



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



*The*  
*Journal of Theological Studies*

VOLUME IV



STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

*The*  
*Journal of Theological Studies*

VOLUME IV





*The Journal*  
*of*  
*Theological Studies*

VOLUME IV

London  
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED  
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1903

769467

*COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION:*

Rev. DR. INCE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford.

Rev. DR. SWETE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

Rev. DR. DRIVER, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

Rev. DR. KIRKPATRICK, The Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity, Cambridge.

Rev. DR. LOCK, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

Very Rev. DR. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, Dean of Westminster ; late Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

Rev. DR. SANDAY, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford.

Rev. DR. STANTON, Ely Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

*EDITORS:*

Rev. H. A. WILSON, Magdalen College, Oxford.

W. EMERY BARNES, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Peterhouse, Cambridge.



## I

## INDEX OF WRITERS

	PAGE
ABBOTT, G. F.	
THE REPORT AND DEATH OF PILATE . . . . .	83
ARENDZEN, Rev. J., Ph.D.	
THE XXXII CANON OF HIPPLYTUS . . . . .	282
BARNES, Rev. W. E., D.D.	
A STUDY OF THE FIRST LESSON FOR CHRISTMAS DAY . . . . .	17
A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE (ISAIAH XLI 5-7) . . . . .	266
OLD TESTAMENT CHRONICLE . . . . .	449
BARTLET, J. V.	
NOTE ON ACTS XII 25 . . . . .	438
BATE, Rev. H. N.	
NEW TESTAMENT CHRONICLE . . . . .	301
BEBB, Rev. LL. J. M.	
ADDRESSES ON THE ACTS (Archbishop Benson, <i>Addresses on     the Acts of the Apostles</i> ) . . . . .	444
BIBLE STUDIES (G. A. Deissmann, <i>Bible Studies, contributions     chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the history of the     language, the literature, and the religion of Hellenistic     Judaism and primitive Christianity</i> ) . . . . .	618
BETHUNE-BAKER, Rev. J. F., B.D.	
TERTULLIAN'S USE OF SUBSTANTIA, NATURA, AND PERSONA	440
THE AGE OF THE FATHERS (W. Bright, <i>The Age of the Fathers,     being Chapters in the History of the Church during the     fourth and fifth centuries</i> ) . . . . .	621
BEVAN, A. A.	
THE KING OF TYRE IN EZEKIEL XXVIII . . . . .	500
BISHOP, E.	
ON SOME EARLY MSS OF THE GREGORIANUM . . . . .	411
ON THE EARLY TEXTS OF THE ROMAN CANON . . . . .	555
BLAKISTON, Rev. H. E. D., B.D.	
THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER . . . . .	548
BRIGHTMAN, Rev. F. E.	
CHRONICLE OF LITURGICA . . . . .	142
BURKITT, F. C.	
SARBÔG, SHURUPPAK . . . . .	125
THE INTERPRETATION OF 'BAR-JESUS' . . . . .	127
THE SYRIAC INTERPRETATION OF S. JOHN I 3-4 . . . . .	436

	PAGE
ON SOME CHRISTIAN GRAVESTONES FROM OLD DONGOLA . . . . .	585
ON CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (#) . . . . .	587
CHAPMAN, DOM.	
THE ORDER OF THE TREATISES AND LETTERS IN THE MSS OF ST. CYPRIAN . . . . .	103
CHARLES, Rev. R. H., D.D.	
THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES (J. Geffcken, <i>Die Oracula Sibyllina</i> )	446
THE BOOK OF ENOCH (J. Flemming, <i>Das Buch Henoch</i> ; Aethiopischer Text : J. Flemming and L. Radermacher, <i>Das   Buch Henoch</i> ; Greek Text) . . . . .	614
CODRINGTON, H. W.	
THE SYRIAN LITURGIES OF THE PRESANCTIFIED . . . . .	69
COWLEY, A. E.	
ORIENTALIA . . . . .	624
CRUM, W. E.	
TEXTS ATTRIBUTED TO PETER OF ALEXANDRIA . . . . .	387
DERMER, Rev. E. C., B.D.	
MISCELLANEA (A. J. Worledge, <i>Prayer</i> : and other works) . . . . .	628
DOWDEN, Right Rev. J., D.D. (Bishop of Edinburgh).	
NOTES ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS OF ST. ANDREWS FROM A.D. 1093 TO A.D. 1571. I. . . . .	593
DRIVER, Rev. S. R., D.D.	
NOTE ON ISAIAH XLI 5-7 . . . . .	434
FRERE, Rev. W. H.	
THE CONNEXION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND NORMAN RITES . . . . .	206
GAYFORD, Rev. S. C.	
CHRONICLE OF DOGMATICA . . . . .	460
GRAY, Rev. G. B., D.D.	
A QUESTIONABLE PLURAL IN HEBREW . . . . .	124
GWILLIAM, Rev. G. H., B.D.	
THE PUNCTUATION OF ST. JOHN I 3-4 IN THE PESHITTO . . . . .	606
HART, J. H. A.	
THE NEW SEPTUAGINT FRAGMENT . . . . .	215
NOTE ON ENOCH IN SIR. XLIV 16 . . . . .	590
NOTE ON SIR. XLVIII 17 <i>a, b</i> . . . . .	591
HEADLAM, Rev. A. C., B.D.	
THE EDITIONS AND MSS OF EUSEBIUS: PART I . . . . .	93
HOLMES, Rev. R.	
THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION . . . . .	543
JAMES, M. R., Litt.D.	
INVENTIONES NOMINUM . . . . .	218
JOHNS, Rev. C. H. W.	
THE CODE OF HĀMMURABI, FRESH MATERIAL FOR COM- PARISON WITH THE MOSAIC CODE . . . . .	172
KENNEDY, Rev. H. A. A., D.Sc.	
THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION . . . . .	270
KING, Rev. E. G., D.D.	
PSALM CX . . . . .	338

*The*  
*Journal of Theological Studies*

VOLUME IV



## II

### INDEX OF ARTICLES

	PAGE
CHRISTMAS DAY, A STUDY OF THE FIRST LESSON FOR. Rev. W. E. Barnes, D.D. . . . . .	By the 17
<b>CHRONICLE:</b>	
CHURCH HISTORY. Rev. E. W. Watson . . . . .	310
DOGMATICA. Rev. S. C. Gayford . . . . .	460
LITURGICA. Rev. F. E. Brightman . . . . .	142
NEW TESTAMENT (ENGLISH BOOKS). Rev. H. N. Bate . . . . .	301
OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS. Rev. W. E. Barnes, D.D. . . . .	449
'CONTENTIO VERITATIS.' By the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. . . . .	1
<b>DOCUMENTS:</b>	
AMBROSIASTER ON 2 CORINTHIANS, THE GENUINE PROLOGUE TO. By A. Souter . . . . .	89
INVENTIONES NOMINUM. By M. R. James, Litt.D. . . . .	218
PETER OF ALEXANDRIA, TEXTS ATTRIBUTED TO. By W. E. Crum . . . . .	387
PILATE, THE REPORT AND DEATH OF. By G. F. Abbott . . . . .	83
PRESANCTIFIED, THE SYRIAN LITURGIES OF THE. By H. W. Codrington . . . . .	69
SEPTUAGINT, THE NEW FRAGMENT. By J. H. A. Hart . . . . .	215
ST. CYPRIAN, AN UNCIAL FRAGMENT OF THE 'AD DONATUM' OF. By Dom Ramsay . . . . .	86
HAMMURABI, THE CODE OF: FRESH MATERIAL FOR COMPARISON WITH THE MOSAIC CODE. By the Rev. C. H. W. Johns . . . . .	172
MOBERLY, ROBERT CAMPBELL. By the Rev. W. Sanday, D.D. . . . .	481
MONASTERIES, THE GREEK, IN SOUTH ITALY. By the Rev. K. Lake . . . . .	345, 517
<b>NOTES AND STUDIES:</b>	
A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE (ISAIAH XLI 5-7). By the Rev. W. E. Barnes, D.D. . . . .	266
AN EARLY IRISH LITURGICAL FRAGMENT. By the Rev. F. E. Warren, B.D. . . . .	610
A NEW SEPTUAGINT FRAGMENT. By the Rev. C. Taylor, D.D. . . . .	130
A POSSIBLE VIEW OF ROMANS X 13-21. By the Rev. H. Pope . . . . .	273
A POSSIBLE VIEW OF ROMANS X 13-21. By the Rev. W. S. Wood . . . . .	608
A QUESTIONABLE PLURAL IN HEBREW. By the Rev. G. B. Gray, D.D. . . . .	124

	PAGE
NOTES AND STUDIES ( <i>continued</i> ):	
A RUSSIAN VIEW OF THE CREED OF CONSTANTINOPLE. By N. Orloff . . . . .	285
CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF LATIN MSS: III, THE LYONS-PETERSBURG MS OF COUNCILS. By C. H. Turner . . . . .	426
CYPRIANICA. By the Rev. E. W. Watson . . . . .	131
NOTE ON ACTS XII 25. By J. V. Bartlet . . . . .	438
NOTES ON THE BIBLICAL USE OF THE PRESENT AND AORIST IMPERATIVE. By the Rev. F. W. Mozley . . . . .	279
NOTES ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS OF ST. ANDREWS FROM A.D. 1093 to A.D. 1571. I. By the Right Rev. J. Dowden, D.D. (Bishop of Edinburgh) . . . . .	593
ON CODEX CLAROMONTANUS ( <i>h</i> ). By F. C. Burkitt . . . . .	587
ON SOME CHRISTIAN GRAVESTONES FROM OLD DONGOLA. By F. C. Burkitt . . . . .	585
ON SOME EARLY MSS OF THE GREGORIANUM. By E. Bishop . . . . .	411
ON THE EARLY TEXTS OF THE ROMAN CANON. By E. Bishop . . . . .	555
ON THE LXX OF ISAIAH V 14, 17, 18. By R. R. Ottley . . . . .	269
SARBÔG, SHURUPPAK. By F. C. Burkitt . . . . .	125
SIRACH XLVIII 17 <i>a, b</i> . By J. H. A. Hart . . . . .	591
TERTULLIAN'S USE OF SUBSTANTIA, NATURA, AND PERSONA. By the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, B.D. . . . .	440
THE EDITIONS AND MSS OF EUSEBIUS: PART I. By the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D. . . . .	93
THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF JEREMIAH. By H. St. J. Thackeray . . . . .	245
THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF EZEKIEL. By H. St. J. Thackeray . . . . .	398
THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF THE PROPHETICAL BOOKS. By H. St. J. Thackeray . . . . .	578
THE INTERPRETATION OF 'BAR-JESUS.' By F. C. Burkitt . . . . .	127
THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By the Rev. H. E. D. Blakiston, B.D. . . . .	548
THE ORDER OF THE TREATISES AND LETTERS IN THE MSS OF ST. CYPRIAN. By Dom Chapman . . . . .	103
THE PERICOPE OF THE ADULTERESS. By the Rev. C. Taylor, D.D. . . . .	129
THE PUNCTUATION OF ST. JOHN I 3, 4 IN THE PESHITTO. By the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D. . . . .	606
THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION. By the Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sc. . . . .	270
THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION. By the Rev. R. Holmes . . . . .	543
THE SYRIAC INTERPRETATION OF ST. JOHN I 3, 4. By F. C. Burkitt . . . . .	436
THE XXXII CANON OF HIPPOLYTUS. By the Rev. J. Arendzen, Ph.D. . . . .	282
THREE PASSAGES IN SS. IGNATIUS AND POLYCARP. By the Rev. T. Nicklin . . . . .	443



INDEX OF ARTICLES

xi

PAGE

NOTES AND STUDIES (*continued*):

TWO NOTES ON ENOCH IN SIR. XLIV 16. By the Rev. C. Taylor, D.D., and J. H. A. Hart . . . . .	589
TWO NOTES ON ISAIAH XLI 5, 7. By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., and the Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D. . . . .	434
PALAEOGRAPHY AND ITS USES. By A. Souter . . . . .	506
PASSOVER, THE, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER. By the Rev. J. C. Lambert, B.D. . . . .	184
PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES. By the Rev. H. B. Swete, D.D. . . . .	321
PERSONALITY, A RELIGIOUS VIEW OF HUMAN. By the (late) Rev. R. C. Moberly, D.D. . . . .	161
PSALM CX. By the Rev. E. G. King, D.D. . . . .	328
PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION. By C. C. J. Webb . . . . .	46
'REASON AND REVELATION.' By the Rev. C. J. Shebpeare . . . . .	369
RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES . . . . .	155, 317, 475, 636

REVIEWS:

H. ACHELIS. <i>Virgines Subintroductae</i> . By the Rev. E. W. Watson . . . . .	633
BENSON (Archbishop). <i>Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles</i> . By the Rev. Ll. J. M. Bebb . . . . .	444
W. BRIGHT. <i>The Age of the Fathers, being Chapters in the History of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries</i> . By the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, B.D. . . . .	621
E. W. BROOKS. <i>The sixth book of the Select Letters of Severus</i> . By A. E. Cowley . . . . .	627
<i>Cambridge Modern History, The: vol. i. The Renaissance</i> . By the Rev. E. W. Watson . . . . .	634
W. CUNNINGHAM. <i>The Gospel of Mark</i> . By the Rev. E. C. Dermer, B.D. . . . .	631
G. A. DEISSMANN. <i>Bible Studies, contributions chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the history of the language, the literature, and the religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity</i> . By the Rev. Ll. J. M. Bebb . . . . .	618
A. M. FAIRBAIRN. <i>The Philosophy of the Christian Religion</i> . By C. C. J. Webb . . . . .	291
J. FLEMMING. <i>Das Buch Henoch: Aethiopischer Text</i> . J. FLEMMING AND L. RADERMACHER. <i>Das Buch Henoch: Greek Text</i> . By the Rev. R. H. Charles, D.D. . . . .	614
J. GEFFCKEN. <i>Die Oracula Sibyllina</i> . By the Rev. R. H. Charles, D.D. . . . .	446
H. GOLLANZ. <i>The Ethical Treatises of Berachya</i> . By A. E. Cowley . . . . .	624
G. H. GWILLIAM. <i>Place of the Peshitto Version in the Apparatus Criticus of the Greek New Testament</i> [Studia Biblica, v 3]. By A. E. Cowley . . . . .	625



	PAGE
REVIEWS ( <i>continued</i> ):	
S. JONES. <i>England and the Holy See. An Essay towards Reunion.</i> By the Rev. E. C. Dermer, B.D. . . . .	629
A. S. LEWIS. <i>Apocrypha Syriaca</i> [Studia Sinaitica, xi]. By A. E. Cowley . . . . .	626
S. SCHECHTER. <i>Midrash Hag-gadol.</i> By A. E. Cowley . . . . .	624
A. J. WORLLEDGE. <i>Prayer.</i> By the Rev. E. C. Dermer, B.D. . . . .	628
H. ZIMMER. <i>Pelagius in Irland: Texte und Untersuchungen sur patristischen Litteratur.</i> By C. H. Turner . . . . .	132
H. ZIMMER. <i>The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland.</i> By the Rev. E. W. Watson . . . . .	632
rites, THE CONNEXION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND NORMAN. By the Rev. W. H. Frere . . . . .	206
ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, A PARTITION THEORY OF. By the Rev. W. Lock, D.D. . . . .	194
'SUBSTANCE,' THE HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL TERM: PART III. By the Very Rev. T. B. Strong, D.D. . . . .	28
TYRE, THE KING OF, IN EZEKIEL XXVIII. By A. A. Bevan . . . . .	500

### III

## INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS REVIEWED, NOTICED, OR DISCUSSED

	PAGE
ACHELIS, H. <i>Virgines Subintroductae</i> . . . . .	633 f
ALLEN, T. W. <i>Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts</i> . . . . .	525
ALLEN, W. C. <i>The Aramaic Element in St. Mark</i> [Expository Times, April 1902] . . . . .	186
ASEWITH, E. H. <i>An Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles</i> . . . . .	306 f
<i>Auctarium Solesmense</i> . . . . .	145
BARNSELY, S. H. (see SCHULTZ, R. W.)	
BATIFFOL, P. <i>Agape</i> [Dictionnaire de théologie] . . . . .	142
<i>Études d'histoire et de théologie positive</i> . . . . .	143 f, 327, 331, 336
<i>L'Abbaye de Rossano</i> . . . . .	523 f, 533, 536, 540
BÄUMER, S. <i>Geschichte d. Breviers</i> . . . . .	424
<i>On the Sacramentarium Gelasianum</i> [Historisches Jahrbuch, 1893].	412 ff
BELSHEIM, J. <i>Évang. sec. Matth. e cod. olim Claramontano</i> . . . . .	587 f
BENSLY, R. L. (and JAMES, M. R.). <i>Fourth Book of Esdras</i> . . . . .	240
BENSON, E. W. <i>Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles</i> . . . . .	444 ff
<i>Cyprian</i> . . . . .	103, 333 f
BERTHOLDT. <i>Historisch-kritische Einleitung in Schriften des A. und N. Test.</i>	257 ff
BEVAN, A. A. <i>The Hymn of the Soul</i> [Texts and Studies, v 3] . . . . .	125
BISHOP, E. Appendix to Kuyper <i>Book of Cerne</i> . . . . .	148
BLAU, L. <i>Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen und zur bibl. Litteratur</i>	410
BLISS, W. H. <i>Calendar of Papal Registers</i> . . . . .	593 f
BOEHMER, J. <i>Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes</i> . . . . .	453
<i>Breviarium Bothanum</i> . . . . .	147 f
BRIGHT, W. <i>The Age of the Fathers, being Chapters in the History of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries</i> . . . . .	622 ff
BRIGHTMAN, F. E. <i>Liturgies Eastern and Western</i> . . . . .	69, 587
<i>British School at Rome, Papers of the, vol. i, 1902</i> . . . . .	144
BROOKS, E. W. <i>The sixth book of the Select Letters of Severus: Syriac text and translation</i> . . . . .	627
BUDDE, K. <i>Samuel</i> [Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A. T., Lieferung 18] . . . . .	457
BULLEN, F. T. <i>With Christ at Sea</i> . . . . .	59
BURKITT, F. C. Tyconius, 'Rules' . . . . .	252
BURY, J. B. <i>Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire</i> . . . . .	393
CAIRD, E. <i>Christianity and the Historic Christ</i> [New World Review, 1896]	292
<i>Cambridge Modern History, The. Vol. i, The Renaissance</i> . . . . .	634 f
CAMPBELL, J. MACLEOD. <i>The Nature of the Atonement</i> . . . . .	498
CARPENTER, J. E. (and HARFORD, G.). <i>The Composition of the Hexateuch</i> . . . . .	454 f
CERIANI, A. M. <i>Monumenta Sacra et Profana</i> . . . . .	261
<i>Notitia Liturgiae Ambrosianae</i> . . . . .	556, 561, 563 f
CHARLES, R. H. <i>The Book of Jubilees</i> . . . . .	591

	PAGE
CHASE, F. H. <i>The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles</i> [Hulsean Lectures]	305 f
CHATELAIN, E. <i>Uncialis Scriptura Codicum Latinorum</i> , Fasc. i . . . . .	86
CHEVALIER, U. <i>Ordinaire et Coutumier de l'Église cathédrale de Bayeux</i> [Bibliothèque Liturgique] . . . . .	207
CHEYNE, T. K. <i>Crítica Biblica</i> , Part i . . . . .	456
<i>Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text of Isaiah</i> . . . . .	266
<i>Introduction to Isaiah</i> . . . . .	19, 266
<i>Jewish Religious Life</i> . . . . .	19
<i>Prophecies of Isaiah</i> , 4th edition . . . . .	269 f
CHWOLSON, D. <i>Das letzte Passahmahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes</i> . . . . .	185 f
COMPTON, B. <i>Sacrifice</i> , 2nd edition . . . . .	463
<i>Contentio Veritatis</i> , by Six Oxford Tutors . . . . .	1 ff
COOK, S. A. <i>A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus</i> [Proc. of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, Jan. 1903] . . . . .	454
CORNILL, C. H. <i>Das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel</i> . . . . .	405, 453, 505
COUSIN, V. <i>Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard</i> . . . . .	30, 32, 36
<i>Opera Abelardi</i> . . . . .	30, 35, 37
CRUM, W. E. <i>Coptic Ostraca</i> [Egyptian Exploration Fund] . . . . .	143 f
CUNNINGHAM, W. <i>The Gospel of Work</i> . . . . .	631 f
DALMAN, G. <i>The Words of Jesus</i> [tr. by D. M. Kay] . . . . .	302 f
DAUBNEY, W. H. <i>The use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church</i> . . . . .	470
DAVIDSON, A. B. <i>Biblical and Literary Essays</i> . . . . .	456
DEISSMANN, G. A. <i>Bible Studies, contributions chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the history of the language, the literature, and the religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity</i> : trans. by A. Grieve . . . . .	618 ff
DELEHAYE, H. Fragments attributed to Peter of Alexandria [Anal. Boll. xx]	387
DELITZSCH, FRANZ. <i>Jesaja</i> . . . . .	26
DEWICK, E. S. <i>Horas de beata Maria Virgine</i> [Henry Bradshaw Society, 1902]	147
Metz Pontifical [Roxburghe Club, 1902] . . . . .	147
<i>Dictionary of the Bible</i> , ed. J. Hastings. 187, 191, 261 f, 309, 398, 409, 449 f, 548	
<i>Dictionary of Christian Biography</i> , s. vv. Josephus, Marcion . . . . .	259, 325
DIETRICH, G. <i>Isó dádh</i> . . . . .	458
DOBSCHÜTZ, E. VON. <i>Die urchristlichen Gemeinden</i> . . . . .	310
DREWS, P. <i>Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe</i> . . . . .	146
DRIVER, S. R. <i>Introduction to the Old Testament</i> . . . . .	247, 255 ff
DUCHESNE, L. <i>Origines du culte chrétien</i> . . . . .	415
DUHM, B. <i>Jesaja</i> . . . . .	20, 23, 266
EBNER, A. <i>Iter Italicum</i> . . . . .	412 ff, 420, 423, 425, 556, 570 f
EDERSHEIM, A. <i>Josephus</i> [Dictionary of Christian Biography] . . . . .	259
EICHHORN, J. G. <i>Repertorium für biblische u. morgenländische Litteratur</i> . . . . .	258
<i>Einleitung in das A. T.</i> . . . . .	258
<i>Encyclopedia Biblica</i> , ed. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black . . . . .	258 f, 307 ff, 450
<i>Euchologion of the Alexandrine Church</i> . . . . .	154
EUSEBIUS, Editions of the <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> of . . . . .	93 ff
FAIRBAIRN, A. M. <i>The Philosophy of the Christian Religion</i> . . . . .	291 ff
FEUERBACH, L. <i>Essence of Christianity</i> , tr. M. A. Evans . . . . .	384
FLEMING, J. <i>Das Buch Henoch</i> . Aethiopischer Text . . . . .	616 f
(AND RADERMACHER, L.) <i>Das Buch Henoch</i> : Greek Version and German Translation . . . . .	614 f
FORBES, G. H. <i>Bobbio Missal</i> . . . . .	563, 574
FRANKLAND, W. B. <i>The Early Eucharist</i> . . . . .	549



INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS

XV

	PAGE
FRANZ, A. <i>Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter</i> . . . . .	572 f
FRERE, W. H. <i>Bibliotheca Musico-liturgica</i> . . . . .	149
<i>Pontifical Services illustrated from miniatures of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries</i> [Alcuin Club] . . . . .	146 f
<i>Use of Sarum, vol. ii</i> . . . . .	149
(and see Procter, F.)	
FUNK, F. X. <i>Kirchengeschichte</i> . . . . .	11
GAIRDNER, J. <i>The English Church in the Sixteenth Century</i> . . . . .	314 f
GEE, H. <i>The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments</i> . . . . .	151 f
GEFFCKEN, J. <i>Die Oracula Sibyllina</i> . . . . .	446 ff
GERBERT, M. <i>Monumenta Liturgica</i> . . . . .	570 f, 573
GIBSON, M. D. (see LEWIS, A. S.)	
GILLERT. <i>The St. Petersburg MS of Councils</i> [Neues Archiv, v] . . . . .	432 f
GLOVER, T. R. <i>Life and Letters in the Fourth Century</i> . . . . .	313 f
GOLLANZ, H. <i>The Ethical Treatises of Berachya</i> . . . . .	624
GRIEVE, A. (see DEISSMANN, G. A.)	
GWILLIAM, G. H. <i>Place of the Peshitto Version in the Apparatus Criticus of the Greek New Testament</i> [Studia Biblica, v 3] . . . . .	625 f
(and PUSEY, P. E.) <i>Tetraeuangelium Sacrum</i> . . . . .	436 ff, 606 f
HADDAN, A. W., and STUBBS, W. <i>Councils</i> . . . . .	595 ff
HAMMOND, C. E. <i>Liturgies</i> . . . . .	280
HANEBERG, D. B. VON. <i>Canones S. Hippolyti</i> . . . . .	282
HARFORD, G. (see CARPENTER, J. E.)	
HARMER, J. R. (see LIGHTFOOT, J. B.)	
HARNACK, A.	
<i>The Creed of Constantinople</i> [Herzog's Realencyclopädie] . . . . .	285
<i>Die Aufgabe der theologischen Facultäten und die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte</i> . . . . .	316, 464 ff
<i>Dogmengeschichte</i> . . . . .	28 f, 34, 40, 42
<i>Das Wesen des Christentums</i> . . . . .	298
<i>On the Agape and the Eucharist</i> [Texte und Untersuchungen, N. F. vii 2] . . . . .	190
<i>Sokrates und die alte Kirche</i> . . . . .	463 f
(and see PREUSCHEN, E.)	
HARRIS, J. RENDEL. <i>A curious Bezan Reading vindicated</i> [Expositor, March 1902] . . . . .	128
<i>Memoranda Sacra</i> . . . . .	546
HARTL, W. <i>S. Cypriani Opera</i> [Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat. 1868-1871] . . . . .	86, 103 ff, 115, 131
HAUCK, A. (see HERZOG, J. J.)	
HAURÉAU, B. <i>Histoire de la Philosophie scolastique</i> . . . . .	33
HEADLAM, A. C. (see SANDAY, W.)	
HEIDER, A. <i>Die aethiopische Bibelübersetzung</i> . . . . .	453 f
HERZOG, J. J. <i>Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i> , ed. 3 by Hauck . . . . .	34, 285
HÖFFDING, H. <i>Religionsphilosophie</i> . . . . .	48
HORNER, G. <i>The Service for the Consecration of a Church and Altar according to the Coptic rite</i> . . . . .	154
HORT, F. J. A. <i>Life and Letters</i> . . . . .	194, 198
<i>On Acts xii 25</i> [Westcott & Hort <i>Greek Testament</i> , vol. ii] . . . . .	304
<i>Two Dissertations</i> . . . . .	285

	PAGE
ILLINGWORTH, J. R. <i>Divine Immanence</i> . . . . .	372, 498
<i>Personality, Human and Divine</i> . . . . .	498
<i>Reason and Revelation</i> . . . . .	369 ff
IRVING, F. F. <i>The Ceremonial Use of Oil among the East Syrians</i> [Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association]. . . . .	154
JAMES, M. R. ( <i>see</i> BENSLEY, R. L. : <i>and also</i> RYLE, H. E.)	
JAMES, W. <i>The Varieties of Religious Experience</i> . . . . .	46 ff
<i>The Will to Believe</i> . . . . .	64
JASTROW, M. <i>Religion of Babylonia and Assyria</i> , Licff. 1, 2 : German translation . . . . .	456
JENSEN, P. <i>Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen</i> . . . . .	126 f
JEREMIAS, A. <i>Im Kampfe um Babel und Bibel</i> . . . . .	456
<i>Jewish Encyclopedia, The</i> , vol. iii . . . . .	450 f
JOHNS, C. H. W. <i>Assyrian Deeds and Documents</i> . . . . .	455
<i>The Oldest Code of Laws in the World</i> . . . . .	455 f
JOLY, H. <i>The Psychology of the Saints</i> . . . . .	58
JONES, S. <i>England and the Holy See: with an Introduction by Lord Halifax</i> . . . . .	629 ff
JÜLICHER, A. <i>Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weissäcker gewidmet</i> 187, 190	
KAHLE, P. <i>Der masoretische Text nach der Ueberlieferung der babylonischen Juden</i> . . . . .	453
KAY, D. M. ( <i>see</i> DALMAN, G.)	
KEATING, F. J. <i>The Agape and the Eucharist in the Early Church</i> . . . . .	142 f, 190
KELLING, <i>Geschichte der Arianischen Häresie</i> . . . . .	285
KEMBLE, J. M. <i>Salomon and Saturn</i> . . . . .	243
KING, E. G. <i>Psalms in Three Collections</i> . . . . .	456 f
KING, L. W. <i>Seven Tablets of Creation</i> . . . . .	452
KITTEL, R. <i>Die Bücher der Chronik</i> [Handkommentar zum A. T.] . . . . .	457 f
KNEUCKER, J. J. <i>Das Buch Baruch</i> . . . . .	246, 261 f, 265 f
KUYPERS, DOM. <i>The Prayer Book of Aedelmaid the Bishop, commonly called the Book of Cerne: with Appendix by E. Bishop</i> . . . . .	148 f
LAGARDE, P. DE. <i>Apostolic Constitutions</i> . . . . .	129
<i>Onomastica</i> . . . . .	129
LAWLOR, H. J. <i>Chapters on the Book of Mulling</i> . . . . .	588
LEBEDEFF, A. P. <i>On our Creed</i> . . . . .	285 ff
LECLERCQ, DOM H. <i>Les Martyrs. Tome I: Les temps néroniens et le deuxième siècle</i> . . . . .	311 f
LEGG, J. WICKHAM. <i>Three Coronation Orders</i> [Henry Bradshaw Society]. . . . .	152
LEGG, L. WICKHAM. <i>English Coronation Records</i> . . . . .	152
LENORMANT, F. <i>La Grande Grèce</i> . . . . .	349 f
LEWIS, A. S. <i>Apocrypha Syriaca</i> [Studia Sinaitica, xi] . . . . .	626 f
<i>and GIBSON, M. D.</i> . . . . .	627
LIGHTFOOT, J. B. <i>Colossians</i> . . . . .	202
<i>and HARMER, J. R. The Apostolic Fathers</i> . . . . .	265
LINDSAY, W. R. <i>Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation</i> . . . . .	510
<i>Liturgies, The Book of the Divine</i> [Beirut, 1900] . . . . .	154
LOWRIE, W. <i>Christian Art and Archaeology</i> . . . . .	143
LUMMIS, E. ( <i>see</i> WENDT, H. H.)	
MACCOLL, M. <i>The Reformation Settlement</i> . . . . .	315 f
MANEN, W. C. VAN. <i>Old Christian Literature, Paul, Philemon, Philippians</i> [Encyclopedia Biblica, vol. iii] . . . . .	308 f
MARSHALL, J. T. <i>Baruch</i> [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible] . . . . .	261 f



INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS

xvii

	PAGE
MARTI, K. <i>Das Buch Jesaia</i> [Handkommentar zum A. T.] . . . . .	19 f, 266 f
MARTIN. <i>Quatre mss. importants des Evangiles</i> . . . . .	523
MAYOR, J. E. B. <i>Latin Heptateuch</i> . . . . .	513
McCARTHY, B. <i>The Stone Missal</i> [Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, Literature and Antiquities, xxvii] . . . . .	555, 558 ff, 563, 567
MENZIES, A. <i>The Earliest Gospel: a historical study of the Gospel according to Mark</i> . . . . .	301 f
On Luke xxii 19-20 [Expositor, October 1899] . . . . .	187 f
MERCATI, G. <i>Antiche reliquie liturgiche Ambrosiane e Romane</i> [Studi e Testi 7, 1902] . . . . .	145 f
<i>D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano</i> . . . . .	103, 111 f
METALLINOS, E. <i>Imperial and Royal Coronation</i> . . . . .	153
MEYER, W. <i>An Early Irish Service Book</i> [Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1903, Heft 2] . . . . .	610 f
MINASI. <i>Lo Speleota</i> . . . . .	366, 534 f
<i>San Nilo</i> . . . . .	537 ff
<i>Miscellanea Cassinese</i> . . . . .	218
MOBERLY, R. C. <i>Atonement and Personality</i> . . . . .	375, 379, 381, 484 ff, 498
<i>Christ Our Life</i> . . . . .	487, 491
<i>Ministerial Priesthood</i> . . . . .	486
<i>The Incarnation as the Basis of Dogma</i> [Lux Mundi] . . . . .	487, 492, 496
Other Works and Pamphlets . . . . .	496 f
MOMMSEN, TH. <i>Römisches Strafrecht</i> . . . . .	311
MORTIMER, A. G. <i>The Eucharistic Sacrifice: an historical and theological investigation of the Sacrificial Conception of the Holy Eucharist in the Christian Church</i> . . . . .	460 ff
MÜNSTERBERG, H. <i>Psychology and Life</i> . . . . .	46
<i>Mysteries, A Book of the Ministry of the Holy</i> [Cairo, 1900] . . . . .	154
<i>Mysteries, The Order of the, with the three Anaphoras, according to the Rite of the Holy Church of the East Syrians or Chaldaeans</i> [Mosul, 1902] . . . . .	153
NESTLE, EB. <i>Septuagint</i> [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible] . . . . .	398
NITZSCH. <i>Boethius</i> [Herzog's Realencyclopädie] . . . . .	33 f
NÜLDEKE, TH. <i>Die alttestamentliche Litteratur</i> . . . . .	580, 589
NORRIS, J. P. <i>On the Chronology of John v-vi</i> [Journal of Philology, 1871] . . . . .	198 f
<i>Notizie storiche e topografiche intorno Metauria e Tauriana</i> . . . . .	537
NOWACK, W. <i>Die Bücher Samuelis</i> [Handkommentar zum A. T.] . . . . .	457
<i>Theologische Abhandlungen: Festschrift für H. J. Holtzmann</i> . . . . .	20
OLDEN, T. <i>On the Old Irish Rite of Consecration of Churches</i> [Transactions of St. Paul's Eccl. Soc. iv, 1897-1898] . . . . .	154
PAYNE-SMITH, R. <i>Jeremiah</i> [Speaker's Commentary] . . . . .	255
PLUMMER, A. <i>Lord's Supper</i> [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible] . . . . .	187
POWER, M. <i>The Anglo-Jewish Calendar for every day in the Gospels</i> . . . . .	192 f
PREUSCHEN, E. <i>Manuscripts of Eusebius</i> [Harnack, <i>Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur</i> ] . . . . .	102
PROCKSCH, O. <i>Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Ueberlieferung bei den vorzivilischen Propheten</i> . . . . .	452 f, 501
PROCTER, F. <i>A New History of the Book of Common Prayer: revised by W. H. Frere</i> . . . . .	150 f
PURCHAS, H. T. <i>Johannine Problems and Modern Needs</i> . . . . .	310 f
PUSEY, P. E. (and GWILLIAM, G. H.). <i>Tetraevangelium Sanctum</i> . . . . .	437
RACKHAM, R. B. <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> . . . . .	303 f

	PAGE
RADERMACHER, L. (see FLEMMING, J.)	
RAHMANI, I. E. <i>Prayers of Simple Days</i> [Sharfeh, 1902] . . . . .	153
<i>Testamentum Domini</i> . . . . .	337
RAINE, J. <i>Historians of the Church of York</i> . . . . .	598
RAINY, R. <i>The Ancient Catholic Church</i> . . . . .	312 f
RAMSAY, W. M. <i>The Church in the Roman Empire</i> . . . . .	513
RÉCÉJAC, E. <i>La Connaissance mystique</i> . . . . .	67
<i>Religion in Oxford</i> [Church Quarterly Review, October, 1902] . . . . .	481 ff
RICHMOND, W. <i>Personality as a Philosophical Principle</i> . . . . .	498
RHEDEL, W. <i>Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alex.</i> . . . .	282 f
RITSCHL, A. <i>Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung</i> . . . . .	499
ROBERTSON, A. <i>Regnum Dei</i> [Bampton Lectures] . . . . .	466
ROBINSON, J. ARMITAGE. <i>A Study of the Gospels</i> . . . . .	303
ROCCHI, DOM. <i>Codices Cryptenses</i> . . . . .	519 ff, 536
<i>De Coenobio Cryptoferratensi</i> . . . . .	542
<i>La Badia di Grotta Ferrata</i> . . . . .	542
RODOTA, P. P. <i>Il Rito Greco</i> . . . . .	540 f
ROYCE, J. <i>The World and the Individual</i> [Gifford Lectures] . . . . .	297
RYLE, H. E. <i>Canon of the Old Testament</i> . . . . .	583
(AND JAMES, M. R.) <i>The Psalms of Solomon</i> . . . . .	261
SABATIER, A. <i>Esquisse d'une Philosophie de Religion</i> . . . . .	48
SANDAY, W. <i>The Cheltenham List of the Treatises of St. Cyprian</i> [Studia Biblica, iii] . . . . .	105, 111, 123
<i>Jesus Christ</i> [Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible] . . . . .	187, 191
(AND HEADLAM, A. C.). <i>Epistle to the Romans</i> . . . . .	274
SAYCE, A. H. <i>Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia</i> [Gifford Lectures] . . . . .	452
SCHECHTER, S. <i>Midrash Hag-gadol</i> . . . . .	624 f
SCHERL, V. <i>The Code of Hammurabi</i> [Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse: published by the French Minister of Public Instruction] 172, 174	
SCHMIDT, C. <i>Text attributed to Peter of Alexandria</i> [Texte und Unter- suchungen, N. F. v 4, 1901] . . . . .	387
SCHMIDT, W. <i>The Creed of Constantinople</i> [Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1899] . . . . .	285
SCHMIDEL, P. W. <i>Briefe an die Thessalonicher und Korinther</i> [Hand- kommentar zum N. T.] . . . . .	190
<i>Jesus Christ and Ministry</i> [Encyclopedia Biblica] . . . . .	295, 307 f
On the text of Luke xxii 19-20 [Protestantische Monatshefte, 1899] . . . . .	187
SCHRADER, E. <i>Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament</i> , third edition [edited by ZIMMERN, H., and WINCKLER, H.] . . . . .	21, 451 f
SCHÜRER, E. <i>History of the Jewish People</i> . . . . .	259, 261
SCHULHOF, J. M. <i>The Law of Forgiveness as presented in the New Testament:</i> <i>A Study in Biblical Theology</i> . . . . .	474
SCHULTZ, R. W. (AND BARNESLEY, S. H.). <i>The Monastery of St. Luke of</i> <i>Stiris in Phocis, and the dependent monastery of St. Nicolas in the</i> <i>Fields near Skripou in Boeotia</i> . . . . .	144 f
SCHWARTZ, E. <i>Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos</i> [Texte und Untersuchungen, N. F. iv 1] . . . . .	101 f
SIMPKINSON, C. H. <i>The Conference between Laud and Fisher</i> . . . . .	315
SKENE, W. F. <i>Celtic Scotland</i> . . . . .	594
SKINNER, J. <i>Isaiah</i> [Cambridge Bible] . . . . .	266 f
SMITH, W. ROBERTSON. <i>Religion of the Semites</i> . . . . .	503 f
SPITTA, F. <i>Der Gottesdienst des Urchristentums</i> . . . . .	184, 190



INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS xix

	PAGE
STREANE, A. W. <i>Jeremiah</i> [Cambridge Bible] . . . . .	255
<i>The Double Text of Jeremiah</i> . . . . .	245, 255
STRONG, T. B. <i>God and the Individual</i> . . . . .	498
STUBBS, W. <i>Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum</i> . . . . .	598
(and see HADDAN, A. W.)	
SWETE, H. B. <i>Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek</i> . . . . .	245, 261 f, 583
<i>Patristic Study</i> . . . . .	303
<i>The Psalms of Solomon, with the Greek Fragments of the Book of Enoch</i>	615
SWING, A. T. and A. M. <i>The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl: with Ritschl's</i>	
<i>'Instruction in the Christian Religion'</i> . . . . .	468 ff
TAYLOR, A. E. <i>The Problem of Conduct</i> . . . . .	68, 298
TENNANT, F. R. <i>The Origin and Propagation of Sin</i> [Hulsean Lectures] . . . . .	470 ff
THEINER, A. <i>Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scottorum historiam illustrantia</i> . . . . .	593
THIERSCH, H. W. J. <i>De Pentateuchi Versione Alexandrina libri tres</i> . . . . .	245
THOMASIVS, J. M. <i>Opera</i> : edited by Vezzosi, A. F. . . . .	425
THOMPSON, E. M. <i>Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography</i> . . . . .	508
THURSTON, H. <i>The Coronation Ceremonial: its true history and meaning</i> . . . . .	152 f
TICKELL, S. C. <i>Christian Heresies</i> . . . . .	474
TISCHENDORF, C. DE. <i>Evangelia Apocrypha</i> . . . . .	83
TRAUBE, L. <i>Perrona Scottorum</i> [Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Classe, 1900] . . . . .	414 f
TURNER, C. H. <i>The Oxford MSS of St. Cyprian</i> [Classical Review, May 1892] . . . . .	105, 107
<i>The Cheltenham List of the Treatises of St. Cyprian: Appendix</i>	
[Studia Biblica, iii] . . . . .	106, 121
VASSILIEV, A. <i>Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina</i> . . . . .	239, 391, 447
VEZZOSI, A. F. (see THOMASIVS, J. M.)	
VIELHABER, H. <i>On Hippolytus, Canon xxxii</i> [Texte und Untersuchungen, vi 4] . . . . .	282 f
WACE, H. <i>Confession and Absolution. Report of the Fulham Conference, 1901-1902</i> . . . . .	473 f
WARD, J. <i>Naturalism and Agnosticism</i> [Gifford Lectures] . . . . .	66
WARREN, F. E. <i>Liturgy of the Celtic Church</i> . . . . .	560, 563
WAY, H. S. <i>The Letters of St. Paul</i> . . . . .	307
WEISS, J. <i>Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes</i> . . . . .	466
<i>Die Idee des Reiches Gottes in der Theologie</i> . . . . .	466 f
WEIZSÄCKER, C. J. <i>The Apostolic Age</i> . . . . .	193
WELLS, H. G. <i>Anticipations</i> . . . . .	47 f
WENDLAND, P. <i>Aristeae Epistola</i> . . . . .	411
WENDT, H. H. <i>The Gospel according to St. John: an Enquiry into its genesis and historical value</i> : translated by LUMMIS, E. . . . .	194 ff
WERNER, J. <i>Nothers Sequenzen: Beiträge zur Geschichte d. lateinischen Sequenzendichtung: aus Handschriften gesammelt</i> . . . . .	149 f
WERNER. <i>Die nach-scholastische Scholastik</i> . . . . .	40
WESTCOTT, B. F. (and HORT, F. J. A.). <i>The New Testament in Greek</i> . . . . .	129, 187 f, 304, 511
WHITE, H. J. (see WORDSWORTH, J.)	
WIEGAND, F. <i>Die Stellung des apostolischen Symbols</i> . . . . .	426
WILSON, H. A. <i>The Gelasian Sacramentary</i> . . . . .	417, 419, 555, 561, 564, 577

	PAGE
WINCKLER, H. <i>Die babylonische Kultur</i> . . . . .	456
<i>Die Gesetze Hammurabis, Königs von Babylon um 2250 v. Chr. : das</i> <i>älteste Gesetzbuch der Welt</i> [Der alte Orient] . . . . .	455
WORDSWORTH, CHR. Clement Maydeston <i>Ordinale Sacrum sive Directorium</i> <i>Sacerdotum</i> . . . . .	149
WORDSWORTH, J. (and WHITE, H. J.). <i>Novum Testamentum Latine</i> . . . . .	511
WORLLEDGE, A. J. <i>Prayer</i> [Oxford Library of Practical Theology] . . . . .	203, 628 f
WRIGHT, A. <i>New Testament Problems</i> . . . . .	187
WRIGHT, W. <i>Apocryphal Acts</i> . . . . .	125
<i>Catalogue of the Syriac MSS in the British Museum</i> . . . . .	69
ZAHN, TH. <i>Brot und Wein</i> . . . . .	190
<i>Ignatius</i> . . . . .	8
<i>Marcellus of Ancyra</i> . . . . .	8
ZELLER, E. <i>Geschichte d. griech. Philosophie</i> . . . . .	30
ZIMMER, H. <i>The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland</i> : trans. by A. MEYER <i>Pelagius in Irland</i> [Texte und Untersuchungen zur patristischen Litteratur] . . . . .	632 f 132 f
ZIMMERN, H. (see SCHRADER, E.)	
ZÖCKLER. <i>Jesus Christus</i> [Herzog's Realencyclopädie] . . . . .	191

*The Journal*  
*of*  
*Theological Studies*

OCTOBER, 1902

'CONTENTIO VERITATIS!'

IT has been said that the non-commissioned officers are the 'backbone' of an army, and in particular of the British army; and no one familiar with Oxford would hesitate to say that the College Tutors are the backbone of the University system. It is they who are in the closest and most continuous contact with the undergraduates, and who have most to do with the direct moulding of character.

When, therefore, a volume of 'Essays in Constructive Theology' appears, by 'Six Oxford Tutors,' it is natural that one who is himself concerned with the teaching of theology at Oxford should look upon it with keen interest. He will know how sensitive is the subject with which he has to deal, and he will be eager to learn from the self-revelation of the printed page, which sometimes goes deeper than that of ordinary intercourse, to what sort of hands the teaching of it is entrusted. And it may be not unwelcome to the contributors on their part to learn how their book strikes one who has been himself rather longer in the field.

I do not say it at all by way of disparagement, but the outside observer should not go away with the impression that all, or even the greater part, of the Oxford teaching of theology is exactly of the same colour as that of the 'Six Tutors.' They would apparently describe themselves, at least on the subjects on which they have combined to express an opinion, as representing the 'liberal wing' of the teaching body. At the same time the

<sup>1</sup> *Contentio Veritatis*. Essays in Constructive Theology, by Six Oxford Tutors (London, 1902).

difference is one that is largely a difference of shades. The writers are justified in claiming, as they do on p. vii of the Preface, 'that "liberal" ideas, which were once characteristic of a very small group of prominent men, have now to so large an extent permeated general Christian thought, that they have ceased to be party watchwords, and have been found capable of harmonious combination with what is permanently valuable in the teaching of other schools.' It is a happy feature of the Oxford teaching that differences are not extreme and are not bitter, and that there are many intermediate gradations between the two ends of the scale.

Still the volume does on the whole represent 'the liberal wing.' And in view of this there will be many who will be glad to see the general attitude and temper of the writers so moderate and self-restrained as it is. Two things have struck me more particularly in their book—and that especially among the less marked and therefore perhaps in a sense more characteristic essays: these are on the one hand a pleasing candour which gives the impression of great sincerity, and on the other hand a certain cheerful optimism which is everywhere more sensible of gain than of loss and which does not take pleasure in the mere act of destroying. The essays are described as 'in constructive theology,' and they are really constructive.

There can be little doubt that three of the essays stand out from the rest. They are the first (by Dr. Rashdall) and the second and last, which are both by Mr. W. R. Inge. The two essays last named have a distinction of style which is an index of real distinction of mind. More than any of the others perhaps they are an original contribution of permanent value to the subjects with which they deal, 'The Person of Christ' and 'The Sacraments.' But Dr. Rashdall's, on 'The Ultimate Basis of Theism,' is also an able, and in many ways helpful, piece of work.

In regard to this essay I have a slightly mixed feeling. With the greater part of it I find myself in warm agreement; but there are one or two things in it with which I should disagree, and there are others which seem to require a rather fuller discussion.



Under the first head, besides those parts of the argument which would be common to all Theists, I would place especially the criticism on an Idealism which is that and nothing more (p. 25), the insistence on the point that, if we are to think of limitations in connexion with God, they are all *self*-limitations or limitations from within (pp. 37, 45), and the frank defence of Anthropomorphism (pp. 32, 42, 46, 49). This last is shared with Mr. Inge who happily expresses it: ‘The human spirit as it ought to be is the World-Spirit in little. What is good and evil to us is good and evil to Him. The cosmic process is a moment or phase of His life, even as our lives here are a moment or phase of our existence as eternal spirits’ (p. 63).

One of the passages that seem to me most open to criticism is that on the doctrine of the Trinity (p. 48). ‘Power, Wisdom, and Will’ surely cannot be a sound trichotomy as applied either to human nature or Divine. Surely Power is an expression of Will and not co-ordinate with it. The common division, Power (or Will), Wisdom, and Love is more to the point. Yet Dr. Rashdall identifies the two triads by what I must needs think a looseness of reasoning. What is said on the doctrine itself is hardly explicit enough to present much that is tangible.

