

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

APRIL, 1930

NOTES AND STUDIES

PROLEGOMENA TO THE *TESTIMONIA* AND
AD FORTUNATVM OF ST CYPRIAN

IV. THE DATE AND TEXT OF THE TWO WRITINGS:
THE O.T. CITATIONS IN *AD FORT.*

AMONG St Cyprian's writings two stand out as providing more material than the rest for the recovery of his Biblical text, because they consist almost entirely of Biblical quotations, the *Testimonia* and the *ad Fortunatum*. The genuineness of the *ad Fortunatum* and of the first two books of the *Testimonia* has not been, and cannot be, questioned: if not quite as much can be said of the third book of the *Testimonia*, the internal evidence is decisive in its favour. Further, their chronological position in the series of Cyprianic treatises can also be fixed with some approach to certainty. When the results of these two preliminary enquiries are established, we have then to face the problem of their text; and here too, though the only modern printed text is gravely defective, the available material is amply sufficient to correct its deficiencies and to arrive, save in relatively few instances, at secure knowledge of the form in which St Cyprian cited alike the Old and the New Testament. The total bulk of his citations is circumstantial enough to suggest that he did not cite from memory, and the presumption is borne out by the very high percentage of agreements where the same passage is cited by him on different occasions or in different writings.

This summary statement of conclusions will be examined and established, with special reference to the Old Testament quotations in the *ad Fortunatum*, in the present instalment of prolegomena.¹

The two treatises under discussion are drawn up, as their prefaces and their contents alike demonstrate, on a precisely similar method.

¹ The reasons for confining the area of investigation to O.T. quotations are (1) considerations of space, (2) the scope of the lectures on which this article is based. It represents one or two of my Grinfield Lectures on the LXX in the academic year 1926-1927.

To each book of the *Testimonia* and to the *ad Fortunatum* a list of chapter-headings or *tituli* is prefixed, and each title is then taken in its turn and illustrated by a number of passages (in the third book of the *Testimonia*, and especially towards the end of it, sometimes by only one passage) of Scripture. These passages are called *capitula* (Hartel 36. 2, 101. 8, 318. 10) or paraphrastically *diuina magisteria* (35. 6) *praecepta dominica et magisteria diuina* (101. 16), *praecepta dominica, praecepta diuina* (317. 10, 318. 28): and they are left in the main to speak for themselves—*compendio breuiante* (35. 10), *breuiario* (101. 11), *compendium* (318. 9)—without commentary, so that the collections may be regarded rather as material for sermons than as sermons in actual form, *non tam tractatum quam materiam tractantibus* (318. 11, 36. 3). The circumstances of the composition of the two treatises were not the same, and therefore the treatment is not identical. But the resemblance in plan and outline is so clearly indicated by the parallels just given that common authorship and continuous developement is beyond possibility of denial.

That the *Testimonia* is the earlier, the *ad Fortunatum* the later, of the two works, external and internal evidence combine to prove.

The order of the Cyprianic treatises in the MSS and in the Cheltenham list¹ was discussed by Dr Sanday and myself in *Studia Biblica* iii (1891, pp. 282 ff, 308 ff): perhaps the most definite result that emerged, so far as concerns the present purpose, is that the *Testimonia* are always found at the beginning or at the end—generally at the end—of the series of treatises. The relative length of the book was the chief factor no doubt that made for isolation: the shorter treatises could change their places much more easily. Certainly there is in this respect no indication of chronological order: it is simply that the *Testimonia* stand apart. On the other hand the *ad Fortunatum* is most frequently found immediately before the *Testimonia* at the end of the series, presumably in order to place in juxtaposition the two Biblical collections: occasionally it is found at an earlier point, never after the *Testimonia*. It belonged, that is to say, to the general *corpus* of Cyprianic treatises to a closer extent or from an earlier moment than the *Testimonia*. As the enumeration of the main body of the treatises seems intended to approximate more or less to chronological order—the large majority of our MSS lead off the series with *ad Donatum, de habitu virginum, de lapsis, de unitate ecclesiae*—there is some probability that the *ad Fortunatum* was intended to be put towards the end of St Cyprian's literary activity.

¹ That is, in the list of Biblical and Cyprianic writings, dated to A. D. 359, preserved in a MS of the Phillipps Library at Cheltenham (12266) which Mommsen discovered in 1885.

But more important than the evidence of the MSS or even of the fourth century Cheltenham list, is the evidence, practically contemporary, of the biography of Cyprian by his deacon Pontius. For Pontius gives us, in defence of Cyprian's retirement from Carthage during the Decian persecution, a catalogue of all the writings of which the Church would have been deprived had the bishop fallen a victim in A.D. 250 rather than in the persecution of Valerian eight or nine years later: any writings earlier than A.D. 250 would be *ex hypothesi* excluded, and the order of those that are enumerated must presumably correspond either to their actual dates or to their position in some already extant corpus. In a paper contributed to the *Classical Review* for May 1892 (reprinted in my *Studies in Early Church History*, 1912, pp. 258 ff) I interpreted¹ the description in Pontius as referring to the following Cyprianic writings: i *ad Donatum*, ii *de habitu virginum*, iii *de lapsis*, iv *de unitate ecclesiae*, v *de dominica oratione*, vi *ad Demetrianum*, vii *de mortalitate*, viii *de opere et eleemosynis*, ix *de bono patientiae*, x *de zelo et livore*, xi *ad Fortunatum*, xii either *ep.* 58 or the group of epistles 10, 28, 37, 11, 38, 39. And I argued that what in effect Pontius was doing was to turn up his codex of St Cyprian's works, and to summarize those later than A.D. 250 in the order in which he found them there.

The *Testimonia* is not included in the catalogue: either because it was published before the Decian persecution, or because it was not in fact contained in Pontius's MS. But I was sure then, and I am sure still, in spite of the dissent of H. Koch *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Bonn 1926)—a book to which this paper owes much—that the phrase *quis martyres tantos exhortatione diuini sermonis erigeret?* refers, and can only refer, to the *ad Fortunatum*. Koch (p. 182) objects that the book was not addressed to martyrs at all but to Christians at large, and to them only indirectly through their bishops. But every word of Pontius's phrase occurs in the preface to *ad Fort.*: 318. 24 ff 'in exhortatione tam necessaria quae martyras faciat . . . ambages sermonis humani subtrahendas . . . praecepta ipsa diuina suggerenda . . . inde aures erigantur', and 317. 11 'Dei plebem classico nostrae uocis erigimus'. Some half-dozen of our MSS put *ad Fort.* exactly in this place after *de zelo et livore*: and I do not doubt that they correctly reproduce the arrangement of Pontius's codex.

One word may be said, before we pass on, about the proper titles of the two treatises: for in the case of both treatises there is an apparent uncertainty which recourse to the older authorities will instantly dissipate. Just as the *de catholicae ecclesiae unitate* ought, as Koch shews

¹ For the most part after K. Goetz *Geschichte der cyprianischen Litteratur*, Basel 1891.

