

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

CHRONICLE

PATRISTICA.

Novatiani Romanae Urbis Presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity: edited by W. YORKE FAUSSET. (Cambridge University Press, 1909.)

A SEPARATE edition of Novatian *On the Trinity* is welcome; still more welcome would have been an edition of his surviving works. In default of the latter the student must use Landgraf and Weyman's edition of the *De Cibis Iudaicis* alongside of Fausset. Mr Fausset's edition follows the general plan of the series to which it belongs, but hardly reaches the standard of the best in the series. The introduction and the notes are the best parts of the book: the index also deserves our gratitude, though it might have been fuller with advantage. In the absence of manuscript authority, more attention should have been devoted to the readings of the early editions, and we fear that textually Mr Fausset has rather lost the opportunity of gathering up the work of his predecessors for all time. A chapter, also, on Novatian's Biblical Text would have been very much in place: in 1 Tim. iv 1 (p. 110, 15) the emendation *mendaciloquentium* (= Lucifer) might have been risked, especially as in the *De Cibis Iudaicis* (p. 235, 13) the same verse is read with *mendaciloquorum* (= d). It is no easy matter nowadays for an editor of a patristic text to satisfy all his readers: the present chronicler can only say he has read through Mr Fausset's volume with great pleasure: but would not *Urbis Romanae* (in the title) have been more consonant with usage?

La Tradition des opuscules dogmatiques de Foebadius, Gregorius Illiberitanus, Faustinus. Par DOM ANDRÉ WILMART, O.S.B. (mit 3 Tafeln) [*Sitzungsb. d. Wien. Akad.* Bd. clix, 1. Abh.]. (Alfred Hölder, Vienna, 1908.)

THE title sufficiently explains the scope of this brief but learned treatise, which is the earnest of a forthcoming work which will be highly valued by all students of fourth-century dogma. Some ten years ago Mr C. H. Turner in the pages of the JOURNAL expressed the hope that the three works above named might yet be united in one volume. For the task of preparing such an edition Dom Wilmart, who might be called the resuscitator of Gregory of Elvira, is specially qualified. The interrelations which subsist especially between Gregory and Foebadius will be graphically indicated for the first time. The manuscript tradition of the treatises is interesting, and, as it would appear, adequate for

the reconstruction of their texts. Assuredly the edition of Wilmart will be a great advance on preceding editions and of great interest to students of the Latin Bible as well as to students of the theology of the fourth century. The photographs are of Voss. lat. F. 58 (saec. ix) (of Foebadius), Bodl. Laud. Misc. 276 (saec. ix) (of Gregory), and of Köln xxxiii (saec. ix) (of Faustinus). It is all the more necessary to call attention to a valuable piece of work like this, as no publications issue more unobtrusively from the press than the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*.¹

De codicum Prudentianorum generibus et uirtute scripsit IOANNES BERGMAN. (*Adiectae sunt tres tabulae.*) [*Sitzungsb. d. Wien. Akad.* Bd. clvii, 5. Abh.] (Alfred Hölder, Vienna, 1908.).

FOR quite a generation hardly anything critical had been done on the text of Prudentius, when three workers entered the field, Stettiner, with his interesting work on the illustrated manuscripts, Winstedt, well known to readers of this JOURNAL, and Bergman, the future Vienna editor. The valuable papers of Winstedt in the *Classical Review* and elsewhere shewed how much precious and unused material existed for the restoration of the text. Bergman has been similarly comprehensive in his researches, and, as Winstedt has generously put all his own material at the disposal of the other scholar, the present pamphlet gives us as complete and as clear as possible an account of the existing documents. These are wonderfully abundant, there being over 300 manuscripts in existence, of which the last critical editor Dressel knew only sixty-six. At the head of all stands the Puteaneus (Paris B. N. lat. 8084), which is now considered to be not earlier than the sixth century. The older part of the Bobbio MS (Ambros. D 36 sup.) is not later than the seventh century, and there is a fragmentary one of the eighth. While a few belong to the ninth, a great many have survived from the tenth. Classification of the authorities is aided by the order in which the poems come, by the style of the illustrations, by the subscriptions, and by the presence or absence of interpolations. All necessary information about the manuscripts is given, and the comprehensiveness of the work done has probably never been surpassed in the case of any other author: the only rival piece of work the present writer can recall is Von Soden's *Cyprianische Briefsammlung*. The seriousness with which Dr Bergman has taken his task gives one every confidence that his text of the poet will meet all demands. The three interesting photographs are of leaves of Puteaneus, Bobiensis, and a Casinensis.²

¹ The name 'Phillips' has led Dom Wilmart (p. 33), as many others, into error. On p. 31, n. 2, for 'Seek' read 'Seeck'.