The section on Miracles does not carry me much further. Here, and indeed all through the book, I suspect that the writers do not keep clearly enough apart the view of miracles entertained by the actors in the New Testament history and the historical attestation of miracles in connexion with this view, and the estimate which we are inclined to form of miracles at the present day. I speak of course with all reserve of our Lord Himself: in regard to Him and His view of miracles, we know only so much as He has been pleased to reveal to us. But that He performed, and that some of His disciples—notably St. Paul—performed what were commonly thought to be miracles, I consider absolutely certain. When St. Paul speaks of ‘signs and wonders’ as the marks of an Apostle and as the characteristics of his own ministry (2 Cor. xii 12, Rom. xv 19); and when he speaks again of such signs and wonders as prevalent in the Church (1 Cor. xii 9, 10, 29, 30; Gal. iii 5), it seems to me that we must absolutely take him at his word. And I have equally little doubt that the evidence, when it is all summed up,

is as decisive in a general sense in regard to the miracles of our Lord. The story of the Temptation alone would prove it, because it turns on the power to work miracles, and yet no one of His contemporaries had insight enough to invent that story, if it had not come directly from Himself. And this is only one item among a number that are most strongly commended on grounds internal as well as external.

The real problem is therefore not 'whether miracles happened,' but what exactly we are to include under the term miracle, and how we are to adjust and relate our own conception of miracles with that which was current in the apostolic age.

By far the most conspicuous and the most important subject on which I should desire a rather fuller discussion than Dr. Rashdall has given us is on what I might call 'the question of questions' at the present moment, the ultimate relation of our finite spirits to the supreme Spirit. On this subject Dr. Rashdall and Mr. Inge use rather different language, and indeed seem to be more or less directly opposed. And I must needs think that Mr. Inge's analysis (on p. 76 f) is the more subtle and delicate of the two. It is summed up in the following sentence:—

'The ideal goal which we contemplate and hope for is a state in which our nature and will shall be perfect instruments of the Divine nature and will, but in which they shall remain in a condition of free subordination to the Divine—not abolished or absorbed, so as to lose all possibility of *communion*, nor yet so separate as to admit only of an ethical harmony.'

This language is very carefully guarded, and I am not sure that an understanding based upon it may not be nearer than it would at first sight seem. At least I have noted a number of expressions in Dr. Rashdall's essay which lead me to infer that if he followed up his own thought far enough it would be found to be in harmony with Mr. Inge's. Such, for instance, as these:—

'Indeed, we may say (with Lotze) that the ideal of personality is one which is never fully attained by the human consciousness, and that God is the only being who is in the fullest and completest sense a Person' (p. 33).

'No doubt there is a resemblance, an identity of nature between God and all other spiritual existence, especially in the higher



stages of its development, such as we do not feel to exist between God and any mere object of thought. There is therefore no objection to saying that a human soul is a "spark" or "emanation of the divine," or a "limited mode of the divine self-consciousness," or that "human thought is due to the partial communication to the human soul of the divine thought" (p. 34 f).

It is true that this is qualified a little lower down. 'But such expressions must not be used to disguise either the causal dependence of the human soul upon the divine will or the distinctness of God from such souls when once they have appeared.' These, however, are conditions that neither Mr. Inge nor his allies would have any inclination to deny.

Again: 'Even inanimate nature is part of the thought of God; He is still more fully revealed in the life of souls—with increasing fullness as animal life passes into the intellectual, moral, and religious life of humanity. . . . Every human soul is an emanation from the divine, a reproduction of the divine. But not all souls represent the divine in equal measure. All who accept the idea of a God who is good must admit that the better the soul and the more profound its spiritual insight, the more fully that soul can be regarded as representing or revealing God' (p. 48 f).

'The divine Logos, present in all souls to some extent and in some degree, was pre-eminently present in the human soul of Christ' (p. 50).

Dr. Rashdall may be invited to define a little more exactly what he means by this presence of the divine Logos 'in all souls to some extent and in some degree.' He has just told us that it must be such as to render the human soul capable of at least partially 'representing and revealing God.' Would that be possible if the presence were not something more than metaphor?

I wish that I could do justice to Mr. Inge's two essays, if only as some return for the genuine pleasure they have given me. To read them is like reading poetry of fine quality. The thought not only moves in high regions but it is also constantly touched by generous emotion. There is a special attraction for me in what he has said in both essays as to the adumbrations of Biblical facts and Biblical ideas in pre-Christian and non-Christian civilizations (pp. 64-68, 272-278). The 'old English verse'



quoted in this connexion (which I seem to remember, but cannot at the moment identify) does honour to our race:—

‘Many man for Cristes love  
Was martired in Romaine,  
Er any Cristendom was knowe there,  
Or any cros honoured.’

And hardly less moving are the pages at the end of the first essay which plead for a considerate and sympathetic judgement of those who have the spirit of Christianity but find the modern world too much for them in regard to the formal acceptance of the Christian creed.

Mr. Inge is a born Platonist, and the merits and charm of his essays are directly connected with his Platonism. But this reminds us of the *ultimum et radicale discrimen ingeniorum*; and we cannot be surprised if he comes a little into collision with minds of a different type. I think that, without meaning it, he has been rather hard on the historical method and its votaries.

‘I do not wish,’ he says, ‘to associate myself with the contempt which has been cast upon the “Old Bailey Theology” of Paley and his school’ [for this concession I am grateful]; ‘but I do wish to impress upon my readers, with all the earnestness that I can, that it is a false method, and that those who rely upon it are trusting to a broken reed, which will pierce their hands as soon as they really lean upon it. The majority of Christians to-day do *not* really lean upon it, whatever they may think; they are Christians because they have found Christ, or rather because Christ has found them, not because they have given the apostles a fair trial on the charge of perjury and acquitted them. The Christ whose claims are made “probable” by such arguments is a dead Christ, who could only preside over a dead church’ (p. 104).

I always suspect that writers who express themselves thus fail to realize the impression made upon minds differently constituted from their own of a multitude of historical particulars, finely graduated perhaps in regard to degrees of proof but with certain fixed points as centres, and all convergent in their ultimate effect and rendering to each other mutual support. In a picture con-

structed by such a method the little facts, the lowly features come by their due—'the violet by the mossy stone half hidden from the eye' no less than the great leading ideas. The Christ who is thus imaged, however imperfectly, in the glass of the mind may be a Christ in whom the human side is strongly developed, and it may be through this human side that the imagination seeks to climb up to the Divine, but He is certainly not 'a dead Christ, who could only preside over a dead church.' He is at least a Christ who *has lived* a real true moving human life, and not a Docetic phantasm.

I have said above, on the strength of allusions in the writings of St. Paul as well as on the evidence of the Gospels, that the reality of what were at least *thought to be* miracles is to me quite certain. I could not easily conceive anything to be more certain. Life is not made up of propositions of Euclid, but it is made up of convictions which the mind grasps as firmly. This that I have just mentioned is such a conviction; and to me it is luminous. It is one of those 'fixed centres' of which I have spoken, round which other beliefs cluster and crystallize. I too should deprecate an 'Old Bailey' method; but the method of which Paley was one of the first to set the example, is capable of other applications, and is deserving of a better name.

Apart from this question of principle—for it *is* a question of principle, and there are more disparaging expressions of the same kind scattered about the essay besides the paragraph I have noted—the queries that I should have to put to Mr. Inge are not of great importance, and do not denote any fundamental divergence.

It is very probably my own obtuseness, and what I desiderate is perhaps really supplied in the essay before me; but the following sentence interests me so much, and a fuller expansion of it would be so valuable to me, that I hope Mr. Inge may return to the subject at some future time:

'The idealistic philosophy of the last century and a half has, we may hope, brought back Christology to its true path by showing us how the Divine and human may be united without confusion and distinguished without separation' (p. 71 f).

This formulates the problem so tersely and so happily that although I think I can see how the argument of the essay tends



towards its solution, I should be glad to see it worked out rather more explicitly and completely.

Mr. Inge's first essay is to a large extent a review of the history of the Logos doctrine in ancient and modern times. In regard to this I have rather had to ask myself whether the sketch of the history of the doctrine does not make it appear more homogeneous than it really was. Mr. Inge appears to treat the sequence, Philo—St. John—the Apologists—the Christian Platonists, as though it were more direct and in a straight line than I should quite have supposed. The main question of course would be, what is the exact place of St. John in this sequence? In other words, how far does St. John's doctrine of the Logos approximate to that of Philo and coincide with that of the Apologists? The Apologists no doubt took up the doctrine as they found it in Greek philosophy; and with the help, or at the suggestion, of the Fourth Gospel they utilized it for Christian theology. But in doing this how far did they keep true to, and how far did they depart from the model set them in the Gospel? I wish Mr. Inge would make a detailed study of this subject and give us his mature thoughts upon it. As at present advised I am inclined to think that he somewhat exaggerates the resemblances and somewhat minimizes the differences. I should not be prepared to go quite so far as Bishop Westcott on St. John i 1 and say that, 'the term *logos* never has the sense of *reason* in the New Testament.' I think that a rational element is implied in the use of Light in the same context. It does not seem to me wrong to define the Logos as the uttered Mind or Thought or Character of God. But the stress is upon the utterance or projection or revelation. It is true that the content of that which is uttered comes in; but this is the whole nature of God, there is no prominence to the conception of a rationally articulated system, a world of ideas, such as was present to the mind of Plato and the Apologists. The superiority of the Johannean view lies, if I am not mistaken, specially in the fact that St. John escaped the temptation of the Apologists to conceive of the Father mainly as the Absolute, as the highest and most attenuated of abstractions, to be described only by negations<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Zahn's two monographs on Ignatius (1873) and Marcellus of Ancyra (1867) are important for this subject.

It is interesting to observe how Ignatius, the writer who is nearest to St. John in time, also presents the closest affinity to his thought. I am not prepared to say that Ignatius necessarily used the Fourth Gospel, but I think that he must certainly have come within the orbit of the teaching of which the Fourth Gospel is the permanent expression.

I have a slight demur to make, somewhat of the same kind, to Mr. Inge's essay on the Sacraments. I have no objection in principle to the influence which is ascribed to the Greek mysteries. I do not doubt that in the later stages of Christian theology this influence was not inconsiderable. But I believe that the readiness to assume influences of this kind is with some writers greater than it should be, and I am not sure that I can altogether exclude Mr. Inge from the number. It seems to me that in such cases it is not enough to note analogies, and then at once to infer that every analogy represents direct influence. In each case the facts should be examined with close attention to dates and channels of communication. If these are adverse, it is better to set down the apparent coincidences, not to direct influence of the pagan institution or practice upon the Christian but rather to like causes in both producing like effects. The difference is not great, but it does affect the total conception.

I should be content to take the three essays that I have so far been discussing as a sufficient *raison d'être* for the whole volume. I could not place the remaining essays at all upon the same level with them. They all, or nearly all, have the pleasing characteristics which I have mentioned (p. 2, above). But they recall to me in different degrees the drawbacks to which a volume of this kind is subject.

One knows what the genesis of such a volume is apt to be. The idea occurs to two or three personal friends or colleagues that a volume surveying some particular field and stating the position of research in regard to that field is desirable. But then they have to look round to make up their number. And whereas in their own case perhaps their materials are ready and the time for their publication is what they would naturally choose, the same cannot be said of the supplemental essays. The writers of these have their subject chosen for them, and they are often



pressed into publishing before they are really ready, before their materials are fully digested or their own opinions matured.

I am also reminded of certain special tendencies of the 'Oxford essay.' It cannot be said that this particular form of composition has quite a high reputation with 'those who know.' I remember well how the late Canon T. S. Evans used to describe Dean Stanley's commentary on Corinthians: 'And every twenty pages or so you come to an elegant Oxford essay—all wrong.' I am far from saying that the essays in *Contentio Veritatis* are all wrong; on the contrary I think that they decidedly tend to be right: at least they decidedly tend to that form of opinion to which I should lean myself. But what the critic of Dean Stanley meant was that the ease and grace of outward form was often not in proportion to the thoroughness and well-considered grounding of the subject-matter.

So in these essays, it seems to me, if I may say so, that the writers have aimed at conveying a sort of average view (not *the* average view, which would require a wide extent of reading and much care to determine, but what might be called a casual average or middle view); and then they give expression to this easily and pleasantly, but without sufficient sense—or at least without *showing* sufficient sense—of what lies on both sides of it and of the objections to which it is exposed.

I rather incline to like best of these remaining essays that on the Old Testament by Mr. C. F. Burney. This essay is not only very clear and readable, but it gives the impression of being based upon accurate study of detail. At the same time, like the rest, it has a certain appearance of slightness, and in this respect hardly does justice to the amount of real balancing of argument that I conceive lies behind it. In particular, when we come to a grave doctrinal question like that of the *Kenosis*, the conclusion seems to be reached rather too easily; one has a feeling that the writer has in view only what has been said upon the subject from the point of view of criticism.

I have little doubt that the least satisfactory of all the essays is that upon 'The Church.' What can be the value of a survey which covers nineteen centuries of Church History in some twenty-seven pages of large print? Naturally a survey of this kind can consist only of the broadest generalizations; and more

unfortunately still, these are for the most part only the conventional generalizations of one side in an age-long controversy.

For instance, take the following :—

'If we may venture to sum up the characteristics of the Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we should say that, speaking generally, the doctrine of the Church, once a living and growing reality, had become abstract and sterile, while its discipline was decayed. The Church was corrupt in head and members, incapable of interpreting aright its own more profound religious ideas; and yet the more corrupt it grew, the more obstinately and arrogantly did it refuse any concession to the new developments of the religious consciousness and to the growing demand for its own reform' (p. 261).

This, at a time when the history of the Reformation sorely needs to be re-written in the spirit of the true historian, balancing the scales of right and wrong, of good and evil, with firm and steady hand. I am tempted to place in contrast with the above a like summary by a Roman Catholic writer :—

'Especially deplorable for us Westerns is the disruption of the sixteenth century. Much as we may be troubled by it, it was not without salutary consequences. The question has often been asked whether a reform of the Church would ever have been brought about without it. This question is not to be answered in the negative unconditionally; otherwise we should have to doubt of the living forces at work in the Church and of its providential guiding. Just as little can it be denied that the Reformation had to be waited for too long, and that it was not introduced until the edifice of the Church had been shaken to its very foundations and a great secession had already taken place. History further shows that the Reformation not only was not accomplished until *after* the secession, but that it was also brought about and hastened by it. So the revival of the Church is intimately connected with its disruption' (Funk, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 589).

A paragraph like this will show how summary judgements, when they must needs be passed, ought to be expressed; with what anxious care a writer, even when he is committed to a definite point of view, should yet guard his words, so as to do some kind of justice to his adversaries. There is a great danger



of supposing that summary judgements are easy. They are easy—at the cost of being unscrupulous<sup>1</sup>. But to judge summarily, and at the same time with all the needed restrictions and qualifications is a very difficult thing indeed. It is just this that we look to the new school of historical writers to help us to do. I am afraid I cannot say that I receive much help in this direction from the author of the essay.

I remark in passing that he speaks of the Reformation as having brought with it 'new conceptions of the theory of the Church.' It would have been instructive if we had been told what exactly these new conceptions were; e.g. if some account had been given of the discussions as to the relation of the Visible and Invisible Church at the Reformation. But we are told nothing about this, and nothing about anything at all distinctive in the Anglican position.

The two essays on which I have not yet touched both relate to the New Testament. Mr. Wild's on 'The Teaching of Christ' has all the merits of which I have spoken. It is very pleasantly written, and in an excellent spirit. The writer himself has caught a fresh enthusiasm from reading the Gospels with his new guides, and he succeeds in conveying something of this freshness of enthusiasm to his readers. What the essay chiefly wants is more thoroughness—if I may say so baldly—more work.

The impression that the essay gives is superficial. It is just an average view that does not make it clear that it is an average. It frequently uses much-debated data as though only one construction of them were possible.

For myself, I entirely agree that the teaching of Jesus culminates in His Person. Mr. Wild has, I think, done well in working up gradually to this conclusion. But he ought not to do so without a hint of the existence of any different opinion. Harnack's famous lectures were published in 1900, and *Contentio Veritatis* not until 1902. By this time Harnack's book was well before the world, and had caused considerable stir; and there were other phenomena of the same kind. Really what Mr. Wild has done has been to give

<sup>1</sup> This is of course intended only as a general warning. I would not for a moment imply that the writer of the essay would knowingly allow himself to be unjust.

us a sketch of the effect which writers like Wendt have had upon himself personally, and not at all to give us a sketch of the whole present position of research on the subject he has chosen. But this rather detracts from the weight which the volume should carry as representing—or so far as it claims to represent—the teaching of theology at Oxford.

Mr. W. C. Allen, who writes on 'Modern Criticism and the New Testament,' has taken a different course. He has evidently put some restraint upon the expression of his own personal opinion and endeavoured to state as objectively as possible the critical position on the various literary problems connected with the New Testament. This essay possesses in a high degree the note of candour, and in a less degree the note of optimism of which I spoke. I should have said that the optimism went a little too far if it were not confined to the presumed *effects* of criticism. In the statement and expression of critical opinion I do not think that Mr. Allen is at all too optimistic. Indeed he makes rather more concessions to the objector than I should be prepared to make.

It is here that the candour of his mind becomes apparent. One can see that he is setting himself to write with independence, to look at things not through the glasses of tradition, but strictly as they are. It seems to me that in the process he has been carried some shades further away from tradition than he need have been.

The effect is perhaps rather heightened by a peculiarity of style. The short, crisp, clear-cut sentences in which Mr. Allen expresses himself sometimes read a little dogmatically, and give an impression of curt dismissal where curt dismissal would not be in place and where I do not think it is intended.

It is akin to this mental habit that statements and contrasts are sometimes (as I believe, unconsciously) exaggerated. An instance will show what I mean. The first paragraph on the Synoptic Gospels begins thus:—

'The view current in the Christian Church since the beginning of the second century is that St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke wrote independently the Gospels called by their names. This view still has its adherents, but they diminish in numbers daily' (p. 208).



Which of the ancients has anywhere said that the first three Gospels were written 'independently'? The preface to St. Luke certainly implies that he made use of existing material. And did not St. Augustine expressly describe St. Mark as *pedisequus Matthaei*? One sees, of course, what is meant. It is true that the ancients commonly speak of the evangelists as though each were the author of his own Gospel, and without reference to the materials of which he made use, just as we do. But where they discuss the relations of one Gospel to another they rather imply dependence than the reverse. There is no doubt a difference of critical result, but not quite that strongly-marked contrast which Mr. Allen's words would lead us to suppose.

I cannot help bringing in my personal knowledge of the excellent original work that Mr. Allen has done upon a part of his subject—excellent in method, in objectivity, and in patience. With the thought of this before me I feel that the essay as it stands hardly does justice to its author. I should apply to it the general remark that I made a little while ago. It is published before its time. It is published before the writer has been able to bring his own critical researches to a conclusion, and before he has had the opportunity of applying methods learnt and practised on one part of the field to other parts of it.

The point at which I regret this most is the section of three brief pages relating to the Fourth Gospel. One of these pages, which deals with the external evidence, I may put aside as quite fairly, though summarily, stated. There has been the same effort to write objectively throughout; and if the result is unfortunate, it is not from want of will, but because the data were imperfectly apprehended.

If I might make a guess as to the way in which these paragraphs came to take the shape they bear, I should say that they were probably written under the influence of a group of recent German writers, more particularly Jülicher. At the time when they were written, the memorable work of Bishop Westcott was forgotten. It is a melancholy fact that in the last decade the criticism of the Fourth Gospel has gone backwards and not forwards. There is a less healthy feeling abroad, and a tendency to overlook points that ten years ago were familiar. They have simply dropped out of the current statement of the problem.

Hence I should say that Mr. Allen's statement of the internal considerations that bear upon the question of authorship turns on one great omission and a *non sequitur*.

The omission is the ignoring of the great mass of evidence which goes to show (1) that the Gospel was written from the standpoint of the inner circle of the Twelve; and (2) that it must have been written by a contemporary who had been himself intimately mixed up with the events which he describes. It would be tempting to launch out into the fuller proof of this; but I shall probably have occasion to do so elsewhere before very long, and in the meantime I may refer to Bishop Westcott's commentary, pp. v-xxv.

The *non sequitur* is in the arguments that are adduced in support of the opposite contention, that 'the entire representation of Christ's person and teaching is very different from that of the Synoptic Gospels, and seems to represent a later stage of tradition' (p. 223). I should demur to the epithets 'entire' and 'very different.' Some difference no doubt there is; but it should not be overstated. And when it is stated in strict conformity with the facts, I do not believe that it is in the least incompatible with Apostolic authorship. On the contrary, I believe that it positively favours it; for no one was so likely as an Apostle to exercise the freedom which the author has assumed.

I willingly admit that there are signs of late origin in the Gospel; but there are also signs, if not exactly of early origin, yet of an authentic and original relation to the facts. The problem is to combine these two sets of phenomena. They are combined if an Apostle who had companied with the Lord wrote the Gospel towards the end of his life. On no other hypothesis are they combined so satisfactorily; for Wendt's partition theory is a blind alley; and Harnack's 'Presbyter' will not answer to the conditions.

Mr. Allen asks: 'Is there not between John the son of Zebedee, the eye-witness of the life of Christ on the one hand, and the Christian philosopher and theologian who wrote this Gospel on the other hand, a gulf in respect of time and thought and relation to historic fact which it is difficult to bridge?' 'Yes,' I would say; 'it is difficult to bridge on such a presentation of the case as Jülicher's. But the reason is that the gulf is

artificially widened, and that the hand-marks of John the son of Zebedee are not recognized.' To pursue the metaphor, I might add that the gulf is naturally not to be spanned by a single pier and a broken arch: erect a second pier (the authentic data from the beginning of the Gospel) and carry across the arch (the life of the Apostle), and the bridge is complete.

'Constructive Theology,' as the name implies, is a process and not a finished work. 'Essays in Constructive Theology' is an appropriate title. What we have been discussing are essays or attempts, some of which really build—and the building has beauty as well as strength—while others do not so much attempt to build as register what is being done in the way of building, and do this perhaps rather imperfectly. But all the essays are inspired by a good hope and a good courage.

W. SANDAY.

## A STUDY OF THE FIRST LESSON FOR CHRISTMAS DAY<sup>1</sup>.

Isaiah ix 1-7.

1. . . . As for the former *king*, he despised the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but the later *king* honours it, *both* towards the Sea *and* beyond Jordan<sup>2</sup>, *he honours* 'Galilee of the Nations'<sup>3</sup>.

2. The people that walked in darkness  
    See a great light!  
    They that sat in a land of the shadow of death,  
    Light shines upon them!
3. Thou increasest the 'Nation'<sup>4</sup>,  
    To it thou givest great joy,  
    They joy before thee<sup>5</sup> as with joy of harvest,  
    As men rejoice when they divide spoil.
4. For the yoke that is their<sup>6</sup> burden,  
    And the staff *that smites* their<sup>6</sup> shoulder,  
    The rod of their<sup>6</sup> taskmaster,  
    Thou dost shatter as in the day of Midian!
5. For every boot of the earth-shaking host<sup>7</sup>,  
    And *every* garment rolled in blood,  
    Shall be for burning, fuel for fire.
6. For to us is born a child,  
    To us is given a son,  
    And the government falls upon his shoulder,

<sup>1</sup> Revised from a paper read before the Rhondda Valley branch of the C. S. S. S., May 27, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> i. e. both westward (towards the Mediterranean) and eastward.

<sup>3</sup> A depreciatory designation.

<sup>4</sup> A reference back to ver. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Deut. xii 18 *al.*

<sup>6</sup> *Heb.* his.

<sup>7</sup> A paraphrastic translation of a phrase which cannot be literally translated.



And his name is called:  
 Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God;  
 Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace.

7. Great is his government, and peace hath no end upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom; *he cometh*<sup>1</sup> to establish it and to uphold it in judgement and in righteousness from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of JEHOVAH SABAOTH shall perform this.

(1) *The state of the Text.* There is almost certainly some corruption in the text of ch. ix 1 (viii 23, Heb.). In particular the words 'In the former time' (כעת הראשון) seem to be faulty. 'Time' (עת) is feminine ('seldom, mostly late, masculine,' *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* s. v.), whereas the epithets 'the former' (הראשון) and 'the latter'<sup>2</sup> (האחרון) are masculine. If therefore we disjoin כעת from what follows, we are left with a contrast not between *times*, but between *persons*, such a contrast indeed as is implied in Isa. xlv 6, 'I am the first (ראשון), and I am the last (אחרון)'; cp. also Job xix 25, 'And one-who-comes-after (אחרון) shall rise up over my dust.' Symmachus gives ὁ πρότερος . . . ὁ ἔσχατος. (I begin my translation at the point at which the text ceases to be doubtful.)

The 'not' of ver. 3 (ver. 2, Heb.) is a very ancient mistake. The LXX and the other Greek versions have it, and though the printed editions of the Peshitta (*Lee* and *Urmī*) with the Ambrosian MS (*wēlēh*) and the Buchanan Bible (*dhēlēh*) follow the Hebrew *Kēri*, yet the negative survives in Camb. Univ. Add. 1965 (Cent. xv, Nestorian), while in Brit. Mus. Add. 14,432 (Cent. vi) the reading is blurred as though the doubt between *lā* and *lēh* had not been resolved.

(2) *The form of the Passage.* We commonly call this passage a *Messianic prophecy*, and perhaps we commonly mean by the phrase a *prediction about the Messiah*. Substantially (I believe) this description is correct, but in form it is faulty, and especially open to the objections of those who refuse to see any close connexion between the Old and New Testaments. It is not in

<sup>1</sup> I supply a necessary verb here.

<sup>2</sup> 'Time' is not repeated in the Hebrew, as in the English Version.

form a prediction; the prophet does not say that certain events will come to pass in the future; indeed there are in the passage only two verb forms which correspond with an English future (*vis. ver. 5* 'shall be for burning, fuel of fire'; *ver. 7* 'shall perform this').

The tenses in the Hebrew are *perfects*, although it is clear that they do not refer to the past. We can only conclude that the prophet describes certain events and their consequences, which are fully present to his own mind, as though he had already had experience of them, and was recalling them by memory. It is in short a *vision* that Isaiah shows us. Out of the darkness of the present he sees a child, a son, born; to him the government comes; and his destiny is to exercise such a rule as the world did not know before. The Prophet tells us step by step what he sees, and accordingly we translate the Hebrew Perfects by English Presents.

To regard the passage as the description of a Vision helps us to understand a second peculiarity in the form of the prophecy, *vis. the transition from prose to poetry and back again to prose.* Vers. 2-6 are arranged according to poetical parallelism (as I have tried to show in my translation), and a rhythmic beat (a rudimentary form of poetical measure) is to be found here just as in other Hebrew poems. Vers. 1 and 7 on the contrary are in prose. The prophet begins in prose as one who has a simple message to deliver; the exaltation of his vision lifts him to poetry; he returns to prose to press home the assurance that his vision is no mere dream, *The zeal of YEHOVAH SABAOTH shall perform this.*

(3) *The Context of the Passage.* It has been suggested by some writers (*e.g.* by Hackmann *apud* Cheyne, *Introduction to Isaiah*, pp. 44-46; Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life*, pp. 98-101; Marti, *Hand-Commentar*) that this prophecy has no real context. Isa. ix 2-7 (1-6, Heb.) is said to be an appendix added by an unknown writer in the age which followed the Return from the Babylonian Captivity ( $\pm 500$  B.C., Marti), the object of this writer being, we are told, to relieve the dark picture given in ch. viii. The function of Isaiah, it seems, was to threaten; to give comfort was a task reserved for exilic and post-exilic pro-

phets<sup>1</sup>. (Even Duhm, *Jesaja*, 2<sup>te</sup> Auflage, while allowing Isaianic authorship assigns the passage to the reign of Hezekiah. Cf. Nowack, *Theologische Abhandlungen*, Festschrift für H. J. Holtzmann, p. 49.)

Now it seems to me that there is very little support for such views as these, but in the present instance I believe we can give not only this negative rejoinder, but also a positive one. We may indeed say that there is little reason for holding Isa. ix 1-7 to be a late appendix to ch. viii, but we may also say that we have solid grounds for treating this passage as Isaiah's own continuation of his prophecy against Ahaz. We must *not* separate it from its present context, for it can be best understood in connexion with the verses which precede and those that follow.

(4) This may be readily seen when we come to the consideration of what I should like to call the *immediate occasion* of the prophecy. The passage which precedes (chs. vii, viii) and the passage which follows (ch. ix 8-21) both deal with the Syro-Ephraimite war. Accordingly I shall endeavour to interpret our prophecy on the assumption that it has for its historical background the reign of Ahaz in general and this miserable civil war of Israel and Judah in particular.

Now it is necessary for us to know something about this war, if we are to understand Isaiah in his true greatness as a Man of God who from first to last brought religion to bear on statesmanship. With a later event of Isaiah's lifetime—the invasion of Sennacherib—we are sufficiently familiar. We are familiar with the thought of the Assyrians as the enemies and oppressors of Judah in the reign of Hezekiah, but in order to form a complete view of the meaning of the career of Isaiah, we must accustom ourselves to a very different condition of things, i. e. to the Assyrians as the friends and patrons of Judah. When we see the prophet under the most perplexingly different circumstances giving the very same advice we realize that we are not contemplating a mere human reed shaken by all political winds, but a Man of God speaking from God and for God. Pekah of

<sup>1</sup> According to Marti Isaiah did *not* even promise deliverance for Jerusalem in 701 B. C.



Samaria comes down from the north upon Jerusalem terrifying the supporters of the House of David and flattering the hopes of the disloyal, and Isaiah with unshaken courage says to Ahaz, 'Take heed and be quiet.' The rab-shakeh comes up years afterwards with a great host from the south-west, and the prophet with just a slight variation of his former words tells his people, 'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.'

Had Isaiah's advice been taken on the first of these two occasions, there would be little to chronicle about the Syro-Ephraimite war. It would have proved only a passing storm. But Ahaz went his own way, and the whole story must be told.

Assyria, a great inland empire like Russia, sought expansion like Russia towards the Mediterranean Sea. One of the conquests of which she was most proud was the conquest of the port of Arpad in the Levant; 'Where is the king of Arpad?' triumphantly asks Sennacherib once and again of Hezekiah. Arpad was captured in 740 B. C. by Tiglath-pileser, after a three years' siege, and became an Assyrian possession<sup>1</sup>. This event was a terrible blow to Northern Syria; it meant that Assyrian fetters would be rivetted on the cities which hitherto had escaped with a nominal submission and a moderate tribute. Native kings would be removed and Assyrian governors would be put in their place. Accordingly Rezin king of Damascus took steps to form a coalition against the Assyrian. Pekah king of Israel joined him. Probably resistance was hopeless from the beginning, but for any hope of success it was necessary that every state of Syria which could put a few thousand men in the field should be represented. Certainly Judah could not be spared. An invitation (it is commonly believed) was sent to Ahaz and rejected by him. There was nothing to be done but to depose the Jewish king and to compel Judah by force to join the coalition. This task no doubt seemed comparatively easy, since a party—perhaps a strong party—in Jerusalem itself was favourably inclined towards the two kings (Isa. viii 6).

Accordingly an allied army of Syrians and Israelites appeared before Jerusalem and blockaded it. There is nothing to show that an assault was attempted; on the contrary it is probable that the besiegers hoped that the city would be betrayed to them by

<sup>1</sup> Schrader, *Keilinschriften und das A. T.* (3<sup>te</sup> Aufl.), S. 53.



their partisans within the walls. The alarm of Ahaz and his supporters was extreme.

Two obvious courses now lay open to the Jewish king. He might yield to the pressure of Syria and Israel, and trust that, if he joined the coalition even at the eleventh hour, the allies would not insist on deposing him. He might on the contrary defy them to the uttermost by allying himself to the foe whom they both feared. To take either of these courses was indeed to lean on the arm of flesh, and to drag little Judah from her retirement among her mountains into the whirlpool of the great politics of Western Asia. There remained, however, to the eye of faith and patience a third course; Ahaz might listen to Isaiah; he might 'take heed and be quiet,' confine himself to a passive defence of Jerusalem, and wait in faith for God to work.

But the Jewish king was too weak a man to carry out a policy of 'masterly inactivity,' and too irreligious a man to put faith in an unseen Power into practice in his hour of trial. He might at least save his crown, even if Judah lost her independence, by submission to the Assyrian king, and accordingly he took the temple treasures which were kept for times of emergency, added to them the treasures preserved in the royal palace, and sent the sum as tribute to the Assyrian king. With this tribute he sent a message of complete submission: 'I am thy servant and thy son: come up, and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me' (2 Kings xvi 7).

Now it must have been obvious to Ahaz that there was only one way in which the king of Assyria would respond to such an appeal, if he responded at all. Tiglath-pileser would not march straight to Jerusalem, while there was territory belonging to Damascus and to Northern Israel immediately in his path to overrun and to plunder. Ahaz was in fact asking—nay, even bribing—the Assyrian king to invade the north and east of Israel. In any case this was the form in which the Assyrian answered the invitation. 'In the days of Pekah king of Israel,' writes the author of the book of Kings, 'came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maacah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali; and he carried them captive to Assyria.' It is true

indeed that the population of the districts named was of somewhat mixed descent (Judges i 30-33), and to this fact the general title 'Galilee of the Nations' is doubtless due. But that a population in the main Israelite should be carried into captivity and scattered at the instigation of a king of Judah must have been hateful to the best spirits of the southern kingdom, and especially to the best of the best, Isaiah himself. 'The brotherhood between Judah and Ephraim' (Zech. xi 14; cf. Hos. i 11) was a very old watchword; it was one of Isaiah's own; in another passage the prophet looks forward to the Messianic Age (for one reason) because 'Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim' (xi 13<sup>1</sup>). This sympathy was not merely a sympathy of kinship; it was also a religious bond. In a psalm which belongs, I believe, to the later days of the Jewish monarchy we have this feeling strongly brought out. 'The north and the south thou hast created them: Tabor and Hermon rejoice in thy name' (lxxxix 12). Here 'the north and the south' is a phrase describing the land of Israel in its full extent; while Tabor is mentioned as the characteristic mountain of the land of Zebulun, and Hermon as the range which towers over the land of Naphtali. The Psalmist standing on Mount Zion in the south pictures the mountains of the north joining in the chorus of praise which rises to the God of Israel.

But in the visions and aspirations of prophet and psalmist Ahaz had no share at all. He desired only to save his tottering throne. It was the sight (I believe) of this degeneracy in the House of David which was the external starting-point of Isaiah's vision of a new king and of a new era.

(5) *The substance of the Prophecy.* Isaiah begins where Ahaz leaves off. Ahaz has nothing to do with the vision of future glories. The prophet's eye of compassion and sympathy is fixed on the devastated lands of northern Israel. The true author of this devastation is dismissed in one short sentence, and passes out of sight: 'The former king despised the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali.' The word 'despised' is full of significance; it suggests an offence against the sacred bonds of kinship (2 Sam.

<sup>1</sup> I am unable to accept Duhm's view (*in loco*) that these words are a late gloss inserted into a second-century prophecy.



ix 44 [43]; Ezek. xxxi 7); Ahab is condemned as having committed the capital sin of unbrotherliness, and is excluded from the coming glories.

In his place another ('the later Ahab') is introduced. Of him the prophet says that he 'honours' the land which his predecessor has despised and disowned. He owes his kinship with its people throughout the whole land from west to east; it may be 'Galilee of the Nations' or 'Galilee of the Heathen' in name, but to him it is part of the land of Israel, part of the old kingdom of David, the prosperity of which must be dear to the successor of David. The word 'honours' in this connection is significant (cf. Exod. xx 12) in the opposite sense to the word 'despised' in the previous clause. To 'honour' means to fulfil those duties arising from kinship which Ahab had despised.

Thus understood we may see a certain fulfilment of the words in Isaiah's own day. The prophecy bore fruit in the prophet's lifetime. Hezekiah the son of Ahab, sometime after the kingdom of Israel had fallen, celebrated a solemn passover in Jerusalem. It was used as an occasion for asserting the unity of the whole Israelite people in a striking manner. Hezekiah 'honoured' the ties of kinship even in those who were far removed from the narrow limits of his kingdom. All Israel was summoned in an open letter to attend this passover. 'So the poets passed,' says the chronicler, 'from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh even unto Zebulun: but they laughed them to scorn and mocked them'. Nevertheless divers of Asher and Manasseh and Zebulun humbled themselves, and came to Jerusalem' (2 Chron. xxx 10, 11). This action of Hezekiah was really large-minded, for there was more than a trace of heathenism in these northern Israelites. 'For a multitude,' writes the chronicler again, 'had not cleansed themselves, yet did they eat the passover otherwise than it is written. For Hezekiah had prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that setteth his heart to seek God, . . . though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary' (2 Chron. xxx 18, 19).

We can be sure from such an incident as this that Hezekiah's views and aspirations were wholly different from his father's.

<sup>1</sup> No wonder, seeing what Ahab had done!

Ahaz might see with satisfaction the ravages committed by the Assyrians on Israel, but the younger king's heart would be given to the ideal which Isaiah paints in vers. 2-5. It is a true altruist's picture. The prophet looking forth from Jerusalem sends his full sympathy to his kinsmen in the north involved as they are in the ruin of war. He sees with exultation the light of joy rising upon their night of sorrow, he sees the sadly diminished people multiplied once more, he sees the heavy yoke of the Assyrian broken, he sees the very traces of war obliterated in great cleansing fires. Isaiah's vision in short is of the restoration of that which Ahaz had destroyed, and of the deliverance of those whom a narrow spirit in Judah had despised as a 'Nation,' *i.e.* as Gentiles, Heathen, Foreigners.

When was this deliverance to come? Not at once. It was to be the work of One whose birth is part of the great vision; the deliverance is to be (no doubt) the work of his full manhood, when the government comes upon his shoulder. But even while Isaiah speaks of a king who is born and grows up to receive his kingdom, the prophet's vision extends beyond time and earth. The king who is to undo the work of Ahaz and to heal not only the material but also the spiritual wounds which he had inflicted on the chosen people of God, could not be merely the heir and successor of the apostate king. When it comes to naming him only superhuman epithets suffice; He is the *Wonderful Counsellor* ('doing things past finding out'), the *Mighty God* ('strong in divine power to conquer evil'), the *Father of Eternity* ('a guardian who never fails'), the *Prince of Peace* ('one who can command the very waves of war to be still')<sup>1</sup>. The king thus

<sup>1</sup> Justice cannot be done to the language of ver. 6, unless the allusion to a super-human personality be acknowledged. To state the fact briefly, the four names of the king when considered, as they should be, together, point decisively to a sphere of mystical Hebrew thought which is well represented in the Old Testament, though absent from, or only latent in, post-Biblical orthodox Jewish writers, I mean the sphere in which the Divine and the human meet. Thus the root from which *šilo* ('wonderful') comes (though not restricted to the description of Divine action) is characteristically used of the working of God, or of the 'Angel of the Lord'; Judges xliii 18, 19 ('wonderful . . . wondrously'); Ps. cxviii 23 ('marvellous'); cxxxix 14 ('wonderfully made'). Again, *gibbôr* ('mighty') is most commonly applied to men, but it appears in a striking context as one of the epithets of God; Deut. x 17 *al* ('the great, the mighty, the terrible God'); and in Psalm xlv the mysterious ruler who is addressed with the words, 'O mighty one' (*gibbôr*) in ver. 3 [4], is addressed in ver. 6 [7] as 'God' (*šlohm*). The exact phrase *el gibbôr*



described cannot, I believe, be (as the great Jewish commentator Abraham ben Ezra maintains) the Hezekiah whom we know from Bible history. Other great Jewish authorities, though differing among themselves, agree that the first three epithets cannot be given to a merely human king. In particular they hesitate to allow the title 'Mighty God' to a 'Son' *born and given*. The best alternative put forward by them is to take the four epithets as a sentence, translating thus, 'And his name is called, *The Mighty God, the Father of Eternity, the Prince of Peace, counsels wondrously*'.<sup>1</sup> We know that the English Puritans, who were filled with the spirit of the Old Testament, did take names which consisted of words strung together to form a sentence, such names, I mean, as *Fight-against-sin, Hew-Agag-in-pieces-before-the-LORD*. But the nearest parallels in the Old Testament (including the 'JEHOVAH is our righteousness' of Jer. xxiii 6) belong to a later period than this prophecy; they consist chiefly of names found in Chronicles which seem to have come into use not before the close of the Babylonian captivity, and even among these we find nothing so elaborately framed as the one suggested by Jewish commentators here (Isa. ix 6). We get for example nothing more than *Jushab-hesed* ('Mercy is restored') or *Hodaviah* ('Thank ye JEHOVAH'). On the whole I think we have no choice but to acknowledge that four separate names or epithets are applied to the 'child' or 'son' mentioned at the beginning of the verse. And, if I dare not go so far as to say that Isaiah shows by the use of these four names

('Mighty God') appears again in ch. x 21, where it corresponds with the 'JEHOVAH, the Holy One of Israel' of the preceding verse. 'Father of Eternity' (אבי עולם) finds its closest parallel in the epithet 'One that inhabiteth Eternity' (ch. lvii 15 עשן עולם), which is applied to JEHOVAH, but on the other hand the cognate expression 'for ever' (עולם) is used sometimes to express a continuance other than Divine; cf. Ps. xxii 27; xxxvii 29. Finally, 'Prince of Peace,' though in itself a title suitable for a human ruler, has yet, when applied to a king of Israel, a touch of unexpectedness sufficient to confirm the impression of the superhuman nature of the expected king, which is gathered from the other epithets when they are studied in conjunction. Eastern kings are not 'princes of peace' (i. e. 'givers of peace'); 'peace' is a supernatural gift. Ps. xxix 11; compare too the Pauline title (also found in the Epistle to the Hebrews) 'the God of peace' (Rom. xv 33 *af*). Solomon himself was no more than a 'man of rest' (1 Chron. xxii 8), a ruler untouched by such mighty convulsions as those through which his father first rose to power, and afterwards more than once almost fell from it altogether.

<sup>1</sup> Luzzatto *apud* Delitzsch, *Jesaja* (3<sup>te</sup> Aufl.), *in loco*.

that he saw in vision the Incarnation, I do venture to say that the names prove that the prophet realized to himself a Person upon whom the Spirit of God rested to a degree and in a manner unknown before. This later king is in his person and in his achievements a fresh revelation of the God of Israel.

One point more. The 'Son' is given, the prophet says, to *us*, to us Jews, not directly to the suffering 'nation' to which he was destined to bring deliverance. The spiritual parallel between the prophet's vision and the Gospel history is very striking in this respect. The son is given to the house of David and to the Jews, but his work of salvation is manifested in half-Gentile Galilee. Isaiah's vision no less than the life of the Lord illustrates the truth—the Salvation is of the Jews, *ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*.

(6) *Conclusion*. At the outset I said that I preferred to call this passage a *vision* and not a *prediction*. A *prediction*, if a prediction be taken to be a foretelling of future certain events, is most likely to be a barren, fruitless thing, until the events predicted have come to pass, and even then its chief result may be merely to establish the credit of the person by whom or through whom the prediction is given. But a vision deals not so much with mere events as with great principles active in the present and full of promise for the future. A vision appeals to the men of the present to work towards the future. Understood as a vision this passage of Isaiah had its meaning both for its own day and for the apostolic age; it bears a message *ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*.

W. EMERY BARNES.

[NOTE.—I make no apology for the use made of 2 Chron. xxx on page 24. In the introduction to *Chronicles* in the Cambridge Bible I have given reasons for dissenting from the exaggerated depreciation of the book as a history which is popular at present. Moreover the particular narrative referred to seems to me to bear the impress of truth.—W. E. B.]

### THE HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL TERM 'SUBSTANCE': PART III.

IN previous articles we have considered the history of this word 'Substance' in its theological relations, during the time in which pagan philosophy and Christian doctrine were being brought into comparison and contrast. We have observed the way in which associations hidden in the philosophical vocabulary came to be modified, when the Church from the necessity of the case adopted this vocabulary for the accurate expression of its doctrine. We now pass to the consideration of a very different situation. It will be necessary only to note briefly some of the characteristic differences. The previous discussions were concerned with the nature of God as revealed by the Incarnation. Years of controversy had brought this question to something like a determined conclusion. In the subsequent period, therefore, the doctrine of God is taken rather as a datum—a starting-point for exposition, than a matter in debate. Further, in the previous period Greek philosophy, though long past its prime, was still in some sense a living force. We are now concerned with a time when it had ceased even in the country of its birth to be a profitable pursuit, and when the larger problems and the old way of treating them had passed out of the memory of men. For the discussions to which we must now turn arise and are carried on in the West, by people who deal with Greek philosophy in fragments translated into Latin, or filtered through the writing of Augustine or Jerome, or Isidore of Seville. It is true that the latest phase of Neo-platonism finds an enthusiastic support in the work of Scotus Erigena. He translated the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius into Latin, and his own point of view is closely akin to that of this unknown Platonist. But Harnack hardly goes too far when he says of him (*Dogmengesch.* iii p.



224 n.), 'Without influence in his own day, and even treated with suspicion, he did not even in later times become a teacher of the West, though western mystics have learnt much from him.' Had this been different, had Scotus attained the position his power and insight deserved, the history of mediaeval systematic philosophy would certainly have been widely different. Erigena made a serious attempt at a philosophic system on the grandest scale. Reason is for him a real instrument for the attainment of truth, and he is prepared to deal somewhat freely with doctrine, to claim, at least, that it must submit to philosophic interpretation, and find its place in a philosophic system. Such a method was entirely alien to the spirit of the age, to which philosophy was rather a process by which truth, otherwise attained, was articulated, than an instrument of attaining it.

It will not fall within our scope to enter at length into the conditions and minuter history of scholastic thought: it will only be necessary to make plain the origin of the scholastic discussions sufficiently to account for the form of the Eucharistic controversy which will be our main subject. We notice first that the gradual collapse of the Greek philosophic impulse had led to the closing of an ancient controversy. In the old days there had been a rivalry between the schools of Plato and Aristotle: it had by no means been admitted that these two philosophers and their followers had been really very close together in their doctrine. But the later forms of Platonism had been very largely influenced by Aristotelian doctrine, and at the end of the career of the School of Plato we find a Platonist like Simplicius commenting on Aristotle and maintaining his essential agreement with Platonic doctrine. Perhaps of all the works attributed to Aristotle we should least expect this assertion to be maintained in regard to the *Categories*: the ten Categories seem to imply a direct criticism of the Platonic ideal theory. Yet in his Commentary on this work Simplicius warns us not to assert disagreement between the philosophers, *πρὸς τὴν λέξιν ἀποβλέποντα μόνον τῶν πρὸς Πλάτωνα λεγομένων, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν νοῦν ἀφορῶντα τὴν ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις συμφωνίαν αὐτῶν ἰχνεύειν*<sup>1</sup>. A somewhat similar view is expressed by Boethius, who, though

<sup>1</sup> Simpl. *In Cat.* 2.



## THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

...antist in his sympathies<sup>1</sup>, yet hopes to demonstrate  
...ible agreement between the two thinkers<sup>2</sup>.

...ussion as there was on metaphysical questions at the  
...of the mediæval period arose in connexion with the  
...on of Aristotle's logical doctrines. It seems clear that  
...world was entirely without translations of the larger  
...ristotle till the twelfth century, and the treatises by  
...was known were mainly the *Categoricæ*, and the *De  
...ionæ* together with Porphyry's *Isagoge*<sup>3</sup>. Besides these  
...treatise attributed to S. Augustine on the Ten Cate-  
...it was commonly read: there were the Commentaries  
...on the *Isagoge*, the *Categoricæ*, and (in two forms)  
...*Interpretationes*, and the works of Cicero and Seneca.  
...ors of the early Middle Age were thus without the  
...ante and distinctive works of Greek philosophy and  
...ir system, in large measure, for themselves.

...ing-point of their enquiry seems to have been a phrase  
......tion of Porphyry, in which the author raises the  
...the nature of universals, and discusses it as being

phyry leaves aside: but he arrives at different results. In the first treatise he adopts a conclusion that would be called, in Scholastic language, a realism of the most uncompromising kind: in the other, his solution is more like the view of the nominalists. In the first treatise<sup>1</sup> the author explains the question raised by Porphyry with some care and then proceeds to deal with it. He makes the question turn on the five predicables, the subject of the *Isagoge*. These must be real existences, he contends: else the things to which they apply would not exist: 'Si rerum veritatem atque integritatem perpendas, non est dubium quin vere sint. Nam cum res omnes quae verae sunt, sine his quinque esse non possint, has ipsas quinque res vere intellectas esse non dubites.' The same argument applies to the *Categories*: 'Cur enim Aristoteles de primis decem sermonibus genera rerum significantibus disputaret? vel eorum differentias propriaque colligeret, et principaliter de accidentibus dissereret, nisi haec in rebus intimata et quodammodo adunata vidisset?' The question of their existence being thus settled Boethius turns to the second point raised by Porphyry, whether they are corporeal or incorporeal; he decides that they are incorporeal. And in answer to the third of Porphyry's questions, in what relation they stand to corporeal existence, concludes that they are sometimes united to it and sometimes not<sup>2</sup>.