(p. 102), to be known as the *de ecclesiae unitate*—so the Cheltenham list, the Reichenau catalogue (G. Becker, p. 7), and our MSS R O and G—so the *Testimonia* or *Testimoniorum libri aduersus Iudaeos* was originally published as the *ad Quirinum*, and the *ad Fortunatum de exhortatione martyrii* simply as the *ad Fortunatum*. For the correctness of *ad Quirinum* we have the Cheltenham list, St Jerome, St Augustine,¹ and all our older MSS without exception: for *ad Fortunatum* without addition the preponderance is not quite so overwhelming, but the Cheltenham list is reinforced by the MSS V R S T. But though there can be no question as to what is the proper title, it would be pedantic at this time of day not to follow accepted usage in reference to the *Testimonia*.

(a) *Date of the Testimonia, and genuineness of the third book.* That the two first books of the *Testimonia* hang together more closely than the first two with the third is patent from the respective prefaces: the second has no separate preface, but the preface to the first book summarizes the contents of both the first book and the second, while it gives no hint of the existence of a third. The first book, we learn, supplies the scriptural proof of the rejection of the Jews and their supersession by a universal Church gathered out of all nations, and the second book similarly the scriptural proof of the advent of the promised Messiah, and of the correspondence of His life and works at all points with the prophecies of the Old Testament. In these two books we have then naturally a mine of quotations which serve the special object of enquiry into the Septuagint text, since St Cyprian, with all Latin Christians before Jerome and nearly all Greek Christians before Origen, knew the O. T. only through the medium of the LXX. On the other hand the third book not only has a preface of its own, but its contents too have little or no connexion with the subject-matter of the other two, and quotations from O. T. become relatively rarer as the book proceeds. It is a much more miscellaneous compilation, dealing with different departments of Christian faith and life, constructed apparently on no particular system and with no plan of continuous developement. It is more like the contents of a note-book, jotted down from time to time as fresh points arrested the attention of the writer. All that is quite consistent with unity of authorship; but it does go some way to suggest an interval between the composition of the first two books and of the third, and perhaps a disparity between their circumstances.

That the third book is Cyprianic through and through is proved in the first place by its Biblical text, which is homogeneous both with that

¹ But Augustine twice uses the word 'testimonia' in the near neighbourhood of his reference to the 'ad Quirinum', *contra duas epp. Pelagianorum* iv 27 (ed. Ben. X 486 E F): it may have been already a subordinate title.

of the first two books and with that of the other treatises and letters. Cyprian repeats his favourite quotations so regularly that this kind of proof is easier of application with him than with most of the Christian fathers: in his case, indeed, it can be pushed so far that a special number of common quotations between any two of his works is often a presumptive proof of their nearness in date. But in the second place Koch has also shewn (pp. 183-200) that the writer's own language in the prefaces and the chapter-headings of the third book is full of points of contact with the language of the Cyprianic writings generally. And, thirdly, the MS tradition preserves no trace whatever of the circulation of the first two books without the third. Even if there was an interval of time between the composition of the different parts, it must apparently have been so brief that the earlier part never got into public use without the other.

Only one ground for suspicion of the third book as it stands remains to be mentioned, its quite unusual length. It is not simply longer than either of the first two books, but longer than both of them put together. When all allowances are made for the larger apparatus, looser printing, and the inclusion of some spurious passages, in Hartel's edition, it remains true that it is more than double the length of any other Cyprianic letter or treatise. That does not make the size impossible in itself: three books of the New Testament and the *Apologeticus* of Tertullian must cover equal or greater space. But it does again suggest some special circumstance that made for disregard of what was obviously Cyprian's normal standard.

What then are the limits of date within which the *Testimonia* as a whole must be placed? By the general consensus of critics, the book belongs to the earliest period of Cyprian's literary activity; though I certainly see no reason to place it, with Abp. Benson (*Cyprian* p. 22) in the time of his presbyterate—indeed the address 'Quirino filio' I should rather take to imply that the writer was a bishop. But the composition of even the third book before the outbreak of the Novatianist schism does seem to result from the title of *Test.* iii 28 'Non posse in ecclesia remitti ei qui in Deum deliquerit'. That way of putting things would correspond exactly to the point at which the development of the penitential discipline of the Western Church had arrived by the middle of the third century. Perpetual exclusion from communion in the case of idolatry, homicide, adultery, and perhaps fraud, had been the rule fifty years earlier: but before the middle of the century sins against the second part of the decalogue had, one after another, received milder treatment, and only apostacy remained in the older category. That is exactly Cyprian's attitude in the title to this chapter: the Church can forgive sins against man, but cannot

receive back to communion those who by sacrificing or other form of idolatry sin against God. Contrast now the heading of *ad Fort.* 4 'non facile ignoscere Deum idololatriis', and it is obvious that in the interval between *Test.* iii and *ad Fort.* some definite change had taken place.

That is what we know did in fact happen. So numerous had been the cases of lapse in the persecution of Decius, coming as it did after nearly forty years of peace, that the ecclesiastical authorities, at Rome and Carthage alike, saw themselves in the end forced to hold out to the lapsed some hope of re-admission to communion. Novatian the Roman presbyter seceded, and organized his schism, rather than consent to this derogation of the older rule. Cyprian himself appears throughout the letters of the year 250—that is, while the persecution was still raging—as the upholder of canonical rigour, and refused to recognize any re-admissions (other than, in certain excepted cases, *in articulo mortis*) before the bishop and his faithful flock could meet in peace and determine the principles and policy to be followed. In the late spring of 251 the persecution had ceased, and the African bishops were able to meet in council; the momentous decision was reached to admit the lapsed, after the examination of each individual case, to penance, with the promise of death-bed restoration to communion and (it would seem) with the prospect of a more general re-admission at some later date. But this restoration was to membership only, not to office: bishops or clergy who had sacrificed could under no circumstances look for more than lay communion: it was assumed that they could never exercise their ministry again. Two years later, in the spring of 253 (to anticipate for a moment the later course of events), another council determined, in view of the renewed threat of persecution, to re-admit to full communion all those of the lapsed who had shewn during the preceding three years a true penitence for their fall. *Ad Fortunatum* represents this later stand-point, that of 253: the *Testimonia*, including the third book, must be placed before even the qualified re-admission of the spring of 251.

But it does not follow that the whole *Testimonia*, with the third book, must be placed before the outbreak of the persecution at the beginning of 250. And I am inclined myself to account for the distinction between the methodical plan of the first two books, and the unmethodical character of the third, by placing the composition of the former at Carthage in the peaceful surroundings of the year 249, and of the latter in the time of Cyprian's retirement into the country during the early months of 250. He did not expect the persecution to be more than a passing phase—Koch brings out, admirably and conclusively, the contrast between the optimism of his attitude then, and the pro-

found gloom of his anticipations three years later, pp. 52 ff, 168 ff—and he may well have occupied part of his enforced leisure, and quieted his mind when perturbed by the news which reached him from time to time as to events at Carthage, in poring over his Bible and jotting down, as opportunity offered, the thoughts which his study of it suggested to him.¹

(b) *Date of the ad Fortunatum.* However that may be, I think that there is no doubt that the whole collection of *Testimonia* as we have it was complete before the close of the year 250, and that two or three years elapsed before the composition of his other collection of proof-passages from Scripture in the *ad Fortunatum*. Of the date of the latter work Koch's demonstration is unanswerable: he shews its intimate connexion with *ep.* 57, 58, (65), and the treatises *de mortalitate* and *ad Demetrianum* (pp. 172–182), that is to say, with the documents that belong to the period of the great plague and the abortive persecution under Gallus, A. D. 252–253. It is of less moment, but I think he is also right (pp. 169–172) in further fixing *ad Fort.* to the time when persecution appeared to be imminent but had not yet actually broken out, that is to the spring of 253.

