'Dr Balth. Geier an den Generalvikar Dr Dietrich Zobel, 2 Mai 1521,' 'Instruktion für Karl v. Miltitz [Ende Juli 1521],' 'Albrecht von Mainz an Karl V [Ende August 1521],' 'Leo X an Albrecht von Mainz, 5 Oktober 1521,' 'Capito an Joh. Bader, Prokurator an der Rota Romana, 14 Februar 1523,' and 'Capito an den Nuntius Franc. Chierigati'. When it is added that the text of the work is fully annotated, and that there is an excellent index, it is unnecessary to do more to call the attention of Reformation students to this work.

A. SOUTER.