In the second treatise Boethius argues in different style. He contends that a common notion which includes opposites must be equally present in all its constituent species and cannot therefore be really existent: 'Si neque unum est, quoniam commune est, neque multiplex, quoniam eius quoque multitudinis genus aliud inquirendum est, videbitur genus omnino non esse<sup>3</sup>.' He then shows with great clearness, and by aid of arguments drawn, without acknowledgement, from Aristotle, how the mind by reflexion and abstraction attains these universal ideas: and he points out that, though produced by this action on the part of the mind, they are not false ideas, but means by which the mind can attain real truth. The passage concludes with the following curious statement: 'Plato genera et species caeteraque sensibilia non modo intelligi universalialia, verum etiam esse, atque praeter

<sup>1</sup> Opp. Boeth. ed. Bas. 1570, pp. 8 seqq.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. pp. 9, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Opp. Boeth. p. 55.

corpora subsistere putat: Aristoteles vero intelligi quidem incorporalia atque universalia, sed subsistere in sensibilibus putat, quorum diludicare sententias aptum esse non duxi, altioris enim est philosophiae. Idcirco vero studiosius Aristotelis sententiam executi sumus, non quod eam maxime probaremus, sed quod hic liber ad predicamenta conscriptus est, quorum Aristoteles auctor est<sup>1</sup>. Boethius speaks apparently rather as an exegete than as a philosopher. The effect of his words, however, in this second mood, has been most influential upon those who followed him.

The discussion of this question, uncertain as its result is, still is a revival of a serious problem—that which divided the Platonic and Aristotelian schools: and the account which Boethius gives of the different attitudes of Plato and Aristotle is roughly true. But it was a new thing to raise the question over the Predicables. Porphyry seems to have definitely intended to exclude all metaphysics from his purview and to use the words *genus, species, &c.* in a purely logical or even grammatical sense. Moreover, as Cousin pointed out<sup>2</sup>, there is a confusion involved in raising the question here at all: 'Boëce . . . a converti la grande et légitime question de la réalité des genres et des espèces en la question insensée, et qui n'en fut jamais une, de la réalité du genre, de l'espèce, de la différence, du propre, et de l'accident.' It is possible, no doubt, to exaggerate the influence of this confusion, but it certainly is a confusion and has its effects. The Predicables cease to be a list of Heads of possible affirmations and denials, they acquire a kind of independent value as a scientific principle of reality: the so-called Tree of Porphyry and other formal logical processes take on the appearance of scientific methods. This is true of the Predicables even with the less severely realistic solution of Porphyry's question which Boethius adopts in his second work on the *Introduction*.

There is, as we now see, a somewhat imperfect clearness in Boethius's treatment of the Predicables: the same quality affects his discussion of the Categories. He announces with considerable decision that the division into the Categories refers only to words<sup>3</sup>: but, as may be readily understood, he finds a difficulty

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Cours des Leçons d'Aristote*, *Introd.* p. lxxviii.

<sup>3</sup> *Opp.* p. 127: 'Non de rebus, sed de vocibus tractaturus est, ut diceret: Dicuntur'



in maintaining this position firmly. We have two divisions *sermonum omnium* given and discussed. One, which Boethius calls 'parvissima,' is into four heads: *substantia, accidens, universalis, particularis*: and he adds 'Omnis enim res aut substantia est, aut accidens, aut universalis, aut particularis.' These four terms are capable of combination, indeed the two substantival terms cannot be expressed except as either universal or particular. Thus *man* is *substantia universalis*, *Socrates* is *substantia particularis*, *scientia* is *accidens universalis*, *Grammatica* is *accidens particularis*. In like manner in reference to the *Categories* Boethius tells us 'Omnis res aut substantia est,' &c.; and then he adds 'quo circa tot erunt etiam sermones qui ista significant.' What we have, in other words, is not merely a grammatical or logical treatise in which the distinctions of terms could be laid down, but a discussion of terms on the hypothesis that they closely correspond to the differences in things. Some of the distinctions drawn are more completely verbal than others. The general terms *colour* and *white* are accidents and not *secundae substantiae*, because they are not generic or specific names of concrete individuals. This looks more like a distinction between various kinds of general names. But the distinction between substance and accident has a more metaphysical air: 'substantia locus quidem est ubi accidentis valeat natura consistere.' This is a metaphor, no doubt: but it implies an assertion of the validity in nature of the distinction of substance and accident<sup>1</sup>.

The general drift of the philosophy of Boethius is peripatetic in character in spite of the shorter treatise on the *Introduction*. But he does not seem to us to go very far into the questions before him, or to be fully aware of the very great problems which underlie his discussions. He is not, as we have seen, severely consistent: nor would it be hard to find other evidences of inconsistency. One very conspicuous case occurs in the theological treatise *De Trinitate*, if that is really his<sup>2</sup>. In this work the

(referring to the words of the text 'Eorum quae secundum nullam complexionem dicuntur'): 'res enim proprie non dicuntur, sed voces.'

<sup>1</sup> Opp. p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> The authenticity of the Theological Treatises is doubtful. Hauréau, in his *Histoire de la Philosophie Scolastique* (vol. i pp. 451-2), repudiates them with scorn: he offers no reasons, however, and describes the books inaccurately. Nitzsch, author of a monograph on the system of Boethius, and of the article on him in

author, who, if not Boethius, had the name and weight of Boethius throughout the larger part of the Middle Age, attempts to explain and to vindicate the doctrine of the Three in One. He makes some interesting remarks as to the importance of approaching questions in the method appropriate to the science to which they belong; he discusses the general meaning of number and suggests ways in which triplicity may be consistent with unity: and then proceeds to consider by means of the ten Categories what affirmations are possible about God and in what sense. We are back at once in the atmosphere of neo-platonism. 'Ad aliquid (*πρός τι*) omnino non potest praedicari. Nam substantia in illo non est vere substantia, sed ultra substantias. . . . Cum dicimus Deus substantiam quidem significare videmur: sed eam quae sit ultra substantias. Cum vero iustus, qualitatem quidem, sed non accidentem, sed eam quae sit substantia, et ultra substantiam. Neque enim aliud est Deus quod est, et aliud quod iustus est: sed idem est esse Deo quod et iustum<sup>1</sup>.'

When we remember that the thinkers of the Middle Age started with an extremely limited library and that the Commentaries of Boethius and the theological treatises ascribed to him had a place in it, it will not seem excessive to have spent some time over this author. The main result noticeable is that we have in Boethius words which would necessarily arouse the question between the Nominalists and the Realists, but also suggestions which would lead to both conclusions. It was this controversy which occupied the minds of philosophers most completely during this period, and governed their attitude towards other disputes: and the germ of it all is to be found in Boethius. But besides this, it is important to notice that the questions involved in this controversy are raised and discussed in the region of Logic. This also was largely due to Boethius. It was in many ways unfortunate. The old controversy between the schools of Plato and Aristotle was a question between two different ways of looking at the world. And though this emerged in the later controversy, the discussion was always hampered

Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, also rejects them. He admits the ancient tradition which ascribes them to him, but thinks their genuineness extremely improbable in view of the number of persons of the name Severinus. Harnack, however (*Dogmengeschichte*, iii p. 30 n.), thinks that Usener has proved their genuineness. According to Nitzsch, one is already cited as Boethius by Alcuin.

<sup>1</sup> Opp. p. 1124.



in its movement by the forms in which it was conducted; and the absence of any general criticism of principles made it easy to assume that logical forms were also principles of knowledge, and to take commentaries upon authoritative documents as the natural form of philosophical speculation.

There are various problems in Theology which the controversy as to the nature of Universals was bound to affect. The most important relate to the nature of God, and the theory of the Eucharist. We must recall the fact that philosophy stands to doctrine exactly in the opposite relation to that which it held in patristic times. When the Church first began to deal with the question of its own creed, philosophical theories were in possession of educated thought: and the problem was to express accurately with the aid of the precise language of philosophy the doctrinal inheritance of the Church. By the time of the Schoolmen doctrinal discussions were largely settled: the main lines of the Creed were firmly defined, in such a sense that divergence from them was an offence; and the problem for thinkers was to make the surviving fragments of philosophical language express and, in a measure, criticize the dogma defined. Thus we have now to consider the effect of the contact of a clearly formulated Trinitarian doctrine with the new discussion as to Universals.

The first person of whom we must speak is Roscellin. Unfortunately his actual works are no longer extant, but we have evidence of his views in Anselm and Abelard<sup>1</sup>. From this it will appear that he was a Nominalist of an extreme kind. He seems to have held that general names were merely *flatus vocis*, and corresponded to no reality<sup>2</sup>: and Abelard affirms that he made the same assertion in regard to the parts of a body<sup>3</sup>. It was the effect of this view on the Trinitarian doctrine that led to Anselm's attack upon Roscellin. In the work above mentioned Anselm does not discuss the question of Universals; he notes some of the consequences of the theory in the region of philosophy, but is chiefly concerned to trace its heretical results. Philosophically, it

<sup>1</sup> Anselm, *Liber de Fide Trinitatis*, chs. i-iii. Abelard *Dialectica*, P. v. p. 471, ed. Cousin.

<sup>2</sup> Ans. op. cit. ch. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Abel, loc. cit. 'Fuit autem, memini, magistri nostri Roscellini tam insana sententia ut nullam rem partibus constare vellet, sed sicut solis vocibus species ita et partes adscribebat.'



is Materialism: theologically, it is either Sabellianism or Tritheism, according as those who hold it lay emphasis on the Unity of God, or on the diversity of the Persons to whom Divine attributes are ascribed. The language used by Anselm is noticeable. He says that the philosophers in question 'non nisi flatum vocis putant esse universales substantias, et colorem non aliud queunt intelligere quam corpus, nec sapientiam hominis aliud quam animam.' He says further that these men's mind is so 'imaginationibus corporalibus obvoluta, ut ex eis se non possit evolvere, nec ab ipsis ea, quae ipsa sola et pura contemplari debet, valeat discernere'.<sup>1</sup> The phrase *universalis substantia* comes from Boethius, and means, of course, the general terms—universals: the rest of the passage hints at the way in which Anselm thought these universals were reached, viz. by Abstraction; and the power of reason to contemplate them. From the *Monologism* it is plain that the head of the scheme of universal constitutive ideas was the *summa substantia*, i.e. God.

Anselm, as we see, rejects Nominalism altogether: for him the general idea is the true reality<sup>2</sup>, and God on the metaphysical side is the supreme reality<sup>3</sup>. Abelard also regards God as *summa substantia*: but his different theory of existence involves a different application of the word to Trinitarian theology. Abelard was equally discontented with both schools of philosophy. He rejected the doctrine of Roscellin, and also claims to have publicly disproved that of William of Champeaux (who professed an extreme form of Realism) and compelled him to modify his teaching. This attitude makes it difficult to say precisely what his own doctrine was. A few things are certain. Abelard started from the individual person or thing, just as Roscellin had done; but he gave more reality and significance to the higher and more general ideas than he. Also, he attributed the formation of these ideas to the operation of the mind. 'Speciem igitur dico esse non illam essentiam hominis solum quae est in Socrate, vel quae est in aliquo alio individuorum, sed totam illam collectionem ex singulis aliis huius naturae coniunctam'.<sup>4</sup> This rather obscure sentence

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. ch. ii ad fin.

<sup>2</sup> Monol. ch. i.

<sup>3</sup> 'Summa substantia' *Monol.* ch. xi; 'Essentia' ch. xii; 'natura' ch. xiii. Cf. *De Fide Trin.* ch. ix.

<sup>4</sup> *Ouvrages Inédits*, ed. Cous.; *Dial.* P. v. p. 524.

seems to be intended to protect the theory from any suggestion of the separateness of universals: it is in them, different in each and yet similar: and the whole collection of these individual essences makes the species, 'just as a people is called one, though it is formed by the combination of many persons.' The general element Abelard calls the matter, the individualizing element he calls form. Applying this process to wider and wider class-names we reach at last the ultimate substance 'quae tamen nondum est simplex, sed ex materia mera essentia, ut ita dicam, et susceptibilitate contrariorum forma constat<sup>1</sup>.' Thus it would seem that Abelard, starting with the intention of recognizing the truth in both Schools, never really overcomes the opposition between the individual and the universal. The relation of form and matter by which he interprets it pursues him to the end.

When we ask how the notion of Substance is applied to God we find that the theological requirements of the case involve some modification. Abelard states and reiterates that God is *substantia*, and as such is absolutely simple, this being assumed to be a superior type of reality to anything in which there is multiplicity. But he has to reconcile this with the doctrine of the Trinity. In his interpretation of this he uses, of course, the orthodox names of the Three Persons, but he gives them a kind of abstract interpretation. The Father is equivalent to Power, the Son to Wisdom, the Holy Ghost to Benignity<sup>2</sup>. There he treats this diversity in the Unity of God as a *diversitas proprietatum*, and is careful to state that it involves no breach of unity in substance. 'Constat . . . quoque nullam trium personarum ab alia substantialiter esse diversam, vel etiam secundum numerum rerum esse discretam, sed tantummodo proprietate sua diversam esse unam ab alia, non autem substantia dissimilem aut numero, ut Arius putat.' He argues that human individuals do not differ in substance: still less is there any final difference between one Person in the Holy Trinity and another—'quarum unica est penitus substantia singularis, nullam partium aut formarum diversitatem recipiens<sup>3</sup>.' Two questions arise out of this view which are relevant to our present purpose: (1) What is the relation between

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 525-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Opp. Abael.* ed. Cous. *Theol. Christ.* I c. ii p. 360.

<sup>3</sup> *Theol. Christ.* III p. 468.

the substance and the properties? (2) Why is the number limited to Three? Abelard denies that the diverse properties which constitute the diversity of Person inhere *accidentally* in the Divine substance. They are *substantialiter inhaerentes*. 'Omnino enim Deum necesse est esse sapientem, nec ullo modo aut non esse potest, aut non esse sapiens, aut aliquam suscipere corruptionem, ut ei aliquid accidere possit<sup>1</sup>.' This view he connects with the transcendent notion of Boethius that the Divine substance is *ultra substantiam*<sup>2</sup>. But though he rejects the phraseology of substance and accident, and even of matter and form<sup>3</sup>, he uses the analogy of wax and the image made of wax to illustrate the relation between the Father and the Son. 'Est divina Sapientia ex divina Potentia: quomodo cerea imago est ex cera, aut quomodo, iuxta philosophos, species ipsa ex genere esse dicitur cum tamen idem sit species quod genus, ut homo idem quod animal et imago cerea idem quod cera<sup>4</sup>.' This process he conceives as being timeless, as also the Procession of the Holy Ghost. In answer to the question why the number of these properties should be limited to Three, he answers bluntly that the authority of the Church has so limited them<sup>5</sup>.

When Abelard affirms that the ultimate Substance is God, or uses the word *substantia* as the fittest to describe Him, we seem to be on familiar ground. But the question whether the *proprietaes* inhere *substantialiter* or *accidenter* is not one which would have occurred to a real Platonist or Aristotelian. It comes from the narrower logical associations into which the conditions of mediaeval thinking had brought these discussions. In Plotinus and the theologians who were most profoundly affected by neoplatonism, the diversity in the ἀρχαὶ καὶ ὑποστάσεις, or in the Divine substance, was a necessary and timeless process. There are reminiscences of this position in Abelard, as when he says that the generative process is beyond time, and in the discussion earlier in the *Theologia Christiana* of the relation of the two terms *Verbum* and *Sapientia*. But the contrast between substance and accident haunts the word, and while it complicates the conception of the relation of the *substance* and the *properties* it further involves the theologian in the difficulty of saying what

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 471.<sup>2</sup> p. 472.<sup>3</sup> p. 470.<sup>4</sup> p. 525.<sup>5</sup> p. 496.



are and what are not essential attributes. In the earlier stages of thought it might have been hard to say how the generation of the Son was to be distinguished from the creation of the world, but Abelard's difficulty could not have arisen because the conception of substance was different. The association of the word before had been with just those parts of Greek philosophy of which the direct knowledge had so largely disappeared: with the Schoolmen the notion of substance was associated with the logical use of it, modified by some imperfect glimpses of the wider point of view.

It is worth noticing that this difficulty which arose, as we venture to think, from the logical associations of the word *Substantia*, seems to have affected scholastic thought even after the deeper study of Greek philosophy had again become possible. The question of the Attributes of God, and how to interpret them in connexion with the Divine Substance and the Trinity of Persons, is a question which belongs to the scholastic theory of substance. We have seen that Abelard found it by no means free from difficulties. Successors of his were no less perplexed. For the theory which was associated with the distinction of substance and accident was always in danger of a form of Sabellianism and of holding to the existence of a single undifferentiated Divine substance to which attributes became attached in a more or less accidental way: so that the Personal distinctions themselves were in danger of being treated as accidental. This is the meaning attached to the theory of Gilbert de la Porrée—a later contemporary of Abelard's—that the Trinity cannot be predicated of God *substantialiter*<sup>1</sup>. But even later still St. Thomas Aquinas, though he has accepted the negative conception of the Being of God which dates back to neo-platonism, endeavours to explain the position of the Attributes. God is not adequately or necessarily known by us: 'essentia eius est supra id quod de Deo intelligimus et voce significamus'. We use names of God, and it is not quite true to say that they have only a negative meaning: 'et ideo dicendum est quod huiusmodi nomina significant substantiam divinam et praedicantur de Deo substantialiter: sed deficiunt a representa-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Baur, *Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeit*, vol. ii p. 511 &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa Theol.* P. I. qu. xiii art. i ad primum; cf. art. 2.

tionem ipsius<sup>1</sup>. God has *eminentiori modo* all the perfections which there are, and of which we observe imperfect copies in nature. So far there is little talk of accidents and substance. But in a later section when he comes to discuss the multiplicity in the Godhead and therefore the presence of relativity within its unity he deals with the question in connexion with the Categories and condemns Gilbert de la Porrée, not for bringing in considerations from an inappropriate region of philosophy, but for using them wrongly<sup>2</sup>.

We have mentioned this controversy, though it lies somewhat outside the main subject, because it emphasizes the persistence with which the notion of substance and accident in its logical shape affected mediaeval thought. This is, perhaps, in no way an unexpected or startling announcement: it is, however, of great importance to keep it firmly before us in discussing the next subject which comes before us, the application of the notion of substance to the Eucharist. In order to explain this point clearly it will be necessary to go back in the history a short way and indicate the stage of the discussion upon this Sacrament.

The history may be said to begin with Paschasius Radbert, who was abbot of Corbey, and died in or about 851. His treatise *De Corpore et Sanguine Christi*, which belongs to the year 831, is the first work devoted entirely to the subject<sup>3</sup>, and we may therefore well begin with some account of its doctrine. He treats the effect of consecration as a miracle, on the analogy of the Incarnation itself (c. iii): as that was the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit, so 'per eundem (Spiritum) ex substantia panis ac vini mystice idem Christi corpus et sanguis consecratur' (c. iv). Further, though it is true to speak of the outward part of the Sacrament as *figura*, yet this does not exclude the reality of that which it conveys: the true Body and Blood are there by a miraculous process, which Paschasius definitely declines to attempt to explain (c. iii 3). The wicked,

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. qu. xiii art. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa Theol.* P. I. qu. xxviii art. 2. For the further history of this discussion see Baur as above; Werner, *Die nach-scholastische Scholastik*, ch. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* iii p. 278.

though they receive the true Body and Blood, derive only judgement from the reception of it : as is shown by certain miraculous occurrences which have befallen unworthy recipients (c. vi). And further, so great is the change consequent on the words of consecration that the elements can only be called Bread and Wine in a spiritual sense. The Bread is still bread, 'quia Christi caro et vera caro, et tamen panis vivus qui de caelo descendit iure catholice praedicatur. . . . Secundam praemissam doctrinae veritatem nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis iure creditur, quae non sapore carnis, sed spiritali dulcedine degustantur, et fidei ratione intelliguntur' (c. xvi). This view seems to exclude the doctrine of a Presence real only to the faithful recipient, and, except that it provides no explanation of the miracle, it closely resembles the later articulate doctrine. Those who go back to Paschasius for the doctrine of Transubstantiation are justified in so doing, though the word is never mentioned in his treatise, and though there is comparatively little said about *substantia* at all<sup>1</sup>. It is clear that the real question depends on the result of the words of consecration ; when these are pronounced, do the bread and wine remain any longer in existence or do they disappear altogether, their place being taken by the Body and the Blood? Paschasius seems to have assumed the second of these alternatives, and his view was probably the prevalent one. In the eleventh century the controversy between Berengarius and Lanfranc mainly turns on this point. The terminology which the opponents used is not very precise : there is not as yet any direct use of the contrast of *substantia* and *accidens*. But the discussion points to the solution which the use of this contrast supplies. The word *substantia* occurs with some frequency in both authors, and in the documents connected with the controversy. Berengarius is made to accept the view 'panem et vinum quae in altari ponuntur post consecrationem non solum sacramentum sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Iesu Christi esse, et sensualiter non solum sacramento

<sup>1</sup> The question of the reception of the wicked is not in so many words before Paschasius. He discusses and endeavours to define the judgement with which St. Paul threatens them : and so tells stories of miraculous paralysis or other misfortunes which have befallen the unworthy. From this, we should infer that the judgement consisted not in missing reception of the Body altogether, but in incurring punishment for sacrilegiously approaching so holy a Thing.



ate manibus sacerdotum tractari": and again, "panem substantialiter converti . . . non tantum per signum et sacramenti, sed in proprietate naturae et veritate sub-

For the word *substantia* Berengarius occasionally uses<sup>3</sup>. He speaks of the theory which he disapproves of the effect of consecration *per generationem substantiae* he claims that Ambrose supports him in holding that substances remain *secundum proprietatem speciei suae*; and he uses the phrase as follows: "speciem autem dico secundam panem et vinum, non secundum colorem vel quae in eis sunt accidentia"<sup>4</sup>.

The phrase last quoted the formula of Transubstantiation fully expressed. The word seems to occur first some time at the beginning of the twelfth century<sup>5</sup>, but thereafter development wanted to articulate the idea. It is not necessary to trace the doctrine through all its phases: for present purpose it is sufficient to have established the date of the phrases when they appear. We pass on, therefore, to consider the elaborate treatment of the whole matter by Thomas Aquinas. It is clear that the solution of the problem applied by the doctrine in question is apparent rather

been allowed to persist through the change; because the presence of one substance must have seemed inevitably to mean the absence of another<sup>1</sup>. But it could not fail to catch the attention of so exhaustive a thinker as S. Thomas that the accidents which remained preserved a great deal of the force and operation of a substance. It is clear from his language that the matter was in debate, and that various opinions were put forward and discussed. The interest of a large number of his *Quaestiones* is to go as far in allowing substantial features to the accidents without exactly confusing them with substances. He argues that the Body of Christ is present 'secundum modum substantiae' and not 'in loco'<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, the senses report effects from the elements which are indistinguishable from the realities themselves. They inhere in the 'quantitas dimensiva sicut in subiecto'<sup>3</sup>. They produce ordinary physical effects—are capable of various physical processes, such as change, corruption, mixture, and there is no sign of the return of the substance of the bread and wine after consecration<sup>4</sup>. The point above mentioned of the accidents inhering in *quantitas dimensiva* is of special interest. A substance, according to S. Thomas, is a remote reality in which accidents inhere on a quasi-hierarchical principle. 'Quia primum subiectum est materia, consequens est quod omnia alia accidentia referantur ad subiectum, mediante quantitate dimensiva, sicut et primum subiectum coloris dicitur esse superficies.' Hence when the subject or *substantia* is removed, it follows that by the same miraculous act the *quantitas dimensiva* is endowed with the power of sustaining all the other phenomena. It is, however, expressly provided that the accidents remain accidents still<sup>5</sup>. It will be seen how difficult a position this really involves. The substance is conceived in sharp opposition to the accidents, yet all the appearances ordinarily attached to the presence of a substance are obviously sustained: the climax is, perhaps, reached in the discussion<sup>6</sup> as to the possibility of the mixture of some

<sup>1</sup> It appears, therefore, to be futile to endeavour to maintain that the Lateran Council of 1215 did not propose to lay the philosophical theory of the Sacrament as a dogma upon the Church. The language they used can hardly have meant anything else.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa Theol.* P. iii Q. lxxvi art. v.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* Q. lxxvii art. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* Q. lxxvii art. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* Q. lxxvii art. 1 and 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* Q. lxxvii art. 8.

other fluid with the consecrated wine. If so much of the new fluid is added that the character of the wine changes, its sacramental burden will also disappear: 'si fiat tanta permixtio liquoris cuiuscumque quod pertingat ad totum vinum consecratum, et fiat permixtum, erit aliud numero, et non remanebit ibi sanguis Christi.' At this point the distinction of the substance and the accidents ceases to hold, or at least becomes a very precarious instrument of explanation.

The subsequent history of this doctrine before the Reformation is the history of the attempt to make the idea of substance and accidents work intelligibly in regard to the Sacrament. Duns Scotus refines upon the idea of Transubstantiation: the process, he says, is of two kinds, production and adduction. By the former a substance *accipit esse* as a result of the change: by the latter it only *accipit esse hic*. And he describes the Sacramental change as being of the latter sort: 'nec panis convertitur nec transit in corpus Christi, nisi secundum esse hic praesens pani praexistenti<sup>1</sup>.' This involves a considerable weakening of the idea of the change, more especially as he further denies any necessity for the annihilation of the substance of the bread. On the other hand, the accidents tend more and more to play the part of a substance. Scotus will not accept the doctrine that on the disappearance of a substance, the accidents require a subject in which to inhere<sup>2</sup>. Inherence is not of the essence e.g. of *albedo*: though *albedo* has a tendency to inhere in a subject. And again on the destruction of the elements the Sacrament disappears because God has attached the eucharistic gift to certain qualitative phenomena. The question of the accidents—especially of the relation of quantity and quality to substance—was still further elaborated by Occam<sup>3</sup>, and it became difficult to be certain what was the distinctive and essential feature of the sacramental element: until Wyclif<sup>4</sup> derides the uncertainty prevailing upon the whole subject. The larger part of the province of Canterbury thinks 'quod sacramentum altaris est ponderositas': in the diocese of Lincoln the opinion prevails 'quod hostia altaris est quantitas': others think that it is

<sup>1</sup> *Sent.* iv. dist. x.

<sup>2</sup> *De Sac. Altaris*, cc. xiv seqq.

<sup>4</sup> *De Euch.*, Wyclif Society's Edition, pp. 183-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* dist. 12.



*qualitas*, and of all possible qualities *albedo*; this view, says Wyclif, prevails in Wales and Ireland 'ubi vident mortuos.'

The purport of these remarkable speculations seems to be, as we have already said, to make the conception of substance and accident work intelligibly in connexion with the Eucharist. And it is hardly too much to say that they make conspicuous the total inadequacy of those Categories for the purpose. The doctrine of Transubstantiation as at first formulated provided what appeared to be a solution of a dogmatic difficulty. There were, on one side, the Lord's words of Institution, and on the other the patent empirical facts: a secret miraculous change that left the accidents unaltered seemed to meet the difficulty. And it was natural to look in this direction for a solution, because of the prevailing tone of philosophical thought, and because it seemed axiomatic that two realities (or *substantiae*) could not occupy the same space<sup>1</sup>. But the attempted solution was really a surrender of the doctrinal interest to a philosophical theory, which was quite incapable of doing the work required of it. And the successive refinements upon the words substance and accident lead us no further philosophically, nor get rid of the inexorable contrast between the two categories, nor seriously help to the understanding of the Sacrament. They are only a means of retaining the formula of Transubstantiation, at the expense of its meaning.

T. B. STRONG.

<sup>1</sup> Occam rejects this principle, following Scotus, on the ground that it limits the Divine Omnipotence; *De Sacr.* c. v.

## PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION.

IN every age of civilization there is to be found among the sciences pursued one which, for the time, not only attracts a larger share of attention than any other, but determines the point of view from which all the other sciences are treated. At one time it may be theology, at another logic, at another mathematics, at another biology. At present, so Prof. Münsterberg contends<sup>1</sup>, it is psychology which, in the course of the last ten or fifteen years, has stepped into this place. If this be so, it cannot but be of the greatest interest and importance to the students of any other department of knowledge to observe the results for their own science of psychological investigation, and to look at the problems with which they are busy in the light of psychological ideas. It can hardly therefore be out of place to invite the attention of the readers of this JOURNAL to the contents of an important work, treating of the phenomena of the religious consciousness (the form of consciousness with which students of theology are especially concerned) as they appear to the mind of one of the most distinguished representatives of modern psychological science<sup>2</sup>.

It is probable that if, thirty years ago, an intelligent observer of the currents of contemporary philosophical thought in England had been asked what would in all likelihood be the attitude of thinkers at the beginning of the twentieth century towards the problem of 'the freedom of the will'—one of the three great problems, according to Kant, of metaphysics and theology—he would have hazarded some such guess as this: that the further extension of the methods of physical science to the problems of life and mind would have rendered the belief in 'free will' obsolete among scientific psychologists, and among philosophers inclined to look upon physical science as affording (so far as it

<sup>1</sup> *Psychology and Life*, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, by W. James. (Longmans, 1902.)



goes) the only sure guidance for which a seeker after truth need hope; but that a remnant of idealistic metaphysicians might perhaps still be defending, by subtle arguments, in the supposed interest of religion and morality, some more or less attenuated form of the ancient doctrine, emphasizing still, it might be, with Kant, the impossibility of denying the existence of a power necessarily inaccessible to the methods of empirical investigation, or mysteriously assuring the enquirer, after the manner of Hegel, that when all was said the truth of necessity would turn out at last to be no other than freedom.

Such a prediction, however, would have been very far out. When we look around us now, it is certainly not among the idealistic metaphysicians (at least since the deaths of Lotze and Martineau) that one will find the name of 'free will' held in honour; among the empirical psychologists, on the other hand, we find an increasingly strong conviction—based upon their experience as scientific investigators—of the impossibility of extending to the mental life the categories of mechanical determinism, taking shape in various doctrines of free will, often unsatisfactory enough from a philosophical point of view, but all showing an absence of that repugnance to the idea which characterized the scientific positivists of the past, and characterizes also the metaphysicians of the present.

No proof of this is more striking than that afforded by Mr. H. G. Wells in his suggestive *Anticipations*. Mr. Wells is a man in many respects in sympathy with the type of mind caricatured in Mr. Mallock's picture of Mr. Saunders in *The New Republic*; but he has, as a man of his period, passed under the influence of the psychologists; he is an admiring student of Prof. James, and with him 'free will' is an article of the 'faith of the New Republic' (his own, not Mr. Mallock's) that is to be<sup>1</sup>. It is treated, no doubt, as belonging to a sphere altogether apart from that with which the investigations of the physical sciences are concerned; but that is a sphere of merely 'abstract' truth; the 'real' world is that of purpose and duty, and in this world the conception of 'free will' is valid. This dualism is not indeed wholly satisfactory to the philosopher, who still, as in the days of Plato, is unwilling to be put off with many, or even with two, instead

<sup>1</sup> *Anticipations*, pp. 284, 285.



of the One which is the object of his search. But it is very much to the fore in contemporary thought; and it is at least more satisfactory than the rough and ready unity attained by a 'positivism' or 'naturalism' which deals with one-half of human experience—and that the half which in common life we treat as the more important—by ignoring it altogether, or by forcing it, in an arbitrary and thoroughly *a priori* fashion, to conform to the categories appropriate to the other half.

The language in which this dualism commonly expresses itself is indeed derived, like most of the language of modern thought, from Kant. But the world which lies beyond the reach of the categories of physical science is not treated (as by the imperfect Kantianism popularized by Mr. Herbert Spencer) as a void 'unknowable'; it is peopled (as indeed it was by Kant himself) with 'judgements,' as the phrase goes, not 'of existence,' but 'of value'; judgements, that is, which state that something *is good*, not that it *exists* or *happens* in the same way as bodies in space or events in time. Here again the philosopher may often find himself objecting that the 'judgement of value' is sometimes treated as so different from the 'judgement of existence' that one might well wonder why both alike are called 'judgements' at all; and he may allow himself to wonder how far Kant would have acknowledged a dualism of the 'practical' and 'theoretical' spheres which goes the length of ignoring the need of such a unity as he himself sought in the 'idea of God.' But for the present it is to be noted that this dualism of 'judgements of existence' and 'judgements of value' is characteristic of the thought of our day. It is the foundation of the Ritschlian theology, and of much theology which is akin to the Ritschlian—of Sabatier's<sup>1</sup>, for instance, and of that of the celebrated Danish psychologist, Prof. Höffding<sup>2</sup>. The sense of universal purpose, not inferred, as by Paley, from the study of external nature, but inevitably arising within us in the course of life's activity, is the basis of the theism which will be the religion of the citizen of Mr. Wells's ideal state<sup>3</sup>. Now, that religious 'belief' is not a belief like that in a geometrical proposition or an historical fact; that

<sup>1</sup> *Esquisse d'une Philosophie de Religion*. (Paris, 1898.)

<sup>2</sup> *Religionsphilosophie*. (Leipzig, 1901.)

<sup>3</sup> *Anticipations*, p. 284.

a 'belief' which should be of that sort would not be *religious* belief at all (for, as St. James says, 'the devils also believe and tremble'), while, on the other hand, confirmed religious faith knows itself to be independent of such results of scientific or historical enquiry as would necessarily affect belief in scientific or historical propositions; this is surely true, and is at any rate part of the meaning of those who say that the propositions of religion are judgements of value, not of existence. Still, we cannot but ask ourselves what is the relation of this world of 'values' to the world of 'facts.' And not only is the metaphysician forced to put this question in the interest of the unification of knowledge; religion itself also (and here it seems to differ from art), by instinctively throwing its propositions into the form of statements about fact or existence—as it does in framing the simplest of creeds—shows that it cannot avoid raising the same question sooner or later. That it should raise it later rather than sooner; that the 'judgement of value,' the adoption of a standard or of an attitude, not the conviction that something is abstractly true, is primary in religion; this is the great lesson which Ritschlianism and kindred movements have sought to teach our generation.

Prof. James, in his study of the 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' is not however in the main concerned with 'judgements of value' as such, but with 'judgements of existence'; although these judgements concern the existence of 'judgements of value' made by certain persons. It is not the interpretation of the phenomena of the religious consciousness that he takes for his subject; it is the phenomena themselves. The book is, to use the Baconian phrase, a *comparentia instantiarum*; a marshalling before the mind of the relevant facts, to the interpretation of which he proposes to pass in a subsequent series of lectures.

'The question, "What are the religious propensities?"' he says, 'and the question, "What is their philosophic significance?"' are two entirely different orders of the question from the logical point of view<sup>1</sup>.

The former, as he explains, is a *judgement of being*, the latter a *judgement of value*, *spiritual judgement*, or *Werthurtheil*.

For a majority of Prof. James's readers in this country his

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 4.

Gifford Lectures will be the first dispassionate study on a considerable scale of the phenomena of 'conviction of sin,' 'conversion,' 'saintliness,' and so forth, that will have come into their hands. Work on the same lines has, however, been done before by such writers as Dr. Leuba, in Germany, and Professor Starbuck, in America. The latter in particular has, it seems, formed a large collection of original documents in which numerous correspondents have related their own religious experiences; a collection of which Prof. James has made much use as a storehouse of facts.

He deals first of all with the view often advanced that the religious propensities are sexual in origin. This view he dismisses with some impatience.

'Few conceptions,' we read, 'are less instructive than this re-interpretation of religion as perverted sexuality<sup>1</sup>.' It is not, of course, to be denied that the religious emotions are often quickened into activity at the period of puberty; but this is quite as true of many emotions beside the religious. Awakening interest in science is as much a feature of adolescence as religious conversion<sup>2</sup>. His conclusion is that, if thoroughly worked out, 'the whole theory' of the sexuality of religion will be found to have 'lost its point in evaporating into a vague general assertion of the dependence, *somehow*, of the mind upon the body<sup>3</sup>.' One may be allowed, however, to wish that Prof. James had given greater completeness to this part of his argument by attempting the difficult and delicate task (perhaps, indeed, impossible in the conditions under which the lectures were delivered) of discussing what seem to be the more special relations of religious and sexual emotion which are suggested by the experiences and language of some eminent saints, and which form the chief interest of such a story as Georges Sand's *Mademoiselle La Quintinie*.

As little importance as Prof. James attaches to the explanation of religion as *sexual*, does he attach to the view which dismisses it as *pathological*. He does not, of course, deny that physical processes accompany religious as well as other emotions and thoughts; but 'there is not a single one of our states of mind, high or low, healthy or morbid, that has not some organic process as its condition. Scientific theories are organically conditioned just as much as religious emotions are<sup>3</sup>.' But this

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> p. 14.



consideration deprives of all importance the contention that religious experiences are not valid, because organically conditioned. The doctrine is never impartially applied. 'It is needless to say that medical materialism draws in point of fact no such sceptical conclusion' as that 'none of our thoughts and feelings, not even our scientific doctrines, not even our *disbeliefs*, could retain any value as revelations of the truth' because organically conditioned. On the contrary 'it is sure, just as every simple man is sure, that some states of mind are inwardly superior to others and reveal to us more truth. It has no physiological theory of these its favourite states, by which it may accredit them; and its attempt to discredit the states it dislikes, by vaguely associating them with nerves and liver, and connecting them with names connoting bodily affliction is altogether illogical and inconsistent. Let us play fair in this matter'.<sup>1</sup> We have no physiological criterion for determining the comparative value of organic processes from which we could infer that of the mental states associated with them, 'When we praise the thoughts which health brings, health's peculiar chemical metabolisms have nothing to do with determining our judgement. We know in fact almost nothing about these metabolisms. It is the character of inner happiness in the thoughts which stamps them as good, or else their consistency with our other opinions and their serviceability for our needs'.<sup>2</sup> Our criterion, in fact, is derived from the internal witness of the states of consciousness themselves. '*Immediate luminousness, philosophical reasonableness and moral helpfulness* are the only available criteria'.<sup>3</sup>

Not only the methods of dismissing religion as *perverted sexuality* or as *pathological*, but that which dismisses it because it can be shown to have grown out of demonstrably unreasonable attitudes towards life, such as those which go by the name of fetishism, magic, and the like, falls under Prof. James's censure. It is, indeed, plainly an odd kind of evolutionism which supposes that the end of a development has no more worth than its starting-point. 'By their fruits ye shall know them' says Prof. James, 'not by their roots'.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, these primitive states of mind are the ancestors of other than religious theories of the world, just as coincidence with puberty is characteristic of

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, pp. 14, 15.

<sup>2</sup> p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> p. 20.

other emotional excitements than the religious. 'The whole system of thought which leads to magic, fetishism, and the lower superstitions may just as well be called primitive science as called primitive religion<sup>1</sup>.'

Having rejected as inadequate these superficial characterizations of religion as perverted sexuality, mental disease, or a survival of savage superstition, Prof. James turns to discover from an examination of the religious sentiment, as it appears in the civilized mind which we know best, in what manner it may be better described. First, then, he considers the view which sees in what we call a man's religion his 'total reaction upon life'; and he enlarges this conception as follows: 'that curious sense of the whole residual cosmos as an everlasting presence, intimate or alien, terrible or amusing, lovable or odious, which in some degree every one possesses<sup>2</sup>.' Now this states admirably the kernel of the religious sentiment; though Prof. James refuses, as we shall see, to identify this 'sense of the cosmos' with religion, unless the element of *solemnity* be added to the description. But at present it is worth observing that this 'sense of the whole residual cosmos' must be implicitly a sense not of gods, but of God; and that what Prof. James here says is incompatible with a later assertion<sup>3</sup> which amounts to saying that polytheism is just as naturally agreeable as monotheism to the religious sentiment.

This 'sense of the cosmos,' however, is not, in Prof. James's view, a sufficient definition of religion, unless it be accompanied by a feeling of *solemnity*. To regard the 'cosmos' as amusing—one of the possibilities suggested—is not to be religious. The possibility of doing this is illustrated<sup>4</sup> by an interesting quotation from Renan, which also, by the way, illustrates an attempt to regard the universe in what may be described as a double-minded way, as though there were an off-chance it were not a serious business, while treating it for the most part (but not unreservedly) as though it were; thus indicating (if, with Prof. James himself, we conceive this very double-mindedness of Renan's outlook to deprive it of the right to be called religious) the essentially monotheistic tendency of the religious sentiment. Certainly the attitude suggested by Renan is in strong contrast

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> p. 325.

<sup>4</sup> pp. 36, 37.



to the spirit of whole-hearted self-surrender recommended in the Gospel, a spirit which Browning loved to enforce<sup>1</sup> by showing how whole-hearted self-surrender, even to lower ends than the highest, might earn the blessing denied to any form of half-heartedness, even though half the heart were given to what might be thought a holier claim. Now whole-heartedness is in fact obedience to the 'first and great commandment'; the unity of God means for practice the entire devotion of heart, soul, and mind to one supreme service.

Prof. James, then, insists on *solemnity* as the characteristic of the religious mood. 'There must be something solemn . . . about any attitude which we denominate religious<sup>2</sup>.' But this is not to give a definition; this is, strictly speaking, impossible; 'at their extreme of development, there can never be any question as to what experiences are religious. The divinity of the object and the solemnity of the reaction are too well marked for doubt<sup>3</sup>.' As we cannot define beauty, yet all know what we mean by it, even though we may not be able to see beauty in savage music or enter into the feelings of its admirers, so we cannot define religion, even though we may not be able to feel the divinity of Mumbo-Jumbo or sympathize with his worshippers. This is what we take Prof. James to mean, and it seems to be, as so taken, true. But his language seems unsatisfactory, because it suggests that there is less possibility of doubt than actually exists as to particular forms of advanced religion. Perhaps no one may deny that a sunset is beautiful or that the experiences of Bunyan were religious. But has one never heard of doubts as to the beauty of Wagner's music, as to the divinity of Spinoza's God, or the religious solemnity of that philosopher's intellectual love of him<sup>4</sup>?

Having distinguished religion by its attribute of solemnity from a 'sense of the cosmos' in which an element of this kind is lacking, Prof. James goes on to distinguish it from mere 'morality.' 'Morality,' he says, 'accepts the law of the whole . . . but it may . . . never cease to feel it as a yoke. But for religion in its strong and fully developed manifestations, the service of the highest is never felt as a yoke<sup>5</sup>.' This is true

<sup>1</sup> e. g. in *Which?* and the *Statue and the Bust*.

<sup>2</sup> *Varieties*, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> I do not speak as sharing these doubts.

<sup>5</sup> p. 41.



and well said, at any rate as regards the 'fully developed' stage of the religious sentiment. Yet religion (in a less mature stage of its development, no doubt), may feel the service as a yoke still, though a yoke that one would not put off if one could. 'For morality,' says Prof. James, 'life is a war, and the service of the highest is a sort of cosmic patriotism which calls for volunteers'.<sup>1</sup> No better illustration of this aspect could be found than 'the old rover with his axe,' in Stevenson's fable, who went off, when the powers of darkness had stormed the city of the gods, 'to die with Odin': but we feel that the old rover exemplified not only a more genuine morality than the 'priest' and the 'superior person,' but that he was in a real sense religious as well.

It is not, however, meant by this to imply that religion is sufficiently characterized in relation to morality, if it be looked upon as a more inward morality: there is a distinction of kind between the merely moral attitude and the religious, however readily the one may pass over into the other. The merely 'ethical' attitude is at once more anxious and more lax than the truly 'religious': more anxious, because there is absent that sense of reconciliation and atonement which, however the nature of this reconciliation and atonement and the mode of its accomplishment may be envisaged, somehow puts away the wrong done; there is no propitiation (to use phrases familiar to Christians), no forgiveness for sins; the thought of such is even regarded as 'unethical' and detrimental to a full sense of moral responsibility. But for that very reason, 'what is done cannot be undone,' and the spirit of passionate penitence characteristic of the Christian (and not only of the Christian) saint is a foolish waste of time, diverting the energies from future amendment. M. Zola in *Paris* has strikingly illustrated this difference of the 'ethical' from the religious attitude by the incident where Marie, in her hankering after *l'absolu*, gives way to passionate regret for an error committed, and is chidden for it by her lover.

It would of course be impossible to deny that the great Stoics were religious men; and yet Prof. James is not mistaken, we think, in seeing in the Stoic religion, as a whole, one in which the element of 'morality' overbalanced the specifically 'religious,' and contrasting 'the drab discoloured way of Stoic resignation'

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 45.

with 'the passionate happiness of Christian saints'.<sup>1</sup> Nor is his judgement altogether at fault when even of Marcus Aurelius he says, 'There is a frosty chill about his words which you rarely find in a Jewish and never in a Christian piece of religious writing'.<sup>2</sup> This is indeed to be taken with the qualification that during the history of Christendom there have been times at which the influence of Stoicism on Christian minds has been so great that religious writing has passed as Christian which was really far more Stoical than Christian in its tone. Hence the long ascendancy of the Stoic Seneca and the *Consolatio Philosophiae* of Boethius (which is Stoical in moral tone, though not in its philosophical tenets) over Christian minds, which even believed it to be Christian, 'although,' as John of Salisbury observed, 'it nowhere speaks expressly of the Word incarnate'.<sup>3</sup> Shakespeare, who understood everything else, did not understand the Christian as distinguished from the Stoical spirit: the consolations which the disguised Duke administers to Claudio in prison in *Measure for Measure*, though neither consoler nor consoled question their Christian character, are indeed nothing less than Christian; they are purely Senecan. Even a professedly devotional writer like Jeremy Taylor often reminds us in his topics rather of the Stoic than of the Christian form of the *contemptus mundi*; and it was with a profound insight that Luther<sup>4</sup> saw in the monastic ideal of the perfectly 'religious' less the Pauline Christian, justified by faith and not by the works of the law, than the wise man of the Stoics. The likenesses between Seneca and St. Paul have often caught the notice of Christians, while the profound differences have remained hidden from their eyes.

The solemnity in which Prof. James finds the distinctive mark of the truly religious attitude, he seeks to characterize further. We see that it is excited by the 'absolute and everlasting.' 'This sort of happiness in the absolute and everlasting,' which we call religious, 'is parted off from all mere animal happiness by the element of solemnity'.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore the sense of solemnity implies the attainment, at least in feeling, of a synthesis of opposites. 'A solemn state of mind . . . seems to contain a certain measure of its own opposite in solution. A solemn joy presents a sort of

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 41.<sup>2</sup> p. 42.<sup>3</sup> *Policraticus* vii. 15.<sup>4</sup> *In Gal.* v. 19.<sup>5</sup> *Varieties*, p. 48.



bitter in its sweetness: a solemn sorrow is one to which we intimately consent<sup>1</sup>. This is further expanded by calling to our minds the well-known picture by Guido, of Satan under the archangel's feet: 'The world is all the richer for having a devil in it, so long as we keep our foot upon his neck. In the religious consciousness, that is just the position in which the fiend, the negative or tragic principle, is found; and for that very reason the religious consciousness is so rich from the emotional point of view<sup>2</sup>.' The insight here shown into the meaning of the religious consciousness is, we may venture to say, of a deeper kind than the author's brilliant and thought-provoking 'Will to Believe' would have led one to look for: and it makes one wonder even more than before, at the petulant disrespect, which in that work Prof. James permitted himself to indulge, for what he has called (apparently from motives like those which the Duchess in *Alice in Wonderland* attributed to the baby) by the ugly name of Hegelism.

'The personal attitude . . . towards . . . the divine . . . will prove to be both a helpless and a sacrificial attitude<sup>3</sup>.' This is true in many cases: though Prof. James goes on to discuss in what he calls 'The Religion of Healthy Mindedness,' a form of religious experience of which it is not true. This form is that exemplified by such a man as Walt Whitman. As Prof. James says<sup>4</sup>, Whitman's 'gospel has a touch of bravado and an affected twist.' Yet one sees what a power for good it may have in the stimulating influence which it exerted upon Robert Louis Stevenson, whose essay on the American optimist in *Men and Books* is a masterpiece of discriminating admiration. The 'religion of healthy-mindedness' is illustrated by the various forms of belief in 'mind cures,' the importance and significance of which in our time is more evident (at least at present) in America than on this side of the Atlantic: but we think that Prof. James fully justifies by his remarks upon them the comparatively large space which he has allotted to a subject which is probably new to many of his English readers. Of the religion of healthy-mindedness in all its shapes, he concludes that it 'casts its vote distinctly for' the 'pluralistic view<sup>5</sup>,' and he adds very justly that 'the healthy-minded consciousness is left with an irremediable sense of precariousness<sup>6</sup>': it has no consolations laid up in store for the day

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 48.    <sup>2</sup> p. 50.    <sup>3</sup> p. 51.    <sup>4</sup> p. 87.    <sup>5</sup> p. 132.    <sup>6</sup> p. 136.



of sickness of soul. To that opposite of 'healthy-mindedness,' Prof. James refers in his chapter on 'The Sick Soul.' He describes the experience of religious melancholy in a very interesting manner; quoting a striking phrase from Gratry (to the truthfulness of which many will bear testimony from personal experience) concerning the 'abstract heaven over a naked rock<sup>1</sup>,' in whose presence the melancholy spirit seems to find itself. The world, a short time ago so full of interest, seems suddenly turned to dust and ashes. 'As the excited interest which' the 'passions put into the world is our gift to the world, just so are the passions themselves *gifts* . . . to us from sources sometimes low and sometimes high, but almost always non-logical and beyond our control<sup>2</sup>.' The experience of such melancholy is just the reverse of that of conversion; in short to one sick in soul 'the world now looks remote, strange, sinister, unmeaning; whereas a common consequence of conversion is 'a transfiguration of the face of nature' in the eyes of the converted<sup>3</sup>. There is an interesting extract given by Prof. James from Emerson, in which that eminently 'healthy-minded' philosopher compares the problems of the origins of evil and the like, which beset religious men in their sickness of soul, to such diseases as mumps. There is some appropriateness in the comparison (which may be found better made in the central three chapters of *Sartor Resartus*) but nothing for the proof of Emerson's point that they 'never darken any man's road, who did not go out of their way to seek them<sup>4</sup>.' Do we generally 'go out of our way' to seek mumps?