So much being premised as to the genuineness and the occasion of St Cyprian's two Biblical collections, we turn now to the problem of their text.

Many editions of the works of St Cyprian followed one another from the latter part of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the eighteenth—the *princeps* was published in 1471, the edition of Baluze appeared posthumously in 1726—and much was accomplished over the improvement of the text. But for the purpose of establishing the exact form of Cyprian's quotations from the Old Testament no edition is adequate which does not supply us with the readings of at least the more im-

¹ Koch, p. 200, n. 1, in answer to H. von Soden, speaks of 'agape' *Test.* iii 3, and 'catechumenus' *Test.* iii 98, as the only two words used in the *tituli* or chapter-headings which are un-Cyprianic. As to (1), Cyprian quite commonly takes the key-word of the title from the quotations that are to follow, and in this case 'agape' was the translation in his Bible of ἀγάπη in 1 Cor. xiii and 1 Jo. iv 16: so L and other MSS (115. 12–20, 116. 17). The other word (2) 'catechumenus' is not so easy to explain, for, as Koch points out, Cyprian in *ep.* 18. 2 and 29 uses 'audiens'. But the Roman clergy in *ep.* 8 use 'catechumenus', and so does Cyprian himself in the (much later) *ep.* 73. 22, and Abp. Benson (*Cyprian* p. 397) seems to me clearly right in supposing Cyprian to be there alluding to the *auctor de rebaptismate* 11, 14. But *de rebapt.* uses 'uerbum audiens'; and so Cyprian's 'catechumenus', far from being (as Koch supposes) borrowed from the writer he is controverting, is his own substitution for the writer's phrase. I conjecture that while 'audiens' or 'uerbum audiens' was traditionally African, Cyprian himself progressively leant to the newer, ultimately universal, 'catechumenus'.

portant MSS in an *apparatus criticus*: and the edition of W. Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (vol. iii, 1871) is the only attempt to satisfy this need. Therefore, though Hartel's own text is perhaps the worst text of these two writings—certainly the worst text of the *Testimonia*—that has appeared in the last three centuries, it is nevertheless the indispensable starting-point of our enquiry. Only, since even Hartel's apparatus is, compared to the richness of the manuscript material, unpardonably jejune, recourse must be had to the evidence of other MSS not cited by him. For the *Testimonia* he collated four MSS of the eighth and ninth centuries, one of the eleventh: for the greater part of the *ad Fort.* three MSS only. In both treatises he pinned his faith on the oldest MS he had at his disposal, the eighth-century MS of the *Test.* Sessorian. lviii (now Vitt. Eman. 2106), A, and the sixth-century MS of *ad Fort.*, Paris B. N. 10592, S. In both cases his leading MS is in fact the worst of all the MSS that he collated, though fortunately in both cases his apparatus contains also the readings of an infinitely better MS, from which the intelligent reader can in substance reproduce the true Cyprianic text for himself—for *Test.* the Lorsch MS L, now Vienna 962, for *ad Fort.* the MS of Peter Daniel (from Fleury?), R, now Vat. Reginensis 116, each of the ninth century. For the *Testimonia* the labours of a succession of scholars have worked out this conclusion with such unanimity that it can be assumed as the base of any further work on the text: for *ad Fort.* the inadequacy of Hartel's text has not yet been so clearly shewn.

But before proceeding to this demonstration, something must be said about the MSS not used by Hartel at all: and here again the criticism of the *Testimonia* has reached a more advanced stage than that of the *ad Fort.* Among ourselves Dr Sanday's Seminar on the Western text studied during many years the text of the *Testimonia*, and constructed a tentative edition of the greater part of it. Besides Hartel's apparatus we had at our command a complete photograph of L, and we received from Dr Mercati collations of the two Vatican MSS R and T, besides an invaluable series of notes on the readings of the two lost MSS of Verona, V, and of Benevento, b, so that these two MSS can be cited to an extent and with a certainty quite unattainable hitherto. Moreover I myself re-collated (in 1903) the text of A, and collated three new MSS, the Crawford MS now in the Rylands Library, X, of the eighth century (in 1906), the Oxford MS. Laud. misc. 105, U, of the early tenth (but copied perhaps from a quite ancient exemplar), and Hartel's P (a sister MS to L, but inferior to it), Paris B. N. 1674 A of the ninth; besides making a partial collation of Hartel's Q (a sister MS to M, but superior to it) Troyes 581, written about A. D. 800.

Hartel's apparatus is thus fully doubled; and at the same time it is,

with regard to A and L, controlled, with the result that he is found to be on the whole a good but far from impeccable, and in some respects a negligent, collator. In fact, just where A, as our oldest MS, is of most value, namely for its orthography, and especially its orthography of proper names, the apparatus is rather gravely defective.¹

Similarly for the *ad Fortunatum* we have again Mgr Mercati's account of the evidence of the Vatican MSS (collation of T and re-collation of R) and of the lost MSS V and b: and I have myself re-collated the Paris MS S.²

We are therefore equipped with sufficient material to attack our next problem, namely the verification of Hartel's text of *ad Fort.* by comparison with the true text of *Test.* Cyprian is admittedly so methodical and so accurate in his citations from Scripture, that there is strong *a priori* probability that if he makes the same citation more than once he will make it in the same form. And for the reasons already given we will here limit our examination to the citations from the Old Testament.

In the following list of readings in which the quotations in *ad Fort.* are compared with the text of the same passages as cited in other works of St Cyprian and especially in *Test.*, it should be understood that for *ad Fort.* the reading taken as the basis of discussion is that given by Hartel, while for *Test.* the reading similarly taken as the starting-point is that of L as recorded in the photographs. The quotations are taken in the order of their occurrence in *ad Fort.* The pages and lines for each reading are those of Hartel's edition.

Ps. cxxxiv [cxxxv] 15-18. *ad Fort.* 1 = *Test.* iii 59.

1. 321. 14 **manuum**: manu M* manus V

161. 1 manum LX* and a Basle fragment³: manu A* manuum *rell.* 'manum' is probably right, as a contracted form of the genitive plural. So 5 and 9 below: in all three cases *Gr.* has χειρῶν.

2. 322. 1 **sint illis** V W B b illis: sint R illis fiant M

161. 3 illis L: sint illis (illi B) V b W B P U illis sint X illis fiant A fiant illis M

Gr. γένοιτο. But the Latin variations suggest that there was

¹ I gave some details under this head in the last section of the Prolegomena, *J. T. S.* xxix (Jan. 1928) pp. 130, 131.