² On p. 61, l. 9, for 'collegii' read 'uniuersitatis'.

Sancti Aureli Augustini Scripta contra Donatistas: Pars II: Contra Litteras Petiliani Libri Tres, Epistula ad Catholicos de Secta Donatistarum, Contra Cresconium Libri Quattuor. Recensuit M. PETSCHENIG [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. lii] (Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1909).—*Sancti Aureli Augustini Scripta contra Donatistas: Pars III: Liber de Unico Baptismo, Breuiculus Collationis cum Donatistis, Contra Partem Donati post Gesta, Sermo ad Caesariensis Ecclesiae Plebem, Gesta cum Emerito Donatistarum Episcopo, contra Gaudentium Donatistarum Episcopum Libri II, Appendix, Indices.* Recensuit M. PETSCHENIG [Corpus Scr. Eccl. Lat. vol. liii] (F. Tempsty, G. Freytag, Vienna & Leipzig, 1910).

HEARTIEST congratulations are due both to the editor and to the printers for the astounding rapidity with which the Vienna edition of the anti-Donatist works of St Augustine has been published. To pass nearly 1,500 octavo pages through the press in a period well under two years is a remarkable feat. With regard to the quality of the work the editor's name is sufficient guarantee.¹ Of the four manuscripts of the *Contra Litteras Petiliani* accessible to the Maurists three only can now be traced, and no fresh MSS have turned up. Two of them are of the twelfth century, one of the eleventh, and all three have been collated afresh for this edition. There is some doubt about the title of the next work. It is commonly cited as *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, but on the faith of an Orléans MS (saec. xi), one of the two coeval surviving manuscripts, Petschenig has given it the more accurate title. (In view of the fact that it is rarely possible to identify the MSS employed by the early editors, it is of interest to know that the second MS was used by Amorbach.) His study of the diction of the tractate has sufficed to remove all doubts on the subject raised by the Maurists. Time has been somewhat kindlier to the MS tradition of the *Contra Cresconium*. A study of the older surviving MSS, all of French provenance, three belonging to the ninth century and one to the tenth, renders it possible to reconstruct an archetype, probably of the Merovingian period. This archetype had the usual errors of that age, and the editor has found emendation not infrequently necessary. An extensive study of the form of the biblical quotations, an excellent test of the quality of an edition, has shewn that this new recension makes a great advance on its predecessors. There are some considerable passages quoted, for example, Acts xvii 16-23, xix 1-7, and Luke xxiv 44-53. The last I have thought it worth while to piece together, representing in capitals what is common to Augustine with Cyprian and *e* against the Vulgate, and in italics what is common to Augustine and the Vulgate.

¹ Cf. vol. xi p. 148 of the JOURNAL.

(44) *ISTI sunt SERMONES QUOS locutus sum ad uos cum adhuc essem uobiscum* QUIA oportebat impleri (OPORTET ADIMPLERI) omnia (quae) scripta [sunt] in lege [Moysi] et prophetis et psalmis de me (45) *tunc aperuit eis (illis) sensum ut intellegerent scripturas et dixit eis (ILLIS)* (46) *quoniam (QUIA) sic scriptum est et sic oportebat Christum pati et resurgere [a mortuis] [TERTIA DIE]* (47) *et praedicari in nomine eius (suo) paenitentiam et remissionem peccatorum per (in) omnes gentes incipientibus (INCIPIENS) ab HIERUSALEM.*

(48) *ET UOS testes horum (horum testes) (49) et ego mitto PROMISIONEM MEAM SUPER uos uos autem sedete in ciuitate quoad usque induamini uirtute ex alto* (50) *PRODUXIT autem ILLOS usque Bethaniam et LEUAUIT MANUS SUAS ET benedixit ILLOS* (51) *et factum est CUM BENEDIXISSET ILLOS DISCESSIT ab eis* (52) *et ipsi REUERSI sunt cum gaudio magno in Hierusalem* (53) *et fuerunt semper in templo LAUDANTES deum.*

This mosaic admirably illustrates Augustine's way of citing small portions of the Gospel after 400.