From the experience of the 'Sick Soul' Prof. James passes to that of the 'Divided Soul,' which feels two selves, as it were, striving for the mastery within us. This experience should be considered in the light of that twofoldness of our nature which Kant found to be the key to the problem of freedom. In 'Conversion' to which Prof. James then goes on, another self comes to power than that which was conscious of sickness and of death. It is the victory of the spirit over the flesh, of the law of the mind over the law of sin in the members. To the phenomena of the crisis usually thus designated, Prof. James has devoted a large and important section of his work. He has by no means limited himself to conversions of the Christian or even of the theistic

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> p. 151.

<sup>4</sup> p. 167 n.

type. This makes his treatment of the subject really valuable, as such a treatment of it as Prof. Joly's in *The Psychology of the Saint* cannot be, just because of its avowed dualism, and its concern to assign to the 'natural' and the 'supernatural' distinct spheres of action. We cannot thus put asunder what God has put together. Prof. James observes<sup>2</sup> that what is theologically expressed by saying 'Man's extremity is God's opportunity,' can be physiologically put thus: 'Let one do all in one's power, and one's nervous system will do the rest.' 'Psychology,' he says further on<sup>3</sup>, 'defining the forces' that 'bring redemption,' as 'subconscious' merely 'implies that they do not transcend the individual's personality'; theology 'insists that they are direct supernatural operations of the Deity.' A full treatment of this matter would carry one into the fundamental theological question of the relations of God and man, and the nature of 'personality' as ascribed to both; but it is well here to observe that a view of God's personality as 'external' to man's, even in the sense in which our man's may be called 'external' to another's, will lead to arbitrariness in psychology as well as to the necessity of reducing to the position of mere 'metaphors' the deepest instincts of the religious consciousness.

Among the 'conversions' described by Prof. James we have the French philosopher Jouffroy's 'counter-conversion,' as it may be called<sup>4</sup>; that of a curious non-religious conversion by 'elimination of anger and worry'<sup>5</sup>; the conversion of John Stuart Mill to a more idealistic view of life than his inherited views had allowed him<sup>6</sup> (with which an experience recorded in the life of Shelley may be compared); the 'purely ethical' conversions of drunkards (Gough's, says Prof. James, 'is practically the conversion of an atheist—neither God nor Jesus being mentioned'<sup>7</sup>); the experiences recorded of himself by the greatest religious teacher of our time, Count Leo Tolstoy, which, while theistic and Christian, are dissociated from the dogmas now closely bound up with such crises in the view of these Christian communities which pay most attention to their sensible phenomena<sup>8</sup>. These dogmas are also absent from the thought of those who are unitarians in doctrine; yet among them also similar experiences are known. One such is

<sup>2</sup> *Essays*, p. 406.

<sup>3</sup> p. 304 n.

<sup>4</sup> p. 475.

<sup>5</sup> p. 303.

<sup>6</sup> p. 477.

<sup>7</sup> p. 152.

<sup>8</sup> p. 104, 105.



described by Prof. James<sup>1</sup>; and, in a case of which the present writer has private knowledge, a young man, Christian by training, and Christian by subsequent conviction, in the first rush of the experience of conversion was conscious of a sudden and instantaneous sense of God's all-encompassing presence, without at first finding anything in his feelings to correspond to what he had been taught about Christ or His atonement, though to this a more definitely Christian stage of the experience very shortly succeeded.

As a rule, however, the experience of conversion is more frequent in circles where it is expected, and in these circles it tends to conform to a certain recognized type. A striking quotation from Jonathan Edwards is given by Prof. James<sup>2</sup>, in which the great Calvinistic theologian calls attention to this fact. From the collection of documents to which reference has already been made, Prof. Starbuck 'has shown,' says Prof. James<sup>3</sup>, 'by a statistical enquiry how closely parallel . . . the ordinary 'conversion' which occurs in young people brought up in evangelical circles is to that growth into a larger spiritual life which is a normal phase of adolescence. The age is the same, falling usually between fourteen and seventeen. In the case mentioned above as known to the present writer, and which was interesting because the young man in question was not brought up to expect 'conversion,' nor did he look to have its reality admitted by his parents, who were religious persons of a different school from that which insists upon it—the age was twenty. Prof. James observes upon the comparative absence of 'anxiety and conviction of sin' in 'Catholic lands . . . and in our own Episcopalian sects,' and supposes this to be due to a greater reliance on grace imparted in the sacraments<sup>4</sup>. The case already quoted, though occurring to a member by training of the 'High Church' party in the Church of England, presented the usual features of an 'evangelical' conversion in this respect, although the sacraments were still used and valued. The charming narrative of Mr. Bullen in *With Christ at Sea* (which Prof. James mentions with well-deserved admiration<sup>4</sup>) shows an Anglican finding a difficulty after conversion in relating the sacraments to his personal religious experience; but Mr. Bullen was unconfirmed, and had not begun

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> p. 200.

<sup>3</sup> p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> p. 287.



already to make the frequenting of the Eucharist a part of his religious practice. It must be observed, moreover, that a later generation of 'High Church' clergy in the Anglican body have found themselves able to give to the characteristic 'evangelical' experience of conversion a place in their own scheme of spiritual life which would have been grudged to it by their predecessors.

Such conversion is usually 'instantaneous.' Wesley (as Prof. James remarks<sup>1</sup>) became convinced late in life that 'conversion is commonly, if not always, an instantaneous work.' There is probably often some ambiguity in the discussion of this point. What is meant by 'instantaneous'? That the process of turning from the life of which self is the end, to that of which God is the end, should be 'instantaneous,' may be usual, but cannot be necessary, and certainly is not invariable. Even where the great change can be dated, it may extend, with ups and downs of emotion, over many instants, days, or even weeks. Yet it is not unlikely that some in attaching importance to the 'instantaneousness' of conversion have intended not so much to insist upon a fact of feeling as upon a theological principle, that between a will turned to God and a will turned away from God, there may be fluctuations but can be no middle stage. The notion that the 'good will' is a something won by mere gradual improvement, that there is no line drawn between the converted and unconverted, is one which can scarcely be called Christian, and can never be called true to experience. It is because the Kantian ethics (as distinguished from the Aristotelian) recognize the intrinsic distinction of the good and bad will as the central point of moral philosophy, that they are Christian while the Aristotelian is pagan. The pietistic training of Kant had this as its result, that his ethical doctrine is one to which the clue is to be sought (and can only be found) in that experience of conversion which it has been the special mission of the Pietists, Methodists, and kindred schools to have brought into prominence.

On the sensible instantaneousness of conversions, psychology has, of course, much to say, and Prof. James's discussion of the subject in relation to current psychological views seems not only interesting, but convincing. His conclusion is that sudden con-

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 227.

versions happen where there is an 'active subliminal self'<sup>1</sup>. Now this is certainly confirmed by many facts: in a case known to the writer of two very intimate friends—who were accustomed to make no secret from one another of their religious thoughts and experiences, and who arrived at substantially the same general view, mutually influencing one another at every step—the one experienced a 'sudden' (if not strictly instantaneous) conversion, the other did not. The former was a man whose mind worked chiefly (as Newman describes his own as working) by the only half-conscious growth of ideas, developed by reading and intercourse with life, but yet developing, like the seed of corn in the Gospel, 'he knew not how'; while the mental life of the latter was pre-eminently self-conscious, not lightly receptive of influences as yet unrelated by fully understood links to convictions already formed, but moving always by the deliberate thinking out of each question in turn. Kant, it is worth observing, although, as has been said, he gives in his ethical system the analysis of the experience called 'conversion,' yet, as a philosopher of pre-eminently discursive and self-conscious intellect, does not seem to have passed in his own person through any such sudden crisis as is generally associated with the term, unless indeed we count as such his conviction by the study of Rousseau of the primacy of the practical over the theoretical in man.

It is from a psychological point of view easily intelligible that where a sudden conversion has been experienced there should be recurrences of similar feelings of awakening to new light, more particularly when the converted, conscious of remaining defects in their spiritual life, are looking for a further change to be wrought by the same grace whose operation they have known previously as acting thus suddenly upon them. Hence it is probably not necessary to find a theological standing, so to speak, for each such echo of the first experience, as is done (for example) where the original conversion is held to be 'justification,' the next crisis to be 'sanctification of heart,' and the last (abolishing even sins of infirmity), 'sanctification of mind.' The discussions which have sometimes been raised on this subject seem to suffer from somewhat the same defect of reality as kindred discussions in a different school of religious thought as to the precise nature

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 241.



of the grace or of the forgiveness of sins, received in the several sacramental ordinances of the Church, such as baptism, confirmation, penance, and the Eucharist.

An interesting point on which Prof. James incidentally touches in connexion with sudden conversions is the frequency with which the change experienced is envisaged as the revealing of a light. Sometimes<sup>1</sup> there is an actual luminous sensation, as in the case of St. Paul: often<sup>2</sup> there is no such sensation, but the metaphor of light is felt to be the only one which naturally describes the experience. The case of conversion before quoted, as known to the present writer, falls into the latter of these two classes: and some verses written by the young man thus converted, in which he speaks of a light—

‘Not visible, but yet the same that sent  
Saul to the Street called Straight in other days,’

correspond very closely to the records alleged by Prof. James. The same person when after many years he passed through a crisis very similar to that described by Prof. James as occurring to a scientific friend of his own<sup>3</sup>, in which he lost the sense of God’s presence which he had long enjoyed, could only describe it as the extinction of a light which had for a long while been the guiding star of his life.

In leaving the subject of conversion, Prof. James gives Prof. Starbuck’s conclusion, drawn from the study of the statistics collected by him as to the effect of this crisis, that it imparts ‘a changed attitude towards life, which is fairly constant and permanent, although the feelings fluctuate. In other words the persons who have passed through conversion, having once taken a stand for the religious life, tend to feel themselves identified with it, no matter how much their religious enthusiasm declines’<sup>4</sup>. For himself Prof. James says: ‘That,’ the experience of conversion ‘should for even a short time show a human being what the high water mark of his spiritual capacity is, this is what constitutes its importance, an importance which backsliding cannot diminish’<sup>5</sup>.

Prof. James turns from the phenomena of conversion itself to

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, pp. 251, 252.  
<sup>4</sup> p. 258.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 253, 254.  
<sup>5</sup> p. 257.

<sup>3</sup> p. 65.



the consideration of the asceticism so often characteristic of the converted or religious life. Though he begins by speaking of 'the hopelessness of Christian theology in respect of the flesh and the natural man'<sup>1</sup>—an incorrect form of expression which could only be justified if the unhistorical identification of Christianity with Buddhism and the estimate of it as a religion of mere renunciation which determined the attitude towards it both of Schopenhauer and of his revolted disciple Nietzsche, could be upheld—yet we find much sound sense in what Prof. James says on this subject. He pleads for something which asceticism gave, and of which our modern life is sadly in need. 'Is not the exclusively sympathetic and facetious way,' he wisely asks<sup>2</sup>, 'in which most children are brought up to-day—in danger, in spite of its many advantages, of developing a certain trashiness of fibre?' He refers to the influence of war in affording a means of self-discipline, but points out very clearly the difference of the military and ascetic types of character<sup>3</sup>. 'What we now need,' he concludes, 'to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war: something heroic that will speak to men as universally as war does, and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved itself to be incompatible'<sup>4</sup>. What, he asks, of 'voluntary poverty' as the substitute? 'The prevailing fear of poverty among the educated classes is the worst moral disease from which our civilization suffers'<sup>5</sup>. Prof. James has probably his American countrymen chiefly in view, but those engaged in the education of those belonging to our own 'educated classes' are not likely to think his strong words uncalled for in this country.

From asceticism we pass to mysticism. Prof. James seeks its germ, as it would seem, in the 'dreamy state' of 'vaguely reminiscent consciousness'<sup>6</sup>, which most of us have occasionally experienced. He thinks indeed that Dr. Crichton-Browne in connecting this state with inchoate epilepsy 'takes a rather absurdly alarmist view.' 'He follows it . . . downward to insanity; our path pursues the upward ladder.' For 'we make any phenomenon appear admirable or dreadful according to the context by which we set it.' But he calls attention not to this 'dreamy

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 302.

<sup>4</sup> p. 367.

<sup>2</sup> p. 365.

<sup>3</sup> p. 369.

<sup>5</sup> p. 366.

<sup>6</sup> p. 384.

state' only as alien to the mystic consciousness; he finds something of the same kind in the abnormal mental states sometimes produced by the action of intoxicants and drugs. Indeed 'the drunken consciousness is one bit of the mystic consciousness'<sup>1</sup>. Strange as this may seem when we think of mystics so far removed from the condition of drunkards as St. Theresa or St. John of the Cross or Jacob Behmen, yet it must not be forgotten that the influence of strong drinks such as 'Soma' played no small part in the religious life of ancient nations; that the Bacchic frenzy was accounted the inspiration of a god; that less Epicurean mystics than Omar Khayyam have used the excitement due to wine as the readiest symbol of divine enthusiasm. An interesting passage from J. A. Symonds's autobiography, recording his experiences under an anaesthetic, is adduced by Prof. James as illustrating the capacity of drugs to induce a consciousness of the mystical sort. Prof. James himself (who regards, probably with only very partial correctness, the problem of Hegel as set to his intellect by mystical feeling)<sup>2</sup> only seems to himself to understand that philosopher when under the influence of nitrous oxide<sup>3</sup>. The remarks of Prof. James on this subject show a grave misunderstanding of Hegel, who was not properly speaking a mystic at all; and he could not have weighed, before writing what he has written, the famous retort of Hegel himself to those who looked to mystical intuitions for a revelation of higher truth than reason can give, that the wisdom they thought God had given to them as His beloved in sleep was—dreams<sup>4</sup>. But there is no doubt that Hegel respected in the mystics their perception of the need of a unity, of which the 'abstract understanding' did not even dream; that some of the phraseology which to him represented the goal of hard intellectual labour was, in its insistence upon unity in difference and the reconciliation of opposites, not unlike that employed by the mystics; and that there does seem to be a real tendency in conditions of mind artificially induced by drugs to feel as though the unity and reconciliation which we painfully seek were suddenly attained without the intellectual 'mediation' to which Hegel attributed so much importance. So far, though only so far, is there any

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 387.

<sup>2</sup> p. 389 n.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. *Will to Believe*, &c. pp. 294 foll.

<sup>4</sup> *Werke*, ii. p. 9.

connexion between 'the drunken consciousness' and the Hegelian philosophy.

Yet for himself Prof. James has learned much of the lesson Hegel had to teach on this subject. He says that 'to come,' as mystical experiences do, from the subliminal region, 'is no infallible credential'<sup>1</sup>; and he contends that philosophy's 'aspiration is to reclaim from mystery and paradox whatever territory she touches. To redeem religion from unwholesome privacy, and to give public status and universal right of way to its deliverance, has been reason's task'<sup>2</sup>. This is entirely in Hegel's spirit.

But much of the philosophy to which Prof. James devotes the later pages of his book is less satisfactory than this. He borrows from an American writer, Mr. Pierce, the expression *pragmatism*, to designate his position—by this he seems to intimate that he makes conduct or rather 'meaning for conduct' the test of truth<sup>3</sup>. On the ground of this principle he decides to 'bid a definitive good-bye to dogmatic theology'<sup>4</sup>. If he here meant by 'dogmatic' merely what, on the whole, Kant meant by it—that is, uncritical, all serious philosophers must agree with him. But he means more than this; he will have nothing to do with the supposed 'metaphysical attributes of God'<sup>5</sup>. And here he is, no doubt, in sympathy with the most influential school of theology—the Ritschlian—which our age has produced. He is right, we may add, again in this point, so far as he means to deny to the 'metaphysical attributes of God' any religious value apart from religious feeling; but the 'dogmas' of the traditional theology are (or were at the beginning) ways of expressing the needs and requirements of religious feelings when face to face with certain philosophical problems. There is indeed a measure of confusion running through the whole of Prof. James's reasoning on this point. The incapacity of being proved by 'philosophy' alone is made a characteristic of religion in particular. But in fact philosophy is *always* critical of data otherwise obtained. It starts, as Plato said, from *ὑποθέσεις* in its search for an *ἀρχὴ ἀνυπόθετος*. It has, as Hegel taught, to explain rather than to create experience.

Prof. James's own conclusions, as to the validity of religious

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 426.

<sup>2</sup> p. 432.

<sup>3</sup> p. 444.

<sup>4</sup> p. 448.

<sup>5</sup> p. 447.



experience, rest upon a philosophy (not unlike that to which Prof. James Ward has given expression in his Gifford Lectures on *Naturalism and Agnosticism*) which he thus describes: 'So long as we deal with the cosmic and the general we deal only with the symbols of reality, but as soon as we deal with private and personal phenomena as such, we deal with realities in the completest sense of the term<sup>1</sup>.' 'To describe the world with all the various feelings of the individual pinch of destiny . . . left out . . . would be . . . like offering a printed bill of fare as the equivalent for a solid meal. Religion makes no such blunder. It 'remains infinitely less hollow and abstract, as far as it goes, than a science which prides itself on taking no account of anything private at all. A bill of fare with one raisin on it instead of the word "raisin" might be an inadequate meal, but it would at least be a commencement of reality. The contention of the survival theory that we ought to stick to elements exclusively seems like saying that we ought to be satisfied for ever with reading the naked bill of fare.' For 'it does not follow, because our ancestors made so many errors of fact, and mixed them with their religion, that we should therefore leave off being religious at all<sup>2</sup>.' Prof. James thus finds the stronghold of religion in individuality<sup>3</sup>. He observes that Prof. Baldwin and Prof. Rutgers Marshall prefer to describe it, on the contrary, as a 'conservative social force.' And this is certainly a more usual point of view. What is the relation of these two different ways of regarding religion? The whole history of religion seems to support the view of it as pre-eminently social rather than individualistic, and in laying stress upon this characteristic of it Hegel and Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Tolstoy are agreed. The consideration which has led some, like Prof. James, to reverse this statement seems to be this: that science is true for all alike, while a religious truth cannot (like a mathematical truth) be proved to the equal satisfaction of all alike, but, while certified to the believer as a fact of individual personal experience, must remain incommunicable to others by any abstract formula bearing the same meaning for all educated persons. In this way there is conceded to religious experience a greater concreteness or reality than belongs to science, while at the same time the often-noticed absence of that

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 498.

<sup>2</sup> p. 500.

<sup>3</sup> p. 503.

agreement in the religious world which characterizes the scientific, is explained, and even connected with its superiority.

But is there not here a difficulty only to be surmounted by abolishing this strict antithesis? Religion is precisely that region of human experience in which we are concerned with the unity of subject and object: in which what is objective—as true for others as for ourselves—is perceived, not as therefore indifferent to us in particular, but as our own most vital concern; in which, on the other hand, what is felt as most individual, as our personal life, our inmost self, is recognized as the presence in us of the universal and eternal, in a word, of God.

This, indeed, is recognized by Prof. James himself. He tells us<sup>1</sup> that religious feeling always consists of two parts: of an *uneasiness*, a feeling that something is wrong about us; and the *solution* of the uneasiness, a feeling that we are saved from the wrongness. So far as an individual 'suffers for his wrongness and criticizes it,' he 'is to that extent consciously beyond it and in at least possible touch with something higher.' Thus he can adopt as his own<sup>2</sup> some words of M. Récéjac, the writer of a well-known work on *La Connaissance Mystique*, to the effect that 'we find consciousness possessed by the sense of a being at once *excessive* and *identical* with the self; great enough to be God; interior enough to be *me*.'

Though he loves tilting at the 'transcendental idealists,' whose position he seems not adequately to appreciate, Prof. James is not so far removed from their position as he would wish us to think. He is offended by the apparent submergence of morality in their view. He sympathizes with a friend of his who thinks 'a God who is on the side of our enemies as much as He is on our side' is an 'odd evolution from the God of David's psalms'<sup>3</sup>. But after all the Christian God, who is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, would have seemed—must have seemed—as odd an evolution to the older Jews. Though Prof. James recognizes<sup>4</sup> that 'evil is not evaded but sublated'—what Hegel called *aufgehoben*, we suppose—in the higher religious cheer of those whom, after Francis Newman, he calls 'the twice born,' he has hardly, so far as the present work bears witness, realized the startlingly close agreement of the attitude which is most markedly

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 508.

<sup>2</sup> p. 509.

<sup>3</sup> p. 522 n.

<sup>4</sup> p. 488 n.

religious with the Spinozistic determinism — an agreement well brought out in Mr. A. E. Taylor's recent book *The Problem of Conduct*, a work of real importance to the student of the philosophy of religion, however open it may be, as it is, to severe criticism in certain details.

The Lectures are professedly only introductory to a further discussion of the subject, of which, indeed, it would probably be difficult to extract from them a consistent view. The philosophy to which the author's conclusions point, does not appear to me adequate to the phenomena described; while to the description itself it may be objected that it is confined too exclusively to cases which seem to have in them something of the extravagant and the morbid. To this objection Prof. James has himself replied by anticipation<sup>1</sup>; but it might have increased the value (as well as the bulk) of his book, had there been more studies of the soberer manifestations of the religious life by the side of those less sober; while some consideration was due to the remarkable absence of the 'extravagant' features characteristic of the lives of saints from the recorded life of the greatest figure in the whole history of religion. But upon the whole we have nothing but gratitude for this sympathetic presentation of the facts of religious experience by one so fully conversant with the thought of his time, and so thoroughly imbued with the scientific spirit as Prof. James; and look forward with eager anticipation to the sequel which he has promised us.

C. C. J. WEBB.

<sup>1</sup> *Varieties*, p. 486.



## DOCUMENTS

### THE SYRIAN LITURGIES OF THE PRESANCTIFIED.

THE Syrian liturgies of the Presanctified fall into two classes, (A) Orthodox and (B) Monophysite, under the latter of which may be conveniently placed the Maronite rite, in this instance directly derived from that of the Jacobites.

(A) The orthodox liturgy may be shortly dealt with, as it is only known from its *diaconica* contained in Cod. Sinait. 1040 under the title of St. James (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 494). It seems to have been formed from the ordinary liturgy by the omission of all between the *ecphonesis* of the Veil Prayers and the Prayer of the Our Father.

(B) a. The Jacobite rite is to be found in a considerable number of MSS in the British Museum and elsewhere. It has never yet been published, perhaps owing to the fact that in Wright's *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS in the British Museum* it has been usually described as 'The Benediction of the Chalice,' a misapprehension of the meaning of *ܠܫܢܐ ܡܫܢܝܬܐ*, or the consignation of the unconsecrated chalice with the presanctified host. There are three forms of Presanctified Anaphora, named respectively after Severus, St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. The Anaphora of Severus is contained in nine MSS in the British Museum (saec. x, Add. 14,493, fol. 21 a: Add. 14,496, fol. 18 b: Add. 14,525, fol. 67 a: saec. x-xi, Add. 14,667, fol. 15 a: Add. 14,495, fol. 42 a: Add. 14,522, fol. 27 b: Add. 17,128, fol. 41 a: saec. xi, Add. 14,500, fol. 2 b: saec. xii, Add. 14,498, fol. 40 a, dated A.D. 1133), and it is the type on which the Anaphorae of St. Basil (saec. x, Add. 14,496, fol. 21 a: saec. x-xi, Add. 14,522, fol. 27 b) and of St. John Chrysostom (saec. x-xi, Add. 17,128, fol. 41 b) are formed: it is moreover stated to have been translated from the Greek (Add. 14,495). The text given below is that of a MS in the possession of Mgr. Ignatius Ephraim II Rahmani, the Syrian patriarch of Antioch, who has kindly permitted its publication. Besides being slightly fuller, it is of a later date than any copy in the British Museum, having been written in the year 1546 of the Greeks (A.D. 1235). The outlines of the Anaphorae of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom may be seen from the table which follows the text.

The rite, as contained in the MSS of the British Museum collection, almost invariably commences with the Sedro of the Entrance, the liturgy following the lessons and gospel of the seral Vespers of Lent. Mention





communion practised by the early hermits (S. Bas. *Ep.* xciii). James also permits the priest to sign the chalice with the host, if it be reserved, for the communion of the sick and of those who fast until evening (Barhebraeus, *Huddoyo*, cap. iv. § 8), but the celebration of this liturgy seems to have been the rule in Lent, as Isho'yabh the Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis (c. A. Gr. 1501, A. D. 1190) in his *Liber demonstrationis de vera fide* (par. 4, cap. 1, in Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* tom. iii, par. 1, p. 305) blames both the Melkites and the Jacobites for the practice of consecrating only on the Sundays of Lent and giving communion on week-days with the presanctified host. This rite has now completely disappeared among the Monophysites, though Michael Jarweh, afterwards the Syrian Uniat patriarch, attempted to restore it from the description attributed to Severus in the *Huddoyo* of Barhebraeus (cap. iv. § 8); for it appears in a collection of anaphorae belonging to him and dated A. D. 1760 (now at Sharfeh in the Lebanon). At the present day a new liturgy has been constructed by the Uniat from the anaphora of St. James and is in use on Good Friday only.

In point of form the ancient liturgy of the Jacobites differs from the rite of the Orthodox in the substitution of a single prayer for all that part of the ordinary mass which extends from the Prayer before the Peace to the end of the intercession.

β. In the middle of the fifteenth century the liturgy of the Presanctified was still in use among the Maronites of the Lebanon on the ferias of Lent, though now it is restricted to Good Friday. In its present form it is merely the Anaphora of St. Peter iii (which nearly resembles the Persian type, and indeed is taken in part from the Nestorian liturgy of the Apostles) with the substitution of two prayers, composed of the anaphoral prayers of the presanctified liturgies of St. Basil and Severus, for the Post-sanctus. It is also to be noticed that the former of these two liturgies, with the exception of the central prayer, is formed in a like manner from other anaphorae.

In conclusion I wish to return my best thanks to His Blessedness Mgr. Ignatius Ephraim II Rahmani, and also to the Rev. F. E. Brightman, to whose assistance I am especially indebted.

H. W. CODRINGTON.

Lacunae in the Syriac original have been supplied from Add. 14,498. Cues have been expanded in the translation, those of frequent occurrence not being marked, while the rest have been completed within brackets from the following texts:—a. Add. 14,693 (1), saec. xiii-xiv: b. Add. 14,691, A. D. 1230: c. Add. 17,229 (1), A. D. 1218: d. *Missale Syriacum*, Rome, 1843: e. ܐܢܦܘܪܐ ܕܫܘܒܐ, Mosul, 1881; the last two of which agree in general with the modern Jacobite texts.





The Signing of the Chalice of the holy mar Severus, patriarch of Antioch.

*First, the holy mysteries being ordered on the table, the holy body and the chalice which is about to be signed, while the clerks pray the Prayer of the Evening (i.e. Vespers), he also who is prepared to sign begins secretly to himself the prayer (of the beginning?) and 'Have mercy upon me' (Ps. li), and so reads the Gospel in a loud voice in common and afterwards says the Sedro of the Entrance:*

⟨THE CENSING⟩

*For the Prümīyon:* Glory [<sup>d</sup>and thanksgiving and honour and praise and good unceasing exaltation continually at all times and at all moments may we be accounted worthy to send up] to him the bread of life, who appeared from the daughter of David, and was broken on Golgotha, and is divided in the holy church, and given to the faithful people, and sufficeth to rejoice the living and the dead, whom besitteth glory and honour now [<sup>a</sup>and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.]

*Sadro.* O Christ our God, who art true life and reasonable food to those who hunger well for thee, who hast granted to us from thy side spiritual drink, which is the strength of delights and the fount of all joy, and with thy lifegiving and propitiatory blood hast moistened our lips and hast given to us this holy chalice, the chalice of thanksgiving and of salvation, the chalice of gladness and of exultation, and hast granted to us thereby true life and forgiveness of sins; thou therefore, O Lord, in thy love towards man art exalted over all and raised on high above the worlds: strengthen us that with pure and holy soul and with chaste and holy and lowly minds we may draw nigh to complete the immolation of thy divine mysteries, and with this smoke of incense which is offered to thee by our weakness may the savour of our prayers be pleasing unto thee, and turn not away thy grace from us by reason of our sins and of those of thy faithful people, but, O merciful Lord, change also the mixture in this chalice that is set before us into the holiness that is of thee, and by its participation may we be delivered from destruction of souls and of bodies, and accounted worthy of the portion of thy saints, and for all thy graces towards us send we up glory and honour and exaltation to thee and to thy blessed and blissful Father, and to thine holy Spirit, now and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.

*The priest.* Peace be to you all.

*The people.* And to thy spirit.

*The priest.* Holy is the Father, [<sup>b</sup>holy is the Son, holy is the holy Spirit, who halloweth our souls and our bodies by his grace and by his many mercies for ever. *The people.* Amen.]







## 〈THE CREED〉

*The deacon.* Sophia : theō proschōmen.

*The priest.* We believe in one God, *and the people answer.*

## 〈THE PREPARATION OF THE ANAPHORA〉

*The priest.* O holy Trinity, have pity on me, [<sup>c</sup> holy Trinity spare my sinfulness, holy Trinity receive this oblation from the hands of my feebleness. O God make rest and a good memorial to our fathers and our brethren at this time on thine holy and heavenly altar. O God, pardon all the faithful men and women who have asked the prayers of our humility, by the prayers of all the saints. Amen.]

## 〈THE ANAPHORA〉

*The deacon.* Stōmen kalōs.

[<sup>d</sup>*The people.* Kyrie eleison].

*And the priest begins after the manner of the kūrōbhō.*

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost : now and at all times and for ever. *The people.* Amen.

*The priest.* O Christ our God, who hast committed unto us this great mystery of thy divine incarnation, hallow this chalice, which is set with wine and with water, and unite it to thy venerable body, that it may be to us and to all those who receive and partake of it for holiness of soul and of body and of spirit, for the pardon of offences and forgiveness of sins and cleansing from all evil, for the sprinkling of conscience and the safeguarding of the life hereafter, for strength and the keeping and accomplishment of thine holy and lifegiving commandments, and for answer before thy fearful and terrible tribunal, and account us worthy all the days of our life without sin and without molestations and error and disturbance, whilst pleasing thee, to serve thee with good service, by thy grace and by the goodwill of thy blessed and blissful Father, and by the operation of thy Spirit holy and good and adorable and lifegiving and consubstantial with thee, now and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.

## 〈THE BLESSING〉

*The priest.* Peace be to you all.

*The people.* And to thy spirit.

*The priest.* The mercies of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ be with you all.

*The people.* And with thy spirit.



## 〈THE CONSIGNATION〉

*The priest takes the coal<sup>1</sup> and signs therewith the chalice three times in the form of a cross and says thus :*

The chalice of thanksgiving and of salvation is signed with the propitiatory coal for pardon of offences, and for forgiveness of sins, and for eternal life to those who receive. *The people.* Amen.

## 〈THE LORD'S PRAYER〉

*The priest: the prayer of the Our Father who art in heaven.*

O Lord God of holy hosts, who holdest all and disposest all according to the will of thy goodness, who art the life of spirits, who art the hope of those that are hopeless, who art the help of them that are helpless, who hast taught us by thine only Son, our Lord indeed, and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ the prayer of access to thyself: account us worthy in pure conscience together with right intention and love and confidence befitting children to make bold to call on thee O God the Father almighty holy, and to pray and say, Our Father who art in heaven.

*The people.* Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come.

*The priest.* <sup>2</sup>Yea O Lord who hast given us might and power to tread upon serpents and scorpions and all the power of the enemy, crush his head under our feet speedily and every artifice of his evil skill against us make void, for thou art a God mighty and all-powerful, and to thee do we send up glory and thanksgiving, with thy Father lover of man, and thy Spirit holy and good and adorable and lifegiving and consubstantial with thee, now and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.

## 〈INCLINATION〉

*The priest.* Peace be to you all.

*The people.* And to thy spirit.

*The deacon.* Bow we down our heads to the Lord.

*The people.* Before thee O Lord our God.

*The priest.* Receive also this our supplication, O Christ our king, and send down thy mercies on the work of thine hands, whilst thou turnest away from our sins: convert us, O God our Saviour, and make the face of thy mercies to shine upon us, and we shall be delivered: for thy dominion standeth for ever, and of thy kingdom there is no end: and thee befiteth glory and honour and dominion with thy Father and thine holy Spirit now and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.

<sup>1</sup> i. e. the particle of the host, cf. Isa. vi 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> This is identical with the corresponding prayer of the Coptic St. Gregory.





## 〈THE BLESSING〉

*The priest.* Peace be to you all.

*The people.* And to thy spirit.

*The priest.* The grace and the mercies of the one nature of the holy Trinity, uncreated and eternal, adorable and consubstantial, be with you all.

*The people.* And with thy spirit.

## 〈THE ELEVATION〉

*The deacon.* Attend we in trembling.

*The priest.* The presanctified holies to the holy.

*The people.* One is the holy Father, [° one is the holy Son, one is the living and holy Spirit.]

*The priest.* The one holy Father is with us [° Amen ; the one holy Son is with us Amen ; the one holy Spirit is with us for ever. Blessed be the name of the Lord from everlasting and for ever and ever. Amen.]

## 〈THE COMMUNION〉

## 〈THE THANKSGIVING〉

*The deacon.* Stand we fairly all of us, [° after that we have eaten and drunk and partaken of these holy and heavenly and dominical and immortal and lifegiving and vivifying mysteries of the venerable and holy body and the propitiatory blood of Christ our God : glory send we up to him, the good giver, who hath given and accounted us worthy of so great a gift.]

*The people.* We give thanks unto thee, O Lord, [° especially for thy benefits towards us.]

*The priest.* O adorable and all-wise and thrice blessed and only mighty, God the Word only-begotten of the Father, now that we have received and are filled with the sweetness of thine holy and lifegiving mysteries, we send up glory and honour and worship to thee and to thy stainless Father and to thy Spirit holy and good and adorable and lifegiving and consubstantial with thee, now and at all times for ever.

*The people.* Amen.

## 〈INCLINATION〉

*The priest.* Peace be to you all.

*The people.* And to thy spirit.

*The deacon.* After the reception [° of these holy mysteries which have been given, before the merciful Lord bow we down our heads.]

*The people.* Before thee, O Lord our God.

*The priest.* O Lord, king of glory, look upon those who have bowed down their heads before thine invisible might and bless them with all spiritual blessing : support thy church by the grace and love towards man-





kind of thine only Son, with whom thee befitteth glory and honour and dominion, with thy Spirit all-holy and good and adorable and lifegiving and consubstantial with thee, now and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.

*The priest.* O our Lord Jesus Christ, the race of the house of Adam sufficeth not to give thanks to thine unspeakable grace for that thou hast given unto us thine holy body and thy propitiatory blood; and we beseech thee grant us to receive it continually with our heart pure and our body and our spirit holy, and bless thy people and keep thine inheritance, that continually and at all times we may praise thee; even thee who art alone our true God, and God the Father who begat thee, and thine holy Spirit, now and at all times for ever. *The people.* Amen.

(THE DISMISSAL)<sup>1</sup>

*The deacon.* Bless O my lord.

*The priest.* May God, who hath accounted us worthy to eat his holy body and to drink his propitiatory blood, account us worthy of his heavenly kingdom and of his mansion that passeth not away, and make us children of the heritage with all the just and righteous who have been pleasing before him, by the prayer of the mother of God, and of the prophets, and of the apostles, *and the rest*<sup>2</sup>.

*The people.* Thy body which we have received<sup>3</sup>.

*The priest.* Ye are committed to the grace of the holy Trinity [b from the propitiatory altar of the Lord, with the viatica and the blessings and the benefit which ye have received; and may it keep your life from all corruption of sin, and us with you, by its grace and many mercies for ever.]

Ended is the Signing of the Chalice of the holy mar Severus the patriarch: his prayer be with us. Amen.

<sup>1</sup> In the description given in the *Huddoye* of Barhebraeus, and attributed to Severus, the rite is terminated immediately after the Prayer of Inclination by the usual 'seal' or concluding prayer of the mass 'Bless us all, keep us all,' &c.

<sup>2</sup> The conclusion of a similar prayer in Add. 14,693 runs thus:—'and of the martyrs and of the confessors and of the just and of the priests and of the holy fathers and of the orthodox doctors and of all the choir of the saints who have loved our Lord and kept his commandments and of all our masters and our brethren for ever.'

<sup>3</sup> Add. 17,128, saec. x-xi gives 'Thy body which we have received and thy living blood which we have drunk.' Barsalibi (+1171) in his *Exposition of the liturgy* mentions verses beginning with the same words, which may perhaps be continued from the second of the four verses said by the priest after the Sedro of the departed at the conclusion of the Syrian Jacobite mass, 'in faith be a bridge and a way, and thereby may we be delivered from the fire and from gehenna, halleluiah, and inherit life.' Similar verses are still said by the minister at the end of the Maronite liturgy.

TABLE SHOWING THE OUTLINES OF THE ANAPHORAE OF ST. BASIL AND ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

ST. BASIL.		ST. CHRYSOSTOM.
1. Add. 14,496.	2. Add. 14,522.	Add. 17,128.
		Rubric as to Vespers.
Sedro.		Sedro.
Creed.		
The memorial of our Lord <sup>1</sup> ...		<i>And he proceeds with the prayer and then says, Glory be to the Father...</i>
O Ruler over all, God of the Fathers... <i>Eph.</i> And we beseech thy grace, O King of ages...	O Ruler over all, God of the Fathers... <i>Eph.</i> And we beseech thy grace, O King of ages...	O God the Father who for thy love towards man...
Peace... And may the mercies...	And may the grace...	Peace...
The chalice of thanksgiving...	We sign the chalice of thanksgiving...	The chalice of thanksgiving...  The Commixture.
O God the father of light and prince of life... [Coptic St. Mark.] Our Father... Yea, O Lord, and lead not any of us... [Coptic St. Mark.]	O Lord God of holy hosts... [Severus.] Our Father... Yea, O Lord, who hast given us power... [Severus.]	Do thou therefore, O our God, strengthen us continually... Our Father... Come to the aid of thy servants...
Peace... Bow we down... Those who have bowed down the necks of soul and of body before thy love towards man...	Peace... Bow we down... Receive this our supplication... [Severus.] (As alternative, the last Prayer of Inclination from St. Chrysostom.)	Peace... Bow we down... To thee indeed and before thee, O great eternal King...
Peace... And may the grace...	Peace... And may the grace...	Peace... And may the grace...
Attend we in fear. The presanctified holies... One holy Father...	Attend we in fear. The presanctified holies... One holy Father...	Attend we in fear. The presanctified holies... One holy Father...
O adorable and all-wise...	After that we have received... We give thanks unto thee... O adorable and all-wise...	After the reception... We give thanks unto thee... Jesus, Word of God... <sup>2</sup> We give thanks unto thee for this thine unspeakable gift...
Thy servants... [St. Chrysostom.]		Peace... Bow we down... Thy servants who have bowed down their heads before thy glory, O Lord, do thou protect... [Cf. Ethiopic Ch. Ord.]

<sup>1</sup> So also in Severus, Add. 14,525, and in the Maronite Presanctified.<sup>2</sup> A note has been inserted in the MS to the effect that this prayer, being out of place, is not to be said.

## THE REPORT AND DEATH OF PILATE.

THE document printed below forms part of a volume of miscellaneous MSS, which came into my possession a few years ago during one of my tours in the interior of Macedonia. The calligraphy of the manuscript is good, its orthography somewhat eccentric, and they both point to a date perhaps not earlier than the eighteenth century. The main interest of the find lies in the fact that it presents us with a new version of a legend familiar to students of Christian mythology, and as such it may fairly be considered an original contribution to Apocryphal Literature. Though shorter than any of the texts hitherto published, it includes two narratives usually found separate, viz. the *Ἀναφορά Βασίλιου τοῦ Πιλάτου* and the *Παράδοσις Πιλάτου*. Compared with C. de Tischendorf's standard edition of these (*Evangelia Apocrypha*, 2nd ed., Lipsiae, 1876) it offers several variants.

In the first place, while Tischendorf's MSS end with the execution of Pilate, our text gives in the last paragraph a dramatic account of the death of Annas and Caiaphas, which apparently originated in a desire to supply a fulfilment to the prophecy supposed to be contained in the Psalmist's words quoted in the text: 'They shall fall by the sword; they shall be a portion for foxes. But the king shall rejoice in God.'

The manner of Pilate's death also differs from that in Tischendorf; but corresponds with a similar episode in the *Letter of Tiberius*, where the story is told of Annas, though some attribute it to Pilate.

The miracle of the fall of the idols at the reading of Pilate's letter before Caesar is in Tischendorf's text described as occurring on the utterance of Christ's name by Caesar (*Παράδοσις Πιλάτου* 4).

The cross-examination of Pilate, again, in Tischendorf occupies two days, while in our text it is compressed into one sitting.

The executioner in Tischendorf is called *Ἄλβιος*, here *Σάλδιος*; and the prefect of the East *Λικιανός* here figures as *Λικίνιος*, a reading (*Λικίνιος*) also occurring in MS E cited by Tischendorf in his critical apparatus.

These are the chief points of difference, and, when to these is added the general difference in style, which is terser than that of the common text, there is little doubt left that we have here a version derived from an independent source. It would, however, be difficult to decide whether our text is the result of a later compression, or whether it preserves an earlier tradition of which the other narratives are mere amplifications.

G. F. ABBOTT.

[In the following text several minor errors of the scribe have been tacitly corrected: in the case of such changes as are of more importance the reading of the MS is given in the footnotes.]



ΑΝΑΦΟΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΛΕΙΩΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΙΛΑΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ  
ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΝ.

Κρατίστῳ σεβαστῷ θειοτάτῳ Καίσαρι Τιβεριῷ Αὐγούστῳ ὁ σὸς ἰκέτης Πιλάτος Πόντιος, ὁ τῷ σῷ κράτει τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπέχων, μηνίω πρὸς τὴν σὴν μεγαλειότητα διὰ τῆς παρουσίας ἀναφορᾶς τάδε· οἱ ἐπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρέδωκάν μοι τινὰ ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν λεγόμενον ἄκαιρα ἐγκαλοῦντες αὐτὸν ὅτι τὸ Σάββατον ἔλυε, θαυματουργῶν ἐξαισία καὶ παράδοξα θαύματα τυφλοὺς ἐφάπτεσεν, χωλοὺς ἀνάρθρωσεν καὶ παραλύτους καὶ δαιμονιώντας λόγῳ ἰθεράπευσεν μόνῳ, γυναῖκα αἰμορροοῦσα(ν) ἀψαμένη(ν) τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ εὐθέως ἰάσατο, νεκροὺς ἐπὶ τάφον ἀγομένους ἐζωοποιήσεν) καὶ ἀνέστησεν καὶ ἕτερόν τινα τετραήμερον ἐκ τάφου φωνήσας<sup>1</sup> ἐξήγειρεν καὶ ἀνέστησεν, καὶ ἕτερα πλείωστα εἰργάσατο θαύματα. Ἐν τινι δὲ ποιηρῷ ἔργῳ ἢ λόγῳ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐλέγξει αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἀδίκως Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας στάσιν κινήσαντες κατ' αὐτοῦ σὺν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις καὶ Γραμματεῦσιν ἔπεισαν τὸν λαὸν<sup>2</sup> κατακρῖναι αὐτῷ θάνατον. Ὅτε δὲ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπάγγησαν οἱ ἥλιοι εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας ὥστε καὶ πέτραι ἐρράγησαν καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἀπὸ ε' ὥρας ἕως θ<sup>ης</sup> καὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε<sup>3</sup> καὶ λύχνους ἤψαμεν, ἀπελθόντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις ἡμῶν μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν θ<sup>ην</sup> ὥραν πάλιν ἐφάνη ὁ ἥλιος<sup>4</sup> καὶ πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν ἐν τῷ ἀέρι ἐφάνησαν ἐξαστράπτοντες καὶ νεκροὶ ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἐξανέστησαν οὗς<sup>5</sup> καὶ διερωτήσαντες εἶπον τελευτήσαι πρὸ β<sup>η</sup> ἡρῶν. Ὅθεν καγὼ τρόμῳ ληφθεὶς ἔγγραφον<sup>6</sup> ἀνήγαγον τῷ σῷ κράτει ὁ σὸς ἰκέτης.

Τοῦ δὲ γράμματος φθάσαστος ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἀναγνωσθέν(τος) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Καίσαρος εὐθὺς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰδωλα κατέπεσον εἰς γῆν καὶ συντριβήσαν. Ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐθαύμασαν· ἀκούσαντες δὲ περὶ τῶν θαυμασίων ὧν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος κατηγόρησαν τοῦ Πιλάτου λέγοντες· Πῶς τοσαῦτα σημεῖα ἰδὼν ἐπίεσθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις θανατώσαι αὐτόν; ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ ἐκέλευσεν ἀχθῆναι τὸν Πιλάτον δέσμιον ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Ἀχθέντα δὲ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εἰπέ μοι, κατάρτα, τίς ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος δι' οὗ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ λεχθέντος πάντες οἱ θεοὶ ἡμῶν ἀοράτως ἔπεσον πάντες; Λέγει δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ αἴτιος τοῦ κακοῦ τούτου, δέσποτα αὐτοκράτορ, ἀλλ' Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας καὶ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Καὶ ὁ Καῖσαρ λέγει· Ἔδει σε, κατάρτα, ὅτε σοι<sup>7</sup> παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν ἀσφαλῆσαι καὶ πέμψαι πρὸς με καὶ μὴ πεισθῆναι αὐτοῖς καὶ σταυρώσαι, ἀλλὰ σταυρώσας αὐτὸν ἔγραψας ἐν αὐτῷ οὕτως· (οὗτος) ἔστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς γὰρ ἐμπαίζων τὴν ἐμὴν βασιλείαν ταῦτα πεποιήκας. Οἱ δὲ παράνομοι Ἰουδαῖοι οὐκ ἠθελον αὐτὸν θεὸν ἔχειν κἂν ὡς ἱατρὸν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἠθελον ἔχειν. καὶ γὰρ διὰ τῆς τῶν ἡμετέρων θεῶν συντριβῆς ἐγνωρίσαμεν μείζονα αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπάντων θεῶν. Καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος· Κάγῳ, αὐτοκράτορ, ἐπίσταμαι μείζονα εἶναι τῶν ἡμετέρων θεῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> φωνήσας    <sup>2</sup> λόγον    <sup>3</sup> ὅτι    <sup>4</sup> Sign for the sun, with accent and breathing  
<sup>5</sup> οὗς    <sup>6</sup> ἔγραψον    <sup>7</sup> σε

ἀναγκάσαν με ἔθνος ἀδίκως αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσα. Τότε κελεύει ἐμβληθῆναι τὸν Πιλάτον ἐν τῇ φρουρᾷ.

Καὶ δόγμα γράφων λέγει οὕτως· Λικινίῳ τῷ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπέχοντι ἀρχῆν τολμῆς γενομένης ὑπὸ τῶν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων οἵτινες παρέδωκαν πρὸς Πιλάτον ἄνθρωπὸν τινα εὐλαβῆ καὶ πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐργασάμενον καὶ ἐθανάτωσαν ἀδίκως σταυρώσαντες. Πειθάρχησον ὃν τῷ δόγματί μου καὶ παραλαβὴν πλήθη στρατιωτῶν δορυφόρων πορεύθητι καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἄνναν καὶ Καϊάφαν δεσμεύσας ἀσφαλῶς ἀνάγαγον πρὸς με, τοὺς δὲ κατοικούντας πάντας ἐκεῖ Ἰουδαίους αἰχμαλωτίσας ἐκβαλὼν καταδούλωσον διασπείρας εἰς τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν πόλεις καὶ χώρας τοῦ μηκέτι ὑποστρέψαι τινὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.