² S is defective as far as Hartel 325. 4. As for A, so for S, I gave some results of my re-collation in *J. T. S.* xxix (p. 131). I ought there to have noted that in 331. 20 S reads sp̄m sanctum: i. e. 'sanctus' is not abbreviated; so in 332. 14, 337. 18: in 342. 6 dme, in 331. 10 dōm: in 335. 24 daniel profetam: in 338. 9 eseiam: besides praesura *passim*.

³ This Basle fragment, F III 15^c, s. viii-ix, in an insular hand, covers 160. 7-161. 5; a collation of it was sent to me by Dom de Bruyne in 1907.

no verb at all in Cyprian—none perhaps in the Greek from which Cyprian's version was rendered—and that therefore L is alone right. 'sint illis' has obviously the next best claim.

3. 322. 1 **omnes** R W b: hi M; *om.* V B (Hartel gives R's reading incorrectly)

161. 3 omnes: *om.* M X and the Basle fragment¹

A corresponding variation in the Greek: πάντες B N* A R; *om.* N^{ca} T. Obviously Cyprian went with the first group. But in the light of what appears to be the revising activity of V, we may conjecture that V's Bible did represent the other Greek reading.

Sap. xv 15-17. *ad Fort.* 1 = *Test.* iii 59.

4. 322. 3 **uisus** V b: usus R T W M B

160. 8 usus L P R T U M B: uisus A W X Basle fragment¹

Gr. χρήσις BC (χρήσις N A), from which 'usus' is seen to be right, and Hartel wrong in *ad Fort.* with V, as in *Test.* with A

5. 322. 5 **in manibus** R T W M B: manus (as in 1) V

160. 10 manum L T* U: manuum P R T² W, manus B and the Basle fragment, in manu X M², in manibus A V

Gr. χερῶν, so that once more 'manum' (manuum) is presumably right, and 'in manibus' perhaps a correction of a seemingly unintelligible form. But it is possible that Cyprian's Latin text on the two occasions was different.

6. 322. 9 **ingit** V R W B: fingit M b

160. 13 fingit L M U: ingit A V W X B P finxit T

Gr. ἐργάζεται: the difference is only between i and e in Latin, and L for once seems to be wrong: its sister MS, P, is right.

Sap. xiii 1-4. *ad Fort.* 1 = *Test.* iii 59.

7. 322. 16 **solem aut lunam** (solem autem lunam V) R T M B (V): solem et lunam W

160. 18 solem et lunam L R T U M B: solem aut lunam A W X P

Gr. φωστῆρας οὐρανοῦ, and if this is what lay before the Latin translator 'solem "et" lunam' is a closer rendering than 'aut'. But again *ad Fort.* may here represent a different Bible text from *Test.*, since there is no trace in any of the MSS (of *ad Fort.*) of the next words in *Test.*, 'rectores orbis terrae' (= *Gr.* πρυτάνεις κόσμου θεοῦς). Comparison of the verses in the Greek and Latin shews that the whole passage bristles with difficulties.

Hier. xxv 6. *ad Fort.* 3 = *Test.* i 2 = *ad Demetr.* 6.

8. 324. 2 **eos** R M B (V b): *om.* T W

40. 5 *om.* eos L P T U X M: eos A W (V R)

355. 3 eos *omnes* (R S W)

¹ See above, p. 233, n. 3.

Gr. αἰρώϊς, and so it seems likely that *ad Fort.* and *ad Demetr.* must be supposed to give 'eos' correctly, and differ from *Test.* in which the authority for omission (for Hartel is wrong in not citing L on that side) is certainly preponderant, though perhaps not overwhelming. But it should be noted that the Greek and Latin texts give different constructions to the clause.

9. 324. 3 **manuum** (S W T²): manum R T*. Mercati's authorities give, it seems, no indication as to the reading of V b

40. 5 manuum L A W M X: manum R T U

355. 4 manuum R W: manum S

Comparing 1 and 5 above, and considering that there is authority here for 'manum' on each of the occasions where this verse is cited, it seems inevitable to decide for the contracted form, in spite of the defection, on this occasion, of L.

Exod. xxxii 31-33. *ad Fort.* 4 = *Test.* i 1 = *de lapsis* 19.

10. 324. 16 **eis** V R M: illis W B

39. 4 eis L A M P² T U X (V R): ei P* illis B

251. 1 eis (*om.*, with the two following words, S)

Gr. αἰρώϊς, and 'eis' is beyond question right in all three treatises. But Hartel has obscured the issue by recording in *Test.* the reading of L as 'ei', when in fact it has 'eis'.

Hier. xi 14. *ad Fort.* 4 = *de lapsis* 19.

11. 324. 21 **pro ipsis** R T W M B: pro eis V

251. 11 pro eis *omnes*

Gr. περὶ αὐτῶν gives no help, and decision must be left in suspense. Probably V has assimilated *ad Fort.* to its own Bible text.

12. 324. 23 **adfectionis** (W M B T): adfectionis R

251. 13 adfectionis S O (= Bodl. Add. C 15): adfectionis R W

In *ep.* 59. 15 (685. 1) Cyprian himself uses 'adfectione' on the consentient testimony of L P Q R V against C. And the *Thesaurus* makes it quite clear that 'adfectatio' (Cicero, Seneca, Apuleius, Tertullian) is the earlier word, 'adfectio' (not before Ambrose, save for a single citation in the Antonine Itinerary, in the late third-century recension) the later. Consequently we must follow R in *ad Fort.*, S O in *de lapsis*, and read 'adfectionis' in both.

Ezech. xiv 12-14 a, 16 b. *ad Fort.* 4 = *de lapsis* 19 (but the latter quotation omits the first nine words quoted in *ad Fort.* and begins at 'terra').

13. 325. 2 **de ea** V W T M B: ab ea R b

251. 24 ab ea *omnes*

Gr. ἐξ αὐτῆς B Q: ἀπ' αὐτῆς A. That is to say, the difference

in the Latin corresponds to a difference in the Greek, and the only question is whether that difference does or does not go back to Cyprian himself.

14. 325. 3 **uiri hi**: uiri hi iusti V

252. 1 uiri hi: uiri hi iusti V

Gr. ἄνδρες οἱ τοῦ. Unless V is right against all other authorities in both treatises (which is quite improbable), it seems as though the scribe of V or its ancestor must have collated Cyprian's quotations carefully with his own Bible and corrected in both places accordingly. It is however just possible that 'iusti' represents an 'isti' of V's Bible, for 'isti' is a known variant here for 'hi'. If 'isti' had been put in the margin of V's archetype, the next copy might have put both in the text.

1 Reg. ii 25. *ad Fort.* 4 = *Test.* iii 28. Note that S commences just before this point, and Hartel ceases to cite the MSS M B.

15. 325. 5 **uir peccet** S: peccet uir R T W (V)

142. 15 peccet uir L A U X: peccetur M peccatur W peccat uir peccauerit uir P

Gr. ἁμαρτήν ἀνὴρ: it is clear that the literal rendering 'peccet uir' is right in both treatises, and that S and with it Hartel are wrong.