Some corrections may be suggested. On p. 47, ll. 12-15, the words left unspaced should be spaced, as they belonged to Petilian's Bible, which has hardly received from students the attention it deserves. On p. 122, l. 12, *saltem* should surely have been printed in the text, despite the fact that this form is repudiated in the orthographical index of vol. liii: my own impression is that I have never seen *saltem* in a good MS. On p. 123, l. 8, *Dani(h)elum* should be read. On p. 154, l. 9, space *manifesta opera carnis*. On p. 270, l. 3, *conuertimus nos* should be read with Augustine elsewhere and other Africans: *conuertimur* is Vulgate. Similarly on p. 338, l. 3, *superstitiosos* should be read, as *superstitiosiores* is Vulgate. On p. 375, ll. 3-4, the echo of Col. iii 14 should have been noted. In the index, add an asterisk to Act. ix 4-5, and delete the 5; add an asterisk also to Rom. iii 10-18, as it is not quite identical with the Vulgate; after Phil. i 18 for '322' read '332'.

Of the *De Unico Baptismo* there is a goodly crop of MSS, of which two are of the ninth century and two of the tenth. (In naming certain of the MSS Dr Petschenig has written 'Philippicus' for 'Phillippicus', and 'Durhamensis' for 'Dunelmensis'.) Of the *Breuiulus Collationis cum Donatistis* the editor has not been successful in finding a manuscript copy. Like his predecessors, therefore, he has had to depend on the *editio princeps* of Amorbach, which, however, was printed from a good MS. The *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta* (generally known as the *Ad Donatistas post Collationem*) is preserved in a sixth-century semiuncial MS, but all the MSS are descended from a defective archetype. A thirteenth-century Grenoble manuscript of indifferent worth

is the solitary representative of the next work on the list, of which the Maurists knew no copy at all. Of the two books *Contra Gaudentium* also a solitary MS has survived (British Museum, Add. MSS 17,291 (saec. xii)), identical with the 'Parcensis' of the Louvain editors: this unfortunately is descended from an archetype which had lost a number of leaves. The appendix contains new editions of two spurious treatises which the Maurists give in their edition, namely the *Sermo de Rusticiano subdiacono*, first published in the middle of the seventeenth century from a MS now lost, and the much more interesting, if rather stupid, *Libellus aduersus Fulgentium Donatistam*. Of the first no MS is now known, but the text of the second has been signally improved by the advent of the Reichenau MS xcv (saec. x). Its Biblical text is of some importance: for instance, its text of Matt. xxiv 41 agrees with *e* in the striking rendering *molendino*. On p. 101, l. 2, *Laudociae* is surely nothing more than an unconscious assimilation to *Cappadociae*: a MS tradition which could preserve *Zmyrnae* can hardly have exhibited *Laudociae* in its archetype. The text of Act. i 6-9 (pp. 219-220) could have been safely devulgarized from other parts of Augustine. On p. 298, l. 21, I should read *resisterunt* with the better MSS.

The plan of the Vienna *Corpus* provides for an index of scripture references at the end of each volume, but other indexes are reserved for the ends of sections, in cases where the authors are voluminous. Thus it happens that, whereas the *Corpus* in all now contains fifteen volumes of Augustine apart from the anti-Donatist works, this is the first section to be completed. Volume liii contains, therefore, in addition to the scripture index, an index 'nominum et rerum', twenty-nine pages long, which all students of the Donatist movement will find invaluable, and also an index 'uerborum et elocutionum' of ninety-eight pages, which from the point of view of other students is equally, if not more, valuable. In fact the last has a very special significance. It happens to be the best and fullest guide published to the language of Augustine, and is quite indispensable to the serious student of that author. An index of orthography at the end appeals to a smaller circle, but is very welcome. In the way of surprises it can hardly be said to contain much: but the absence of *cottidie*, *saltem*, and *scisma*, is significant. With regard to the form *triticum*, Petschenig mentions that it occurs in the great semi-uncial Hilary of St Peter's (saec. vi), but it is found also in such MSS as *b* and *ff*² of the Gospels, Buchanan having shewn that Bianchini and others ignored it. Examples are Matt. iii 12 (*b*), xiii 25 (*b*), 29 (*b*, *ff*²), 30 (*b*, *ff*²), Ioh. xii 24 (*b*), Lc. iii 17 (*b*), xvi 7 (*b*), xxii 31 (*b*), Mc. iv 28 (*b*).¹ Doubtless the evidence for this form will accumulate as time goes on.