Τὸν δὲ Πιλάτον ἐκβαλὼν τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς φρουρᾶς ἐνέβαλεν ἐν τινι βοίῳ δέρματι ὑγρῷ, ἔθηκεν ἐν ἡλίῳ ὅπως τοῦ δέρματος ξηρανθέν(τος) συσφιγῆ<sup>2</sup> αὐτὸν καὶ σφοδρῶς<sup>3</sup> τιμωρηθεὶς τελευτήσῃ. Τοῦ δὲ δέρματος ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου θερμανθείτος φλογὸς<sup>4</sup> καὶ διαρραγέντος<sup>5</sup> ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Πιλάτος ἀβλαβῆς. Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Καῖσαρ τὸ(ν) διὰ ξίφους αὐτοῦ θάνατον ἐψηφίσατο. Λαβὼν οὖν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν φέκτωρ [sic] ὁ Σάλδιος ἐπὶ τὸν τεταγμένον ἤγαγεν τόπον. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος σταθεῖς προσηύξατο οὕτως εἰπὼν· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, μὴ συναπολέσῃς με μετὰ τῶν παρανόμων Ἰουδαίων· σὺ γὰρ οἶδας ὅτι ἀγνοῶν τολμήσας τοῦτο ἐπραξα καὶ χεῖρας οὐκ εἶχον ἐμβαλεῖν κατὰ σοῦ εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸ ἀναγκάσαν με ἔθνος· μὴ οὖν ἐν τινι ἀμάρτημα ταῦτα [sic] ἐκείνοις συναπολέσῃς με, ἀλλ' ἐν μερίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου με καταξιώσων.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ οὐρανόθεν ἠκούσθη λέγουσα· Μακάριος εἶ ὅτι τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν εἰρημένα ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐπράχθησαν καὶ ἔσει μάρτυς ἀψευδῆς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου.

Καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς ὁμοῦ καὶ φόβου κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετμήθη, σὺν αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ Πρόκλα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ.

Ἀκούσασα δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἄλλαι τοῦ Κυρίου μαθήτριάι ἀνέδραμον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πρὸς τὸν Καῖσαρα καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λεπτομερῶς, ὃ δὲ Καῖσαρ ἀκούσας καὶ μεγάλως θαυμάσας εἶπεν· Ὡ ποιητὰ βουλευόμενα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τοιούτων ἄγιον ἄνδρα καὶ μηδὲν πονηρὸν ἐργασάμενον ἀδίκως θανατώσαι τολμησάντων.

Τοῦ δὲ δόγματος φθάσαντος ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ καὶ μαθόντες Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας τὸν κατ' αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος θυμὸν νυκτὸς τῆς πόλεως ἀποδράσαντες ἀπῆλθον ἐν ὄρει τινι κρυπτόμενοι. Ὁ δὲ Λικίνιος πειθαρχήσας τῷ τοῦ Καίσαρος προστάγματι παραλαβὴν πλήθος στρατιωτῶν ὄπλοφόρων παρεγένετο εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ μὴ εἰρόντες τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς ἐξῆλθε σὺν τῷ στρατῷ ἐν τοῖς ὕρεσιν ἀναζητεῖν αὐτούς. Οἱ δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς κύνες ἀλώπεκα ἐντυχόντες κατεδίωξαν, ἧ καὶ φεύγουσα ἀπῆλθεν ἐν τινι πετραίῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους διασωθῆναι. Τινὲς δὲ τοῦ στρατοῦ καταδιώκοντες ὄπισθεν τῶν κυνῶν ἦλθον ὅπου ἡ ἀλώπηξ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ χαλάσαντες τριῶντα<sup>6</sup> ποτὲ μὲν

<sup>1</sup> πειθάρχησε<sup>2</sup> συσφιγξας<sup>3</sup> σφοδρῶς<sup>4</sup> φλόγα<sup>5</sup> διαρραγέντα<sup>6</sup> τριῶντα

ἐπέστειλεν χεῖρα ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἐκ τῶν εἰρησώπων, ὅς καὶ ἀνεγνώσκει  
 ρήματα ἀληθῆς εἶναι Ἰωάννου καὶ Καϊάφου ἀνήγαγον ἐπὶ τὸν Καῖσαρα, οἱ  
 αὖτε ἐχρημάτισεν χεῖρας. Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ προφήτου Δαυὶδ  
 λέγοντος παραδοθήσονται οἱ χεῖρες ῥομφαίας ῥομφαίας ἐλαπίστων ἕσονται  
 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀφραθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ. Ὁ δὲ Δαυὶδ ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ  
 τοῦ ἔθους εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀρχιερεῖς  
 τῆς πόλεως ἐξήγαγε καὶ διέστειρε καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐπέταξε ἐργασίαν εἶναι αὐτῶν  
 τῷ κατὰ τὸν προφήτην ὁ Κίριος ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἐφεθῆ ἔδει λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὅτι οὐ κατα  
 λυθήσεται, ἀλλ' ἢ δοξά εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Ἄμην.

### AN UNCIAL FRAGMENT OF THE 'AD DONATUM' OF ST. CYPRIAN.

IN the Preface to his edition of St. Cyprian<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Hartel briefly notices  
 a MS fragment of the *Ad Donatum*, the existence of which had been  
 made known to him by Nolte. When writing his Preface, Hartel had  
 no information as to the whereabouts of the fragment, but in his  
*Addenda* he was able to state that it formed part of Codex Aurelianensis  
 169. This Codex, which is now numbered 192, once belonged to the  
 Monastery of Fleury, and contains the remnants of divers ancient MSS,  
 most of them written in uncial characters. The Cyprian fragment, con-  
 sisting of a single leaf (fol. 1 of the Codex), so far from being later in  
 date than the other fragments, as Hartel was informed, is one of the  
 most ancient in the collection. M. Chatelain<sup>3</sup> would place it as early  
 as the fifth century: certainly it cannot be later than the seventh  
 century—the date to which it is assigned in the printed Catalogue.

By the kindness of M. Delisle and of the authorities of the Library  
 of Orléans, an opportunity was given to me of examining this fragment  
 at Paris in the autumn of last year, and I am encouraged to believe  
 that a transcript of it may be acceptable to those who are interested in  
 the criticism of St. Cyprian. There can be no doubt that such frag-  
 ments—which are only too rare—throw much light upon the history of  
 the text, and help us to form a right estimate concerning the relative  
 value of the more complete MSS of later date.

Unfortunately the Orléans fragment is in a poor state of preservation.  
 As a rule, the concluding letters of the lines in the second column of  
 the *recto*, and the initial letters of the lines in the first column of the  
*verso*, have disappeared through injury of the outer edge of the leaf.

(Continued on p. 89.)

<sup>1</sup> νεύσονται

<sup>2</sup> p. ix.

<sup>3</sup> M. Chatelain gives a photographic reproduction of the *verso* of the fragment  
 in his 'Uncialis Scriptura Codicum Latinorum novis Exemplis illustrata' (Lutetiae  
 Parisiorum, 1901), Tabula V.



## Recto.

a

(Hartel, p. 14, 28-15, 8)

ROSINREBUSHUMA  
 #ISSUBLIMENACMAG  
 #UMVIDETURIN(T)RASU  
 #MIACERECONSCIEN  
 5 #IAMGLORIATURNIHIL  
 #PETEREIAMNIHILDE  
 #DERAREDESAECULO  
 #POTESTQUISÆCULOMA  
 #REST QUAMSTA

10 #ILLISQUAMINCONCUS  
 #ATUTELAESTQUAMPE  
 #ENNIBUSBONISCÆ  
 #ESTEPRAESIDIUMIN  
 #LICATISMUNDILAQUE

15 #SSOLVIINLUCEMIM  
 #MORTALITATISAETER  
 #NAEDETERRENAFÆCE  
 #URGARIVIDERITQUE  
 #INNOPRIUSINFESTĀ

20 #ISINIMICIPERNICIES  
 #INSIDIOSAGRASSATA  
 #IPLUSAMARECONPEL  
 #IMURQUODFUTURISU  
 #MUSDUMETSCIRECON

25 #EDITURETDAMNARE  
 #quo(DER)AMUS

3 IN(T)RA] The central letter of this word has almost entirely disappeared, but what remains fits in with T better than with F. *Intra* is the reading of SPM $\mu$  and also of W, which is wrongly quoted by Hartel in favour of *infra*.

6 IAM] The first two letters are very badly injured, but the word was certainly IAM, not CUM as Hartel says.

13 INP[LICATIS] So MS. There is no sign of a line above A.

18 *Viderit* is the reading of S and of W as well as of P, though Hartel has omitted to say so. The reading is also supported by M (*m.* 1) and  $\mu$ .

26 The line has been almost entirely cut away, but the top of D is still visible, and the remaining traces leave no room for doubt that the second word was ERAMUS.

b

(Hartel, p. 15, 8-17)

NECADHOCPRÆTII SAUT  
 AMBITUAUTMAN(U)  
 OPUSESTUTHOMINIS  
 SUMMAVELDIGNITAS

5 VELPOTESTASELABO  
 RATAMOLEPARIAT(U)<sup>r</sup>  
 ETGRATUITUMDEDE(Ö)  
 MUNUSETFACILEEST  
 SPONTESOLRADIATDIES

10 LUMINATFONSRIgat  
 IMBERINRORITa  
 SESPSCAELESTISINfun  
 DITPOSTQUAMAUCTo  
 REMSUUMCÆLUMIN

15 TUENSANIMACOGno  
 VITSOLEALTIOREThac  
 OMNITERRENApotes  
 TATESUBLIMiorides  
 SEINCIPitquodesse

20 SECREdit  
 TUTANTUMquemiam  
 SPIRITALIBuscastris  
 CÆLESTISMilitia

25 RUPTAMTENES(OB)riam  
 RELIGIOSISVIRTUTIBus  
 (disciplinam)

7 DE(Ö)] The horizontal line is quite distinct, so is the preceding E. DEÖ occurs again on the *verso*, col. a, line 3.

8 It is practically certain that *ut* was never in the text of this MS at the conclusion of the line. The word is also wanting in the Lambeth MS.

27 *disciplinam*] If this word was ever in the text there must have been an extra line in this column. The parchment has been cut away immediately below l. 26.

## Verso.

a

(Hartel, p. 15, 17-25)  
SITTIBIVELORATIOAD  
SIDUAVELLECTIONUNC

- casu* DEŌLOQUERENUNC  
D̄S(T)ECUM-ILLETEPRAE  
5 *ca*(PT)ISSUISINSTRUAT-  
ILLEDISPONAT-QUEMILLE  
DIVITEMFECERITNEMO  
PAUPEREMFACIET-PENU  
RIANULLAESSEIAMPO  
10 *te*RITCUMSEMELPEC  
*tas*CAELESTISSAGINA  
*sa*(TU)RAUIT  
*iam*tibiAURODISTINC  
*lalaque*ARIAETPRAE  
15 *tiosimar*MORISCRIS  
*timesti*ITA)DOMICILIA  
*sordidumtu*MSCI  
*cris*tis esse)OLEN  
*dum*magisTEPOTIUS  
20 *ornandum*DOMUM  
*tibi*hanc)SSEPTIORE  
*quam*dasi)SEDITTE  
*pi*ssiceINQUOSP̄SSNCT  
(*as*)*cae*PITHABITARE  
25 *pi*NGAMUSHANCDOMŪ  
*pi*GMENTISINNOCEN

10 CUM . . . SA(TU)RAUIT] This is the reading of SPWM<sub>μ</sub>. The editors are divided between *casu* . . . *antrosu* (Rembolt, Erasmus, Manutius, Morelius, Pamelius, Hartel) and *cas* . . . *antrosu* (Rigaltius, Fell, Baluze). Krabinger, however, follows the ancient MSS in reading *casu* . . . *antrosu*.

15 CRISTIS] So MS. Cf. 'cristae sunt montium' in *De Spacioculis*, cap. 9 (Hartel, App., p. 12, l. 4).

18 (esse)] This word is not found in SWM<sub>μ</sub>, but P has it, though Hartel does not record the reading. Fell quotes Voss. 2 and Liss. in its favour. It was admitted into the text by Rembolt, Erasmus, and Morelius, and was probably in this MS, as the line would otherwise be unduly short.

23 QUO] So MS.

b

(Hartel, p. 15, 25-p. 16, 6)  
TIAELUMINEMUSL(U)*ca*  
IUSTITIAENONHÆCUMq̄  
(*casu*)

- P(ROC)UMBETINLAP*Sasu*  
SENIOVETUSTATISN*ca*  
5 PIGMENTOPARIETIS(*ant*)  
AUROEXOLSCENTEF*ca*  
DABITURICADUCASUN*t*  
QU.ECUMQ-FUCATASUN*t*  
NECFIDUCIAMPRÆ*Bent*  
10 POSSIDENTIBUS)TAB*i*  
LEMQUAEPOSSESSIO*nis*  
NONHABENTVERIT(A)*tem*  
HOCMANETCULTUIUG*aler*  
VIVIDOHONOREIN(TE)  
15 GROSPLENDOREDIUT*ar*  
NOABOLERINONPOTE*t*  
NEEXTINGUIPOTEST  
TANTUMINMELIUSCOR  
POREREDEUNTEFORM*ari*  
20 HAECINTEARIMBREV*ibus*  
DONATECARISSEME  
NAMETFACILEMBO*ssi*  
TATEM-PATIENTIAM  
MENTEM-INDŪSOLI(D)*assu*  
25 FIDEMTUAMSALU*is*  
RISAUDITUSOBL(E)*ctat*

5 *Ant* is omitted in the Lambeth MS, but was probably in this MS.

12 HABENT] So P and W, though here again Hartel has overlooked the reading. *Habent* is also the reading of M<sub>μ</sub>, and, I believe, of all the editions except that of Hartel.

24 DŪ. So WM<sub>μ</sub> and the Lambeth MS, and the editions of Erasmus, Morelius, Manutius, and Pamelius. P and the ed. of Rembolt have *dum*. Rigaltius, Fell, and Baluze read simply *mentem* *solam*.

25 TUAM. So P.

Similarly the initial letters of the lines in the first column of the *recto*, and the concluding letters of the lines in the second column of the *verso* are, for the most part, lost to us owing to the manner in which the leaf has been bound into the Codex. Furthermore, the bottom of the leaf has been cut off, causing the loss of the last line of both columns on the *recto*, and of the second column on the *verso*. Nevertheless in spite of these and other injuries, it is possible, by making the most of what remains, to obtain a fairly exact notion of the original text. The writing on the *recto* appears to have been freshened up by retracing, but there is no indication of any departure from the original impressions. The *verso* has not been dealt with in this way. The leaf now measures 21.6 x 16.5 cmm.

As the representation of the fragment on pp. 87-88 is drawn up for critical as distinct from antiquarian ends, letters which are imperfect in the MS are printed without qualification if the traces that remain, however slight, place the identity of the letter beyond doubt. Letters which are in any degree doubtful, or which can only be certainly determined by inference, are enclosed in brackets. Letters of which no trace remains in the MS are printed in small italic type. When there is some *positive reason* for questioning the correctness of letters thus supplied, they are enclosed in brackets.

The readings quoted in the notes from S (Codex Seguerianus), P (Codex Parisinus 1647 A), W (Codex theol. Wirceburgensis 145), M (Codex Monacensis lat. 208),  $\mu$  (Codex Monacensis lat. 18203), and the Lambeth MS are based upon my own examination of those MSS.

H. L. RAMSAY.

### THE GENUINE PROLOGUE TO AMBROSIASTER ON SECOND CORINTHIANS.

EVEN from the critical notes of the Benedictine editors one can see that the manuscript tradition of the Ambrosiaster commentaries is confused to a greater extent than usual at two points. These are, first, the end of the commentary on Romans and the beginning of that on First Corinthians, and, second, the end of the commentary on First Corinthians and the beginning of that on Second Corinthians.

Thus the following colourless production poses in the printed editions as the prologue to the commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians:—

'Secundam epistulam apostolus scribit Corinthiis, cuius haec principalis est causa: quoniam in prima pro quorundam peccatis doctores



eorum praecipue corripuerat, et multum fuerant contristati, nunc eos consolatur, suum eis proponens exemplum, et docens non debere aegre ferre, quod pro aliorum sunt salute correpti, cum ipse pro aliena salute periculis cottidie et morti subiaceat.<sup>1</sup>

I now publish what is certainly the genuine prologue, adding a proof of its authenticity from the character of the language. My knowledge of it is derived from manuscript collations in the possession of Father Brewer, S.J., of Feldkirch, who is preparing the edition of the commentaries for the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Unwilling to take from him the honour of publishing this valuable document, and yet knowing it to be impossible to present my proof of its genuineness apart from its text, I asked, and obtained, his most generous permission to publish this prologue. I here offer him my heartiest thanks.

The document in question is contained in two MSS at least, the MS of Troyes, n. 432 (saec. ix-x), and the MS of Köln, n. xxxiv (saec. x). For other reasons, I should not be surprised to learn that the Troyes MS is the best in existence for the commentaries on First and Second Corinthians. The Köln MS is also of great value. I give the text of the Troyes MS, expanding the contractions.

'Sciens sanctus apostolus profecisse epistolam quam ad arguendam plebem Corinthiorum miserat propter diuersos illorum errores, aliam iterum epistolam ordinat ad exhortandam obauditionem eorum, et tangit horum contumaciam qui emendari<sup>1</sup> nequieverant, in hoc tamen animo releuatus quia ea quae ad ecclesiasticam ordinationem pertinent audierat esse correcta, certus deinceps quia et uitia eorum paulatim corrigerentur, praeterea quod ex magna parte coeperant esse obaudientes. Qui ergo ea quae ad fidem et ecclesiasticum ordinem pertinent emendauerant sine dubio spes erat emendandi mores et conuersationem. Ac per hoc festinanter scribit eis ut contristati ex correptione consolationem haberent et cresceret in eis fructus paenitentiae, ut, uidentes iam placere se ei cui displicuerant, promptiores fierent circa bonos actus. Quid est enim paenitere, nisi iam ab errore cessare, interueniente mentis dolore? Ut ergo probet iam bene se de his sentire, sic scribit ad eos.'

I now proceed to illustrate the language of this prologue by parallels derived from the commentaries and the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* by the same author. The following passage from *quaest.* 102 would alone suffice for proof:—'Hinc est unde *apostolus plebem Corinthiorum arguit, propter* quod illum, qui publice uxorem patris habebat, non corripere aut euitarent, ut se *emendarent* dicens . . . *Ac per hoc* quasi consentientes eos crimini eius *apostolus arguit*' (Migne,

<sup>1</sup> Emendare, Colon.

*P. L.* xxxv, col. 2311, ll. 13 ff.). Compare tract. in 2 Cor. vii 14 si ii qui *arguuntur*, incipiant *emendare se*.

*Sciens* occurs in this author a very great number of times as the first word in a sentence or clause, with a noun clause dependent on it. It is unnecessary to give examples.

*Sanctus apostolus* and *proficere* are also frequent expressions.

For *arguendam* thus used compare, in addition to the passages above cited:—gentiles *arguis* quod sine lege et deo sint (in Rom. ii 21); in istis ergo omnium similium *arguitur* malum (in Rom. iii 18); hic valde *arguit* temeritatem illorum (in 1 Cor. iii 2); in quibus enim tanta vitia *arguit* . . . (in 1 Cor. iv 8), cet.; *arguitur* etiam inprobus Manicheus (qu. 76 (72)), cet.

*Plebem*: 'congregation,' 'church': cf. salutare *plebem* Romanam ad quam scribit (in Rom. xvi 22); in una *plebe* duobus populis scribit (in 1 Cor. i 4); qui prophetat, omnem *plebem* aedificat (in 1 Cor. xiv 4); *plebis* erat corripere eum quem uidebant tam turpiter et obscene inter eos uersari (qu. 102, col. 2311); septem ecclesiae nuncupantur in una *plebe* (qu. 47); qu. 120.

*Diuersus* is a favourite word of this author.

*Obauditio* (cf. Philem. 21): *inobauditio* occurs in the commentaries (in 2 Cor. vii 7), never in the *Quaestiones*. The form *obaudio*, though much less common in Latin than *oboedio*, is the form almost always found in the commentaries (e. g. Migne, *P. L.* xvii (later issue) col. 143 A, 270 C, 294 B, 296 D, 298 B, cet.): *oboedio* is the exception (e. g. 248 A, 325 A codd., 534 D). On the contrary, *obaudio* occurs only once in the *Quaestiones* (qu. 106, col. 2319, 67), and in that place one MS reads *oboedio*. The difference may be after all merely one of scribes. *Inoboediens* (e. g. 248 A, qu. 70) and *inoboedientia* (in 1 Cor. xiii 2) are found in the commentaries.

*Tangit* 'touches on,' 'refers to': so Migne xvii 188 A, 193 C, cet.; qu. 111, 113, 115 *bis*, cet.

*Emendari*: it is somewhat difficult to decide between the passive and the active. *Emendo*, *reformato* and *corrigo* are sometimes used by this author intransitively, like our word 'reform': *emendo*, e. g. 333 D, 353 B *bis*, qu. 68; *reformato*, qu. 126 (codd.); *corrigo*, in 1 Cor. vi 11, and at least seven other times in comm.; qu. 102 pr.

*Animo releuatus*: cf. *releuatur* enim *anima* patientis (qu. 68); per omnia *releuati* (qu. 44); in futuro iudicio *releuatus*, qu. 115.

*Ecclesiasticam ordinationem*: cf. *ordinis officii ecclesiastici* (in 1 Cor. xii 4); *salutatio ecclesiastica* (in 2 Cor. xiii 11) cet.; *ecclesiastica* potestas qu. 93; *ius ecclesiasticum* qu. 93 *bis*; 102 *bis*, cet.

*Certus quia* . . . *corrigerentur*: *certus quia* . . . *possit occidi* (qu. 5); *certi quia* . . . *non potest polluere* (in 1 Cor. x 28); *corti quia* . . .



traderent (in 2 Cor. vii 5); *certus quia* obaudirent (in 2 Cor. viii 23); *certus apostolus quia* exitia . . . ministrantur (in Eph. vi 11); *certi quia* . . . habentur (in 2 Tim. iii 12); *certus* uanitatem uulgi mortuos magis ut deos uenerari quam uiuos (qu. 25); *certus* dei uoluntatem non debere ab homine retractari (qu. 109, col. 2326); qu. 115 et saep.; cf. also ignari *quia* non licuit (qu. 46, col. 2245); *certum* est ergo *quia* non ascendit (qu. 74 (78)).

*Ex magna parte*: *ex magna parte*, *ex parte*, *ex aliqua parte*, cet. are frequent.

*Sine dubio* is used by the author almost to the exclusion of *procul dubio*. Examples are 51 C, 78 A, 84 D, 155 B, 196 C, 200 C, cet.; qu. 3, 30, 40, 46, 51, 62, 76, 81, 83, cet. *Procul dubio* occurs e. g. 195 C; qu. 102.

*Ac per hoc* is found scores of times in each work.

*Festinanter*: e. g. qu. 109 (col. 2326, l. 27).

*Fructus paenitentiae*: *sine fructu paenitentiae* (in Rom. ii 4); *fructus* erit agentibus *paenitentiam* qu. 102 (col. 2304, 20); itaque et est *fructus paenitentiae*, *ibid.* (l. 25); ut hac tergiuersatione *fructum* amputet *paenitentiae*, *ibid.* (l. 51); *fructus* aliquis *paenitentiae*, *ibid.* (l. 54); quis autem *fructus* est *paenitentiae*, *ibid.* (col. 2309, l. 7); misericordia *fructum* non haberet (qu. 69); uberiorem *fructum* iustitiae (qu. 99).

*Promptiores* fierent *circa* bonos actus; *prompti* sint *circa* fidem (in Rom. iv 17); *circa* haec peccata *promptiores* (in Rom. v 14); *prompti* sint *circa* obsequia dei (in Eph. vi 10); *promptam* . . . *circa* fidem (in Col. i 9); *promptiores* . . . *circa* traditionem euangelicam (in Col. ii 5). Cf. nequis indiligens *circa* se (qu. 22; cf. qu. 115, col. 2354); negligentes et inprouidi *circa* se (qu. 34); studiosi *circa* scripturas sacras (qu. 46); *circa* curam animae negligentes (qu. 110, col. 2332); cf. qu. 115 (col. 2358); sollicitus erat *circa* officium (in 2 Cor. vi 5), cet.

*Actus*: this, and not *acta*, is the regular form in our author, who uses *gesta* also, but hardly ever for the deeds of man.

*Paenitere*, personally used, is common to this author with other Latin Christian writers.

*Ab errore cessare*; *ab* hac appellatione *cessare* deberent (qu. 114, col. 2344, 29).

*Interveniente mentis dolore*: cf. *interveniente* causa negligentiae uel erroris (in Gal. ii 11); nulla *interveniente* lamentatione *paenitentiae* (qu. 102, col. 2306, 29); *interveniente* gemitu et fletu (*ibid.* 35); *intervenitu* *paenitentiae* (*ibid.* col. 2308, 29); *intervenitu* misericordiae (qu. 105, col. 2315, 63), cet.

The length of this proof could easily be trebled, but it will, I hope, be regarded as sufficient.

ALEX. SOUTER.



## NOTES AND STUDIES

### THE EDITIONS AND MANUSCRIPTS OF EUSEBIUS :

#### PART I.

THE following notes are intended to summarise all the work that up to the present date has been done on the text of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, so as to serve as a draft of Prolegomena to a projected edition. I should be very glad, therefore, to receive any suggestions or corrections that readers of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES may be able to make. It is mainly with this object in view that notes, which must obviously be only tentative and imperfect, have been published.

#### I. EDITIONS<sup>1</sup>.

The following are the editions of the Greek text which have been hitherto published.

- (1) Stephanus. Paris, 1544.
- (2) " Geneva, 1612.
- (3) Valesius. Paris, 1659.
- (4) " Mainz, 1672.
- (5) " Paris, 1677.
- (6) " Amsterdam, 1695.
- (7) " ed. Reading. Cambridge, 1720.
- (8) " " Turin, 1746.
- (9) " ed. Migne. Paris, 1857.
- (10) Stroth. Halle, 1779.
- (11) Zimmermann. Frankfort, 1822.
- (12) Heinichen, ed. 1 (quoted as Heinichen<sup>1</sup>). Leipzig, 1827.
- (13) Burton. Oxford, 1838.
- (14) " Oxford, 1845. 1856.
- (15) " ed. Bright. Oxford, 1872. 1881.
- (16) Schwegler. Tübingen, 1852.
- (17) Laemmer. Schaffhausen, 1862.
- (18) Heinichen, ed. 2 (quoted as Heinichen<sup>2</sup>). Leipzig, 1868.
- (19) Dindorf. Leipzig, 1871.

<sup>1</sup> For accounts of these see Stroth, pp. xxii-xxxii; Laemmer, pp. 856-70; Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, pp. xviii-xxix.

(1) The *Editio Princeps* of the Greek text of Eusebius (the Latin of Rufinus had been printed long before) was that of ROBERT STEPHANUS<sup>1</sup> (Robert Estienne, 1503-1559), published at Paris in 1544. It was based apparently on two MSS, both still preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris: one described as Codex Regius, which is now Paris Graec. 1437, a thirteenth-century MS; the other as Codex Medicaeus, now Paris Gr. 1434, a sixteenth-century MS. In his text Stephanus followed mainly the Codex Regius, admitting occasional readings from the Medicaeus; in his division of the chapters he followed the Medicaeus; when he deserted both, he probably had recourse to conjecture. The few various readings which he gives have been quoted as *Manuscriptus Stephani* (MSt.), but they are of no value, being drawn entirely from the MSS mentioned.

(2) The second edition<sup>2</sup>, published at Geneva in 1612, in which the Greek text was only a reprint of that of Stephanus, is interesting because it contains the Latin version made by JOHN CHRISTOPHERSON. He was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1553; Dean of Norwich, 1554; Bishop of Chichester, 1557. He died in 1558, shortly after he had been imprisoned by Elizabeth. He was chief of the pioneers of Greek learning at Cambridge, and had devoted very considerable labour to his translation of Eusebius, collecting various readings and emendations from many different sources. This Latin version was published first after his death by Edward Godsalf, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge: '*Edvardo Godsalso Anglo curante ac in prefatione in protestantes debachante.*' This preface, addressed to Trinity College, is dated Cisteriae, 1559, and has suggested an edition in that year; another note dated at Antwerp, 1568, has suggested an edition of that year also; but there does not appear to be any trace of either, and the known editions are Louvain, 1570, Cologne, 1570, 1581, 1612, and this of Geneva, 1612. The editor of this Geneva edition adds to

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesiasticae historiae Eusebii Pamphili lib. X. Eiusdem de vita Constantini lib. V. Socratis lib. VII. Theodoriti episcopi Cyrensis lib. V. Collectanorum ex historia eccles. Theodori Lectoris lib. II. Hermii Sozomeni lib. IX. Evagrii lib. VI. Lutetiae Parisiorum ex officina Roberti Stephani typographi Regii, Regiis typis 1544.* On this edition see Valesius, Pref.; Stroth, p. xxii; Laemmer, p. 857; Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, p. xviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Scriptores Graeci: nempe Eusebii cognomento Pamphili Caesariae episcopi historiae ecclesiasticae libri X, Eiusdem de vita Constantini Magni, libri IV, Constantini Magni oratio ad sanctorum coetum, Eiusdem Eusebii oratio in laudem Constantini Magni, ad trigesimum illius Imperii annum ex bibliotheca Palatina nunc primum graece in lucem missa, &c. . . Graeco-latine nunc primum editi ex interpretatione IOANNIS CHRISTOPHERSONI Angli Cicestrensis quondam Episcopi, et recognitione SUFFRIDI PETRI I<sup>cu</sup> clarissimi. . . Coloniae Allobrogum. Excudebat Petrus de la Rouiere. 1612.* See Stroth, p. xxiii; Laemmer, p. 858; Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, p. xix.

the Greek text a considerable number of various readings. These are quoted by later editors under the following titles:—

*Christophorsonus* (Cph.): variants drawn partly from different MSS which he had examined, partly from MSS of the different authors quoted by Eusebius.

*Curterius* (Curt.): only cited twice.

*Margo Genevensis Editionis* (MG): those variations to which no particular name is attached; these are almost always the same as the *Manuscriptus Stephani*.

*Gruterus* or *Codex Gruteri* (Grut.): these seem to have been drawn from a MS in the Palatine, now in the Vatican, Library.

*Bongarsius* (Bong.): their source is not known.

*Editio Genevensis* (Genev.): applies to any of the above.

None of these variants are now of any value.

(3) The first step towards a critical text was made by HENRICUS VALESIIUS<sup>1</sup> (Henri de Valois, 1603-1675), who in 1659 published at Paris an edition with a new Latin Translation, a much improved text, and copious annotations. He collated four MSS, and had other material supplied him.

*Codex Regius* (Reg.): saec. xiii=Paris Gr. 1437.

*Codex Mazarinaeus* (Maz.): saec. x=Paris Gr. 1430.

*Codex Medicaeus* (Med.): saec. xvi=Paris Gr. 1434.

*Codex Fuhetianus* (Fuk.): saec. xvi=Paris Gr. 1435.

*Codex Savilianus* (Sav.). This was a copy of Stephanus's edition, in which Sir Henry Savile had given the variants of a MS in his possession (now in the Bodleian), mixed, however, with variants of Christopherson.

*Schedae Regiae* (Sched.): saec. xvi, now Paris Gr. 414. Some loose sheets containing the first book of the *Ecclesiastical History*.

*Codex Turnebi* (Turneb.): a copy of Stephanus' edition sent to Valesius by Hadrian Turnebus (Adrien Turnèbe, 1512-1565), with various readings in the margin.

*Codex Moraei* (Mor.): a similar copy given to Valesius by Renatus Moraeus (Renatus Moreau, †1656), containing readings of Vulco-bius of no value.

The text of Valesius was reprinted at (4) Mainz<sup>2</sup> in 1672, a reprint

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem. Eiusdem de vita Imp. Constantini libri IV. Quibus subicitur oratio Constantini ad sanctos et Panegyricus Eusebii.* Henricus Valesius Graecum textum collatis IV MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit et adnotationibus illustravit. Parisiis. Excudebat Antonius Vitre, Regis et Cleri Gallicani Typographus. 1659. See Stroth, p. xxiv; Laemmer, p. 863; Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, p. xix.

<sup>2</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem, Eiusdem de vita Imp. Constantini libri IV, quibus subicitur oratio Constantini ad sanctos et panegyricus Eusebii.*



which is said to be deficient in accuracy, at (5) Paris<sup>2</sup>, 1677, after the death of Valesius, with his corrections, and at (6) Amsterdam, 1857<sup>3</sup>.

(7) In 1720 appeared the edition at Cambridge of *WILHELMUS READING<sup>4</sup>*. He was Librarian of Sion College, 1708-1744. His edition simply repeats the text of Valesius, but he added a large number of ones collected from the works of various scholars, and also a few various readings which have been cited as follows:—

*Codex Jonostanus* (Jon.): a copy of the edition of *STEPHANUS* which had formerly been in the possession of Meric Casaubon and afterwards of an Englishman of the name of John Jones. All its various readings seem to have been taken from the margin of the Geneva edition, with the exception of a few conjectures due to Casaubon.

*Codex Castellanus* (Cast.). Said to have been of greater value, and to have contained readings from the same Vatican MS which *GRECER* had used.

This edition was reprinted at (8) Turin<sup>5</sup>, 1744-1748, and that of Valesius (9) by *MIGNÉ*<sup>6</sup> at Paris, 1857.

(10) The next edition of the *Ecclesiastical History* was that of *STROTH*<sup>7</sup>, published in 1779. This editor made a very full digest

HENRICUS VALESIUS graecum textum collatis IV MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit, et adnotationibus illustravit. Iuxta exemplum quod antea *Pachis* excudebat *Antonius Vitræ*, nonnisi verborum et correctiones edebant *Magnificae Christiani Gerlach* et *Simon Beckenstaia*. 1675.

<sup>1</sup> Parisiis, typis Petri le Petit, 1677.

<sup>2</sup> *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Scriptores Graeci: Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Scholastici, Hermiani Socomeni, Theodoriti episcopi Cyri, Eusebii Scholastici, cum excerptis ex historiis Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris.* Graece et latine ex interpretatione *HENRICI VALESI* cum singulis annotationibus ad postremas editiones Parisienses castigatissime recens. Prostant Amstelodami apud *Henricum Wetstenium*, 1696.

<sup>3</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Scholastici, Hermiani Socomeni, Theodoriti, et Eusebii, item Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris quae continent Historiae Ecclesiasticae graecae et latinae, in tres tomos distributae.* HENRICUS VALESIUS graecum textum ex MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit, et adnotationibus illustravit. GULIELMUS READING novas elucidationes, praesertim chronologicas, in hac editione adiecit. Cantabrigiae, Typis Academicis, 1720.

<sup>4</sup> The title of *Eusebii's History* is as follows: *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem, Eiusdem de vita imp. Constantini libri quatuor, quibus subiunctus oratio Constantini ad sanctos et paenegyricus Eusebii.* HENRICUS VALESIUS graecum textum collatis IV MSS codicibus emendavit, latine vertit et adnotationibus illustravit. Accesserunt criticae plurium eruditorum observationes, variantes lectiones et tabulae geographicæ, quibus GULIELMUS READING editionem suam Cantabrigiensem locupletavit. Augustae Taurinorum, 1746.

<sup>5</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili opera omnia quae extant.* Collegit et denuo recognovit *I. P. MIGNÉ*. Paris; 1857. Tom. II. *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

<sup>6</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri X, Eiusdem de vita Constantini libri IV.* Textum recensuit *FREDERICUS ANDREAS STROTH*, illustri. Gymnas. Quedl.

of all the various readings which previous editors had amassed, and employed also in the composition of his work some readings from a Venice MS, which he quotes as Venet. (Codex Venetus), the Ecclesiastical History of Nicephorus Callistus (Nic.), and the Latin Version of Rufinus, besides quotations of Eusebius in the Chronicles, &c. His edition is chiefly remarkable for the theory he propounded, that Eusebius had published two editions of his history—one represented by the version of Rufinus, one by the Greek MSS. The latter he divided into three recensions: one represented by the Codex Regius (Paris 1437, which he incorrectly designates 1436), the second by Codex Mediceus and allied MSS, the third, the mixed traditions of the marginal readings of Christopherson and Gruter. His chief merits seem to be that he first recognised the value of Rufinus as an old witness to the text, although his theory of recensions cannot be maintained.

The edition of (11) ZIMMERMANN<sup>1</sup> (1822) does not seem to have added much to the materials for the text. In the main, he followed Valesius.

The first edition of (12) HEINICHEN<sup>2</sup> (1827) in three volumes, did the same, while his description of MSS was taken from that of Stroth. Appended to Vol. III (pp. iii-xvi) was a letter from GERSDORF<sup>3</sup>, containing a description of the Dresden MS with a collation of a few chapters. In 1840 Heinichen published his *Supplementa notarum ad Eus. H. E.*<sup>4</sup>, which contained a digest of all the various readings collected by Burton and a collation of the Dresden MS.

(13) The edition of BURTON<sup>5</sup> suffered by being left unfinished at his

Rector ac in eodem Theol. Professor: Volumen I. Halae ad Salam, 1779 (only 1 vol. published). See Laemmer, pp. 866-868; Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, pp. xxi-xxii.

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem, Eiusdem de vita Constantini libri IV, necnon Constantini oratio ad sanctos et panegyricus Eusebii.* Graece et Latine edidit ERNESTUS ZIMMERMANNUS SS. Theologiae Doctor. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1822.

<sup>2</sup> *Eusebii historiae ecclesiasticae libri X.* Edidit FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS HEINICHEN Rev. Min. candidatus societatis historiae-theologicae Lipsiensis sodalis ordinarius. Lipsiae, 1827, 1828.

<sup>3</sup> *Epistola critica ERNESTI GOTTHELFI GERSDORFII ad Fredericum Adolphum Heinichen.*

<sup>4</sup> *Supplementa notarum ad Eusebii historiam ecclesiasticam et excerpta ex editione Burtoniana, cum eiusdem ac Schoedelii vindictarum Flavianarum censura et cum collatione codicis Dresdensis.* Edidit FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS HEINICHEN Phil. Dr. Gymnasii Annaemontani Prorector societatis historico-theologiae Lipsiensis sodalis. Lipsiae, 1840.

<sup>5</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri decem.* Ad codices manuscriptos recensuit EDVARDUS BURTON S.T.P. SS. Theologiae nuper Professor Regius. Tomi II. Oxonii e typographeo Academico, 1838. See Laemmer, p. 869; Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, p. xxiii.

death. He had made considerable collations, had digested the various readings, and had proceeded some way at any rate towards the construction of a text, but left no prolegomena or descriptions of MSS. His edition was published by the Clarendon Press, with a short preface including a list of the MSS cited.

The following MSS were made use of for the first time:—

E. Codex Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis 1431.

G. Codex olim Regiae Societatis, nunc vero Musei Britannici. Collated by Burton himself.

H. Codex Venetus 338, saec. x. This collation is described by Laemmer and Hollenberg (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1858, I p. 123) as being very inaccurate.

I. } Duo codices Florentini Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae,  
K. } Plut. lxx 7 and 20.

Fresh collations were procured of the following:—

C. Codex Mazarinaeus Parisiensis 1430, first collated by Valesius.

F. Codex apud Valesium Savilianus, in Bibliotheca Bodleiana hodie servatus n. 2278 (Auct. E i 9). Collated by Burton himself.

Codex Regius of Valesius, which Burton denotes A, is incorrectly stated to be Paris 1436, a mistake for which Stroth, who had been servilely copied by Heinichen, was responsible. Owing to this confusion Burton had a collation made of Paris 1437, which was published at the end of Volume II; a very cursory examination will show that this is the same as the MS cited in the body of the work as A. This unfortunate mistake has led to the neglect of Paris 1436 which (as will be seen) has a very interesting text. The editor of the volume also had a second collation made by J. Gronovius of the two Florentine MSS, which was placed at his disposal by Dr. Routh. He had purchased them at the sale of the Bibliotheca Te Waterana (*Catal. lib. manusc.*, p. 36, n. 52). In the place of prolegomena, the preface of Heinichen's first edition and his Notitia MSS (taken from Stroth) were reprinted. The majority of Burton's collations which he owed to other hands are unfortunately inaccurate. For instance Paris Gr. 1430 is quoted at the beginning of the first book, where it is defective: the collator seems to have had Gr. 1430 and 1431 open before him at the same time and to have omitted the same variants in both. Nor is the collation of the Venice MS to be trusted. On the other hand both the collations of the Florence MSS are good, that of Gronovius being somewhat the better of the two, and very much superior to the collations given by Laemmer and Heinichen. This text was reprinted in 1845 and 1856, without notes, and again with a preface by Dr. Bright, in 1872.

(16) The edition of SCHWEGLER<sup>1</sup> (1852) was the first which made

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri X.* Recognovit ALBERTVS



use of the collations supplied by Burton, and the first to attempt anything like a scientific study of the MSS. Schwegler divided them into three families, the first containing the three Paris MSS 1430, 1434, and 1435, with the Bodleian MS, the second the two Florence MSS, and the third the two Paris MSS 1431 and 1437 (the latter as usual is incorrectly numbered 1436). The Venice MS 338, which he only knew in an inaccurate collation, he considered had a mixed text, but classed it generally with the second group. He based his text for the most part (probably incorrectly) on the first group, and certainly rejected the third much too cursorily. The reason for his preference of the first group was that in his belief the text in the other MSS had been corrected from the various writers Eusebius had quoted, this suggesting that the greater conciseness of the text in the second group was due to the skill of editors rather than to the superiority of the tradition.

(17) The editor to whom we owe the largest collection of material is HUGO LAEMMER<sup>1</sup> (1859-62). He was educated at Berlin and became a member of the Roman Church. In 1858 he visited the libraries of Dresden, Vienna, Venice, and Munich, in 1859 the Vatican. To him we owe descriptions or collations of the following MSS. The list is the one he himself gives, p. 873, to which his own signs have been appended:—

- (i) Codex Dresdensis A 85. K.
- (ii) Codex Vindobonensis 71 (42). L.
- (iii) Codex Vindobonensis 174 (332). M.
- (iv) Codex Venetus Marcianus 337. N.
- (v) Codex Venetus Marcianus 338. O.
- (vi) Codex Venetus Marcianus 339. P.
- (vii) Codex Venetus Marcianus 452. Q.
- (viii) Codex Patavinus 1291.
- (ix) Codex Mediolanensis D. 95.
- (x) Codex Monacensis 380. R.
- (xi) Codex Vaticanus 399. R<sup>a</sup>.
- (xii) Codex Vaticanus 973. R<sup>c</sup>.
- (xiii) Codex Vaticanus Palatinus 209.
- (xiv) Codex Vaticanus Ottobonianus 108. R<sup>b</sup>.

He took as the basis of his edition the Venetian MS Codex Venetus Marcianus 338, which he designated O, reproducing not only its text,

SCHWEGLER, *Antt. Litt. in Academia Tubingensi Prof. P. E. Accedit brevis adnotatio critica.* Tubingae, 1852. See Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, p. xxiv.

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili historiae ecclesiasticae libri decem . . . Graecum textum . . . recensuit atque emendavit . . . apparatus criticum apposuit HUGO LAEMMER SS. Theologiae et Philosophiae Doctor, Presbyter Varmiensis, Missionarius Apostolicus, in Seminario Episcopali clericorum Brunsbergensi subregens. Scaphusia, 1852. See Heinichen<sup>2</sup>, pp. xxvi-xxviii.*

but also its divisions into chapters, and largely its orthography. Except when otherwise stated he followed this MS, and naturally did not as a rule feel it necessary to quote its readings in the apparatus criticus. Heinichen in his second edition has not observed this, and only quotes the readings of O when they are specifically stated, i. e. when they are rejected or when Laemmer has given the readings of a large number of MSS together. This makes Heinichen's apparatus of little value so far as this MS goes. But where O fails Laemmer uses the Vatican MS 399 (R<sup>a</sup>), which has a text belonging to quite a different family. The Latin translation is that of Valesius, more or less corrected. The opinion of Laemmer on the MSS is contained in two prefaces printed at the beginning, pp. vii-xxv, and in an appendix pp. 856-886.

In Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, I ii 561 (a section due to Preuschen), the following criticism is passed on Laemmer's collation of O. 'Von Laemmer für seine Ausgabe nach seiner Versicherung "maxima cum ἀκριβείᾳ" verglichen, doch flüchtig: vgl. Hollenberg, *Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissenschaft und christl. Leben*, N. F. iii [1860], p. 79.' This criticism is probably quite justified. Moreover his collations of the two Florence MSS are singularly inadequate, and much inferior to both of the two used in Burton's edition. He makes no distinction between the first and second hands of the older Florence MS (Plut. lxx 7), and thus makes the two MSS appear to have the same text throughout.

(18) The second edition of HEINICHEN<sup>1</sup> is useful as putting together all the information which various editors had collected concerning the text of Eusebius, and as giving all the collations of MSS made up to his time. His material is so far sufficient as to enable us to form a general idea of the groups of MSS, but beyond that not much can be said. The collations were rarely made at all accurately in the first instance, and are in almost all cases very defective. For instance we have compared a collation of Paris 1437 with Heinichen's collation, and have found that he omits nearly 50 per cent. of the variants. Moreover, he often uses collations supplied by others singularly unintelligently; we have seen an instance in the case of Laemmer, and another instance in the Dresden MS. The collation of Dindorf of the early chapters was made with a copy of Valesius's text. Heinichen quotes the variants of the MS when they are expressly cited in the collation, but in those cases where the MS agrees with Valesius's text but differs from his own, he does not take the trouble to cite it. Again, the very important and obviously correct variant of Paris Gr. 1430 in I xiii 6, in which Abgar

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii historiae ecclesiasticae libri X. Recensuit cum prolegomenis, apparatu, et annotatione critica, indicibus denuo edidit FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS HEINICHEN. Lipsiae, 1868.*



is called "ΑΒγαπος οἰχ ἄμα, is omitted, although it had been given by Burton. Moreover, he generally follows Laemmer in ignoring the differences between the two hands of the Florence MS, Plut. lxx 7, giving the corrected reading as that of the original text, and thus making this MS a mere duplicate of the other MS in the same library. These instances are quite sufficient to show how little Heinichen's work can be trusted.

(19) The only edition<sup>1</sup> which remains to be mentioned is that of DINDORF, published in Teubner's series in 1871. He based his text on the Paris MS 1430, of which he had begun, but apparently not completed, a new collation: *Ex quo genere est nova et accuratior Mazarinaei collatio qualem ego nunc turbis bellicis interruptam, sed tempore opportuno recensendam, in annotatione critica exhibebo.* His remarks on the MSS are hasty and valueless. He also publishes the first four chapters of the Syriac version from a communication by Wright.

In a short introduction to an edition of Tatian in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, E. SCHWARTZ<sup>2</sup> (who is, we believe, engaged on the edition of Eusebius for the Berlin Corpus) gives some account of the results of an inspection of MSS of Eusebius. He states that the editions of Eusebius are all untrustworthy, and that there is no accurate account of the MSS. The following is his account of the MSS which he had himself examined. It is unfortunate that sometimes quite unnecessarily he designates them by different letters from all previous editors.

Parisiensis 1430 [A] ex bibliotheca Cardinalis Mazarinaei, s. xi.

Vaticanus [V] s. xi: the text is similar to Codex Mazarinaeus. Copies of it are Florentinus Abbadae 196, s. xv; Ottobonianus 108, s. xvi;

Parisiensis 1434, s. xvi: a copy of Florentinus Abbadae is Paris 1435, s. xvi.

Parisiensis 1436 [E] s. xv.

Marcianus 338 [M] s. x.

Parisiensis 1431 [B] s. xi/xii. Copies of it are Paris 1432 and 1437, s. xiv, and Marcianus 339.

Parisiensis 1433 [D] s. xi/xii.

He also notes that a critical edition of Eusebius will be a difficult matter, that accurate collations of all MSS are necessary, and that the text should not be based on any single MS: the mistake in most editions has been that of relying too exclusively on Paris 1430: probably all the MSS contain mixed texts.

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii Caesariensis opera.* Recognovit GULIELMUS DINDORFIUS. Vol. iv. *Historiae ecclesiasticae libri I-X.* Lipsiae in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1871.

<sup>2</sup> *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* von OSCAR VON GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK, IV. Band, Heft I: *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos.* Recensuit EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichsche Buchhandlung, 1888.



The most complete list of the MSS of the Ecclesiastical History as yet published is that given [by PREUSCHEN] in HARNACK *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur* I ii (1893), p. 561, but it is unnecessarily inaccurate, and needs several corrections.