2 Paral. xv 2. *ad Fort.* 8 = *Test.* iii 27.

16. 329. 7 **Dominus omnes**

142. 4 deus: dominus R

Gr. κύριος. Is *Test.* wrong here? and can we suppose that R alone preserves the true text, and that the 'deus' of all other MSS has come in by assimilation to 'deus' of the line before? But the next instance suggests that Cyprian did follow different texts of this verse in the two treatises: see however p. 245, n. 1.

17. 329. 7 **quamdiu omnes**

142. 4 dum L A U X M (V R T): quamdiu B P (*om. est dum per homoeoarcton* W)

Taking 16 and 17 together the conclusion becomes likely that Cyprian was using different Latin MSS. Of course he very rarely had occasion to cite the books of Chronicles.

Ezech. xxxiii 12. *ad Fort.* 8 = *de bono patientiae* 13.

18. 329. 10 **in quacumque die** S R (V): in quocumque die T W b

407. 11 in quocumque die *omnes*

'dies' appears to be masculine both in Cyprian and in Cyprian's Bible: compare, e.g. *Test.* ii 25 title (61. 14, 92. 5) and the texts from Hosea and Exodus there cited. In 61. 14 Hartel indeed prints 'tertia die' with A W (R): but L P V b T U X M Q B have the masculine, and in 92. 5 it stands without variant. Therefore

in this passage the reading of *de bon. pat.* and of T W b in *ad Fort.* must be followed.

Exod. xvii 11-14. *ad Fort.* 8 = *Test.* ii 21.

19. 330. 23 *om.* S W R: sed manus Moysi graues erant V

89. 16 sed manus Moysi graues *omnes*

Gr. αἱ δὲ χεῖρες Μωσῆ βαρεῖαι. It looks as though Cyprian or his amanuensis had accidentally dropped the words in *ad Fort.* For the reading of V compare no. 14 *supra*.

20. 331. 1 **Aaron** Hartel without note of variant, but in fact S has 'aron

89. 17 Aaron again without note: but in fact A has 'aron'

In neither treatise has Hartel recorded the orthography of his earliest MS. In their substantive readings he follows these two MSS respectively, and they are generally wrong: in matters of orthography they are sometimes, as here, right against all other MSS, and he omits to record their readings. The earliest Latin translators invariably avoided the juxtaposition in Hebrew names of the same vowel, and either omitted the repetition, or inserted an h: so 'Aharon' or 'Aron'. Jerome restored the orthography on his own principles, but in the most familiar names, such as Bethlehem and Abraham, Latin usage was too strong for him. Cyprian's Bible had isac, aron, bethlem, etc.

21. 331. 1 **Ur** R W: Or V b S

89. 17 Ur L (Hür T B): Or A V b Q* R* U W X*

Gr. Ὠρ, and the evidence of the older MSS makes it abundantly clear that Or was the reading of Cyprian's Bible in both treatises.

22. 331. 1 **manus eius omnes**

89. 17 manus L R (V) T X M (manuus A): manus eius U W B

Gr. τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ B F *τὰς χεῖρας* A. It would appear therefore that *ad Fort.* followed B F, and *Test.* followed A, of the LXX. Compare 13 above, where also *Test.* agrees with A, while most MSS of *ad Fort.* go with B Q, of the LXX

23. 331. 5 **memoriale** S: memoriae V b R T W

90. 1 memoriae L V A: memoria b T U W B memoria et X in memoria M Q

Gr. εἰς μνημόσυνον, and 'memoriae' must be right in both treatises: S and Hartel are wrong again in *ad Fort.*

24. 331. 6 **Iesu omnes**

90. 2 eius L T U B X: Iesu A V b R W M Q

Gr. Ἰησοῦ. L reads 'eius' (though Hartel does not record this), but in spite of the support of other MSS must be wrong. Transposition of letters has produced 'eius' out of 'iesu'.¹

¹ 'Iesu', meaning Joshua, would not be abbreviated in early MSS, and so would be a relatively unfamiliar form.

Deut. xiii 3 (4). *ad Fort.* 9 = *Test.* iii 15 = *de mortalitate* 11.

25. 331. 11 **et ex tota uirtute uestra omnes**

128. 2 *om.* L P U W X M B (R): *habent* A V

304. 6 *om.* omnes

Gr. omits with *Test.* and *de mortal.* It looks as though the tradition of *ad Fort.* had suffered contamination from the Gospel text. Note once more the identity of the V text in *ad Fort.* and *Test.* Like cod. B in the New Testament V is an edited text, and, like B, a very good one in most, but not in all, respects.

Dan. iii 16-18. *ad Fort.* 11 = *Test.* iii 10 = *ep.* 6. 3 = *ep.* 58. 5.

26. 337. 16 **liberabit** S V b: liberauit R T* W

121. 17 liberauit L T* U W* B: liberabit A (V) P R X

483. 16 liberabit L N C Q* R (V): liberauit T* Q²

660. 18 liberabit P R Q²: liberauit Q* B

Gr. *ῥύσεται* Theodotion, *ἐξέλπει* LXX, from which it is clear that the future 'liberabit' is correct all through, and that L is wrong in *Test.* Cyprian's text is substantially that of Theodotion, but 'rex' in *v.* 16 is from LXX: in *v.* 18 'imaginem auream' agrees with LXX indeed, but also with A Q (against B) of Thdn.

2 Macc. vi, vii. *ad Fort.* 11, cf. *Test.* iii 17.

27. Of the six quotations in *ad Fort.* 11 (339. 12-342. 10), five recur in *Test.* iii 17, but only in V R, and V R must here represent, not the genuine text of Cyprian, but a recension which has taken the citations in *ad Fort.* and inserted them in *Test.*

Sap. iii 4-8. *ad Fort.* 12 = *Test.* iii 15 = *ep.* 6. 2. Note that *v.* 7 b of the Greek is omitted in all three of Cyprian's quotations, though added in *ad Fort.* and *Test.* by W, and in *ep.* 6 by C R (not V).

