NOTES AND STUDIES

PROLEGOMENA TO THE TESTIMONIA AND AD FORTUNATUM OF ST CYPRIAN.

III

THE PRINTED TEXT AND PRINCIPAL MSS OF ST CYPIARN.


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. That does not in the least mean that the text...
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. 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).

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 commonplace 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 repugnare aut manifestis ille inquinaretur mendis, contra reliquos libros omnes huius scripturas in textum recipere', suspicion is at once aroused. And suspicion is more than justified. Sanday could still

---

1 Manuscripts altogether unknown to him are XOU 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 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 Jud. 10. 6.
44. 14. Matt. 23. 37 sq] read Luc. 13. 34, 35; the readings 'gallina' without a verb, 'noluiistis' (LPQ RVX), 'domus uestra' without 'deserta' (L* P V X) shew by comparison with ε 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 A L P V R Q T U X.
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.
94. 18. 1 Io. 2. 32] read 1 Io. 2. 23.
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.
134. 5. no reference] supply Sirac. 1. 14 (16).
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 Ü X) 1 Macc. 2. 59.
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).
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 1. 11 'et iterum' (for 'item illic') with L P R T Ü V W and Gr. *καί 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).
180. 7. Deut. 32. 35] read (with the lemma 'apud Solomonem in Parhoemis') 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.
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322. 24. Exod. 20. 3] read (with the lemma 'In Deuteronomio')
Deut. 5. 7 according to codd. A F of the LXX.

323. 11. Marc. 12. 29, 12 Matt. 22. 37 sq.] Hartel is wrong in separating two quotations, for the 'et' of 1. 12 is part of the Biblical text. It is probable that the quotation is wholly Marcan.

326. 5] add cf. 1 Macc. 2. 24.
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 Vb, Vd, Vv. 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 nuovi 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.

(iii) The *Sententiae 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 (instituisset R) et continentiam firmiter tenere V R.
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473. 8 nostris: non R, shewing that it was copied from an ancient MS which gave ·N· for nostris (cf. 474. 4 zabulo).

13 instruit: read admonet et instruit R (cf. admoneat et instrut 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 redate: 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 superbri et contumaces necantur, dum de ecclesia eiciuntur: insert sic before superbri 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 nobis: ergo inimicus uobis factus sum uerum dicens nobis R. It is possible that ego 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 firmamur 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 con-
struction 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. dom 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: ampulare L. I see no trace of this.
  5 eos: om. M. L P also omit.
  18 agnouit. L* adgnouit.
41. 20 domini: L in ras. L* dnm.
42. 3 quotquot: quodquod L. 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: custodianium L M B. L* has custodianium
   in ras., though the correction is m p.
  12 sicut A: quasi L M B. L (with P) has, what Hartel does
   not make clear, quasi for sicut twice in the line.
  17 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 uesta is clearly discernible. P too omits, so that
   the evidence of the L P family is beyond doubt for omis-
   sion.
45. 1 uenientem: ueniens M V. But uenientem is clearly L*, 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.
6 dices: dicet L L P have dices.
11 iudicabit. L* iudicaut, 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 L* 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 L^2
(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 pin-
guamina).
50. 12 add et sacrificium acceptum non habebo ex manibus uestrís
L. acceptum, however, is added above the line by L^2: P
omits the whole with the other MSS.
15 genui: generaui V. generaui L P.
51. 17 speratis. L gives sperastis with Gr. ἡλπικάρε.
52. 10 fige palos: et fige L^1 effige L^2. There is no suggestion of
effige in L even by m. 2.
54. 12 filii. fili L*.
13 benedictus erit: erit benedictus W M B. erit benedictus
also L P.
22 tuae: om. L. L has tuae.
55. 6 lauabit: lauuit M*. lauuit also L*.
56. 3, 4 item illic . . . confugient. 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 suffi-
cient 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 -L· L P : 50. 1 -XLVIII· wrongly L P : 50. 6 -III· 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 L* 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. 

(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'.


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 i° is by the first hand of W: 136. 8 cixiii] + milia W: 136. 14 manifestate W*: 136. 24 miliagnorum W: 137. 20 fructus W: 137. 20 ueris W* uentris W*: 137. 22 ut ut facias: 137. 24 in the citation from Habakkuk auditus tuum (not auditu tuum) W with Quir.: 138. 6 quomo W: 138. 16 iussus (not iusus) 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 58, 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 disperendum us Q. 40. 11 hesdra Q. 40. 16 (42. 9) eseian Q. 40. 19 meus (pro me 20) Q. 41. 1 fili Q. 41. 3 intellegitis Q. 41. 4 ingras sauit Q. 41. 14 dicetis Q. 42. 2 iohannen 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-inplieri 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 · · ·· Q. 50. 15 dominus Q. 50. 16 paenitebitur Q. 50. 17 helian Q. 51. 6 audire Q. 51. 14 haec Q. 51. 21 nobis: noius 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 concluentur Q². 57. 4 inocabat Q. 57. 15 iocundabantur Q. 58. 3 uir est qui Q. 58. 3 in eum Q. 58. 6 iohannen 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.