- (a) The Vienna MS (3), Cod. Venet. Marc. 452 (7), Cod. Vatic. 973 (10), Cod. Monac. Gr. 380 (8) are all incorrectly placed in the list of complete MSS, as they only contain extracts.
- (b) Cod. Paris Gr. 1436, following the mistake mentioned above, which began with Stroth, is incorrectly identified with the Codex Regius (Burton's A) of the older editions. Schwartz might have saved him this error.
- (c) He does not seem to be aware that Heinichen had completely collated the Dresden MS, for he only refers to Gersdorf's collations of the early chapters.
- (d) The attempt to group the MSS by the position of the Martyrs of Palestine is not of much value, as it combines together MSS of different types of text.
- (e) The preference shown to the text of the Codex Mazarinaeus is almost certainly hasty.

This review of the existing editions and history of the printed text will make it quite clear that there is no adequate edition, and that almost all the work will have to be done over again. No collations of MSS can be trusted, and very little attempt has been made to construct a text on principles which have any pretence to be called scientific. Since Heinichen's second edition was published, one first-rate MS, the Codex Sinaiticus, has become known, and the Syriac version has been edited. There is not as yet any adequate edition of the Latin text of Rufinus, though the gap will no doubt be filled when Prof. Mommsen's edition, which is announced as in the press, sees the light. The remarks of Schwartz quoted above are for the most part quite justified, although probably only a slight amount of work will suffice for clearing away the great majority of MSS.

A. C. HEADLAM.

THE ORDER OF THE TREATISES AND LETTERS  
IN THE MSS OF ST. CYPRIAN.

THE order in which the treatises and letters of St. Cyprian have been handed down to us in the principal MSS has long been recognized as of considerable importance for the classification and genealogy of those MSS. The following note examines the question in some detail. It is, however, only an essay and an attempt to start an inquiry which ought to bring forth great fruit when assisted by further materials, and especially when combined with new and careful study of the readings of the MSS. The subject has a further interest of its own in revealing to us something of the process by which our present body of Cyprianic literature was collected.

The older and more important codices show us distinct and well-defined groups of treatises and letters, though the latter portions of them often degenerate into disorder, the result of borrowing from other MSS which contained letters which they themselves lacked. Later MSS degenerate more and more by the disintegration and mixture of the original groups. We shall consider these groups separately, showing their original contents and their gradual dissolution. We shall thus accumulate evidence with regard to the formation of the collections in the MSS, the relation of the MSS to one another, and their value as witnesses. A certain number only of the MSS is taken into account, those which are simply dependent on known parents being passed over.

Almost all the more comprehensive MSS begin with the treatises, and add immediately to them one or two letters somewhat resembling treatises, and a group of beautiful letters on martyrdom. This seems to be the nucleus to which the other groups and the more loosely connected letters have attached themselves. I will call it

GROUP A<sup>2</sup>.

I give in the first place a diagram for this primary group of the order found in the principal MSS. The small Roman figures refer to the treatises, the Arabic numerals to the letters, as in Hartel's edition. But 'ii' and 'xiv' I prefer to call *idola* and *sent*, as they do not occur among the other treatises<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> I take the order of S from Mr. Turner's note in *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1902, p. 282; that of V from Mercati, *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano*, Roma, 1899, p. 12; that of the Cheltenham list from *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii, and Harnack's *Alchr. Litt.* i. That of Pem. (= Pembroke Coll., Cambr., Fell's Pem. c. 20, 1935 in Bernard, Schenkl, D 42, fourteenth century; Benson, *Cypr.* p. 548, c. 20, 1935 in Bernard, Schenkl, D 42, fourteenth century) was sent me by Dom Butler. Many are from





To begin with, let us examine the first ten places. TH h. Pem. give the same order as Pontius, the deacon and biographer of St. Cyprian, for those treatises which they contain, except that they interchange x and xi. M Q give Pontius's order, except that they invert v vii. S W  $\mu$ <sup>1</sup> have it also, only x has wandered<sup>2</sup>. In  $\beta$  it has wandered further still

Hartel's introduction, where descriptions of the MSS will be found; there are also short accounts in Harnack.

For convenience I subjoin a list of treatises and addresses of letters, numbered according to Hartel's Vienna edition. The letters not written by Cyprian are in italics:

i Ad Donatum	16. Cler. Carth.	53. <i>Maximus</i>
ii Quod id. dñi non sint	17. Pleb. Carth.	54. Maximo
iii Testimonia	18-19. Cler. Carth.	55. Antoniano
iv De hab. virg.	20. Cler. Rom.	56. Fortunato
v De cath. eccl. unit.	21. <i>Celerinus Luciano</i>	57. Cornelio
vi De lapsis	22. <i>Lucianus Celerino</i>	58. Plebi Thibari
vii De dom. orat.	23. <i>Confess. Carth.</i>	59-60. Cornelio
viii De mortalitate	24. <i>Caldonio</i>	61. Lucio
ix Ad Fortunatum	25. <i>Caldonio</i>	62. Ianuar. Maxim.
x Ad Demetrianum	26. Cler. Carth.	63. Caecilio
xi De opere et eleemos.	27. Cler. Rom.	64. Fido
xii De bono patien.	28. Moysi Maxim.	65. Epicteto
xiii De zelo et liv.	29. Cler. Carth.	66. Florentio
xiiii Sententiae episcopo- porum	30. <i>Cler. Rom.</i>	67. Concil.
1. Presb. Furnens.	31. <i>Moys. et Max.</i>	68. Stephano
2. Eucratio	32. Cler. Carth.	69. Magno
3. Rogatiano	33. Lapsis	70. Concil.
4. Pomponio	34. Cler. Carth.	71. Quinto
5. Cler. Carth.	35. Cler. Rom.	72. Stephano
6. Sergio et Rog.	36. <i>Cler. Rom.</i>	73. Iubaiano
7. Cler. Carth.	37. Moysi et Max.	74. Pompeio
8. <i>Cler. Rom. ad Cler.</i> <i>Carth.</i>	38-40. Cler. Carth.	75. <i>Firmilianus</i>
9. Cler. Rom.	41. <i>Cald. et Hercul.</i>	76. Nemesiano
10. <i>Confess. Carth.</i>	42. <i>Cald. et Hercul.</i>	77. <i>Nemesianus, etc.</i>
11-12. Cler. Carth.	43. Pleb. Carth.	78. <i>Lucius, etc.</i>
13. Rogatiano	44-45. Cornelio	79. <i>Felix, etc.</i>
14. Cler. Carth.	46. Maximo et Nicost.	80. Successo
15. <i>Confess. Carth.</i>	47-48. Cornelio	81. Cler. Carth.
	49-50. <i>Cornelius</i>	
	51-52. Cornelio	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. H. Turner has pointed out that Dr. Sanday, in *Studia Biblica*, has omitted x from O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> by mistake (*Classical Review*, May 1892, p. 207, note). With this correction they have the same order as  $\mu$  for the treatises.

<sup>2</sup> I have given xii xiii for S, instead of Mr. Turner's xiii xii, which is unparalleled in the best MSS, while xii xiii gives the same order as W  $\mu$ , etc. My reason is the following. The whole gathering R (fol. 91-98) has the headline *de zelo et livore* instead of *de bono patientiae*. Mr. Turner explains this by supposing that the page containing the *explicit* of xiii *de zelo et livore* and the *incipit* of xii *de bono pat.* was lost in the archetype. A simpler explanation would be that the gathering R,

The common parent of all these is obviously the order of Pontius. The same is true of the more disturbed sequences. In B it is evident that vii and xiii have been displaced. If we replace vii in its usual position after v and put xiii last, we get i iv vi v vii viii x xi xii xiii, that is to say, the order of Pontius with another new position for x. In L, xii xiii come too early. If we put them last we again get i iv vi v vii viii x xi xii xiii, so that L and B had probably a common parent, so far as the first ten treatises are concerned, though the affinity goes no further than this. The order of L is reflected in the curious MS 'K' (Leyden, Voss. lat. f<sup>o</sup> 40, 10th cent.) and in Brussels 918 (11th cent.). The latter has i 13 iv *Pudicit* vi v *idola* xii xiii viii x ix vii 63 11 *Novat* 58 xi, of which K omits 13 *idola* vii 63 58. Brussels 922 (16th cent.) has nearly the same sequence. I am inclined to think that the order of V is derived (by wilful, not accidental rearrangement) from that of B, for if in B we move xi and xiii into the place of vi, and insert vi after xii, we have V. The late place of vii suggests that Chelt. may be connected with this family; but it is not certain that the order given in the stichometry is really the exact order of any MS.

Z is apparently a corruption of S W  $\mu$ . Dr. Mercati has pointed out to me that the MS Vat. Reg. 275 (15th cent.) has preserved to us nearly the same order as the lost MS of Bec (see Turner, in *Stud. Bibl.* iii, p. 310). Nearly the same is found in two sixteenth-cent. MSS at Brussels, 919 and 920, and in  $\rho$  and i (both twelfth or thirteenth cent. Paris 1659 and 1654).

*Beccens.* i x ix xiii xii viii iv v vi *Rufin. symb.* iii a b  
*Regin.* 275 i x xi 11 ix xiii xii viii iv vii v vi 63 63 58 *Rufin. symb.* iii a

This seems to be certainly from S W  $\mu$ , copied in reverse order from ix; iv is out of place, and xi x ought to be before xii xiii, 63 is given twice.

P is from  $\beta$ , as is seen from the sequences x ix and v vii viii xi xii

which contains the middle of *de bono pat.*, was bound by mistake between the beginning and the end of *de zelo et liv.*, the scribe having signed the gathering with R by mistake for Q, before the headings of the pages were added. In this case one of the lost gatherings, Q or S, will have been a quire of five. The diagram will make this clear. The lost quires are bracketed :

1. pp. 83-90	O x	<i>ad Demetr.</i>	p. 352.17-363.8	293 lines	
2.	[P	"	p. 363.8 — <i>expl.</i>	198	} 306]
	{xii	<i>de bono pat.</i>	<i>incip.</i> —401.6	108	
3. pp. 91-98	R	"	p. 401.6 —412.4	295	
4.	[Q	"	p. 412.4 — <i>expl.</i>	97	} 673
	{xiii	<i>de zelo et liv.</i>	<i>incip.</i> . . .	} 347	
5.	[S	"	. . . — <i>expl.</i>		
	{ix	<i>ad Fortunatum</i>	<i>incip.</i> —325.4	229	
6. pp. 101-108	T	"	p. 325.4 — <i>expl.</i>		} 588
7. pp. 109-116	V	"	<i>incip. ad Caec.</i>		

xiii<sup>1</sup>. O<sub>1</sub> (10th cent.) and Vat. Pal. lat. 159 (15th cent.) have i x ix vi xi viii xii vii 63 iv xiii v *idola* 58 76 58 *bis* 55 iii 66 30 2 64 *sent.* The order i x ix and the late place of iv shows connexion with P. R is also from β, by the removal of xiii xi to an earlier place.

Thus we have the following five families: T H h.Pem.—M Q—SW<sub>μ</sub>Z *Bec*—B L K V—and β P O, R, each descending from a progenitor which differed from Pontius's order in only one particular. Therefore the order of Pontius is clearly the parent order of all our existing MSS.

In all the chief MSS, except h and Z, the treatise ix *ad Fortunatum* follows, and then at once iii *Testimonia ad Quirinum*, except in S W (which stops here) β Chelt. Then follow usually 55 (a long treatise on Novatianism *ad Antonianum*), 63 (on the mixed chalice *ad Casilium*) and a collection of seven letters on the subject of martyrdom, with the addition of 58 on the same subject *plebi Thibari consistenti*. Occasionally *laud* and *idola* appear. The order of the seven letters 6 to 28 37 11 38 39 is invariable. The omissions in H β B N P are unimportant, as these MSS are in the habit of dropping out letters without any reason, often adding them in at the end or even the beginning of the codex. In h.Pem. Z C R the seven occur without any interruption. The other MSS insert 58 or *laud* or (absurdly) 55, which last is sometimes before, sometimes after 63; while 58, usually at the end, occurs before iii in L and before ix in Z, whence R has transferred it into the middle of the treatises. *Laud* also occurs in M Q with two other *spuria* at the end of the group, and in β before iii.

With these facts in view, the order of h.Pem. is startling. It includes all the fixed stars and none of the planets.

Now Pontius appears at first sight to mention (c. 7) twelve treatises. The first eleven are generally considered certain, the eleventh being ix *ad Fortunatum*, described by Pontius thus:

*Quis martyres tantis exhortatione divini sermonis erigeret?*

The position of ix in most MSS suggests this identification, and the fact that the treatise consists of a collection of passages of Scripture on subjects connected with martyrdom has appeared to make it certain.

The twelfth and last description of Pontius runs thus:

*Quis denique tot confessores frontium notatarum secunda inscriptione signatos, et ad exemplum martyrii superstites reservatos incentivo tubae caelestis animaret?*

This has been taken to mean the spurious treatise *de laude martyrii*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The treatises have the order of P in Vat. Reg. 117 (11th cent.) and in Vat. 199, 7. and 200, both 15th cent. The rest of these three MSS is variously connected with o, μ and, I think, T.

<sup>2</sup> I see that Mr. Turner (*Class. Rev.* l. c.) suggested that this twelfth question might refer to the letters on martyrdom, thus partly anticipating my present theory.



The obvious objection was that Pontius (of whose truthfulness in describing his intimate relations with St. Cyprian there need surely be no doubt) could hardly have attributed a spurious work to his bishop. To get out of the difficulty by declaring it to be genuine, with Götts, would be as uncritical as to deny the authenticity of the *Life* by Pontius.

But as a fact the words of Pontius do not describe the *de laude martyrii* in the least. It is not addressed to confessors, but to *fratres*; it is not an exhortation to martyrdom, but an encomium of it, probably delivered after the persecution was over. It is African probably, it is Cyprianesque certainly, but it is neither by Cyprian, nor referred to by his biographer.

Returning to ix, we find that a similar difficulty awaits us. *Ad Fortunatum* is not a treatise, but, like iii, a collection of texts of Scripture strung together and addressed to a layman. St. Cyprian says he has provided *non tractatum, sed materiam tractantibus*. As iii is omitted by Pontius, so might ix well be omitted also. It is true that its sub-title *de exhortatione martyrii*, together with its scriptural character, exactly fits the words of Pontius *exhortatione divini sermonis*. But it is not addressed to *tanti martyres*, but to a layman, and its exhortations are intended for the people. It is not so much meant to encourage martyrs, as to prevent lapse. It speaks of the absurdity and iniquity of idolatry, and how the Christian for the love of Christ must not fall back to heathenism, and how persecutions and sufferings will be rewarded in the life to come.

If we suppose that Pontius had before him simply the collection of h.Pem., the invariable portion of our first group, the difficulties vanish.

The letters 6 10 28 37 are exhortations to the confessors imprisoned at Carthage and at Rome, many of whom died as martyrs, including 'those famous martyrs,' *tantos martyres*, Sergius and Rogatian (Ep. 6, perhaps Mappalicus was still alive when this letter was sent), Moses and Maximus (Ep. 28, 37<sup>1</sup>), and others (Ep. 10) well known when Pontius wrote. That they are full of Holy Scripture goes without saying.

The letters 38 and 39 are concerned not with martyrs who died in torments or in prison, but precisely with confessors who have 'twice over had their foreheads signed' with the sign of the Lamb, and have been preserved as a model to their brethren. Of Aurelius Cyprian says (Ep. 38) '*Gemino hic agone certavit, bis confessus et bis confessionis suae victoria gloriosus*,' and of Celerinus (Ep. 39) '*non brevi compendio vulnerum victor, sed adhaerentibus diu et permanentibus paenis longae conluctationis miraculo triumphator*.' In the Apuleian lingo of Pontius this

<sup>1</sup> 37 is called by Q *aspistola secunda*.

becomes '*confessores frontium notarum secunda inscriptione signatos.*' Again Pontius has '*et ad exemplum martyrii superstites reservatos*'; and Cyprian says of Aurelius, Ep. 38, '*Ita et dignitate excelsus est et humilitate summissus, ut appareat illum divinitus reservatum, qui ad ecclesiasticam disciplinam ceteris esset exemplo, quomodo servi Dei in confessione virtutibus vincerent, post confessionem moribus eminent*'; and of Celerinus, Ep. 39, he says that he is to be set up in the pulpit as an example to all who see him and hear him read that Gospel which he has so nobly put in practice, and he adds of both: '*In talibus servis laetatur Dominus, in eiusmodi confessoribus gloriatur, quorum secta et conversatio sic proficit ad praeconium gloriae, ut magisterium ceteris praebeat disciplinae. Ad hoc eos Christus esse hic in ecclesia diu voluit, ad hoc de media morte subtractos quadam dixerim resurrectione circa eos facta incolumes reservavit, ut dum nihil in honore sublimius, nihil in humilitate summissius a fratribus cernitur, hoc eisdem fraternitas sectata comitetur.*' It is inevitable that Pontius is echoing the very words of these two letters.

A difficulty remains. Pontius says that Cyprian encouraged these confessors 'with the sound of the celestial trumpet.' On the contrary, these letters are not addressed to them at all, but to the clergy and people of Carthage, to inform them that he has ordained Aurelius and Celerinus to the office of *lector*. The explanation seems to be that Pontius deals with the seven letters as a group, and speaks of all as exhortations, though he distinguishes the martyrs from the confessors. It was in fact impossible for him to mention that the real subject of 38 and 39 was nothing but the intimation to the clergy and people of two clerical appointments. The point of the twelve rhetorical questions which give the order of the treatises is simply: 'Who, if Cyprian had died in the first persecution instead of retiring into a hiding-place, would have written this or that?' Obviously any one could have announced the appointment of two *lectores*!

Of Ep. 11 I have said nothing. It is rightly described by the Cheltenham list as '*de precando Deo.*' St. Cyprian has been warned by a vision that the persecution is a punishment of the sins of Christians, and that they are above all to pray. 'Even the confessors,' he says, 'do not keep discipline'; yet suddenly, while they boast of their confessorship, there bursts upon them the ingenious fury of the torturer. Prayer alone offered up for them, and unanimous prayer, will enable any to stand. And he concludes with a magnificent enumeration of the objects for which they should pray, an echo perhaps of the style in which he daily offered the great prayer of the Mass, already commencing possibly to crystallize into a Canon. I cannot but connect the '*incentivo tubae caelestis animaret*' with this letter. '*Tuba caelestis*' is clearly not



Holy Scripture, but these *actiones* which so often moved Cyprian to act or write, and of which Pontius makes much elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. But if this is true, it can apply only to letter 12.

If this identification be right, when Pontius wrote, a few years at most after Cyprian's death, he had before him the earliest collection of Cyprianic writings, consisting of i vii v vii x vii xi xii 6 10 28 37 21 38 39, a collection which only h. and Fern. have preserved to us without interpolation<sup>2</sup>. It was formed at Carthage. The first two letters were addressed to the Carthaginian prisons, the last three to the Carthaginian clergy. The two remaining letters were indeed sent to Rome. But St. Cyprian himself tells us (Ep. 52) that he sent a copy of 28 (and also of 27, 30, 31) to the clergy of Carthage. It cannot be doubted that he must have communicated to the Carthaginian confessors the beautiful and elaborate Ep. 37 which he addressed to the martyrs at Rome. A member of the Carthaginian clergy probably put the letters together, perhaps Pontius, or the secretary of whom Paulus of Concordia spoke to St. Jerome. They were letters which will have been especially prized. To collect business letters (so to speak) about the lapses, or the factions at Carthage, or Novatus and Novatian, was not yet thought of—still less about the hugely dominant baptismal controversy. A large edition would be dispersed in Africa. The pious laymen, Fortunatus and Quirinus<sup>3</sup>, would send the treatises addressed to them (ix, iii) to swell the rolls, or perhaps already the codex. Next we presume that Bishop Antonian communicated the long treatise-letter against Novatian (55), and the aged Casculus that on the mixed chalice (63). These were naturally added between the treatises and the letters. Next the Bishop of Thibaris would send the letter on martyrdom, 58, which was appended to the seven letters, as connected with their subject, or placed after 6 as still more closely belonging to the first three. That in T L N P 55 appears in this place, I can only explain by the suggestion that the scribe had been told to put 58 there, and 55 at the end, and that he reversed the order by mistake<sup>4</sup>. These MSS

<sup>1</sup> St. Cyprian uses this metaphor of his own voice: "*classis vocatus meus*," Ep. 55 4, and *ad Fort.* 1; of the "divine precepts" of Scripture also, *ibid.* 2, "*ille aut militaris labor hereticorum, ille paganusque classicus*." Novatian writes to Cyprian of the lapses: "*recomitant presbiteri nostrorum laborum*," Ep. 30 6.

<sup>2</sup> We shall see that h. Fern. have preserved the *most* collection, that of the letters to Cornelius, without addition, omission, or disarrangement.

<sup>3</sup> They would presumably be alive, as the date of *ad Fort.* according to Benson was during the year of exile which closed the Saint's life, and Quirinus is repeatedly mentioned in the last letters (Ep. 77, 3, 5<sup>th</sup> 2).

<sup>4</sup> Can we go back behind this first collection? Perhaps we may have a right to guess that in St. Cyprian's own time his works were to be bought in two or three, i v vi; v vi; xii xiii; while x, vii and xi, were either in separate rolls, or differently arranged in various copies, if in one roll. The collection from the rolls would be



may be related, so far as the letters in this group are concerned. T and H h.Pem. must have separated soon after St. Cyprian's death. The readings in h and T show a close connexion in the treatises and in the letters of this first group. In B<sup>s</sup> they seem to be independent of each other. But the rest of h is simply borrowed from an ancestor of T. I have myself been able to collate what was necessary of h, by the kindness of the keeper of MSS at Leyden, M. Molhuysen.

T and M Q appear to be quite independent for Group A<sup>1</sup>.  $\mu$  gives another slightly different version, and adds *laud* to the martyr letters after 6. Chelt. and  $\beta$  may be connected with it. This appears to be a rather later arrangement than that of M Q and T for (1) *laud* is spurious; (2) the order of  $\mu$  is further on not quite so good as that of T; and especially (3) because in M Q *laud* is an addition with *Jud*, *idola*, and makes a stop<sup>2</sup>. It is therefore a later arrival than the 'planet' letters. In T it comes only after four more groups. The place it occupies is, however, witnessed by Lucifer of Cagliari, who quotes in one treatise (*Moriend. pro Dei Filio*, A. D. 360-1), 6 10 37 55 and *laud*, and by the list of 359. The order is not later than the first half of the fourth century. We may assume that the collection of four more groups in T is earlier than this. The difference between M Q and T will go back then to the third century.

The parent of M Q I will henceforth call (M Q); (T) will mean the parent of T, and so forth<sup>3</sup>.

The order of V is peculiar. Dr. Mercati<sup>4</sup> has shown that it gives the letters in well-arranged groups, and he argues that these represent the primitive collections. If this were so, V would be a sort of archetype for the other MSS, and their varying arrangements would be varying degrees of corruption of V's order. Nothing could be further from the truth. The order of V is not reflected in any MSS. The very carefulness of its arrangement shows that it is due to some learned editor, such as those who flourished between the middle of the fourth and the end of the sixth centuries<sup>5</sup>. It follows that Hartel's judgement that it represents a wilful recension, and does not in its peculiarities testify to

in the new-fangled book form, which may have been introduced by that time (Sanday, *Stud. Bibl.* iii. pp. 233-6).

<sup>1</sup> This is verified by internal evidence of the readings, so far as I have been able to compare them.

<sup>2</sup> We shall see how often the addition of *spuria* indicates a break in the process of formation of a collection.

<sup>3</sup> The position of 58 and *idola* in Z suggests that for the first group it may exhibit an independent arrangement of the early fourth century, though Z is certainly a corruption of ( $\mu$ ) further on.

<sup>4</sup> *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi*, etc., pp. 12 seq.

<sup>5</sup> As Dr. Sanday points out *Studia Bibl.* iii. p. 297.

the original readings, is less likely to be unsound than Dr. Mercati thinks. It is interesting to notice that the editor of V had our group *M* before him. He leaves 63 with the treatises, which he has rearranged. He removes 55 to a collection of letters to suffragans which he has made up. He places 58 with the letters to martyrs 6 10 28 37, adds 13 and 76, and leaves this as the first group. The three remaining letters, 11 38 39, remain in their place, but become the nucleus of a new group of eighteen letters to the clergy of Carthage. In the remainder of his groups we can also trace occasional snatches of the order of the MS from which he selected them<sup>1</sup>.

GROUP B<sup>s</sup>.

Next follows in T h.Pem. a collection of eight letters to Pope Cornelius, 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51. *M* Q, after the three *spuria*, give the same<sup>2</sup>. In L N P the first letter (60) of the Cornelian group is given, then follows C<sup>s</sup> (= Bapt. group), then part of D<sup>s</sup>, and B<sup>s</sup> mixed with it, thus: 52 (1 56 3) 47 45 48 44 (61 46) 57 59. L and N add 51 in an appendix. In (L N P) it was doubtless after 44. What is principally noticeable is that 48 has appeared, thus making the collection of letters to Cornelius quite complete. Chelt. gives the letters to Cornelius as 9, but the St. Gall MS gives 8, so that 48 was probably absent.  $\mu$  gives B<sup>s</sup> after C<sup>s</sup>, thus: 60 57 59 52 45 47 44 51; the transposition of 45 47 is accidental, and doubtless recent, if not a misprint of Hartel's. 48 appears as an extra at what we shall see is the end of a stage in the development of  $\mu$ . Like  $\mu$ , Z gives B<sup>s</sup> after C<sup>s</sup>. It has lost 60 and 52, but possesses 48. The order is 57 59 47 45 44 (49 50 54) 48 51. The omission of 60 is accidental; 49 50 are replies of Cornelius. 48 is not in the same position as in L N P, and has been taken from the later place in ( $\mu$ ). 51 is followed immediately by D<sup>s</sup> as in  $\mu$ . C R depend on (Z). They give after C<sup>s</sup> 57 59 60 52 (C om. 52) 47 45 44 (49 50) followed by D<sup>s</sup>. Here 60 52 are transposed, while Z omits them altogether. They were therefore doubtless in their proper place in the parent of Z C R. C R omit 51. B has 59 52 47 45 44 51<sup>3</sup> 60 57 after fragments of C<sup>s</sup>. H $\beta$  give 60 57 59 52 47 45 44, and have 51 at the end of the MS. The fragments called F have . . . 57 52 47 45 44 . . . ; r has after C<sup>s</sup> 60 59 45 44 51, and supplies 52 47 57 earlier.

<sup>1</sup> The order of V (Mercati l. c.) is: i iv xi xiii v viii x xii vi ix vii iii 63 || 6 13 10 76 28 37 58 || 11 38 39 43 12 40 32 81 7 5 14 16 15 17 18 29 26 34 || 9 20 27 35 33 || 45 60 48 44 57 59 47 46 52 51 54 || 25 41 61 55 69 a 69 b 65 67 72 sent 68 74 73 71 70 2 64 3 1 || (miscellaneous) *idola* 66 4 62 65 || (Rescripts) 77 78 53 49 50 36.

<sup>2</sup> The complete enumeration of the contents of the MSS here mentioned will be given later.

<sup>3</sup> B calls 51 the 6th letter.



Evidently B, H $\beta$ , F, r give merely disarrangements of the true order. None but L N P  $\mu$  Z V (Chelt. ?) have 48, and its varying position appears to prove that it was not an original member of the group, which is therefore given correctly by T M Q, h.Pem. and  $\mu$ <sup>1</sup>.

The collection must have been made at Rome. It contains no letters to the Roman clergy or martyrs, so that it would seem not to have been the result of a general investigation made by some Carthaginian at Rome, but to have been simply drawn from the Papal archives, or from the private papers of St. Cornelius. The too notorious relations of St. Cyprian with Pope Stephen would be a sufficient reason why neither of the letters to that Pope should be given. We shall see that there is no reason for connecting any other group with Rome<sup>2</sup>.

GROUP C $\beta$ .

This group I take next because in  $\mu$  Z H $\beta$  C R Chelt., &c., it comes in the second place, and also in L N P, but for the introduction of 60 (the first letter of B $\beta$ ) before it. In T M Q it comes fourth of the groups. It does not occur in h.Pem.

T L N P	76 73 71 70 sent 74 69 67 64 2
Chelt.	73 71 70 sent 74 72 64 69 67 2
$\mu$	76 73 71 70 sent 74 69 (40) 67 64 2
Z (14)	76 71 70 (16) 69 (40) 64 2
C R (14)	76 70 (16 15 40) 64 2
B	73 71 70 sent 72 74 69 64 2
H $\beta$	73 71 70 (63) 76 74 69 (40) 67 64 2

M Q have sent 69 67 64 2, and add 71 73 and 76 70 afterwards. H $\beta$  show their dependence on ( $\mu$ ) by the introduction of 40, which has nothing to do with the rest<sup>3</sup>. Z and C R show two stages of the

<sup>1</sup> T introduces Ep. 60 as *ad Cornelium i* (and so also at the end of the letter), and at the end of 51 has *ad Cornelium epistulae numero .viii. explicit*. T does not number the intermediate letters. Q numbers all but the first, and M gives the correct numbers to 52 45 44. F gives the right numbers for 47 45 44.

C R number the letters as they stand in their list: 57 59 (ii, R), 60 (iii, C R), 52 (iv, R), 47 (v, R), 45 (vi, C R), 44 (vii, C R). Next come the two letters from Cornelius 49 (viii, R *sic*), 50 (viii, C; viii, R).

Of Z's numbers Hartel gives only that for 48, viz. viii at the beginning, viiiij at the end of the letter. Either is correct, according as we count or omit the interloper 54. Of  $\mu$  I only know that it numbers 48 xi. This is arrived at by adding 49 50 to the original eight letters, thus 48 becomes the eleventh.

L N P begin to number from 47 (i, P), 45 (ii, L P), 48 (iii, L P), 44 (iv, L P). They do not number 57 59. 48 is numbered iii in o i  $\rho$ . This shows that o took 48 from P.

<sup>2</sup> I venture to suggest that the eight letters were put together and published soon after the death of St. Cyprian by Pope Dionysius, 258-268.

<sup>3</sup> H B have dropped *sent*, probably as being tiresome. They have put 63, which has fallen out of A $\beta$ , in its place.



corruption of ( $\mu$ ) by interpolation and omission<sup>1</sup>. B is strange. It gives C<sup>s</sup> after B<sup>s</sup> and fragments of other groups. It omits 76 here like Chelt. because it has already given it, like T, in F<sup>s</sup>. But its dependence on  $\mu$  is shown by 40 67 together just before the group, from which they have dropped out. The introduction of 72, the letter to Stephen on baptism, is paralleled by Chelt. only, and appears to show that the doubts of Harnack and Turner as to 72, and not 68, being intended by Chelt. are unfounded.

The group is obviously African. 70 *sent* are councils; 73 71 74 69 are letters on the subject of heretical baptism. 67 is the letter of a council in answer to the legation from two Spanish churches. 64 is a council on infant baptism. 2 is a letter to Eucratius, probably Bishop of Thenae, on the impossibility of a Christian being allowed to train actors. 76 is a letter to the nine bishops and clergy and laity confined in the mines in the last year of Cyprian's life. It is a collection of more or less official documents. Four out of ten are councils. 73 71 69 were probably communicated to the bishops of the province. Doubtless the angry 74 was also widely published. 76 is addressed to a group of bishops and a very large number of clergy and lay sufferers. 2 may have been looked upon as a sort of legal decision by the great Primate<sup>2</sup>.

#### GROUP D<sup>s</sup>.

Between B<sup>s</sup> and C<sup>s</sup> in T are found 13 (to the martyrs—exhortation), 43 (to the people of Carthage against Felicissimus), 65 (to the bishop and people of Assuras, about their former lapsed bishop), 1 (to the people of Furni, on clerical guardians), 61 (to Pope Lucius on his return from exile), 46 (to Maximus, Nicostratus and the other Roman confessors, to beg them to leave the party of Novatian), 66 (to Florentius Puppianus, a vigorous reply to a personal attack), 54 (to Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius and the other Roman confessors, congratulating them on their return to Cornelius from Novatianism, and recommending the perusal of his own *de lapsis* and *de Unitate*).

This is a scratch collection, if it is really a collection. 13 43 60 together, as sent to Carthage from exile. 65 1 66 are addressed to Africans, 61 46 54 to Romans. In M Q 66 is omitted. The three Roman letters then come side by side. It is tempting to imagine that

<sup>1</sup> C R supply 69 later from V, and C gives *sent* (68) 74 73 71 70 1 in appendix, from V, as the order shows.

<sup>2</sup> A sub-group is formed by 73 71 70. To 73 in L is prefixed: *Incipit ad Iuvainum de hereticis baptizandis epistolas numero tres*. To 70 in P is prefixed: *Incipit ad Iuvainum liber secundus*. T has before 73: *Incipit ad Urbanum de hereticis baptizandis epistola iii*; before 71: *Item incipit ad Quintum epistola ii de his ipsis* (and at the end *explicit epistola iii*), and before 70: *ad Iubaianum de hereticis baptizandis epistola, n. iii*.

his was the original arrangement. Nevertheless, there are many proofs that {MQ}, from the three *spuria* after A<sup>s</sup> onwards, was merely a copy of (T). The original order of (T) was what T gives us now. This is shown not only by the witness of T's own perfect preservation of the other groups, but the witness of  $\mu$  Z B H  $\beta$ , which all insert 66 where T places it.  $\mu$  gives after B<sup>s</sup> 13 43 65 (78 79 77=F<sup>s</sup>) 1 61 46 66 54. Z, after 51, the last of B<sup>s</sup>, has 13 43 1 61 46 66. Thus Z omits 65. C R have only 13 after 51. B has 43 65 (C<sup>s</sup>) 1 61 54 66. H  $\beta$  (after B<sup>s</sup>) has 13 43 65 66 (4 3 72) 61 1 46 (56) 54. The fragment of F gives us 61 1 46 (56) 54. h.Pem. give after B<sup>s</sup>, 61 46 (78) 13 43 (76 77 *idola*) 66 54, the last two in Pem. only. L N P give (after C<sup>s</sup>) 13 *laud* 43 65 (52) 1, and later 61 46<sup>1</sup>. Then in an Appendix L has *idola* 66 40 (4 72 51) 54 E<sup>s</sup>; N has (40 and 6 others) 54 (E<sup>s</sup> *idola*) 66. In M Q 66 is supplied next before 40<sup>2</sup>. Chelt. gives 40 66. It may be noticed that M Q connect *idola* 4, and V has *idola* 66 4.

GROUP E<sup>s</sup>.

In T after C<sup>s</sup> we find 32 20 12<sup>3</sup>, in M Q the same occur after D<sup>s</sup>, before C<sup>s</sup>. A little further on in T come 30 31, and in M Q 31 30<sup>4</sup>. In  $\mu$  these have been made one group. 12 and 32 are to the Carthaginian clergy, 20 is to the Roman clergy. 30 and 31 are from the Roman clergy, and were sent with 32 (and with 28, as already mentioned, and with 27, which occurs much later) by Cyprian to Carthage. As 20 is a reply to the strictures sent by the Roman clergy to the Carthaginian clergy on the bishop's cowardice in flying from martyrdom, it is certain that Cyprian must have communicated it to the Carthaginian clergy. The collection is therefore African, by the clergy of Carthage.

Z gives only 12 20, C R none. L gives in appendix 32 20 12 30, N gives 20 12 30—the omission of 32 is accidental. Chelt. has 12 32 20 30. B also has 32 20, but no 31; 12 and 30 are scattered; the latter comes (as we have seen) after 6 in the A<sup>s</sup> group. H  $\beta$  have 20 30 31 12 (77 78 79) 32. F had 20 30 31 12 (evidently 12 not 32).

It is noticeable that 30 31 are the first letters to Cyprian we have

<sup>1</sup> P omits *laud* here, and gives 66 *idola* 40 *laud*.

<sup>2</sup> O, from M Q E, is described by Hartel, p. xxxviii note, as giving 13 43 65 1 60 46 54. I presume that 60 is a misprint for 61. 60 has occurred in its right place in B<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> M Q prefix to 32: *Incipit ad Romanos epistula prima*. Q has before 20: *Incipit orationem secunda*.

<sup>4</sup> These form part of the lost nine letters in M Q, which are vouched for by the index of M. Hartel, p. xxxiv, gives 31 36. The index has lxiv *pbr̄i et diac urbis roman ad Cyprianum*, which ought to mean 36, I admit. But it certainly refers to 30. Maximus and Nicostratus were Priests. *Diac.* is a mistake for *confessores*.

yet come across. Till now only his own letters, and the councils, had been collected. These two letters from Rome appear here simply because they were enclosures in St. Cyprian's letter 32 to Carthage. But this accident seems to have suggested the completion of his correspondence by adding to it any letters addressed to him that turned up.

GROUP F<sup>s</sup>.

In T there comes next, after *laud* 40, a group of four letters 78 79 76 77. 76 (to the bishops, clergy and laity in the mines) had already been given in the baptismal group. 77 78 79 are three replies to it  $\mu$  omits 76, having given it already, and places 78 79 77 after the first three letters of D<sup>s</sup>. They do not occur in L N P, nor in Z C R. In B we find 76 79 78 77 after A<sup>s</sup>, with two stray letters intervening. In H B 77 78 79 are at the end, and  $\mu$  also repeats them at the end in this order. In Chelt. Turner restores 78 79 after C<sup>s</sup>. Mommsen and Harnack substitute (I think wrongly) 56 for the two. V has 77 78 only, omitting 79 and 76, though the latter was in two collections. M Q has placed 78 after E<sup>s</sup>, before *sent* and the remainder of C<sup>s</sup>. 76 with 70 at the end is obviously a fragment of C<sup>s</sup>.

GROUP G<sup>s</sup>.

After some sporadic letters, T gives 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29, and MQ has exactly the same. 53 is from Maximus and the confessors at Rome. It may or may not belong to the group. The rest are all addressed to Carthage, to the martyrs, clergy, laity, or to Bishop Caldonius, except 9, which is a reply to the Roman clergy. It is a Carthaginian collection. It does not occur in Chelt. L N P or H B B. E o  $\rho$  have the whole from MQ.  $\mu$  has dispersed the collection, if it was a collection, into 17 18; 16 15 29; 26 25; but it omits 53, 19 and 9. Z has taken and scattered from ( $\mu$ ) 25 17 18 26 29, and has inserted 14 and 16 into C<sup>s</sup>, as we saw. It has added at the end from V 14 16 15 18 29, of which 14 and 16 are duplicates<sup>1</sup>. V has all but 53 15 19. In O<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>5</sub> the group is perfect.

GROUP H<sup>s</sup>.

The remainder of T may be considered as one group for convenience: 27 23 24 21 22 8 35 36 33 49 50 34 41 42 80; after these come ten spurious treatises of which I take no account. Of these letters, M Q have not one. Except the last, 80, they are a fairly homogeneous group—mostly rather early letters. They no doubt represent the last gleaning of the African efforts to collect all that remained of the Cyprianic correspondence. 27 35 are to the Roman clergy; 35 is

<sup>1</sup> The duplicates at the end of Z are quoted by Hartel as z.



a notice about the lapsed; 34 is to the clergy of Carthage; 41 is to five bishops who represented St. Cyprian in Carthage during his concealment; 80 is the intimation to Successus of the publication of Valerian's edict. The remaining nine are none of them Cyprian's; 21 22 8 are not even addressed to him, and the last of these insults him. It was doubtless only when great interest had been aroused in the Saint's magnificent letters, that these letters connected with him were thought worth publishing.  $\mu$  has of these 49 50 and 27 35 41, and separately 33, then 23 24 22 8, at the end of all. 80 81 come probably from an independent source. Z has not 23 24 22 8, so that they were apparently not yet in ( $\mu$ ). But it gives 49 50 27 35 41 scattered, and also 34 which was no doubt in ( $\mu$ ). At the end it gives 33 from  $\mu$  or V, and 34 *bis* certainly from V. Z has also 80 81, and gives 81 in duplicate from V. V has 27 35 41 33 34, the same as Z ( $\mu$ ), but in a new order. It has 81 and not 80, while T has 80 and not 81. V has at the end 49 50, the only two of the group in C R.

## THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE MSS.

We have seen that in the treatises T h. Pem. give the same order, while in the whole group T has added ix iii 63 55 58; h therefore represents the parent of T. The order of (M Q) has, like T, only one point of difference from Pontius. The same is true of S W  $\mu$ , while L has two. There is no reason why these differences should be placed later than the third century. I have said the same with regard to the place of iii ix 65 55 58 in (T), (M Q), (L N P), respectively, while the early position of *laud* in M Q  $\mu$  Chelt. is before the middle of the fourth century, as we learn from Lucifer.

At the end of the first group (M Q) stopped, and added three *spuria*, probably not so very long after the appearance of those treatises. (T) and (h) added the eight letters to Cornelius, I think, independently. (T) added the eight letters of group D<sup>8</sup> and the baptismal group C<sup>2</sup>. (h) took only a part of D<sup>8</sup>, and a little later, for it took also a part of E<sup>2</sup> (viz. 78 79) *idola* and E<sup>8</sup> from (T), and stopped. (T) received E<sup>8</sup> (viz. 32 20 12), then *laud* and stopped; at least a spurious treatise usually implies the completion of a stage. (T) gives its collections so completely that it must have taken them early as they appeared. It had probably already got to this stage when *laud* was inserted in ( $\mu$ ) and Chelt., which had as yet only A<sup>8</sup>.

M Q are by their readings shown to be closely connected with T<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> The order of T (from Hartel, p. xxxix) is i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii ix iii 63 6 57 10 28 37 11 38 39 58 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 66 54 || 76 73 71 70 *sent* 74 69 67 64 2 || 32 20 12 || *laud* 40 || 78 79 76 77 || *idola* 30 31 || 70 5 7 14 4 || 56 3 7 2 12 || 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || 27 23 24 21 22 8 35 36 33 49

but in the letters only. Hartel thought their common parent had the order given in the index of M. We have seen already that T has preserved the groups far better than M Q. For instance, M Q have lost 66 out of D's, and have dropped the first four letters of C's, giving them later in pairs. They also separate 78 from the rest of F's. It is clear that the index of M is the index of the immediate parent of M Q, but that the archetype of M Q T had the order of T. The parent of M Q was a very old codex even when M (eighth to ninth century) copied it, as it had lost nine letters, viz. many sheets. It was probably much older than 700, the date suggested as the latest by Hartel. Justinus, who corrected letters 28 38 39 at Rome, probably had before him only the first stage of (M Q), as he corrects no farther. If his date was, as Dr. Sanday suggests, between the end of the fourth century and the middle of the sixth, this may give the earlier limit to the age of the complete (M Q).

This codex or type of codex (for there must often have been a whole 'edition' of a type, whether of three or four copies or of fifty) having reached its first halt *laud*, appears to have copied all its remaining contents from a MS (T)<sup>2</sup>, which contained everything that T now contains, as far as H's, with the exception of the small group 70 *his* 5 7 14 4. A careful examination will show that (M Q) has omitted nothing. It has copied 12 twice as in (T), but 76 and 70 only once. It has 66 40 together. It adds 75, the letter of Firmilian, which is found in no MSS but E and I, which are apographs of Q. Doubtless Hartel is right that (T) had 75, but that T omitted it as disedifying.

We may consider  $\mu$  next<sup>1</sup>. Taken as far as *idola*, it has exactly the

50 34 41 42 80 *Jud aleat ii mont. ad Vigil. vita resurrec. caena oratio oratio ii Passio* (T = tenth cent.). t (Paris 1648, thirteenth cent.) has almost the same.

The order of M Q (from Hartel, p. xxxiv) is i iv vi vii v x viii xi xii xiii ix iii 55 63 6 58 10 28 37 11 38 39 || *Jud aleat laud* || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 54 || 32 20 12 || 78 || *sent* 69 67 64 2 || 3 72 12 || (71 73 74 || 66 40 || 77 79 || 31 30 [Hartel calls it 36]) 75 || 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || 56 7 76 70 *idola* 4 *ii mont Pascha Oratio ii caena Passio*. The nine letters in brackets are wanting in M Q and their derivatives, but are given from the index of M. The sign || is introduced to mark the divisions of groups, or fragments of groups (M = ninth cent., Q eighth to ninth).

The original order of (h. Pem.) was as follows: i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 61 46 || 78 || 13 43 || 76 77 || *idola* 66 54 || 32 20 30. At present h (tenth cent.) breaks off in the middle of *idola*, and 30 is missing in Pem. (thirteenth-fourteenth cent.). But the Vatican MSS  $\gamma$  (lat. 201) and  $\delta$  (lat. 5099) and the Bologna MS 2572, all fifteenth cent., have 30.  $\delta$  adds a quantity more, from some other source. For this information I have to thank Dr. Mercati of the Vatican and the librarians of the Universities of Bologna (Dr. L. Frati) and Leyden. H (Paris, 15,282) as far as xiii is of the same family, and must have branched off from (h) before 500. See *Revue Bénéd.* for this month.

<sup>1</sup> The order of  $\mu$  (Hartel, p. xlvi) is as follows: i iv vi v vii viii xi x xii xiii ix iii 63 55 6 *laud* 10 28 37 11 38 39 58 || 76 73 71 70 *sent* 74 69 40 67 64 2 || 60 57 59 52



same contents as T taken up to *idola* 30 31, only that  $\mu$  has added 4, and does not give 76 in F<sup>s</sup> as well as in C<sup>s</sup>. Apparently  $\mu$  is not a descendant of T, but a brother; for though it has altered the order of the groups, it has not disturbed the order within each group. This could hardly be so, unless  $\mu$  and T both dealt with the groups as units out of which they independently formed their collections. Their close connexion with each other is shown by the fact that they received precisely the same groups, their independence by their receiving them in a different order. That  $\mu$  divides D<sup>s</sup> in two parts by inserting F<sup>s</sup> may be an indication that D<sup>s</sup> was not a single whole when ( $\mu$ ) and (T) took it. The inferiority of  $\mu$  is only apparent so far as this in the insertion of *laud* in A<sup>s</sup> and of 40 in C<sup>s</sup><sup>1</sup>.

$\mu$  continues by receiving 56 3 72 (rejecting 12, which it had already in E<sup>s</sup>). This confirms the restoration given above of (T)\*, a conjectured parent of MQ, which we assumed to similarly pass over 5 7 14 4.  $\mu$  has then 49 50 (from Cornelius), which occur near the end of T, then 48 (the ninth letter to Cornelius), and 62 (to Stephen), neither of which are possessed by T, and comes to a stop with two *spuria*. Last of all it adds a quantity of letters, all of which (except 81) are in T, and which represent apparently a part of the material out of which (T) formed its completer collection. 80 81 are probably from a different source, and also the repetition of F<sup>s</sup> (77 78 79). The conclusion is a flock of *spuria*.

Z has a far more corrupt order<sup>2</sup>. I have already said that the treatises seem to show a corruption all its own, and the omission of *laud* seems to indicate independence of ( $\mu$ ). But dependence on ( $\mu$ ) is proved in C<sup>s</sup> by the insertion of 40, and is suggested also by the presence of 48. The remainder seems to consist of *disiecta membra* of MSS such as ( $\mu$ ) and others. 7 and 34 are not in  $\mu$ ; the latter was perhaps in ( $\mu$ ). The additional nine letters at the end 81 36 14 16 15 18 29 34 43 are evidently all from V, as the order of some of them shows, and 80 are the preceding letters 67 *sent* 68 74, and doubtless others. All

45 47 44 51 || 13 43 65 || 78 79 77 || 1 61 46 66 54 || 32 12 20 || 30 31 4 *idola* || 56 3 72 || 49 50 48 62 *spect. Turass.* 9 27 35 41 25 5 14 17 18 26 33 80 81 12 16 15 29 31 || 77 78 79 || 23 24 22 8 *vita ii mont ad Vigil. versiculi de caena (?) caena.* ( $\mu$  = fifteenth cent.). The same is found in Vat. lat. 197 and 198, and Palat. lat. 158, all fifteenth cent., and part in Vat. lat. 202, twelfth cent.

<sup>1</sup> The importance of  $\mu$  in its first stage is emphasized by its identity shown above with our best MS S, and with the excellent MS W; also with O<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>5</sub>.

<sup>2</sup> The order of Z (Hartel, p. xlvi) is as follows: i iv xi x viii v xii xiii vi vii 58 ix *idola* iii 63 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 14 76 71 70 16 69 40 64 2 || 57 59 47 45 44 49 50 84 48 51 || 13 43 1 61 46 66 || 41 25 27 80 81 5 17 ii *mont.* 7 12 20 18 26 4 || 73 71 70 || 29 34 72 9 35 56 55 *Ep. sp.* 57 *spect.* 32 27 33 67 *sent* 68 74 *Turass. ad Vigil. sic judic.* 81 36 14 16 15 18 29 34 43 (Z = fourteenth to fifteenth cent.).



but 36 and 15 are repetitions. It cannot be doubted that at the same time the whole MS was corrected according to the readings of V.