28. 343. 16 **holocaustam hostiam** V b T*: holocausta hostiam S W holocausta hostia R

128. 6 holocaustam (holocaustam V olocaustam R holocaustam L) hostiam L V b A P R T* U X: holocaustum hostiam W X holocausta hostiam M*

481. 18 holocaustam hostiam L N P (T*?): holocausta hostiam V holocausta hostia C holocausti hostia R holocaustum hostiam Q

Gr. *δλοκάρπωμα θυσίας*, but of this none of our MSS gives a literal translation, and provisionally at any rate we must, with Hartel, follow the preponderance of MS authority and read 'holocaustam hostiam' in all three citations. 'holocaustum hostiae' would be the literal rendering.¹

¹ Neither *δλοκάρπωμα θυσίας* nor *δλοκαύτωμα θυσίας* occurs elsewhere in LXX. The pseudo-Cyprianic *de laude martyrii* 16 (Hartel App. 39. 8) renders here, as Cyprian does, 'holocaustam hostiam'; though that rendering is entirely unmen-

29. 343. 18 **respectus illorum omnes**
 128. 7 respectus L : respectus eorum W respectus illorum *rell.*
 481. 19 respectus illorum *omnes*
Gr. ἀντῶν, and the omission of 'illorum' by L in *Test.* can only be an individual blunder : it is not shared by P.
- Sap. v 1-9 a. *ad Fort.* 12 = *Test.* iii 16 = *ad Demetrianum* 24.
30. 343. 23 **angustauerunt** V R S T : angustiauerunt W
 128. 15 angustiauerunt L W X : angustauerunt V A P R T U M B
 369. 1 angustauerunt (V) R M : angustiauerunt W B
 Being a matter of orthography, we must follow our oldest MSS, V S A, and read 'angustauerunt' throughout against L of *Test.* 'angustare' is the older and only classical form : see *Theo. Ling. Lat.*
31. 343. 23 **abstulerunt labores eorum** (illorum T) *omnes*
 128. 15 labores eorum diripuerunt *omnes excepto* V : abstulerunt laborem eorum V
 369. 1 abstulerunt labores eorum (illorum B) *omnes*
Gr. τῶν ἀθετούντων τοὺς πόνους αὐτῶν : it is abundantly clear that in *Test.* Cyprian used a different (otherwise unknown) Latin rendering of these words from that followed by him in *ad Fort.* and *ad Demetr.* V once more stands alone in assimilating *Test.* to *ad Fort.* etc.¹
32. 344. 5 **in risu et in similitudine inproperii** V b S W : in risum et in similitudine inp. R in risum et in similitudinem inp. T
 128. 19 in risu et in similitudine inp. LV : in risum et in similitudine inp. A R X in risu et in similitudinem inp. b P T U
 369. 6 in risu et in similitudine inp. (V) W B : in risum et in similitudinem inp. R M
Gr. εἰς γέλωτα καὶ εἰς παραβολὴν ὀνειδισμοῦ. If Cyprian was consistent with himself in all three cases, he must apparently have used two ablatives, or possibly accusative and ablative. Manuscript authority for two accusatives is entirely wanting in *Test.*, as it is also in Lucifer.
33. 344. 15 **ista** S : illa (V b) R T W
 129. 5 illa : ista M
 369. 16 illa *omnes*
Gr. ἐκεῖνα, and S (with Hartel) is obviously wrong in *ad Fort.*

tioned in Sabatier. Further Lucifer 1/2 has also 'holocaustam hostiam'; and 1/2 'holocausta hostia', where Latini (no doubt rightly) conjectured the accusative feminine : and once more Sabatier's report of Lucifer's readings conflicts with our more modern knowledge.

¹ If Cyprian put together *Test.* book iii while absent from Carthage, might we suppose that for some books at least of the Bible he had to fall back on codices or rolls that did not come from his own library ?

Ps. cxv 6 (cxvi 15). *ad Fort.* 12 = *Test.* iii 16 = *ep.* 6. 2 = *ep.* 10. 2 = *ep.* 76. 4. 'praetiosa' should be read throughout.

34. 344. 16 **pretiosa est** V b R S W : pretiosa T
 129. 6 pretiosa *omnes*
 481. 8 pretiosa est L N P Q R T : pretiosa C
 492. 1 pretiosa est L N Q C R : pretiosa P
 831. 14 pretiosa *omnes*

Gr. *τίμιος*, and 'pretiosa' without 'est' is certainly right in *Test.* and *ep.* 76 : but in the other three citations it is a little doubtful whether we can omit 'est' with one MS alone in each case. It is not likely anyhow that the difference goes back to the Greek.

35. 344. 17 **iustorum** V b R S W : sanctorum T
 129. 6 iustorum L V b P R T U X : sanctorum A M B
 481. 9 iustorum L N P C R T : sanctorum Q
 492. 2 iustorum L N P C R : sanctorum Q
 831. 14 iustorum L N P C R (V) : sanctorum M

Gr. *δούλων*, and of course 'iustorum' is right in all five cases : *δούλος* is not *ἄγιος*. But it is interesting to note that Hartel's inadequate selection of MSS for *Test.* results in L standing alone—if his statement of the evidence is to be relied on—with the right reading against his three other MSS (W is defective). For the *Epp.* his text is on the whole much more satisfactory.

Ps. cxviii (cxix) 1, 2. *ad Fort.* 12 = *Test.* iii 16.

36. 344. 22, 23 **beati omnes**
 132. 4, 5 felices L V b P T U X B : beati A R W M. Quir¹ has 'felices' on the second occasion ; it is not extant on the first.
Gr. *μακάριοι*, for which the regular rendering in Cyprian and *k* is 'felices', and that is indubitably right in *Test.* In *ad Fort.* we have to balance the probabilities of Cyprian using a different rendering, and of all the MSS having suffered contamination with the later, soon to be the universal, rendering ; and decision is not quite easy. Exactly the same difficulty confronts us in *de eccl. unit.* 24 (231. 25), where all MSS appear to give 'beati pacifici' for Matt. v 9 : but in that passage we have the contrary evidence of *Test.* iii 3 (115. 1) according to L V b T B. My own belief is that Cyprian in all these passages wrote 'felices'.

¹ Quirinianus, i. e. the fifth-century fragments found at Brescia by Mgr Mercati : see his *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano* (1899), pp. 1-4, 44-67, and my own summary in Prolegomena III (*J. T. S.*, Jan. 1928, xxix pp. 125, 126). For this quotation see Mercati p. 44 : the fragment begins 'sunt in uia et qui ambulat . . .' Quir represents, as Mercati shows, the same *recension* of *Test.* as Hartel's W, but it represents it at a much earlier stage : of the five variants 36 to 40, Q gives the true reading of *Test.* four times, W not once.

37. 344. 22 **inmaculati** S (T): qui inmaculati sunt R W (V)
 132. 4 qui inmaculati sunt L (V) P T U X M B (Quir begins with sunt): inmaculati A R W
Gr. ἄμωμοι **Ν**, οἱ ἄμωμοι A R T, and the fuller rendering, which is right in both the Cyprianic passages, certainly implies the Greek article, so that Cyprian's Bible went with A R T against **Ν**. It is not so certain that the shorter rendering implies the absence of the article in the Greek, but decision on that point is not necessary.
38. 344. 23 **qui** (*ante ambulant*) *omnes*
 132. 5 et qui L P T U X M B Quir: *om.* et A V R W
Gr. οἱ πορευόμενοι, and once more we seem to have different readings in the Latin Bible texts used by Cyprian in the two treatises.
39. 344. 23 **luce** S: uia V b R W lege T
 132. 5 uia L (V?) P X: uiam R² uis M lege A R T (legem T* *ut uia*) U W B Quir
Gr. ἐν νόμῳ, and the choice lies between 'in lege' (of which 'luce' of S is presumably a corruption) and 'in uia' in both Cyprianic treatises. I do not myself feel any doubt that he read 'in uia' on both occasions, though it almost looks as if that were a blunder, by reduplication from the preceding clause, whether of his Latin version or only of his own MS of it.
40. 344. 24 **martyria omnes**
 132. 5 martyria L (V) P R T U X M B Quir: testimonia A W
 'martyria' is of course right on both occasions.