¹ In the case of *b*, I am beholden to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press for a copy of the sheets of *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* vi.

Now that Dr Petschenig has completed his task, which has often been one of great difficulty, it is no more than his due to express our sense of the thoroughly able and satisfactory manner in which he has performed it, and to wish him an equal success with those works of Hilary and Ambrose, of which he is preparing editions.

ALEX. SOUTER.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE APOCALYPSE OF PETER.

PAGE 49.

Thanks to the kindness of Dr A. E. Cowley and Mr E. O. Winstedt, I am able to add a small portion of another Greek text of the Apocalypse, which is contained on a vellum fragment assigned to the fifth century, acquired in 1895 from Egypt by the Bodleian Library, and now classed as MS Gr. theol. f. 4 (P) (no. 31810 in Madan's Summary Catalogue). It had been conjecturally assigned to the Apocalypse, and on comparison with the Ethiopic it proves to contain a passage corresponding to that on p. 49 descriptive of the punishment of idolaters. The fragment is a leaf of a tiny vellum book which contained a single column of thirteen lines of eight to ten letters each on each page. The recto, so far as Mr Winstedt has been able to decipher it, reads: (γυ)ναῖκες κ. | . . νντες ἀλύ(ς)εις καὶ μα(ς)ιγοῦντε(ς) | (ἐα)ντοὺς ἐμ(πρ)όσθεν τ(ού)(τ)ων εἰδῶλ(ων) | (τ)ῶν πλάν(ων) | καὶ ἀναν(α)πιστῶς (ἐ)ξ(ε)ουσιν τῇ(ν) | κόλασιν. | καὶ ἔγγυσ . .

Missing or doubtful letters are placed between (). The writing on the verso is very faint. It ends with a passage analogous to οἱ ἀφέντες τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (the last words of the Akhmim text), but in different phraseology.

We seem to have here a relic of another shortened text of the Apocalypse, —shortened, that is, by comparison with the Ethiopic, which, we have seen reason to believe, gives a text nearer to that which was in the hands of Clement of Alexandria and Methodius.

At the beginning we must supply something like ἄλλοι ἄνδρες καὶ (γυναῖκες): the participle that follows ought to be, one imagines, some such word as φοροῦντες, ἔλκοντες, σύροντες: but the initial κ seems plain. Α τῶν has probably slipped out before εἰδῶλων: there is no room for it in the manuscript.

The employment of the future tense (ἐξουσιν) is noteworthy as agreeing with the Ethiopic: on the verso Mr Winstedt reads ἔσονται ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες.

PAGE 53.

M. Grébaut has had the great kindness to lend me the proofs of a further instalment of his translation of the Ethiopic text. It begins with a section corresponding pretty closely to §§ 2-4 James 4-14 Preuschen. Then follow traces of § 5 James 15-20 Preuschen. After this is a somewhat obscure narrative introducing most of the elements of the Transfiguration. The section ends: 'We prayed and came down from the mountain, glorifying the Lord because He had written the names of the righteous in the book of life which is in the heavens.' Peter then addresses Clement. The substance of what he says has been given very shortly in the analysis. It is noteworthy that twice over there occur portions of the description of the righteous in glory, borrowed from the Apocalypse. But, speaking generally, this address to Clement is of late complexion and very diffuse and evasive. I cannot as yet pronounce with any confidence as to the amount of old material which is worked up in it. For one thing, M. Grébaut's translation does not extend to the end of the tract. The impression remains on my mind that the old Apocalypse contained some teaching as to the possibility of ultimate salvation of sinners. The Ethiopic writer is constantly leading up to this and then retreating. There are repeated injunctions to Peter not to reveal the mystery of the mercy of God to sinners, because they will defer their repentance: but what form that mercy will take is never (or not as yet) clearly stated. I am reluctantly obliged to withhold for the present a more detailed account of this portion of M. Grébaut's work.

M. R. J.