C R simply depend on (Z) for A<sup>s</sup> C<sup>s</sup> B<sup>s</sup> 13, i. e. as far as 13<sup>1</sup>. It would appear that (Z) possessed 15 and 60 52. The four letters 55 69 65 67 are of course copied from V. C adds *sent* 68 74 73 71 70 1 from V. Evidently (C R) was a copy made from (Z) about the time of its correction by V. The value of Z C R was always small, if their readings are as much corrupted as their order. The value of their testimony to V is now diminished, since Latini's collation of that lost MS has been discovered in the Vatican by Dr. G. Mercati. A copy of Latini's collation used by Fell is in the Bodleian<sup>2</sup>. The readings of Z C R are hardly likely to preserve any genuine variants not to be found in better MSS, except possibly in A<sup>s</sup>.

L N P<sup>3</sup>, called the first family by Hartel, appear to be another collection of the first four groups, but somewhat mixed. The order was given by Dom Ramsay in *J.T.S.*, July, 1902. Hartel thinks the additions in L N are from a corrupt member of the M Q T family. He notes that P has supplied 10 37 38 (probably ix also?) from a very interpolated MS, 58 from a better one, 69 from a codex of the C R type.

o simply depends on E (from M Q), P and C R, as shown in the foot-note<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The contents of C R (Hartel, p. 1) are as follows: [i iv xiii xi vi 58 v vii viii xii x ix] *idola* iii 63 6 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 14 76 70 16 15 40 64 2 || 57 59 60 [52] 47 45 44 49 50 || 13 || 55 69 65 67. R adds 4 *versus passio*. C omits all in brackets and adds *sent* 68 74 73 71 70 1 (C R both ninth cent.).

<sup>2</sup> I found it last year in the margin of Rigaltius's Cyprian, shelf-mark T 12 11 Jur. It was made at Rome by a Mr. Rigby.

<sup>3</sup> The contents of L N P are A<sup>s</sup>, B<sup>s</sup> + 48-51, C<sup>s</sup>, D<sup>s</sup>-54, with 56 3 *idola* 40 (L = ninth cent., N = tenth, P = ninth).

The MS X which belonged to Lord Crawford (Rylands Library, Manchester) is of the L N P family, independent of all three. It has (so Mr. Turner informs me) 39 67 10 69 b || iii 63 6 55 28 37 11 38 || 76 73 71 70 *sent* 3 74 69 a 64 2 || 72 || 12 32 20 || 13 43 65 52 1 56 3 *bis* || 47 45 44 || 61 46 || 40 4 || 57 59 || 48 51 54 60 *idola*. The four letters 39 67 10 69 b at the beginning, and 48 60 *idola* at the end, are obviously additions to supply omissions. Of these omissions some are peculiar to X, some are paralleled by L, N, or P. E<sup>s</sup> and 72 appear earlier than in L N, and so do 40 4. The rest is identical with (L N P), except the accidental insertion of 3 in C<sup>s</sup>, at a point where 67 and 69 b have got left out, and 69 a and 74 are incomplete, owing perhaps to some disturbance of gatherings or loss of sheets in the parent. Vat. lat. 203, twelfth cent., contains vii viii x xi xiii and parts of v. This seems to be a fragment of the order of L.

<sup>4</sup> The order of o (Hartel, p. xxxviii) is: [i x ix 37 38 10 v vii viii xi xii iv vi] || 30 || [60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 60 (so Hartel for 61!) 46 54 || 32 20 12 || 78 || 67 64 2 || 3] [14 49 50 68] [75 (beginning only) 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 56 7 76 *idola* 4 # *mont*] [6 55 28 39 58 69 b 48 66 40 63]. Hartel remarks—

The Cheltenham list<sup>1</sup> is compared with LNP by Harnack, and with  $\mu$  by Turner. It is closely connected with both of them.

B has got much disarranged<sup>2</sup>. The connexion of 40 with 67 as a fragment of C<sup>s</sup> shows connexion with  $\mu$ . But the presence of 76 with F<sup>s</sup> instead of C<sup>s</sup> is against dependence on  $\mu$ . The contents are A<sup>s</sup> B<sup>s</sup> C<sup>s</sup> D<sup>s</sup>, with a few omissions, but all the groups more or less shattered, and the vagrant letters 30, 40 (in C<sup>s</sup>), 72, 4 (with *idola*, as  $\mu$  M Q), and 56 3 at the end, which connect themselves with 72 and 4. It therefore contains none of the later groups. It may possibly be a corruption of an independent collection of the groups it contains. The loss of 55 recalls H B or CR, and the position of 72 is a parallel to its probable place in Chelt.

H and  $\beta$ <sup>3</sup> differ only in the treatises, H having copied (h), while  $\beta$  appears to retain the order of the parent. The contents are A<sup>s</sup>

that o in copying E has omitted *nescio quo casu* 69 72 12 70 and part of 75. The omission of 12 is easily accounted for, as T M Q E give it twice, o only once. Probably o thought 73 disedifying, and stopped in the middle. Hartel adds that o took 14 48 49 50 68 69b from a CR codex. No doubt he is right about 14 49 50 68. But 48 is not in CR at all! And o numbers it iii as L does. The position of 69 suggests that it is not from CR. Hartel says that the treatises are from P, *immutato ordine* (which means obviously 'in unchanged order,' though the word *immutatus* is ambiguous), and also the letters 6 28 39 55 58 63. I assume that i-vi and 6-63 = P; 60-3, 75-ii *mont* = E; 14-68 = CR, as bracketed above.

<sup>1</sup> The Cheltenham list is restored by Mommsen and Harnack from the Cheltenham MS (I have lost a note made at Cheltenham some years ago, but I think the MS is now at Brussels), and from one at St. Gall, thus: i iv vi xi x v xiii viii xii ix vii iii 55 63 6 *laud* 10 28 37 11 38 39 || 73 71 70 *sent* 74 72 (or 68) 64 69 67 2 || 56 40 66 || 12 32 20 30 *Jud.* viii *epist.* *ad Corn. vita.* C. H. Turner (*Stud. Bibl.* vol. iii) gave 78 79 instead of 56, and 54 for 12. The latter change is certainly wrong, the former is perhaps right, but I cannot discuss the question here. (A.D. 359.)

<sup>2</sup> B has (Hartel, p. lvi): i iv vi v viii x xiii xi xii vii ix iii 63 30 6 28 37 *laud* 10 11 58 || 46 12 || 76 79 78 77 || 32 20 || 59 52 47 45 44 51 60 57 || 55 38 39 || 40 67 || 43 65 || 73 71 70 *sent* 72 74 69 64 2 || i 61 54 66 || 4 *idola Jud.* 56 3 *caena oratio* (eleventh cent.). A MS at Lincoln Coll. (Fell's Linc.), no. 47, is said to give the same order, and was copied from one 'described by Bandini i 268, viz. MS Laurent. plut. 16 cod. 22,' so Benson, p. 548, on the authority of Bp. John Wordsworth. The Lincoln MS is fifteenth century. Vat. lat. 195 and 196, both fifteenth century, have the same order.

<sup>3</sup> The order of H  $\beta$  (Hartel, p. lvii) is:

H i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xiii ix iii

$\beta$  i iv vi v vii viii xi xii xiii x ix *laud* iii

H  $\beta$ : 55 6 28 37 11 38 39 58 || 73 71 70 63 76 74 69 40 67 64 2 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 || 13 43 65 66 || 4 3 72 || 61 1 46 56 54 || 20 30 31 12 || 77 78 79 || 32 51, H adds *idola* 10 ii *mont Jud* 80 *caena*;  $\beta$  adds *Sp. Ep. Corn. idola* 80 10 81. The placing of 30 31 between 20 and 12, and both immediately after 54, suggests a corruption of  $\mu$ . But this may be accidental, as it was natural to place the replies 30 31 near the letters of Cyprian connected with them. Ottobon 80 (fifteenth cent.) and O<sub>1</sub> have



(-55 10), C<sup>2</sup> (-sent + 40), B<sup>2</sup> (-51), D<sup>2</sup> (complete, but scattered), E<sup>2</sup> (+ 31 32), F<sup>2</sup>, 51 is added at the end, B has supplied 10 in an appendix. 56, 3, 72, 4 are also present. Thus only the earlier groups are given. The position of 4 implies dependence on  $\mu$ .

There is every reason to place the date of the collection in B and H $\beta$  (but not their order) before the gathering up of the last fragments which made up the collections which I have called G<sup>2</sup> and H<sup>2</sup>; but the order has become very much disturbed. The importance of H $\beta$  is greater when we recognize that they are from the same parent as the fragments called F, which are of the fifth or sixth century. Of these I need say nothing, as they were fully described by Mr. Turner in July last.

It is not worth while to discuss the lists of other MSS in detail. I<sup>1</sup> is said by Hartel to have taken 60-51 and 16-76 from E. The order suggests that 46-12 are also from E. The intermediate letters are all in K, and 75 can hardly have come from anywhere else. When Hartel says they are 'from elsewhere,' one must suppose an intermediate MS between E and I, which borrowed readings from elsewhere.

$\rho$  and i<sup>2</sup> depend on o, according to Hartel, from 37 to 40, except for two *spuria*. The additions at the commencement are all to supply omissions, except 69 70 72 which are not in o; therefore it is natural to suppose that they were all taken from some other source.

r<sup>2</sup> is simply a corruption of  $\mu$ , except the treatises, which are in quite random order, but which appear to be taken from an early collection or first volume, possessing neither iii nor ix, probably of B family.

Of the English MSS, as given by Dr. Sanday (*Stud. Bibl.* iii, p. 283, cp. *Old Lat. Bibl. Texts*, vol. ii, app. ii):

O<sub>2</sub> for the treatises =  $\beta$ <sup>4</sup>. The letters are exactly = T. Thus it is exactly the converse of H, whose treatises = T, and whose letters =  $\beta$ . As O<sub>2</sub> is of the same date as T, its readings may be just as valuable,

the treatises in the order of  $\beta$ . Ottobon 600 (fourteenth cent.) is a selection from  $\beta$ . Paris 1650 and 1655 are of the same family. A MS at Caius College has v iv vii viii xi xii xiii ix *laud* x i, from  $\beta$  (no. 114, dated Feb. 21, 1452).

<sup>1</sup> The order of I (twelfth cent., Hartel, p. xxxvii) is as follows: vii i x xiii xii viii xii *abus* *unc* ii *mont* *idola* *caena* *pasch* || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 69 70 || 72 78 || *sent* 64 2 || 4 13 3 67 || 65 1 43 46 || 53 54 || 32 20 12 || 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || 36 7 76 || 61 78 *oratio* *oratio* ii *passio*. The inscription of 12 calls it the first of a series of thirteen letters to the Romans! What this may mean, I cannot guess.

<sup>2</sup> The order of  $\rho$  and i is given by Hartel, p. lvii. The order of the treatises has been already spoken of.

<sup>3</sup> For order of r see Hartel, p. xlvii.

<sup>4</sup> The order of O<sub>2</sub> is as described, except that where T has 5 7 14 4, O<sub>2</sub> has 7 5 4 14. (Fell's Bod. 1; MS Laud Misc. 451.)



and it would be good for some one who can spare the time to examine whether it is brother, son, or father to T.

O<sub>3</sub> gives exactly the order of T for all it contains<sup>1</sup>. There is no reason to connect it with M Q. It is strange that Dr. Sanday should have noticed the likeness of this MS to H, and not to T.

O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> give for the treatises the order of  $\mu$ , next come a few odd letters, including the tail of C<sup>s</sup> as in  $\mu$ , 40 67 64 2. Then comes B<sup>s</sup> complete, D<sup>s</sup> (-54), 4 *idola* 56 3 72, then most of A<sup>s</sup>, with another fragment of C<sup>s</sup> in the middle of it; then some letters which had been omitted, and E<sup>s</sup> (= 20 32), and G<sup>s</sup> complete, *spuria* and some vagabonds. No trace of H<sup>s</sup>.

Fell's Bod. 3<sup>3</sup> is a corrupt descendant of (M Q); but my own examination of it suggests that it has not come through E, though Mr. Madan told Archbishop Benson that it follows Q as against M.

The preceding inquiry has already reached an inordinate length. It can be pursued further by examining the order in which the *spuria* appear. But it can only have solid value by a combination with the study of the readings of the MSS.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

<sup>1</sup> O<sub>3</sub> (MS Laud 105) end of eleventh cent. (Sanday), tenth or eleventh (Madan). Mr. Madan told Archbp. Benson that it 'seems to be a selection from T M, and to agree with the first corrector of T'; see Benson, p. 207 note, and p. 548. There is no reason to connect it with M Q at all. It contains only i iv vi v vii xi viii x xii xlii ix iii 63 6 58 *laud idola Jud aleat*. Fell calls it Bod. 4.

<sup>2</sup> O<sub>1</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> (= Bodl. cod. 210, Fell's Bod. 2, and New Coll. 130, both twelfth cent.) have the following order (Sanday, *Stud. Bibl.* p. 283); i iv vi v vii viii xi x xii xlii ix iii 55 [74 69] || 40 67 64 2 || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 66 || 4 *idola* || 56 3 72 || 58 63 6 || 76 73 (71) *sent* || 28 37 38 39 || 70 *spuria* 79 || 20 32 || 47 bis 54 78 75 || 53 16 15 17 18 19 26 25 9 29 || *spuria* [31] (47 31 74 69). The treatises = S W  $\mu$ . The numbers in square brackets are in O<sub>1</sub> only, those in round brackets in O<sub>2</sub> only. The likeness to T (before it got H<sup>s</sup>) seems very close, though A<sup>s</sup> and C<sup>s</sup> have got scattered. I suggest that it descends from the parent of B, and borrowed the end (from 47, or earlier), from (M Q), as the position of 75 next before G<sup>s</sup> suggests. F<sup>s</sup> has lost 77 altogether in its dispersion, unless 47 is a misprint for 77. An MS at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (xxv, fifteenth cent.) has the same order.

<sup>3</sup> MS Laud 217, fifteenth cent., not given in *Stud. Bibl.* It contains vi vii v x viii xi xii xlii ix iii 55 63 6 58 10 28 11 38 39 || *Jud aleat laud* || 60 57 59 52 47 45 44 51 || 13 43 65 1 61 46 54 || 32 20 12 || 78 || 37 i 69 *idola carmen*. The parent had probably lost the first pages. iv is altogether missing, i is added at the end with 37, which had been overlooked. Brussels 921, sixteenth cent., is also from M Q, in part.

## A QUESTIONABLE PLURAL IN HEBREW.

In Hebrew, as is well known<sup>1</sup>, a plural noun is often used to express 'the idea of something composed of parts,' which would in English be expressed by a singular: e. g. פנים, the face. It is thus used of spaces regarded, so it would seem, as wholes made up of innumerable parts or points: e. g. עומק, the deep; ארץ רחוקה, the far land. It is obviously far more difficult to account for a plural expressing a *single point*; and grammars, dictionaries, and commentaries alike appear to have passed over unnoticed an instance—probably the only instance—of such a plural in the Massoretic text.

This is the word תוצאות, which is rendered very awkwardly in the E. V. by 'goings out.' It really means, as the contexts prove, the point at which a (boundary) line terminates, an extremity.

The word has other meanings in Ezek. xlvi 30; 1 Chron. v 16; Prov. iv 33, Ps. lxxviii 21. With these usages we are not concerned, nor is the plural in these cases open to question.

In the sense of 'extremity' or 'point of termination,' תוצאות is used nineteen times (in Num. xxxiv and Joshua xv-xix). In these cases, had the original text a singular or a plural?

The facts are as follows:

1. In every case, the noun occurs as the subject of an expressed verb (היה).

2. In the present Hebrew text, (a) the noun as pointed is always plural. The consonantal text would admit of a singular punctuation in Num. xxxiv 8 (תוצאת) and Joshua xvi 3 (K'tib תוצאתו). Otherwise the consonantal text of the noun is also decisively plural.

(b) The verb is plural in Num. xxxiv 5, 8, 9, 12; Joshua xv 7, 11, xvi 3, 8, xix 14, 22, 29; it is singular in Joshua xvii 18, xix 33. It is singular in the K'tib, plural in the K'ri in Num. xxxiv 4; Joshua xv 4, xviii 12, 14, 19.

3. In the Samaritan text of Num. xxxiv both verb and noun are in all five cases *singular*—*v.* 4 והיה תוצאתו; *vs.* 5, 8, 9, 12, והיה תוצאותו.

4. The LXX always translate by a singular verb and noun (*διξιδος*), except in Joshua xvii 18, where the text varies and the noun is omitted, and in Joshua xix 33, where verb and noun are plural (against the Syriac and, so far as the verb is concerned, the Hebrew text).

5. The Syriac version (texts of Walton's *Polyglott*, and Lee) always translates by a plural noun and verb, except in Joshua xix 22, 33.

The verb always *precedes* the noun, and, therefore, the singular predicate in certain cases in the Hebrew text (above 2 b) does not necessarily point to an originally singular subject.

<sup>1</sup> Gesenius-Kautzsch<sup>2</sup>, § 124; Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax*, § 16.



But in view of the unparalleled use of a plural noun to denote a single point, I am inclined to conclude

(1) That the Samaritan text in Num. xxxiv is the original.

(2) That the LXX, except in Joshua xix 33, is a literal rendering of its Hebrew original and not an idiomatic rendering of our present Hebrew text.

(3) That the singular verbs of the K'tib are older than the plurals of the K'ri, and are a survival of the original text allowed to remain after the noun had become plural as standing *before* the subject and therefore excusable. In any case, the singular verb of the K'tib is more probably original than the plural of the K'ri. The K'tib should therefore have been retained by Paterson and Bennett in the Polychrome text of Numbers and Joshua.

(4) That subsequent to the date of the LXX, the plural noun in almost every case and the plural verb in most cases were substituted in the Hebrew text for original singulars. Sporadic traces of the earlier text are perhaps to be found in the Syriac of Joshua xix 22, 33.

The reason of the change to the plural is not clear; and the unique plural rendering by the LXX in Joshua xix 33 is more interesting than easy of explanation.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

### SARBÔG, SHURUPPAK.

THE *Hymn of the Soul* in the Acts of Thomas, edited first in Wright's *Apocryphal Acts*, pp. 274-279, and then again by Bevan in *Texts and Studies*, v 3, tells the story of the Soul's incarnation and subsequent return to its heavenly home under the figure of a Prince, who left his father's palace in the highlands of Persia to bring back with him the Pearl which was guarded in Egypt by the 'hissing Serpent that is in the midst of the Sea.' The geographical details are suggested with great skill, and modern names like Ctesiphon and Seleucia are generally avoided. A journey which ends by an encampment in Egypt near the Serpent-guardian of a magical Pearl is necessarily a fairy voyage, and the places on the route are more likely to be found in myth and legend than in the pages of a gazetteer. Although the ordinary road to the prosaic Egypt of actual fact passes through the towns and districts of the Upper Euphrates where the author of the Hymn may be supposed to have lived, it is noticeable that these places are never alluded to in the Hymn. For aught that appears the Prince may have been wafted from Babylonia straight through the great and mysterious Syrian Desert.

Three places are mentioned on the way. At *Maishân*, 'the mart of



Eastern merchants, he leaves (travels out); then comes *Babel*, a land of evil spirits; then the city of *Sarbig*. *Musidin* appears to be the district of Mesopotamia near the mouth of the Tigris, *Babel* is actually the district of Babylonia proper, but *Sarbig* is a town with walls. In *Abraham* are strange demons.

Whence and what is this city of *Sarbig*? The Prince goes to Egypt from the highlands of *Thenia* by *Musidin*, *Babel*, *Sarbig*, and a letter follows him which passes these three places in the order named. On his return the Prince passes by *Sarbig*, leaves *Babel* on his left hand, reaches *Musidin* and so arrives home. Thus between *Sarbig* and Egypt there is an intervening stage: the devils in *Sarbig* are terrible and dangerous, but the journey between *Sarbig* and the land of Egypt where the Serpent dwells calls for no remark. If then we are to find a city with which *Sarbig* is to be identified it must satisfy three conditions. It should be (1) famous in legend, (2) the abode of demons, (3) suitable as a starting-point for a journey to the other-end-of-nothing.

All these conditions are satisfied by the city which is called in Babylonian legend *Shuruppak*, the home of the Babylonian hero *Kudurrû*, who has been compared to Noah.

In the first place the two names *Sarbig* and *Shuruppak* are practically identical in form. The Babylonian city is spelt *šur-ur-pak*, *šur-ur-pak*, and *šur-pak* (see *Ex. A. 25*, 2 site). All these forms might equally well be transliterated "Šurūppak" or "Šurūppak," but the generic *šur-ur-pak* (*Simm. Ep. 21 23*) shows that the Assyrians at least pronounced the word with *š* and *r*, not *š* and *g*. This, however, causes no difficulty in a word of Babylonian origin. *Šerwāhā* appears in Hebrew as *שָׂרָו* (*Sargaw*), so that *Šerwāhā* might become *שָׂרָו*. The Syriac Hymn in which "Sarbig" appears is unvocalised, but the metre shows that the word has only two syllables and that a vowel comes between the *š* and the *r*. If the text be correct,—and the word occurs three times in the Hymn without variant,—the vowels may be long or short, and there may or may not be a half-vowel between the *r* and the *p*. In other words *شربيج*, i.e. "Širšibij," is as possible a spelling as *شربو*, i.e. "Sarbuw" or "Sarbuw." If the first of these alternatives be adopted we have an equivalent for the doubtful second vowel of the Babylonian word.

The identification of *Sarbig* and *Shuruppak* was suggested some time ago by G. Hoffmann of Kiel in a communication to P. Jensen, the *Assyriologist*, as my friend Professor Devan has pointed out to me. Unfortunately the identification was made a matter of topography. Dr. Jensen seems to have understood that *Sarbig* was mentioned in some Syriac *Acta Martyrum* as a town near Babylon, and, as there is some reason for thinking that *Shuruppak* was the name of a real place

which existed or had existed in South Babylonia, he rejects Hoffmann's identification on the ground of geographical discrepancy<sup>1</sup>. But from what has been said above it is evident that the position of Sarbôg is as vague as that of Armageddon. We need in fact to illustrate the Gnostic Hymn from the Babylonian Legend, not the Babylonian Legend from the Gnostic Hymn.

The mention of Shuruppak comes quite at the beginning of the Chaldean story of the Flood. Xisuthros begins his tale to Gilgamesh with the words

'Shuruppak, a city which thou knowest [on] the Euphrates doth lie,  
The city it is old, and the Gods within it—

The great Gods who brought their mind to the crossing of the  
Flood. . . .'

Xisuthros himself was of Shuruppak. Warned by the God Ea he embarks in the ship, and so is saved with his companions when the Flood overwhelms the rest of living things. It does not appear to be certain whether the 'great Gods' are distinct from the Gods within Shuruppak.

Thus the Babylonian city occupies a very prominent place in the great Epic: it may very well have entered into the general folk-lore of the Euphrates Valley. It was the abode of ancient heathen Gods who were somehow concerned in a terrible deluge, and a Christian poet would naturally express this by calling it the dwelling-place of savage demons. Above all it was famous as the point from whence the Babylonian Noah started on his wonderful voyage. It was therefore not inappropriate that the Prince in the Gnostic Hymn should pass by this city on his way to find the Pearl that was guarded by the Serpent in the midst of the Sea in Egypt.

F. C. BURKITT.

### THE INTERPRETATION OF *BAR-JESUS*

We read in Acts xiii 6-8 that when Paul and Barnabas came to Paphos they met with 'a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name was *Bar-Jesus*'; and when they were speaking to Sergius Paulus, the proconsul, '*Elymas* the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them.' Here we at once meet with the difficulty that '*Elymas*' cannot be described as an interpretation of '*Bar-jesus*,' nor does it mean 'sorcerer'; in fact, there is no satisfactory explanation of what the meaning of the name can be.

<sup>1</sup> Jensen, *Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen*, p. 481.



The transmitted text, here as elsewhere, falls into two main channels. The ordinary text gives Ἐλύμας in ver. 8, while in ver. 6 MSS vary between βαριεζου (B &c.), βαριεζουτ (B &c.), and βαριεζουα (A &c.). On the other hand the Western texts imply ἑτοιμος in ver. 8 in the place of 'Elymas.'

The evidence is as follows. Lucifer 253 has *etomas* in ver. 8, D\* has *ατωμας*; in ver. 6 the name Bar-jesus is spelt βαριεζουαν by D\*, and *Bariεουδων* by Lucifer who adds the gloss *quod interpretator Paratus*. It is important to observe that this gloss is not an isolated peculiarity of Lucifer. The Fleury Palimpsest (*A*) is not extant at this point, and the Gigas (*g*) and the Vulgate MS called *demid* have the ordinary names, as was only to be expected in late codices, but both *g* and *demid* have the gloss. Moreover E<sub>2</sub> has ὁ μεθιμμεριετας Ἐλύμας, which is no doubt ultimately derived from the same source. No Old Syriac evidence is extant, but the Peshitta has *Bar Shūmā* (? 'Son of a wound') instead of Bar-jesus, and in ver. 8 it reads 'This same sorcerer Bar Shuma, whose name is interpreted Ἄλῦμῶς (ܐܠܘܡܘܫܐ).'

Quite lately Dr. Rendel Harris (*Expositor* for March, 1902, pp. 189 ff.) has come forward as a champion of ἑτοιμος, identifying the 'Bar-Jesus' of Acts with a person called *Atom* (*Atomus*) by Josephus, and mentioned by him as playing a shady rôle in the story of Drusilla and Felix. 'Atom' must surely be a nickname. According to *Ant.* xx. 7, this *Atomos* was a Jew, a Cypriote and a magician, so that the resemblance between him and the Etoemas of Codex Bezae is very striking.

But I still hesitate to accept the identification, or to regard ἑτοιμος or *Etoimas* as the true reading in Acts xiii. 8. No variation in spelling can make *Bar-jesus* mean 'ready.' Still less can it be made to mean 'atom.' At the same time we must not on this account neglect the reading of what is perhaps the most ancient line of transmission. We have, in fact, for the name in ver. 8 two spellings, ελυμας and ετοιμος. Is there no form which explains both, from which both may have been derived? The text of the Acts is certainly faulty in several passages, and a temperate use of conjecture is not out of place in this book of the New Testament. I venture, therefore, to read *ολοιμος*, i.e. ὁ λοιμός, 'the pestilent fellow.' This is so slight a change that the Peshitta reading ܐܠܘܡܘܫܐ might be pressed to support it (cf. Rom. xvi. 15), though no doubt it really stands for the ordinary 'Elymas.' The word occurs once again in Acts xxiv. 5 and was used by Demosthenes for a *φαρμακός*, so that it is quite in place here.

But now we have to consider how *Bar-jesus*, or whatever other spelling we adopt, can be 'interpreted' as ὁ λοιμός. It will not be necessary to seek a scientific derivation; *Bar Yeshu* (בר ישוע) is an exceedingly appropriate name for an Aramaic-speaking Jew in the first century A.D.,



and it is at the same time obvious that the name would sound distasteful to Christian ears when applied to a sorcerer and an opponent of the Apostles. The name was therefore variously disguised: perhaps the most probable spelling is ΒΑΡΙΗΟΥ, found in  $\aleph$  and some other authorities. Now S. Jerome (Lagarde's *Onomastica* 67 25) says *Berieu* maleficum *sive* in malo, *nonnulli Bariesu corrupte legunt*, or as it is excellently paraphrased by Beda *Corrupte legitur Bariesu, cum Barieu* (i.e. maleficus *sive* in malo) *legi debeat, credo quia nomen Iesu eisdem litteris sed nota superposita scribatur*. In other words Beda and S. Jerome wish us to read ΒΑΡΙΗΥ instead of ΒΑΡΙΗΥΥ or ΒΑΡΙΥ. This is not very probable: the real value of their conjecture is that it shows us how easily the greatest Hebrew scholar in the early Church could allow himself to believe that the sorcerer's name meant *maleficus* (כַּר רִשְׁעָא). A similar piece of popular etymology may very well have commended itself to S. Luke, who is himself responsible for the questionable explanation of *Barnabas* as meaning *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* (Acts iv 36). Moreover S. Luke may have been anxious to inform his readers that the name of the sorcerer had really nothing to do with the name of our Lord.

The passage, therefore, as conjecturally restored, runs: ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ λοιμὸς, ὁ μάγος, οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, 'Now they were withstood by the pestilent fellow, the sorcerer I mean, for "pestilent fellow" is the interpretation of his name.'

F. C. BURKITT.

### THE PERICOPE OF THE ADULTERESS.

Of the Pericope of the Adulteress (John vii 53-viii 11) we read in Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament, that *In the whole range of Greek patristic literature before Cent. (x or) xii there is but one trace of any knowledge of its existence, the reference to it in the Apostolic Constitutions as an authority for the reception of penitents. See Apost. Const. ii 24.*

The editors had overlooked the parallel in the earlier *Didascalia*, to which Professor Nestle has lately called attention. The Greek of this is lost, but a Syriac Version of it survives, and the passage in question is preserved also in one of the Latin fragments of the *Didascalia* edited by Hauler (1900). Lagarde in his *Apost. Const.* in Greek refers in the margin of ii 24 to the parallel on the story in his Syriac *Didascalia*, namely by the Syriac letters 𐤒, meaning page *thirty-one*.

*Hermae Pastor* has no express quotation from any book except 'Eldad and Modad' (*Vis.* ii 3. 4 *ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλλάδ καὶ Μωδάτ*), but, as I understand the *Pastor*, it has many slight allusive references to Holy Scripture and other writings. *Mand.* iv 1. 4 puts the case of a married

woman whom her husband may find in some adultery. Was this suggested by the story of the woman taken in adultery? The story ends μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνει (John viii 11, cf. v. 14), and similarly 'Hermas' in his dialogue on the said case makes the Shepherd say, 'Εγὼ οὖν οὐ θίδωμι ἀφορμὴν κ.τ.λ. ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνειν τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα (*Mand.* iv 1. 11, cf. 3. 2). An obvious inference is that he perhaps knew the Pericope, though not necessarily as part of any canonical writing.

In *Apost. Const.* the rare word καρδιογνώστης is used in connexion with the Pericope, and this use of it is traceable through the Syriac and the Latin to the *Didascalia*. In the *Pastor* the word is used in one place only, and there (*Mand.* iv 3. 4) in connexion with the case of the woman found in some adultery. This and other coincidences confirm the hypothesis that the author of *Hermas Pastor* knew the Pericope, and seem to show that he was also acquainted with a primitive διδασκαλία upon it.

The above note is an abstract of a paper read in May last (1902) to the Cambridge Theological Society.

C. TAYLOR.

### A NEW SEPTUAGINT FRAGMENT.

MR. BALDREY, of the Cambridge University Library, has discovered a Hebrew-Greek palimpsest in the Taylor-Schechter collection, containing in its four consecutive pages of Greek a fragmentary uncial text of Psalms cxliii 1-cxliv 6 according to the Septuagint.

Psalm cxliii. Above the middle of page 1 stands ἤλπισα | ὁ ἰσπιάσων κ.τ.λ. (ver. 2), and we can work back to a slight trace of part of verse 1. Page 1 ends ἄστραψον κ.τ.λ. | καὶ συνεπαράξεις (ver. 6), and page 2 [ο]ὐ υἱὸν αὐτῶν ὡς νε . . . (ver. 12). The psalm ends θεὸς αὐτοῦ in line 4 from the end of page 3.

Psalm cxliv. Verse 1 begins [Υ]ψώσω σε ὁ θεὸς μου in the penultimate line of page 3, and the fourth and last page ends [καὶ] τὴν δύναμιν τῶν φοβερῶν (MS φε| . . . ων) σου ἐροῦσιν | [καὶ τ]ὴν μεγαλωσύνην [σου] | [διη]γήσονται (ver. 6).

C. TAYLOR.

[We hope to publish a further account of this fragment in the next number of the *Journal*.—EDITORS.]



## CYPRIANICA.

No satisfactory explanation has been given of the word *budinarium* with which St. Cyprian's Ep. 42 ends; and I may add that neither the name Soliassus, which is assumed to be that of the *budinarius*, nor any other personal name ending in -assus is to be found in the African volumes of the *C. I. L.* But in the reading of  $\phi$ , *soliarium* there is a clue, and I propose *soliarium baxiarium*, thus reducing the number of the *abstenti* by one, and making this the trade of Sophronius. The text would run: 'item abstinuimus Sofronium, et ipsum de extorrentibus, soliarium baxiarium.' This would probably include both Irene and Paula, just mentioned, among the exiles; and it strengthens the evidence for the alien and democratic character of the opposition. An obscure person like Sophronius, of whom we never hear again, would hardly be named, as are the notorious Felicissimus and Augendus, without some description by which Cyprian might know who was meant, or at least the class to which he belonged.

In regard to MSS of St. Cyprian, there is one in the King's Library at Madrid (Codex 2 K 4) which is worthy of attention. It contains a large collection of letters, among which is 62, for which Hartel's only authorities are  $\tau\mu$ , which are, like this Madrid MS, of the fifteenth century. But the readings of this last, from which some collations have been made for me, are so strikingly like those of the Aldine edition, that I had intended to publish the conjecture that Latini had used the MS. Though Mercati's discovery has disproved this, the MS may be useful for determining the text of V.

Mr. H. J. White kindly noted for me that the Würzburg MS Cod. 56, which Hartel (Introd. p. lviii) cites for Ep. 4 and Ep. 80, also contains Ep. 35; and that his W in the Treatises (Würzburg Cod. 145; Hartel, p. xix) includes a considerable collection of Epistles, for which Hartel has not employed it.

E. W. WATSON.



## REVIEW

PELAGIUS' COMMENTARY ON THE PAULINE EPISTLES  
AND ITS HISTORY.

*Pelagius in Irland: Texte und Untersuchungen zur patristischen Litteratur.* Von HEINRICH ZIMMER. Berlin (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung), 1901.

THE merits of this book are many and solid: its demerits lie on the surface, and may be dismissed in two or three sentences. Its contents do not correspond with its title: it is misleading to call your book 'Pelagius in Ireland' when you are going to write not so much about Pelagius as about his Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, and not so much about Ireland as about Irish scholars and manuscripts on the continent. Its arrangement, partly no doubt owing to the accumulation of new material while it was in progress, is more faulty and confusing than would have been thought possible. And it is disfigured from time to time by expressions of opinion, intended to exalt Celts over Romans in general, and Pelagius as a Celt over his Roman contemporaries in particular, of which the following instance may suffice—the italics are my own—'Der Herrschaft des weltlichen Rom, das mehr als 300 Jahre die irische Freiheit aus nächster Nähe bedrohte, war Irland glücklich entgangen' (p. 224 n.). It is a pity that Dr. Zimmer does not realize that it is possible to sympathise with Pelagius and yet not to believe him wholly right, possible to dislike Jerome's controversial method without admitting that the cause on behalf of which they were exercised was necessarily bad. But having said so much by way of criticism, it is necessary to add at once that the book is one of first-rate importance, that if it is troublesome to master it is well worth the trouble, and that indeed it may be pronounced indispensable to all serious students of the history of patristic exegesis. I cannot do better in this review than try to render access to the book easier to English readers by putting Dr. Zimmer's facts and arguments before them in my own words and in my own arrangement. I propose then first to examine the allusions in early Latin writers to commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles; then to compare with these allusions the material hitherto extant in print; lastly to bring into account the additional evidence from Irish sources collected in this volume, and so to throw into clear relief the value of Dr. Zimmer's

contribution to the study of the subject: with this proviso only, that on one subordinate but interesting problem I shall venture to dispute his conclusion and to offer a solution of my own.

I. Of commentaries of Pelagius clear mention is made by both St. Augustine and Marius Mercator. Mercator cites them as 'in apostolum Paulum commentarios,' and tells us that they were written before the sack of Rome (A.D. 410): Augustine calls them 'in Pauli apostoli epistulas expositiones breuissimas,' and in one place quotes them in a way which suggests that though their author was generally known they did not formally bear his name—'sunt quaedam expositiones epistulae Pauli quae scribitur ad Romanos, quae ipsius Pelagii esse dicuntur'.<sup>1</sup> There was of course no necessary reason why annotated editions of parts of Scripture should bear the annotator's name, until such explanations multiplied so far as to make it convenient to distinguish one set of them from another.

Augustine further cites an interpretation of Romans v 12 given by 'sanctus Hilarius',<sup>2</sup> meaning no doubt St. Hilary of Poitiers. There is nothing indeed in his words to shew that he is quoting from a continuous commentary, but we shall see later on that this is in fact the case.

But the *locus classicus* on this early Western exegetical literature, so far at least as it was known in the sixth century, is the eighth chapter of the *de Institutione diuinarum litterarum*, where Cassiodorus gives the inmates of his monastery of Vivarium in S. Italy a description of all the complete Latin commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, five in number, of which he knew or had heard.<sup>3</sup> (1) The first of these was also obviously the most important. The merits of its concise and acute method of statement were universally recognised, and Cassiodorus himself was not insensible to them. But careful study of it had shewn him that the 'poison of Pelagian error' was contained in it—which alone was enough to prove that it was not the work, as was sometimes asserted, of Pope Gelasius—and he had therefore undertaken the task of re-writing the whole of the section on the Roman Epistle, leaving his disciples to continue the same process for the other Epistles.<sup>4</sup> (2) The second commentary, likewise anonymous, was orthodox, and treated the thirteen epistles 'non ignorabili adnotatione.' (3) The third, like the first, is said to have been 'very brief' in its notes: some attributed it to

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Irland*, pp. 13, 15 n.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* pp. 201-203.

<sup>4</sup> It is not, I think, necessary to conclude from the words of his later book *de orthographia* that the disciples' part of the business was still unfulfilled: 'expositionem epistulae quae scribitur ad Romanos unde Pelagianae haereseos prauitates amoui, quod etiam in reliquo commentario facere sequentes admonui' (Zimmer, p. 210 n).



St. Jerome. From the fact that Cassiodorus uses the word 'dicitur' in relation not only to the Hieronymian authorship but to the brevity of the notes, one would conclude that, though he might no doubt have seen the book, he did not lay claim to much first-hand acquaintance with it. (4) The fourth commentary was only a cento from the works of St. Augustine, put together by an abbot Peter of Tripoli, and may for our purpose be left out of account. (5) The fifth and last was one which St. Ambrose was said to have left behind him, 'suavissima expositione completum'; but Cassiodorus had never yet managed to come across a copy.

Cassiodorus therefore supposed himself to know (beyond the work of abbot Peter) of four different commentaries. But he had only read two of them, and one he had never seen at all, so that the possibility must remain open that the third and last were not wholly independent of the other two. It is at least certain that neither the 'Jerome' nor the 'Ambrose' commentary belonged in reality to its putative author: for if either of these two fathers had left a continuous commentary we should certainly have had other knowledge of it.

II. If we now turn to the early Latin commentaries on the whole series of Pauline epistles which are extant in print, and take the sixth century, the age of Cassiodorus, as our *terminus ad quem*, we find no more than three—Ambrosiaster or Pseudo-Ambrose, Pseudo-Jerome, and Pseudo-Primasius. These commentaries were originally published, no doubt on MS authority of some sort or other, under the name of Ambrose Jerome and Primasius respectively, and can still be read in the editions, or appendices to the editions, of these Fathers: but the prefix implies, the attribution is now in each case recognised incorrect.

With regard to the Ambrosiaster, internal evidence shews that he wrote under the pontificate of Damasus, and no doubt at Rome: 'cum totus mundus Dei sit, ecclesia tamen domus eius dicatur, cuius hodie rector est Damasus,' is his comment on 1 Tim. iii 15. The date warrants the claim that this is the earliest complete Pauline commentary in any language; but the personality of the author is quite uncertain. Ambrose, indeed, is out of the question; though as all the probabilities are in favour of identifying the 'Ambrose' commentary of Cassiodorus with our Ambrosiaster, the ascription must be as old as the sixth century. Still earlier is the ascription to 'Hilary,' for the interpretation of Rom. v 12 which Augustine quotes (as has already been mentioned) from 'sanctus Hilarius,' actually comes from our Ambrosiaster: it was under the name Hilary also, as Dr. Zimmer shews, that the commentary was known and used in Ireland. Either then the commentator really was an otherwise unknown Roman Christian Hilary, who was confounded



at least by Augustine with his more illustrious namesake—and this is Dr. Zimmer's view<sup>1</sup>—or the name Hilary got attached to the work exactly like the name Ambrose, as that of a great contemporary saint and writer, no other person being meant from the beginning than St. Hilary of Poitiers. If the latter view is correct, the work must have been published anonymously, and the ground remains free for Dom Morin's ingenious and attractive theory that the true author was the converted Jew Isaac, who played a not unimportant part in the Roman Church politics of Damasus' day and afterwards relapsed into Judaism.

The commentary of Pseudo-Jerome on the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul first appeared in Amorbach's edition of Jerome (Basel, 1516), and owed its place there to the fact that a 'very ancient' MS of it, *Gothicis litteris exaratus*, gave that father as its author. Of the next editors of Jerome, Erasmus rightly saw that the commentary was pseudonymous—if only because of the contrast of its concise and pithy style with Jerome's diffuse exposition—and Marius Victorius that it was Pelagian: but it was Garnier, the seventeenth-century editor of Mercator, who first developed what may be called the accepted view, that we possess in it the revision which (as we have seen) Cassiodorus undertook of the commentary of Pelagius<sup>2</sup>. That Pseudo-Jerome is not unconnected with Pelagius is made certain by the single fact that most of Augustine's and Mercator's citations from Pelagius are present in Pseudo-Jerome: just as the absence of one or two of their citations proves that Pseudo-Jerome is not Pelagius pure and simple, but a revised form of it. What more obvious than to see in Pseudo-Jerome Cassiodorus' edition of Pelagius? Yet Dr. Zimmer objects with reason that it is impossible that Cassiodorus, himself a strict Augustinian, should have retained, after his 'careful purging' of the commentary on Romans, as many as six of the passages to which Augustine and Mercator had taken special exception on doctrinal grounds: and he proposes the much more satisfactory alternative of identifying our Pseudo-Jerome with the third commentary on Cassiodorus' list—the one 'which by some is said to contain very brief annotations by blessed Jerome<sup>3</sup>.' The perfunctory character of Cassiodorus' acquaintance with this commentary would sufficiently explain why its Pelagian tinge had escaped him. The 'Jerome' of Amorbach's MS will then be the same as the 'Jerome' of Cassiodorus.

The third of our printed commentaries is that of which the *editio princeps* was published by Gagney in 1537 under the name of Primasius. No doubt the ascription rested on some MS or MSS: but neither ancient evidence nor internal probability points to the authorship of the celebrated

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Irland*, pp. 117-120.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* pp. 14-16.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* pp. 201, 206.

African writer of the sixth century, Primasius of Hadrumetum. On the other hand the connexion of this commentary with that of Pseudo-Jerome, in all respects save where anti-Pelagian orthodoxy called for alteration, is, as Dr. Zimmer was the first to notice, extremely close: e. g. on the Epistle to Philemon Pseudo-Primasius has nineteen notes, Pseudo-Jerome twenty-one, and sixteen of these are verbally identical, or nearly so, in the two commentators: it is in fact only in the commentary on Romans that the divergence is at all marked. Here then we appear to have a second revision, made apparently from doctrinal motives, of the lost commentaries of Pelagius: and in this case we have a *terminus a quo* for the date in A.D. 450, since the words 'death reigned until Moses' are illustrated by the parallel phrase 'fuerunt Hunni usque ad Attilam'.<sup>1</sup>

III. If we now compare the list of Cassiodorus with the commentaries just described, we shall find that we have already identified his last or Ambrose commentary with our Ambrosiaster, and his third or Jerome commentary with our Pseudo-Jerome. There remain his first and second: and if we grant Dr. Zimmer's premiss, that books known to the sixth century are more likely than not to have survived till the twentieth, we shall probably not hesitate to see in the second commentary—doctrinally and exegetically sound, and fuller than the first or third—another reference to the Ambrosiaster: Cassiodorus, of course, would naturally not suspect that the Ambrose for which he had vainly sought might turn out to be a commentary which, without name of author, had been all the time in his hands<sup>2</sup>. But what of that first commentary—popular, brief, subtle, but Pelagianizing—of which Cassiodorus commenced, but did not himself complete, the revision? Was it, as Garnier and most scholars since his time have thought, the original (though of course anonymous) Pelagius? or is Dr. Zimmer right that it was our Pseudo-Primasius, and that nothing of the whole Pauline library of Cassiodorus has disappeared, except his own revision of the commentary on the Romans<sup>3</sup>?

The key to the explanation of the mutual relation of the three revisions of Pelagius' commentary by Pseudo-Jerome, Pseudo-Primasius, and Cassiodorus, is naturally to be sought in the recovery of their lost original. To have achieved something like this recovery, and to have paved the way for a complete edition of the text of Pelagius, is the signal merit of Dr. Zimmer.

Pelagius was of British, perhaps of specifically Irish, origin. How powerful an influence his teaching had in England we know from the visit of Germanus of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes in 429: in Ireland its influence may well have been equally great, and the Irish Church

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, pp. 121-123, 135.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* p. 207.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* p. 204 sqq.



had no close relations with the continental Churches to counteract it. The barbarian invasions soon interposed a heathen barrier between Christian Ireland and Christian Europe; and after the mission of Palladius in 431 direct contact ceased for some hundred and fifty years. That Pelagianism, however, was alive in Ireland at the end of this period of separation is established by the direct evidence of a letter of Pope John IV in A.D. 640, in which the North Irish Church is blamed not only for its schismatic Easter reckoning but for its revived Pelagianism<sup>1</sup>. And if, in connexion with this, we bear in mind the high degree of culture to which Irish monasteries attained during that long isolation, and the careful preservation and study of the older Christian literature therein implied, we shall naturally look to Ireland as the quarter where the writings of Pelagius were most likely to have continued in use and to have escaped the suppression of their author's name. It is in this direction that Dr. Zimmer's researches have been so fruitful of results. The 'Irish' collection of canons, about 700 A.D., twice quotes the authority of 'Pelagius<sup>2</sup>.' The Book of Armagh, A. D. 807, has several longer prologues at the head of the Pauline Epistles, and briefer summaries to each individual epistle: of the former, two are entitled respectively 'prologus Pilagii in omnes aepistolas' and 'prologus Pilagii in aepistolam ad Romanos,' while of the latter ten bear the superscription 'argumentum Pilagii<sup>3</sup>.' When the tide set from Ireland to the continent, the Irish missionaries took their Pelagius with them. A Würzburg MS of the Epistles (cod. Wirceb. mp. th. f. 12), written about 800 A.D., is equipped with a marginal and interlinear commentary, part Latin, part Irish: the Irish glosses were edited by Dr. Zimmer himself twenty years back, but the Latin, to which he has now turned his attention, are historically of no less interest. Much is anonymous in this Catena, but seven authors are cited by name—Origen on the Romans (*Ori.*) twenty times; Ambrosiaster (*Hel.* or *Hi.*, i.e. Hilary) twenty-nine times; Jerome, mainly from his four commentaries on Pauline epistles—Galatians Ephesians Titus and Philemon—(*Hir.*) 116 times; Augustine (*Aug.* or *Ag.*) nine times; Gregory the Great (*Gg.*) fifty times; Isidore (*Is.*) five times; but Pelagius (*Pl.*) no less than 949 times<sup>4</sup>. The *Collectanea ad omnes b. Pauli epistolas* of Sedulius Scotus, an Irishman who taught at Liège Cologne and Metz about the middle of the ninth century, quote by name an exposition of Pelagius—'aliter secundum Pil.'—on Rom. i 17<sup>5</sup>. The ninth and tenth century catalogues of three libraries on the

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, pp. 22-24.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* pp. 24, 25.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* pp. 25-39.

<sup>4</sup> *ib.* pp. 39-117. Of these 949 citations from 'Pelagius,' 840 are found in Pse.-Jerome: the figures presumably measure the extent of Pseudo-Jerome's revision.

<sup>5</sup> *ib.* pp. 112, 113.



line of Irish MSS include Pelagius' commentary: "explicatio Pelagi super omnes epistolas Pauli" at St. Neipper in Strassburg, "Pelagi super omnes epistolas Pauli in unius auctoritate" at Lorsch on the Rhine, "commentarius Pelagi super omnes epistolas Pauli in viii. c." at St. Gall<sup>1</sup>. And as late as 1059 A. D. Marcanus Scotus, founder of an Irish monastery at Regensburg, wrote there "for the use of his brethren from foreign parts" an annotated copy of the Epistles, now at Vienna (cod. Vindob. 1027), in which the name of Pelagius is still attached to the general prologue—though that of Jerome has been written over it—and no very copious additions in the body of the text<sup>2</sup>.