1. Of these forty passages it will be the simplest course to begin by setting aside those that are concerned only with the form or orthography of words. Of the cases that fall under this head—**1**, **5**, **9**: **12**: **20**: **21**: **30**—there is not one which raises any difficulty, or suggests any variation of text between *ad Fort.* and *Test.*, if we follow, as in such matters it is generally right to do, the testimony of our oldest MSS. We must read 'adfectatio' **12** with S of *de laps.* 19, 'angustare' **30** with V S A, 'aron' **20** with S A, 'or' **21** with V S A. In **20**, **21**, **30** (**12** is not in *Test.*) L is on the wrong side: its excellence is subject to just this qualification, that, while it preserves a very ancient text, it modernizes its orthography to the standards of the Carolingian age. On the other hand in **1**, **9**—and **5**, as far as *Test.* is concerned—the problem is as between 'manuum' and the contracted form 'manum' for the genitive plural of 'manus', and L^{2/3} gives its witness for the unusual and in Cyprian's Bible apparently correct form 'manum': the Greek has χερῶν^{3/3}, and in the Latin we have for 'manum' in

1 LX (and an early Basle fragment¹) of *Test.*; in 5 LTU of *Test.*; in 9 RT of *ad Fort.*, RTU of *Test.*, S of *ad Demetr.* But further, the variants 'manu' and 'manus' are probably corrections of an ancestral 'manum' (since 'manuum' would have caused no difficulty): so in 1 *ad Fort.* manu M* manus V, *Test.* manu A*; in 5 *ad Fort.* manus V, *Test.* manus B and the Basle fragment, in manu XM². For the contracted gen. plur. of nouns in the fourth declension see Neuwagener *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*³ i 547, 548.

2. There remain thirty-three passages where the variations are of substance and not of form. But of these two, 35 and 40, are due only to the wrong judgement of Hartel in constructing his text of *Test.*, seven to similar errors of judgement in his text of *ad Fort.* In 4, indeed, it is only the evidence of the Greek which rejects the otherwise attractive 'uisus' for 'usus', and in 18 the question is arguable: but in the remaining five—15, 23, 33, 37, (39)—it is his unwarranted preference for S in *ad Fort.* over all other authorities combined which has resulted in erroneous readings. In no one of these nine passages except 39 is there any real doubt that Cyprian is consistent with himself. And another passage may be reckoned in here, where difficulty is caused only by Hartel charging to L an error of which it is guiltless: namely 10, where L does not read 'ei', but correctly 'eis'. We are thus reduced to twenty-three or at most twenty-four passages.

3. Our next modification of the total concerns individualisms of our leading MS for *Test.*, L, in addition to its orthographical modernisms of which account has been taken above. L alone in 29 omits 'illorum', but it does not seem possible that this is more than a blunder. We shall further be justified in abstracting from our lists readings where L is in obvious error even in company with other MSS, 6, 24, 26. These are all easy corruptions, 'finget' for 'fingit', 'eius' for 'iesu', 'liberauit' for 'liberabit', and hardly qualify at all its general excellence.

4. Similarly we can eliminate the idiosyncrasies of V. The evidence in the course of our examination has shewn us that, valuable as V is, it does contain an artificial element. There is conscious assimilation of Cyprianic Bible texts either to one another or to some external standard—though if the latter alternative is correct, the standard resembles Cyprian's own so nearly that it must be itself African and not far removed from Cyprian's date. 11, 19, 25, 27, are cases where V brings the two treatises into harmony with one another, but it is an enforced and not an original harmony. 27 is a case where half a dozen quotations from II Maccabees are introduced bodily from *ad Fort.* into *Test.*, though as R here goes with V the origin of this change may possibly be different to the origin of the rest. 11, 19, and 25, the

¹ On this Basle fragment, see under I, p. 233 *supra*.

evidence of V being eliminated, remain as real differences between the two treatises. 14 on the other hand is a case where V has made the same change in both treatises, apparently without any justification so far as St Cyprian's original text is concerned, and therefore 14, like 27, goes out altogether.

Now at last we can proceed to the further examination of the seventeen or eighteen cases which do, at first sight at any rate, present us with real differences between the texts of the different treatises as they stand: and these fall into five groups.

(a) *The whole tradition of ad Fort. corrupt.* The first group consists of three cases where there is perhaps reason to believe that the difference is apparent and not real, because the whole available tradition of *ad Fort.* is corrupt and deviates from what Cyprian either wrote or meant to write, 19, 25, 36. In 19 SW R omit, in comparison with *Test.*, 'sed manus Moysi graues'. The words are necessary to the sense, and there is no trace of their being absent from any other authorities, Greek or Latin: therefore they must have dropped out accidentally whether in the original text of *ad Fort.* or in the course of its transmission. In 25 *ad Fort.*, with AV of *Test.* adds (after 'ex toto corde uestro et ex tota anima uestra') the words 'et ex tota uirtute uestra': but they are absent from the true text of *Test.* and from *de mortal.* as well as from all other known texts of the passage in Deut. Obviously they were inserted from the Gospels, more probably by scribes after Cyprian than by Cyprian himself. In 36 the evidence for 'felix' as the early African equivalent of *μακάριος* is so strong that I cannot believe that Cyprian wrote 'beati'. But 'beatus' so soon and so universally replaced 'felix' that there is hardly a place in Cyprian where some MSS do not present it, and there is nothing really improbable in the supposition that all MSS have done so here, as well as in *de eccl. unit.* 24.

(b) *The true tradition of Cyprian uniform.* The second group includes five cases, 2, 3, 13, 28, 32, besides two that have been mentioned above, 37 and 39, where the evidence may indeed suggest that variant readings go back ultimately to the Greek, but is not adequate to shew that both readings are Cyprian's own. In 2 the variations both in *Test.* and *Fort.* are very numerous, but they would all be accounted for if, with L of *Test.* alone, we read 'illis' without any verb, though *γίνονται* appears to stand unquestioned in the Greek. In 3 there is no doubt that 'omnes' is right in both *Test.* and *Fort.*, but in each treatise two MSS omit it, and the omission corresponds to a known variant of the Greek. As V is one of the omitting MSS in *ad Fort.*, it may be that V's Bible went with the Greek MSS *ca* T,

while Cyprian's certainly followed B N* A R. In 13 'ab ea' of *Test.* is supported by R b of *ad Fort.*, and corresponds to ἀπ' αὐτῆς of cod. A of LXX; the other MSS of *ad Fort.* with 'de ea' correspond to ἐξ αὐτῆς of B Q. I think that R b are good enough authorities to allow us once more to make Cyprian consistent with himself. In 28 the preponderance of MS authority indicates that in each of the three citations Cyprian wrote 'holocaustam hostiam'; and though that does not answer quite strictly to ὀλοκάρισμα θυσίας, it must be taken to be the rendering in the Old Latin Bible. In 32 the three quotations all shew great variety in detail, but the literal correspondence with the two accusatives of the Greek is far too poorly supported to be right, and there is ample authority in all three places for the double ablative, which is presumably right throughout. In 37 Cyprian's text is not doubtful in either *Test.* or *ad Fort.*, and corresponds to codd. A R T of the Greek Psalter, while the inferior reading probably represents that of N. Finally in 39 our best MSS again agree in the two treatises: Cyprian, rightly or wrongly, read 'in uia' in both clauses of Ps. cxviii (cxix) 1, though the Greek text has ἐν ὁδῷ . . . ἐν νόμῳ.