Épp. 39, 67, 10, 69 part ii; Test. I, II, III; Épp. 63, 6, 55, 28, 37, 11, 38, 76, 73, 71, 70; Sententiae Episcoporum; Épp. 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 ép. 69 §§ 16–6, pp. 749. 13 quominus ipse–755. 16 et maiorem, and ép. 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 Cyprianic 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 Cyprian 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 O 1) 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 O 3; ‘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 Weihrich’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 qūm = quoniam, and eung, 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; Man­nnasse 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 dīns dīmi dīmo, in 325. 6 the accusative dōm, and in 343. 11 apparently spē sūc 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 feliciorem S; 341. 19 oc­cansione, not occassionem, 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 S*; just repeating one line by homoeoarcton; 344. 19 metunt S; 345. 1 per­secutiones 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 super­session 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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Genesi</th>
<th>xix 10, 11</th>
<th>92. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>146. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>179. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>723. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>736. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>777. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 16</td>
<td>xx 4</td>
<td>161. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>322. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi I-3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>793. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix 24</td>
<td>xxii 20 (19)</td>
<td>242. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>323.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>362. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>680. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>722. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22-24 (21-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii 27-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi 13</td>
<td>xxiii 7</td>
<td>80. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv I</td>
<td></td>
<td>67. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvii 19, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlviii 17-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix (8-10) I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xili 17-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Exodo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 12</td>
<td>vii 10 (20)</td>
<td>176. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>248. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 2</td>
<td>xi 44 (xix 2, xx 7 : cf. I Pet. 16)</td>
<td>275. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>769. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xix 13, 26, 27 a, 27 b, 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173. 12, 15, 17, 19, 174. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 b 259. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxii 17 (cf. 18, 21)</td>
<td>723. 8:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>736. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>777. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Leviticus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii 5-7 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>761. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii 3 a</td>
<td>635. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Numeris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes and Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi 26b</td>
<td>737. 17: 758. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40a (xvii 5a)</td>
<td>757. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii 10b (25b)</td>
<td>127. 11: 303.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix 9b</td>
<td>762. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b, 12, 13b</td>
<td>761. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>768. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx 25, 26</td>
<td>738. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii 19a</td>
<td>88. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>55. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv 7-9</td>
<td>74. 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>74. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv 10-13</td>
<td>cf. 785. 13, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In Deuteronomio**

| v 7 | 322. 24: 355. 1 |
| vi 5 | 133. 2 |
| 13 (cf. Matt. iv 10) | 121. |
| 22: 241. 26: 354. 26. | 15 |
| viii 2 | 785. 11 |
| xiii 3b (4b) | 127. 22: 304. 4: 331. 9 |
| 5a (6a) | 594. 19 |
| 6, 8-10a (7-11a) | 325. 11 |
| 12, 13b, 15a, 16b, 17b, 18a (13-19a) | 325. 22 |
| xvii 12a | 596. 17 |
| 12a, 13 | 469. 18: 476. 14: 670. 19: 728. 15 |
| xviii 17a, 18, 19 | 51. 8 |
| xxiii 19a (20a) | 153. 16 |
| 21, 23 (22, 24) | 143. 17 |
| xxiv 16 | 646. 1 |
| xxv 9 | cf. 86. 9 |
| xxvii 8 | 82. 16 |
| xxviii 44 | 55. 10 |
| 66 | 87. 19 |
| xxx 6a | 45. 14 |
| 15, 19b | 154. 22 |
| xxvii 17a | 39. 6: 323. 23 |
| 39 | 322. 25 |
| xxxiii 9 | 272. 23: 327. 13: 386. 2 |

**Apud Iesu Naue**

| i 8 | 800. 11 |
| ii 18, 19 | 217. 5: 753. 1 |
| v 2 | 45. 16 |
| 13-15 | 86. 11 |
| xxiv 26, 27 | 82. 17 |

**In libro Iudicum**

| ii 11-13 | 39. 7 |
| x 6 | 39. 11 |

**In basilion [·i·]**

| i 13 | 269. 17 |
| ii 3 | 117. 2 |
| 4 | 117. 4 |
| 5 | 53. 10 |
| 25 | 142. 14: 325. 5 |
| 30 | 274. 17: 429. 18 |
| 35, 36 | 50. 18 |
| vii 12 | 84. 1 |
| viii 7 | 470. 12: 670. 24: 728. 20 |
| xvi 7 | 157. 2: 257. 9 |
| xxi 4 | 146. 4 |

**In basilion [·ii·]**

| vii 4, 5, 12-14a, 16 | 49. 7: 75. 20 |

**In basilion [·iii·]**

| xi 4 (3) | 167. 2 |
| 14 (23) | 173. 6: 286. 13 |
| 31, 32, 36b | 216. 3 |
| xvii 14 | 386. 27 |
| [xviii 21] | 452. 2 |
| xix 10 | 40. 7 |

**In basilion [·iii·]**

| xvii 20, 21 | 754. 20 |

**In paralipomenon**

| II Chron. xv 2 | 142. 4: 329. 7 |
| xxiv 20 | 687. 8 |
**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, affinché i Colleghi conoscano di per sé 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


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 Latini collazionò il Veron. coll'ed. del 1537, non sono sicuro che l'Agostini collazionasse il Neapol. colla stessa ovvero con altra edizione.
NOTES AND STUDIES

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 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 Vb) 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 (Vd), 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, anziché 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) perché ci attesta che l’ interpretazione da me data del cifrario Latiniano è esatta; e (ii) perché ci attesta esplicitamente tante lezioni di V N, non trascritte in (a) perché conformi al testo di quel l’ 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. 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.
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(a) e l'ed. rom., giacché a p. 1 ricorda Vaticani septem integri non possunt inter vetuslos censeri, 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 riguardargare una cognizione abbastanza precisa di V Benev.

A designare le varianti dei tre esemplari, forse si potrebbero adottare i simboli Vb (brancacc.), Vd (bandin.), Vv (viterb.).


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 Concili, 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*. 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.]

C. H. TURNER.