The ten readings in the two groups just dealt with have produced no case where it is certain, or even very probable, that Cyprian used inconsistent texts in his several treatises. But a residuum is left over of about one fifth of the whole number of instances with which we started, and some half of this residuum present different Latin renderings of the same underlying Greek, while the other half imply a different Greek text. Since in the last group we have had to consider questions of Greek readings, it will be convenient to proceed next to the cases where differences of Cyprian with himself go back, or may go back, to differences in the Greek.

(c) *Variations of underlying Greek text.* There is really only one case where a real difference appears to be established between *Test.* and *ad Fort.*, which corresponds to a known difference between the MSS of the LXX. In 22 *Test.* has certainly 'manus', while all MSS of *ad Fort.* have 'manus eius': cod. A of Exod. xvii 11 has τὰς χεῖρας, codd. B F τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ. Provisionally we must say that Cyprian used different texts. But where the conclusion rests on so slight a base as the presence or absence of a personal pronoun, it can only be provisional. A similar, but still more doubtful, case is 8, where *ad Fort.* has 'ne adoraueritis eos' and the best MSS of *Test.* omit 'eos': the omission may go back to an omission of αὐτοῖς 2° in a Greek MS, but as no such omission is known it is a simpler supposition that our best MSS of *Test.* are for once in a way in error, and that 'eos' should be retained with A W, besides V R *ex silentio*. In 38 it is again so small a word as 'et' that is in question, and again the MSS of *Test.* are

divided on much the same lines; even if Cyprian really wrote 'et' in *Test.*, while our Greek MSS and *ad Fort.* omit it, it is much simpler to refer the insertion to some stage in the Latin tradition. Lastly 16 is only a question between a 'deus' of *Test.* and a 'dominus' of the Greek and *ad Fort.* But, as has been said, 16 and 17 stand together as exceptional. Taken as a whole, the variations of underlying Greek text reduce themselves almost to a vanishing point.

(d) *Variations of Latin rendering.* It is disconcerting to find that there are any definite traces of difference between the texts used in the two treatises. We have got so thoroughly accustomed to treating the evidence of St Cyprian, in regard to the Latin Bible used by him, as strictly homogeneous, that it gives us something of a shock when we find ourselves obliged in any degree to qualify or modify this acquired conviction. And perhaps after all the real divergence is not so great as it may at first appear, for it is at least possible that in some cases the whole MS tradition of *ad Fort.* is in error. But at any rate the evidence has to be set out and its implications considered.

The most striking instance is 31 from the book of Wisdom, where $\nu \text{ } \iota \text{ } \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \text{ } \acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu \text{ } \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \text{ } \pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \text{ } \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ is rendered in *Test.* 'labores eorum diripuerunt', in *ad Fort.* and *ad Demetr.* 'abstulerunt labores eorum'. There is no serious doubt as to the readings: if V gives in *Test.* the reading of *ad Fort.*, that sort of assimilation is too much of a habit with V (see 14, 19, 25) to allow us to suppose that its evidence can outweigh the dozen or so MSS, L and A included, which combine to give the other reading. So in 11 *ad Fort.* has 'pro ipsis' apart from V, which has 'pro eis' with all MSS of *de lapsis*. In 17 *ad Fort.* has 'quamdiu', while all the MSS of *Test.* that really count read 'dum'. In 34 *ad Fort.* has 'pretiosa est' in Ps. cxv 6 with *ep.* 6 and 10, *Test.* with *ep.* 76 and the Greek. 'pretiosa' without 'est': though the insertion of 'est' is so natural, especially where the citation is limited to the single clause, that it may well be that it is not a real question here of divergence of Biblical text.

We are now in a position to draw some general conclusions. And first and most important, the substantial homogeneity of Cyprian's Bible text emerges beyond dispute: in one case 31 it is undeniable that $\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ of Sap. xiii 1 is represented by 'diripuerunt' in *Test.* by 'abstulerunt' in *ad Fort.*, and *ad Fort.* is supported by *ad Demetr.*, and in the two connected cases 16 and 17 one difference of text and one of rendering make it likely that different Latin MSS of the books of Chronicles must have been employed by him.¹ It is possible that

¹ Yet the two quotations agree with another against the Greek in omitting the clause $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon \text{ } \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \text{ } \acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\rho\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \text{ } \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$.

in 7 the omission in *ad Fort.* of the words 'rectores orbis terrae' which stand in *Test.* and correspond to the Greek is only an accident (whether the accident is due to an original blunder in writing out the citation, or to faulty transmission of *ad Fort.*, for which treatise we have obviously no MS quite so good as L of *Test.*), and the case of 19 is very similar. It is possible that Cyprian's Latin Bible, as the case of 2 suggests, did not always correspond to the Greek of any of the great uncials, and may represent a more ancient text. All other variations dealt with in the last preceding paragraphs are of so minute a character that they may easily be due to accidental variations of individual Bible MSS or accidental errors in the transmission of the Cyprianic writings. They are not of a character to affect in any appreciable degree our confidence in the trustworthiness of St Cyprian as a witness to a Biblical text that is older than N or B or A. At most our investigation indicates that the text of the *ad Fortunatum* was either drawn up with a little less care, or (more probably) copied with a little less faithfulness by succeeding scribes, than the text of the *Testimonia*: it certainly points to an element of degeneracy in one of the two oldest MSS of the former treatise, S, and an element of editorial revision in the other, V, as compared with the quite exceptional excellence of L in the text of the *Testimonia*.

And one other general remark may close this section of the investigation. The impression is strong on my mind that the text of the New Testament, or at any rate that of the Gospels, offers an easier field and the probability of more clear-cut conclusions than the text of the Old.

Perhaps the opportunity, for which I have long been hoping, of producing a new text of the *Testimonia* may come to me some day. I believe that at least I have accumulated and sifted enough material to justify me in setting down my results. But all depends on what leisure and energy may yet be mine in the near future. Since the last instalment of these Prolegomena was published in January 1929, Cyprianic studies have lost one of their most ardent votaries in this country, Dom Leander Ramsay, Abbot of Downside. He had made large collections with a view to an edition of St Cyprian, though it has not been given him to bring any part of it to completion. Long ago we exchanged letters on the studies we cherished in common, but we never met. It is the hope of my heart that the distinguished house over which he presided may be able to pay tribute to his memory, and add one more to its great services to learning, by making some of his *reliquiae* accessible to the world of scholars.

C. H. TURNER.