That the commentary of Pelagius was popular in Irish circles for a long period during which it was quite unknown (under that name at least), is thus abundantly clear: and the material to be extracted from the Wienburg and Vienna MSS for the criticism of the "continental" versions by Pseudo-Jerome and Pseudo-Primasius, and therefore for the restoration of the true text of Pelagius, is very considerable. Much of the first half of the book under review is occupied with elaborate preparations for this task—a task which has, however, been rendered in part easier and in part unnecessary by a happy discovery of Dr. Zimmer's, made after his earlier chapters had been written. For the Pelagius MS catalogued at St. Gall somewhere before A. D. 900, which Dr. Zimmer had at first sought in vain, turns out to be after all still extant as "codex Sangallensis 73, Glossae incerti auctoris," the first leaf, and with it the author's name and prologue, having been lost between the ninth century and the thirteenth. That in this now anonymous MS we possess some form of the Pelagius commentary, the most cursory examination of its matter in comparison with Pseudo-Primasius, or still better with Pseudo-Jerome, is enough to show: that it is the Irish form becomes certain from its repeated agreement in textual details with the Irish authorities against both Pseudo-Primasius and Pseudo-Jerome: and finally that it is a doctrinally unadulterated form is shown by its retaining every single passage criticised by Augustine and Mercator, including even what was omitted by Pseudo-Jerome.

Yet the new discovery does not enable us to dispense—far from it—with the older material. In the St. Gall MS, besides an unusually large proportion of omissions from careless copying, and besides the accidental loss of two leaves, there are evidences at two separate points of the hand of an editor: in the First Epistle to the Corinthians section-headings are introduced, and alternative explanations are as a rule suppressed; and in the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philemon and Titus, on which St. Jerome wrote, much has been interpolated into the commentaries of Pelagius from the commentaries of his great opponent<sup>3</sup>. It is

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Irland*, pp. 156-158.    <sup>2</sup> *ib.* pp. 137-155.    <sup>3</sup> *ib.* pp. 242-271.

indeed not improbable that all the 'Irish' witnesses give a text which has suffered contamination—literary, not doctrinal—from Hieronymian sources: so that for these four epistles special caution must be used in admitting, as part of the ultimate Pelagius text, anything which is not guaranteed by one or other of the two continental authorities, Pseudo-Jerome or Pseudo-Primasius.

About the relation of the Pelagius commentary to the epistle to the Hebrews a word must be said separately. When Pelagius wrote, Western and Roman opinion on the subject of that epistle was just coming into line with the rest of the Christian world. Ambrosiaster indeed had not included the epistle in his commentary: but Damasus' Council of 382 A.D. had reckoned it as Pauline, and this was also the line taken by Pelagius himself in his general prologue to the epistles. There is therefore every ground to expect that Pelagius commented on all fourteen epistles: and in fact two authorities for the Pelagius text, the St. Gall MS and Pseudo-Primasius, conclude with an exposition of the Hebrews. On the other hand Pseudo-Jerome has no commentary on this epistle, the Würzburg and Vienna MSS have no Pelagius citations on this epistle, while the commentaries of St. Gall and Pseudo-Primasius differ here so much from one another that they cannot be regarded as two recensions of one original. Moreover Cassiodorus distinctly speaks of his first or Pelagianizing commentary as a commentary on thirteen epistles of St. Paul: and it is universally agreed among scholars that this commentary was either the actual Pelagius itself or at least a recension of it. We seem forced therefore to the conclusion that, whatever his reason, Pelagius did not in fact extend his exposition to the epistle to the Hebrews<sup>1</sup>.

It is obvious then that large deductions must be made from any claim of the St. Gall MS to be a faithful reproduction of the original Pelagius: and Dr. Zimmer was perhaps wise in confining himself to a full collation of the new manuscript with the printed (Migne) text of Pseudo-Jerome, the commentary on Romans i and v 12-21, and on Hebrews, being alone given *in extenso*<sup>2</sup>. But though he has thus exhausted the materials at present available on the side of the Irish tradition, the recovery of the original Pelagius can only be accomplished when the continental tradition of Pseudo-Jerome and Pseudo-Primasius has been critically edited from MSS. The two latter commentaries, like that of Ambrosiaster, though they have been known ever since the revival of letters, have suffered from the neglect which for generations has been the fate of every document to which the brand of spuriousness had been once attached. Is it too much to hope that as Vienna has its *corpus* of Latin Fathers, and Berlin its *corpus* of ante-Nicene Greek Fathers, so our English

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, pp. 178-200, 271-276.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.*, pp. 280-448.



Universities should undertake the editing of the exegetical writings of the Fathers on the New Testament? It is in this direction that our special strength seems to lie: at least it would be difficult to name any other department of patristic study in which the last sixty years of English scholarship has produced an output of good work equal to Cramer's *Catena*, Field's *Chrysostom on St. Matthew and on St. Paul*, P. E. Pusey's *Cyril on St. John*, Swete's *Theodore on St. Paul*, Brooke's *Origen on St. John*, and Gregg's *Origen on the Ephesians* just completed in this JOURNAL. Pelagius and Ambrosiaster would be in good company.

I venture to return, before concluding, to one literary question, the answer to which was left open in the course of this review for the reason that I wished to keep my exposition of Dr. Zimmer's argument free from any premature expression of dissent. What was the nature of the 'Pelagianizing' commentary which Cassiodorus began to re-write? Was it, as Garnier held, the real though anonymous Pelagius? Or was it, as Dr. Zimmer believes, the commentary now known as Pseudo-Primasius? The difficulties of Garnier's view appear to be far less than those of Dr. Zimmer's. The latter's main argument against Garnier is that the genuine Pelagius commentary could not possibly have been attributed to Gelasius within half a century after that pope's death, seeing that even if he was not the author of the so-called Gelasian decree *de libris non recipiendis*—among the *libri non recipiendi* are included in the lump all the writings of Pelagius—he had at any rate certainly written against Pelagianism. No doubt the confusion is strange: but is it any more strange than the fact that an edition of Pelagius' commentary, with no essential modification of the doctrinal standpoint, passed—and passed already, it would seem, in Cassiodorus' time—under no less a name than Jerome? Possibly the similarity of the names Gelasius and Pelagius may have lent assistance to the error: certainly it would be hard to set limits to the freaks or the audacity of pseudonymous ascription. But in any case, and however matters stand for Garnier's identification with Pelagius, Dr. Zimmer's identification with Pseudo-Primasius seems to me liable to a much more serious objection. For Pseudo-Primasius is definitely and consciously anti-Pelagian throughout: 'hoc contra Pelagianos facit,' 'hoc contra Pelagium facit,' 'contra abruptum Pelagianae impietatis errorem,' 'non sicut Pelagiani de hoc loco sentiunt,' 'ubi est superbia Pelagiana?'—these are the phrases which he engrafts on to the Pelagian stock, and how then could Cassiodorus speak of 'Pelagiani erroris uenena'? Moreover, it is specially in the commentary on Romans that Pseudo-Primasius has found it necessary to re-write Pelagius: it would surely be curious that



it should be specially in the commentary on the same epistle that Cassiodorus found it necessary to re-write Pseudo-Primasius!

Of the two views then which have been propounded as to the character of the 'Pelagianizing' commentary, we shall more easily accept that which identifies it with Pelagius' own work: but we shall be tempted to ask further why, when all the other contents of Cassiodorus' Pauline library have been thus identified with extant documents, Cassiodorus' own revision of this commentary should be left out in the cold. Neither Garnier nor Zimmer appears to offer any suggestion here: and yet Cassiodorus was no obscure writer, whose works would perish easily and leave no trace behind. His revision might indeed have circulated anonymously—being neither Pelagius proper nor Cassiodorus proper—and so even pseudonymously, but it is difficult to think it could have wholly disappeared. And if Dr. Zimmer's identification of Pseudo-Primasius with the 'Pelagianizing' commentary is wrong, *is not the field left open for the identification of Pseudo-Primasius with Cassiodorus' missing revision?* Pseudo-Primasius is based on Pelagius: if Garnier and the scholars who have followed him are right, Cassiodorus revised Pelagius. Pseudo-Primasius is an anti-Pelagian edition of Pelagius: so was that of Cassiodorus. Pseudo-Primasius has revised his original more on the doctrinal than on the linguistic side, more in the epistle to the Romans than in the other epistles<sup>1</sup>: Cassiodorus 'in order to remove far the error of heresy' purged the epistle to the Romans with all the *curiositas* that he could, leaving the rest of the revision to his pupils, whose work will doubtless have been much more perfunctory than their master's. Pseudo-Primasius adds to the genuine Pelagius on the thirteen epistles a commentary on the Hebrews, which depends on Chrysostom's Homilies<sup>2</sup>: but it was Cassiodorus who, in order to provide a commentary on an epistle which both Ambrosiaster and Pelagius had neglected, caused a certain Mutianus to translate these Homilies of Chrysostom into Latin<sup>3</sup>. The correspondence appears to be exact: Pseudo-Primasius is surely nothing else than the new and standard commentary on the completed Pauline epistles evolved out of Pelagius and Chrysostom by Cassiodorus and his monks of Vivarium. The hypothesis seems to me to be at any rate worthy of further consideration.

C. H. TURNER.

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* pp. 183-195.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* p. 202.

## CHRONICLE

## LITURGICA.

IN *The Agape and the Eucharist* (London, 1901) Dr. Keating collects and comments on the passages in the writings of the first four centuries, including the Hippolytean Canons, the *E.C.O.* and the *Testament*, referring or possibly referring to the Agape, prefixing some discussion of pagan and Jewish religious meals, and adding an appendix on the relation of the Christian Agape to the Roman Law. The resulting impression is, in view of the evidence perhaps inevitably, somewhat indistinct. M. Batiffol, in the fourth of his *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive* (Paris, 1902), has attacked Dr. Keating with some vigour; in fact he has assailed the agape generally, and holds that there was never any such thing as an agape of apostolic institution, but that till the third century *agape* was a title of the Eucharist itself, to which all the passages refer; while the Agape as generally understood was originated as a private and eleemosynary entertainment in the third century—and this is all the Church Orders refer to—and was made more public and held in churches for a while from the fourth century. This represents a change of view on M. Batiffol's part since he wrote his article *Agape* in the *Dictionnaire de théologie*, when he still believed that Tertullian described a public agape. He now believes, and shows some reason for his view, that Tertullian's description is of the Eucharist. And in fact the question seems to turn on Tertullian: if his supposed evidence can be disposed of—and Dr. Keating's tabulation of his account on p. 66 is certainly rather inadequate—there is very little, if anything, left to support the traditional view. But M. Batiffol need not be so hard on those who still accept the traditional view, seeing that he has so lately changed his own mind on the most important item in the evidence. The startling has not the same immediate attraction for every one that it has for M. Batiffol. Another of these studies is on the *disciplina arcana*. After an amusing account of the origin of the phrase—and some people still need reminding that it is the invention of the protestant Daillé—and of the later controversial use of the principle, M. Batiffol shows that Christianity, however prohibited and therefore necessarily clandestine, was never, like the mysteries, intrinsically a secret esoteric cult. He holds that the discipline in its later form, such as it was, was unknown till the third century and was never more in reality than a pedagogic method; in fact it was always artificial and inconsistent with itself. While agreeing that the thing was always artificial and accidental, one cannot but think that M. Batiffol post-dates the rise of it in one aspect



of its practical working. It seems to me that S. Justin Martyr clearly implies the distinction of masses in the liturgy; while the fact, which M. Batiffol mentions, that according to Epiphanius the Marcionites of the fourth century rejected the distinction, by no means proves that the distinction only arose subsequently to the Marcionite schism, and—what he does not mention—S. Jerome, who had access to Marcion's commentaries on S. Paul, says distinctly that Marcion himself rejected it in his comment on Gal. vi 6, which goes to prove that Marcion found it already in existence. The two other studies, on the origins of Penance, and the primitive Hierarchy, only indirectly bear on liturgics; but one is glad to see that M. Batiffol challenges—in fact denies—the assertion that there was ever any such thing as public confession in Exomologesis, and holds with good reason that the element of confession was always private; and one may note that he argues that 'presbyter' was for a while a vague title, and covered among other things an honorary presbyterate without the sacerdotium, a view which explains the treatment of confessors in the Hippolytean canons and derived documents.

Mr. Walter Lowrie's *Christian Art and Archaeology* (Macmillan & Co., 1902) is a book that was wanted, an excellent summary of archaeological results, well and fully illustrated. He deals with the whole subject—the cemeteries and all that concerns them; ecclesiastical architecture—and of course he makes short work of the figment of the conversion of 'law-courts' into churches—and ornaments of the church; pictorial art, painting, sculpture, mosaic, miniatures; metal work, glass, textiles, and ecclesiastical dress. The last section, in which Mr. Lowrie summarizes Dr. Wilpert's illuminating results, is perhaps the newest section. There is appended a select 'reasoned' Bibliography. Perhaps it is not ungrateful to wish that select references to fuller treatment of the topics in hand had been given throughout the book.

Mr. Crum's *Coptic Ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum, and others*, published by the Egypt Exploration Fund (London, 1902), contains some documents which fall to be chronicled here. A flake or slice of white lime-stone may seem a strange form of service-book, but several of these, the texts of which are here lithographed, are in fact incipient service-books. The most important of them (no. 4) is a fragment of a Preface and Sanctus, closely akin to that of a S. Petersburg ostrakon, obviously constructed like those of Sarapion of Thmuis and of S. Mark, and giving a new testimony to the fixed framework of the normal Egyptian preface which these illustrate. The Sanctus is in the otherwise unexampled form of Apoc. iv 8. Besides this there are a number of 'choir-slips,' containing verses of holy Scripture, which are evidently propers belonging to the mass or the divine service, and nos. 2, 512-15, *Ad.* 24, which are arranged under



'Biblical' texts, belong to these; fragments of prayers from the liturgies of S. Basil and S. Cyril; other fragments of prayers, Greek *troparia*, one of which (*Ad.* 39) contains a farsed trisagion and *Ave Maria*; and fragments related to the Kalendar. A series (29-36, *Ad.* 7) are requests for ordination on the part of candidates themselves, or in one or two cases of other individuals on their behalf, undertaking that they will observe certain conditions, and in some cases that they have learnt by heart certain portions of Scripture, and in some cases also citing the names of guarantors. Are there other instances as early as the beginning of the seventh century of application for ordination on the part of candidates themselves? The citation of guarantors illustrates the forty-seventh Egyptian canon of S. Basil (Riedel *Kirchenrechtsquellen*, p. 261). Mr. Crum has lithographed the text of the ostraca, translated and commented on them, and in an introduction discussed the date and provenance (chiefly the neighbourhood of Thebes) and the persons indicated, and summarized results as illustrating the ecclesiastical life of Upper Egypt in the seventh and eighth centuries.

The first-fruits of our new school at Rome (*Papers of the British School at Rome*, vol. i; Macmillan, 1902) contains an admirable monograph by the Director, Mr. Rushforth, on the Church of S. Maria Antiqua in the Forum, which was unearthed at the end of 1900. It represents the ecclesiology and decorative art of the Byzantine period of the City, a period which hitherto has been almost destitute of any monuments, except mosaics. Here we have recovered a specimen of a church with a complete scheme of mural decoration, which is Byzantine, but with a difference; 'S. Maria A. is in process of transformation from an Eastern into a Western church,' and the wall-paintings 'show us a Byzantine art transplanted to the West, and acquiring something of a local character in consequence.' Mr. Rushforth examines the whole church, structure and decoration, in detail, and identifies and illustrates the scenes and persons represented; and, in the decoration of the Eastern end of the church, distinguishes and dates the successive layers of painting, from the earliest, at the end of the fifth century, down to the final decoration by John VII (705-7), which is recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis*.

Under the auspices of the Committee of the British School at Athens, and by the munificence of Dr. Edwin Freshfield, Mr. R. W. Schultz and Mr. S. H. Barnsley, sometime members of the school, have been enabled to publish in sumptuous form their monograph on *The Monastery of Saint Luke of Stiris in Phocis, and the dependent monastery of Saint Nicolas in the Fields near Skripou in Boeotia* (Macmillan, 1901). St. Luke the Younger or the Stiriote died in about 946; and the present double church was built sometime within the following sixty

years. 'They [the two churches] are both characteristic examples of the second great period of Byzantine building (the eleventh century), and the larger one is a magnificent structure, beautiful in its proportions, and gorgeous in the wealth of marble and mosaic decoration which still covers its interior. It is one of the most perfect examples remaining in the East, and even at the time of its erection would have occupied a not unimportant place among the great buildings of the day' (p. 3). The book is a justification of this judgement of the authors, who examine the buildings in detail, their architecture, mosaic decoration, and furniture, and illustrate them in sixty magnificent plates of architectural drawings and photographs and coloured reproductions of the pavement and wall-decorations, besides the illustrations in the text. There can be no better opportunity of studying a fully-developed Byzantine church.

In the first fasciculus of the liturgical series of the *Auctarium Solesmense* (Solesmes, 1900) the Benedictines of Solesmes begin a projected collection of the ancient monuments of the Ambrosian rite with the *Liber sacramentorum* of Bergamo and a lectionary of the Old Testament lessons of the Mass. The first is a hitherto unpublished Sacramentary defective only through the loss of a certain number of leaves, among others unfortunately some belonging to the ordinary and canon. These latter are supplied from an eleventh-century MS in the Metropolitana of Milan. The second supplies incipits and explicits of the lessons, which are not given in the Bergamo book, from a twelfth-century MS in the library of the Prefect of the Ceremonies at Milan. In *Antiche reliquie liturgiche Ambrosiane e Romane* (*Studi e testi* 7, Rome 1902) Dr. Mercati publishes three essays. In the first he prints the text of an *Ordo Ambrosianus ad consecrandum ecclesiam et altaria* from an eleventh-century MS in the Capitular Library of Lucca, and in his discussion of it shows conclusively that it is, as the title describes it, really Ambrosian, and makes it fairly certain that it is the genuine Ambrosian rite, which has been displaced first by the old Roman rite, and subsequently by the modern Roman rite. In an appendix to this essay he criticizes Mr. Olden's theory (*Trans. S. Paul's Eccl. Soc.* iv, 1897-8) that there was no enclosure of relics in the old Irish rite of Consecration. In the second he prints and describes a series of 'Leonine' collects contained, tachygraphically written, in an Ambrosian MS of the sixth or seventh century, and points out its bearing on the probable existence of an official sacramentary lying behind the private collection which we call the 'Leonine Sacramentary.' In the third essay he discusses the neglected liturgical passages quoted in the Arian fragments of the fourth or fifth century published by Mai (*Script. vet. nov. coll.* iii 2, [1827]) and shows their 'Gallican' affinities,



and conjectures that they belong to North Italy or to the line of the Danube: and in an appendix to this essay he considers the date of the fragments as a whole, and agrees with Mai in assigning them to the end of the fourth or to the fifth century. In a further appendix *à propos* of Mgr. Duchesne's reply to the Solesmes criticism on his view of the origin of the Gallican rite, Dr. Mercati lucidly and carefully lays down the conditions of the problem, himself favouring the view that the oriental influences on the Gallican rite belong rather to the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries, than to the fourth.

Dr. Paul Drews of Giessen begins a series of *Studien sur Geschichte d. Gottesdienstes u. d. gottesdienstlichen Lebens* with an essay *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe* (Tübingen & Leipzig, 1902) in which he essays to show that the Roman Canon was originally constructed like the Syrian anaphora, and conjectures that it was rearranged by Gelasius under Egyptian influence. I do not think the attempt is very successful. It is easy to compare the Roman paragraphs with their parallels in the Syrian rite, and then rearrange them, in the Syrian order; but this scarcely proves that they ever stood in this order. Yet Dr. Drews' discussion amounts to very little more than this. It is possible enough that the Canon has at sometime been more or less rearranged and that the first three paragraphs have been inserted from elsewhere; but there is little plausibility in the suggestion that they ever stood after the consecration. On p. 24 Dr. Drews is misled by the Greek 'Liturgy of S. Peter' and fails to realize that it is a conflate of Byzantine and Roman, in which the Byzantine *ἐκφωνήσεις* are interpolated into the corresponding positions in the Roman Canon: and in any case 'S. Peter' is too modern to throw any light on early history. And on p. 26 he resuscitates the ancient spectre of the *ordo missae* of Flacius Illyricus, and certainly misinterprets it.

Mr. Frere has edited, for the Alcuin Club, *Pontifical services illustrated from miniatures of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries* (Longmans, 1901). In the first volume he has written with considerable fullness the history of the Latin rites for Consecration of Churches, Profession of Monks, Consecration of Nuns and Admission of Deaconesses and Widows, as represented by the extant service-books, distinguishing the several earlier forms and tracing the double process of fusion and elaboration which issued in the rites of the later Pontificals. It is an excellent piece of work and a model of what wants doing elsewhere. A descriptive list of English MS Pontificals is added. One is inclined to regret that this volume was not printed in octavo, instead of very large quarto: it would be easier to handle and read, and the tabulations in parallel columns would be easier to follow and grasp. The second volume is



a collection of reproductions in colotype of miniatures from four Pontificals, three English and one German, illustrating the series of pontifical offices, and in some cases their subordinate movements.

In *The Metz Pontifical* (London, 1902) Mr. Dewick has sumptuously edited, for the Roxburghe Club, a manuscript belonging to Sir Thomas Brooke. A series of 100 plates of facsimiles, four of them in colours, is preceded by an Introduction, a description of the plates, and a reprint of the text and an index of liturgical forms. In spite of the erasure of most of the local and personal indications, there is enough left to enable the editor to identify the MS as written for Reinhold von Bar, bishop of Metz, 1302-1316; and the condition of the quires enables him to determine that it was written in parts, which were used separately, and afterwards bound together: while it is plain on the face of it that the book is incomplete, not only as a Pontifical, containing as it does only the offices of Consecration of Churches, the blessing of Abbots of monks and canons, the holding of a Synod, and the Consecration of a Bishop, but also as a work of art, the decorations of the later pages remaining unfinished. Mr. Dewick treats shortly of its liturgical character, in which he finds it closely related to Hittorp's *Ordines*, but further developed; and at greater length of its artistic character, in which he finds that it belongs to the same school as produced the Verdun Breviary, which belonged to Reinhold's sister, Marguerite, abbess of S. Maur of Verdun, but is not by the same hand; and he describes in detail and annotates the illustrations of the rites. It is a gorgeous book in a fine script and splendidly illustrated; and the grotesques in the lower margin, with reminiscences of Aesop, and perhaps of *Reynard*, are as charming as the pictures, and perhaps the delicate outline drawings of the unfinished pages are even more delightful than the finished work.

Mr. Dewick has also edited, for the Henry Bradshaw Society, reproductions of the earliest known forms of the *Horae de beata Maria Virgine* (London, 1902) from MSS *Royal 2 B. v.*, and *Tiberius A. iii* of the eleventh century. The whole of the texts is reproduced in colotype, with a printed text on the opposite pages, and is also reprinted continuously in more modern form, with notes. In the Introduction Mr. Dewick describes the MSS and discusses their origin, identifying the former as a book for common recitation coming from S. Mary's at Winchester, the latter as a private book from Christ Church, Canterbury; and examines the structure and relations of the service. Except for the Psalter, the two series are distinct; even where the individual forms are identical, they are, generally speaking, differently distributed. The common Psalter is selected from the Gregorian system, on which a Benedictine element has been superimposed in the Canterbury book.

*The Breviarium Bothanum* (Longmans, 1900) contains the text,

printed *in extenso*, of a MS of the middle of the fifteenth century, belonging to the Marquess of Bute. It is the Breviary of an undetermined Scottish Cathedral Church, possibly Dunkeld, or a copy for private use of such a Breviary. It is of the Sarum type, and according to the preface, signed W. D. M., follows the English text more closely than does the Aberdeen Breviary, but has characteristics of its own in the Kalendar and elsewhere. 'Several historical notes added in the Kalendar by the original hand, as well as other later notes, connect the volume with Easter Foulis in Perthshire, and with the families of Mortimer and Gray, who were lords of that place.' I have no right to judge of Breviaries, but a doubt may be expressed whether it was worth while to print this one *in extenso*, psalter, lessons, and all.

In *The Prayer Book of Aedhuald the Bishop commonly called the Book of Corne* (Cambridge, 1902) Dom Kuypers of Downside has edited one of the three MSS which are bound together to make up MS LL. 1. 10 in the University Library at Cambridge. It consists of the *Pissis* and *Resurrectio Domini* from each of the four Gospels, a collection of seventy-four prayers and hymns, with a selection from the Psalter, like that of the *Psalterium S. Hieronymi* or the *Excerptae de Psalterio* of the *Irish Liber Hymnorum*, and an apocryphal dialogue between our Lord and Adam and Eve *in limbo patrum*. On palaeographical grounds the MS is assigned to the eighth or ninth century, and the editor identifies 'Aedhuald the Bishop,' who is two or three times mentioned, with Æthelwold of Lichfield, 818-836, and shows that the MS was written in Mercia. The prayers are not liturgical, but private prayers, of which fifty-two are addressed to God, and fourteen to Angels and Saints. Some of them occur elsewhere, and some have been printed, in documents which the editor catalogues, and one at least is common in mediaeval *Horae* and *Primers*. In a discussion of the character of the prayers, Dom Kuypers shows that the collection betrays the influence of two devotional currents, the Roman and the Irish; and in an elaborate liturgical note, appended to the volume, Mr. Edmund Bishop discusses their phraseology with great minuteness, comparing them with the service books, and coming to the same conclusion. On one point this comparison is carried out in still further minuteness and issues in the interesting result, that of 'the familiar prayer which begins the introit of the masses for the dead "*Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine; et lux perpetua luceat eis*". . . the second member . . . expresses the aspiration of the mind and soul of the Roman, the first the aspiration of the mind and soul of the Goth' (p. 275). This and the rest of the note require careful study to enable one to have any opinion of one's own on the matter; but one would like to ask at once what is the bearing on it of 4 Esdr. ii. 34 sq.: Expectate pastorem vestrum, *requiem aeternitatis* dabit vobis:



parati estote ad praemia regni, quia *lux perpetua lucebit vobis* per aeternitatem dierum. In the Appendix, Dom Kuypers further prints the similar and partly identical text of Royal MS 2. A. xx of the eighth century, discusses the text of the Gospel extracts, which he finds to be vulgate, fundamentally Celtic with corrections from a purer type, and adds notes on some other points.

Mr. Frere has finished his *Use of Sarum* (of which the first volume appeared in 1898) by the publication of the second volume (Cambridge, 1901), which contains the *Ordinale vetus*, the first few pages of the *Ordinale novum*, which is not here printed entire since it is practically identical with the rubrics of the Service Books as printed in the sixteenth century and reprinted in modern editions, and the *Tonale*. In his introduction Mr. Frere gives a lucid account of the nature, origin and relations of the books, and skilfully traces the course of the transition from the Old to the New Ordinal between 1270 and the early years of the next century. A further stage in the history of the *Ordinale* is the 'Pye' or *Directorium*, which is an Ordinal simplified, if not in appearance and dimensions, yet for practical purposes, by the reduction of the rules to the form of thirty-five Kalendars, corresponding to the possible varieties of the date of Easter. Mr. Christopher Wordsworth has edited the Pye for the Henry Bradshaw Society in the *Ordinale Sarum sive Directorium Sacerdotum* of Clement Maydeston (London, vol. i, 1901, vol. ii, 1902), reprinted from the Wynken de Worde edition of 1485, a page of which he reproduces in facsimile. In the preface, after interesting notices of Messrs. J. R. Lunn and W. Cooke, who spent much labour on the Pye and largely contributed to this edition, Mr. Wordsworth gives notes on the name, MSS and history of the Pye, and at the end of the second volume sixteen appendices, among which are an introduction and letters by Mr. Lunn, and notes and observations by Mr. Isherwood, and a note of his own in which he gives an answer, which will be welcome to many of us, to the question 'What is a Pye?', an answer which he could have illustrated by the thirty-five tables of the Greek *Εὐαγγελιστάριον*, which is a Pye in its simplest form, as the *Τυπικόν* is, I suppose, an *Ordinale* in its most appalling form. These two sets of volumes seem to complete the republication of the Sarum *Ordinale* literature begun in 1894 by Mr. Wordsworth's edition of *The Tracts of Clement Maydeston* (H.B.S.).

Mr. Frere once more, and his energy is amazing, has completed the first volume of his *Bibliotheca Musico-liturgica* in a second fasciculus (London, 1901), containing a hand-list of Oxford MSS and nine facsimiles.

In *Nothers Sequenzen: Beiträge zur Geschichte d. lateinischen Sequenzdichtung: aus Handschriften gesammelt*, Aarau, 1901, Dr. Jacob



Werner attacks the question of the genuine sequences of Notker. He describes the state of the question, catalogues in detail thirty-one MSS., discusses the origin of sequences, and considers the evidence with regard to Notker, and concludes that out of a list of 117 sequences, forty-seven can with some certainty be ascribed to Notker; and finally treats of the melodies.

'Procter' has long been the best manual on the Prayer Book; but it was originally written nearly fifty years ago, and meanwhile things have advanced apace. Mr. Procter therefore put his book into Mr. Frere's hands to be revised, and the result is *A new history of the Book of Common Prayer* (Macmillan, 1901), which will continue the life of 'Procter' for a long time to come. It is about as good as is possible in the present state of our knowledge. While one or two topics, which belong more properly to other departments, are omitted, nearly the whole of the old book is in substance embodied in this, and its general character remains what it was. Naturally the chief changes and improvements are in the treatment of origins, where knowledge and precision have made progress, and Mr. Frere's descriptions, analyses, tables, and illustrative documents of the older rites are full and adequate. Besides this, certain points in the history now admit of more detailed treatment in the light of new evidence. From time to time Mr. Frere gives summarized accounts of what he has treated more in detail elsewhere, e. g. of the history of the Sarum Use, and of musical matters connected with the Prayer Book. His treatment of difficult and disputed points, like 'Gallican *versus* Roman,' the relation of Convocation to the 1549 book, foreign influences in 1552, and the Ornaments Rubric, is useful, judicious, and equitable. I have noticed two or three small slips: the *Quicumque* was to be said in addition to, not instead of (p. 391), the Apostles' Creed until 1662; the Collect for the second Sunday after Trinity does not 'date from 1661' (p. 553), but is the 1549 translation of the Sarum Collect, which was only turned round and expanded at the last revision; and on p. 460 there is a puzzling misprint, '70' for '§ 7.' And why does Mr. Frere still talk of 'obsecrations' in the Litany? What does it mean? When the book is reprinted, Mr. Frere might add on p. 102 that the only substantial addition made to the Litany since 1544, the expansion of the suffrage for the king, is a translation of the proper suffrage of the Coronation Litany: that the *Antididagma* of Cologne had certainly an important influence in determining the drift of the Canon of 1549; that the frequent vernacular exhortations in German *Ritualia* are probably the origin of the Lutheran exhortations copied by Cranmer; and on p. 577, that, whatever may be the origin of the first part of the opening prayer in the Order of Baptism, the end of it comes from the *Deus patrum nostrorum* of some older

orders given by Martene, and continued in some German *Ritualia*, like that of Mainz; and on p. 578 that the baptismal Gospel from S. Mark is not an invention of Luther's, but follows a common German usage, e. g. that of Cologne.

Since the publication of Mr. Frere's book, a chapter in the history of the Prayer Book has been rewritten by Dr. Gee in *The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments* (Macmillan, 1902), a book which it is a joy to read. Dr. Gee traces the history of the traditional account of the revision of 1559, and shows that it rests wholly on two documents, the *Device for alteration of Religion*, and Guest's letter to Cecil. He then reconstructs the history of the months during which the revision and authorization of the Prayer Book was in hand, and concludes that there was never any other course contemplated than a restoration, with whatever modifications, of the book of 1552. In the third chapter he traces the 'rival policies' in the matter of ceremonial, from the Ornaments Rubric, through the *Injunctions* and the *Interpretations*, down to the *Advertisements* of 1566; and in a fourth chapter traces the fate of the ornaments of the church down to 1571; and in an appendix he prints a collection of documents. Dr. Gee's judgements on doubtful and controverted points, like the Ornaments Rubric, the 'other order,' and the date of the *Interpretations*, which he assigns to 1560, are of course valuable and important; and from time to time he throws into relief neglected documents, like the Proclamation concerning Communion of March 22, 1559, or the Letter of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on rood-lofts in 1560, which have important bearings on the history of things. But the most notable point in the book is the treatment of Guest's letter, which Dr. Gee assigns to 1552, and regards as relating to a stage in the revision of that date, rejecting the traditional view of it as belonging to 1559. His view has all the attractiveness which must belong to anything that would throw more light on the genesis of the book of 1552. But there are difficulties: an array of them is marshalled in the *C.Q.R.* for July 1902. The letter refers to a situation which is otherwise quite unknown, and the question is whether it is more congruous with the conditions of 1552 or with those of 1559. The main difficulty lies in the first three sections, from which it is clear that what had been before the writer and his fellows was a proposal which involved both the book of 1549 and the restoration of 'ceremonies once taken away.' If therefore it belongs to 1552 we have to suppose that the revisers were invited not only to revise the first Prayer Book, which in fact they did in such sense that the book of 1552 was the result, but also, what is surely very improbable at this date, to restore ceremonies which had already been 'taken away,' and among them 'the cross' and out-door processions; whereas, if the letter belongs



to 1559, the restoration of the Prayer Book would *ipso facto* involve the restoration of 'ceremonies once taken away,' while the cross in Elizabeth's chapel and the regulations as to Rogation processions in the Injunctions and subsequent documents, may serve to show that proposals for such further restoration as is referred to in the sections on the cross and procession were quite possible and even probable at this date. And however worthless the evidence may be as to any desire on the part of Elizabeth and Cecil for the restoration of the book of 1549, and however unlikely the revising committee proposed by the *Device* may have been to hark back to 1549—and all this Dr. Gee makes clear enough—yet if the balance of parties in 1559 was so even that the Act of Uniformity was only passed by a majority of three in the Lords, and if among the majority there was a more conservative section strong enough to effect the 'reaction' implied in the Ornaments proviso, it is surely likely enough that there was at least a section of these who would have welcomed the 1549 book as a whole, and was influential enough to secure that a proposal for its restoration should be laid before the revision committee; and this is all that is required by the traditional view.

Of the multitudinous Coronation literature, good, bad and indifferent, only two or three volumes call for record here. Dr. J. Wickham Legg's *Three Coronation Orders* (Henry Bradshaw Soc., London, 1901) contains a pre-Norman order of the second recension, but of a peculiar variety, from MS C.C.C.C. 44 of the eleventh century; an Anglo-French version of the rite of the fourth recension, from MS C.C.C.C. 20, of the beginning of the fourteenth century; and the Coronation of William and Mary from MS L. 19 in the Heralds' College; with appendices containing a number of subordinate documents concerned with the last; and the most valuable part of the introduction is taken up with a discussion in detail and an evaluation of the changes made in the order by Sancroft for James II and by Compton for William and Mary. Mr. Leopold Wickham Legg's *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901) is a valuable collection, including texts of all six recensions, and all sorts of texts variously illustrating English Coronations, with a good many typical illustrations, an introduction discussing the details of the rite in all its stages, and a full index. The Latin texts are accompanied by English translations, which as translations leave something to be desired, and could have been dispensed with in exchange for the texts, or at least the rubrics and cues, of the orders used between William III and Victoria. The comparative table of the successive recensions, as is often the case with such things, is a little tantalizing, because it is so compressed that corresponding features are not always opposite one another. *The Coronation Ceremonial: its true history and meaning*, by Fr. Thurston,





Melkites is published كتاب الليتورجيات الالهية (*The book of the divine Liturgies*), Beirut, 1900, containing the three liturgies (S. Chrys., S. Bas. and the Presanct.) with the Orthros and the Hesperinos. The Coptic Uniat has published Ευχολογιον ιτε φεκυλκισια ηαλεξανδριου (*Euchologion of the Alexandrine Church*), Cairo, 1898, containing the Morning and Evening Incense and the three liturgies; and Ουασιου ιτε φμετρεφωεμυι ιημιαστηριου εοσταδ (*A book of the ministry of the holy mysteries*), Cairo, 1900, being a *Rituale*, containing the orders of Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, Penance, Unction of the sick, and Burial and commemoration of the dead. This last is especially useful, since Tuki's *Rituale* is exhausted and no longer to be had.

*The Service for the Consecration of a Church and Altar according to the Coptic rite* (London, 1902), has just appeared. The text, Coptic and Arabic, is printed from a MS given to the Bishop of Salisbury by the present Coptic Patriarch, of which Mr. Horner, the editor of the present volume, gave an account in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* for March, 1899, collated with that of Tuki and that of an Arabic MS at Berlin. Mr. Horner writes an Introduction, containing notes on historical notices of Egyptian consecrations, a description of the MS, and an account of the office compared with other Coptic rites, followed by a translation (in which it were to be wished that ordinary usage had been followed, and the rubrics printed in italic and the whole made to look more like what it is) and notes on the Coptic and Arabic text. Except that the book is apparently intended for ritual use, it may be doubted whether it was worth while to print at length the Psalms and Lessons, which form more than a half of the whole of a costly book.

The fourth number of the new series of *Occasional papers of the Eastern Church Association* is a valuable essay on *The Ceremonial Use of Oil among the East Syrians* by Mr. F. F. Irving, for some years a member of the Canterbury Mission to the Nestorians (Oxford, 1902). It has been asserted by a series of Western writers that there is, and for some time past has been, no unction of Confirmation among the Nestorians. Mr. Irving shows conclusively by the evidence of service-books and uniform present practice that this view is quite mistaken, and that the baptized are anointed, not indeed with chrism, but with pure olive oil, blessed by a bishop, but regarded as consecrated, not by the blessing, but by the admixture of the holy oil supposed to have been received from the Apostles. He adds an account of the other ritual uses of oil among the Nestorians.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

*RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO  
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*

(1) ENGLISH.

*Church Quarterly Review*, October 1902 (Vol. lv, No. 109: Spottiswoode & Co.). Religion in Oxford—Lamarck, Darwin and Weismann—The Religious Condition of Italy—The Holy Eucharist: an Historical Inquiry, Part V—Missions to Hindus, II—The Third Order of St. Francis—Criticism, Rational and Irrational—Education and Religious Liberty—Short Notices.

*Jewish Quarterly Review*, July 1902 (Vol. xiv, No. 56: Macmillan & Co.). H. S. Q. HENRIQUES, The Jews and the English Law, IV—E. N. ADLER, Auto de Fé and Jew (*continued*)—I. GOLDZIHNER, Bemerkungen zur neuhebräischen Poesie—J. JACOBS, Earliest Representation of the Ark of the Law—W. BACHER, Zu meinem Artikel 'Der Siddur von Jemen' (*J.Q.R.*, xiv 581 ff.)—W. BACHER Die von Schechter edirten Saadyana (*J.Q.R.*, xiv)—W. BACHER Aus einer alten Poetik (Schule Saadja's)—S. KRAUSS Zur Topographie von Caesarea—S. POZNAŃSKI Zum Schrifttum der süd-arabischen Juden—Critical Notices: C. H. TOY Jastrow's Study of Religion: H. HIRSCHFELD Dalman's ערוך ודורש—H. HIRSCHFELD Descriptive Catalogue of Hebrew MSS of the Montefiore Library, V.

*The Expositor*, August 1902 (Sixth Series, No. 32: Hodder & Stoughton). W. M. RAMSAY St. Paul—W. O. E. OESTERLEY The Development of Monotheism in Israel—A. E. GARVIE Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus: VII, The Surrender of Home—R. A. FALCONER Is Second Peter a genuine Epistle to the Churches of Samaria? III—S. I. CURTISS Discoveries of a Vicarious Element in Primitive Semitic Sacrifice—E. KÖNIG On the Meaning and Scope of Jer. vii 22-3—M. DODS Dr. Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible—M. G. PEARSE Brother Anthony.





(3) FRENCH AND BELGIAN.

*Revue Biblique*, October 1902 (Vol. xi, No. 4: Paris, V. Lecoffre, for the School of the Convent of St. Stephen at Jerusalem). MACRIDY-BEY Le temple d'Echmoun à Sidon, fouilles exécutées par le Musée impérial ottoman—M. J. LAGRANGE Note sur les inscriptions trouvées par Macridy-Bey à Bostan-ech-Cheikh—L. HACKSPILL L'angéologie juive à l'époque néo-testamentaire—H. HYVERNAT Petite introduction à l'étude de la Massore—Mélanges: U. CHEVALIER Le Saint Suaire de Turin et le Nouveau Testament: P. LADEUZE Les destinataires de l'épître aux Éphésiens: A. JAUSSEN and R. SAVIGNAC Nouvelles inscriptions nabatéennes de Pétra—Chronique: H. VINCENT Les fouilles allemandes à Ba'albek; Fouilles diverses en Palestine; Les hypogées peints de Marésa; L'église des Saints-Apôtres à Mada'ba; La grappe d'Echkol—Recensions—Bulletin.

*Revue Benedictine*, July 1902 (Vol. xix, No. 3: Abbaye de Maredsous). G. MORIN Autour des *Tractatus Origenis*—J. CHAPMAN Les interpolations dans le traité de S. Cyprien, *Sur l'unité de l'Église*—J. M. BESSE La congrégation espagnole de St-Benoît de Valladolid—U. BERLIÈRE Les chapitres généraux de l'ordre de St-Benoît (*suite*)—U. BERLIÈRE Bulletin d'histoire bénédictine—Mélanges: J. CHAPMAN and G. M[ORIN] A propos de l'autographe de la règle de St-Benoît; U. BERLIÈRE Pierre Bersuire: U. BERLIÈRE Lettres de Dom Calmet à J. F. Schannat—Bibliographie.

*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, July–August 1902 (Vol. vii, No. 4: Paris, 74 Boulevard saint-Germain). J. TURMEL Le dogme du péché originel après saint-Augustin dans l'Église latine: I. La condition primitive de l'homme et la notion de sa chute—C. CALLEWAERT Le codex Fuldensis, le meilleur manuscrit de l'*Apologeticum* de Tertullien—P. LEJAY Ancienne philologie chrétienne: (17) Liturgie (*suite*); IV. Cycle festal et culte des saints; (a) Généralités, (b) Pénétration du paganisme par le christianisme, (c) Notes diverses d'hagiographie, (d) Pèlerinages—A. LOISY Chronique biblique (*suite*): (3) Exégèse; (4) Histoire biblique.

September–October (Vol. vii, No. 5). E. GRISELLE Épisodes de la campagne anti-quiétiste (1696–1699), d'après la correspondance de Bossuet, de son frère et de son neveu; L'aventure de l'abbé Bossuet à Rome: I, L'accusation et la défense—H. L. RAMSAY Le commentaire de l'Apocalypse par Beatus de Liebana—A. LOISY Chronique biblique: (4) Histoire biblique (*suite*); (5) Théologie biblique—M. DE WULF Chronique d'histoire de la philosophie médiévale: (1) Jugements d'ensemble; (2) La scolastique avant le xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle; (3) La philosophie

E JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

e; (4) La philosophie scolastique au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle.—F. LEY  
philologie chrétienne: (17) Liturgie (suite): (4) Cinq

*l'Orient chrétien*, 1902 (Vol. vii, No. 2: Paris, A. Picard)  
*Le Moutassarifat ou Gouvernement autonome de Libé-  
rienne* Récit de Mar Cyrilaque moine de la montagne de  
Paradise fut enlevé du croquant de Cassin et transporté  
de Pheisitha; Texte syriaque.—S. HERMINE Cassin—  
E. BLOCHET Vie de sainte Marine (suite); V. THOMAS auto-  
non.—H. F. TOURNEMINE Histoire politique et religieuse de  
ville)—V. ERMONT Rituel copte du Baptême et du Miroir  
Cyrilien Histoire de saint Nicholas, soldat et saint—  
—Mélanges: H. LAMMENS La question grec-arménienne  
LAMMENS Un nouveau diocèse grec-orthodoxe en Syrie  
a) Le Sionisme et la Turquie—Bibliographie.

(4) GERMAN.

*Die Quartalschrift*, 1902 (Vol. LXXIV, No. 3: Munich,  
KATNER Die armenische *Dormitio Mariae*—Peters Der sog.  
senabrief—SACHMULLER Ein angebliches Papstwahlbrief  
E (1139)—WITTIG Studien zur Geschichte des Papst  
und der Papstwahlen des 5. Jahrhunderts—Hesse—  
Vol. LXXIV, No. 4: Dornum Ein neues Fragment aus der



**Flois**—H. HAUPT Ein deutscher Traktat über die österreichischen Waldenser des 13. Jahrhunderts—J. GOTTSCHICK Studien zur Versöhnungslehre des Mittelalters: III, Alexander Halesius. Bonaventura. Albertus Magnus. Thomas Aquinas—H. WATERSTRAAT Der Caminer Bisstumsstreit im Reformationszeitalter (*concluded*)—Analecta: F. HERRMANN Miscellen zur Reformationsgeschichte: G. LOESCHE Ein angebliches Stammbuch Luthers: A. HELDMANN Die drei Kirchen Augsburgischer Konfession in der Freigrafschaft Düringhausen.

September 1902 (Vol. xxiii, No. 3). J. GOTTSCHICK Studien zur Versöhnungslehre des Mittelalters (*continued*)—KATZER Die Kircheninspektionen der sächsischen evangelisch-lutherischen Landeskirche—Analecta: BRATKE Beatus v. Libana, Hieronymus und die Visio Hesdrae: O. CLEMEN Sechs Briefe aus der Reformationszeit (Latin text): W. FRIEDENSBURG Beiträge zum Briefwechsel der katholischen Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter (*concluded*), IX Robert Vauchop (Latin letters).

*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, August 1902 (Vol. xlv, No. 3: Leipzig, O. R. Reiland). F. NIPPOLD Spahn-Kraus-Ehrhard: Neue Belege für den Kampf zwischen Geschichtsforschung und Infallibilismus—F. W. SCHIEFER Sünde und Schuld in der Apokalypse des Baruch—A. KLÖPPER Zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe (1 Tim. iii 16)—J. DRÄSEKE Zur byzantinischen Kirchengeschichte—E. v. DOBSCHÜTZ Eine Fastenpredigt über das Christusbild von Beryt (*Greek Text*)—E. v. DOBSCHÜTZ Zu der Völkerliste, Act. ii 9-11—J. DRÄSEKE & A. JAHN, Zu Didymos' von Alexandria Schrift 'Über die Trinität'—J. ALBANI Die Metaphern des Epheserbriefes—Reviews.

*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1902 (No. 4: Gotha, F. A. Perthes). MÄCKLENBURG Über die Auffassung des Reiches Gottes, resp. über den Begriff des göttlichen Königtums in den Psalmen—KERN Die Auffassung des heiligen Abendmahls bei Paulus nach 1 Kor. x 14 ff. und xi 23 ff.—SCHMIDT Die Möglichkeit einer Bekehrung nach dem Tode—Notes: KÖNIG Zum Sprachbeweis der alttestamentlichen Kritik: CÖLLE Zur Exegese und zur homiletischen Verwertung des Gleichnisses vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus, Luc. xvi 19-31—Reviews: CLEMEN Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi: JÖRGENSEN Billing, Luthers lära om staten i dess samband med hans reformatoriska grundtankar och med tidigare kyrkliga läror, I: SCHWARZE Pieper, Kirchliche Statistik Deutschlands.

*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, July 1902 (Vol. xiii, No. 7: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). W. CASPARI Konfirmation und Kommunionrecht—KAISER Rudelbachs Konfessionen über sein theologisches

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

1895-1896—HORN Der Kampf um die leibliche Auferstehung  
(weiterführend)—V. SCHWARTZ Ein unbekannter Bericht über  
erzählend.

1901 (Vol. xii, No. 8). G. HOENNICKE Die Chronologie  
des Apostels Paulus—E. KÖHN Sebna und Eljakim—G.  
10 Glossen zum ersten Johannesbrief: III, 1 Joh. iii 18-22.  
1902 (Vol. xii, No. 9). K. HARRÄUS Über Baumanns  
101—ROHMEL Vom Kinderglauben—KLOSTERMANN Bei-  
stehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs—STANGE Luther über  
Rimini.

1902 (Vol. xii, No. 10). KOLBE Gegen Ehrhardts  
102—ZAHN Der zerrissene Tempelvorhang—WULZ Arnold  
—W. SCHMIDT Arthur Schopenhauer—SCHMIDT Gehört  
Evangelium?

*für Theologie und Kirche*, July 1902 (Vol. xii, No. 4:  
und Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr). O. RITSCHL Theologische  
und religiöse Spekulation, II—KABISCH Über die Lehr-  
Religion.

1902 (Vol. xii, No. 5). H. STEPHAN Hamanns  
*und Theologie*, eine Studie zur neueren Kirchengeschichte.

# The Journal of Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1903

## A RELIGIOUS VIEW OF HUMAN PERSONALITY.

(A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Oct. 26, 1902.)

“For as the Father hath life in Himself, even so gave He to the Son also to  
life in Himself.”—S. JOHN v 26.

these words spoken primarily of the Logos—the eternally  
tent Image of the Father, or primarily of the Son Incar-  
a human revelation of God? I must venture to think  
words spoken by the Christ in flesh of Himself the  
must have direct reference to the *Incarnate* Christ; and  
se words are no exception to the rule. Such a view is  
zed by the phrase with which, in the next verse, the  
concludes, ‘And He gave Him authority to execute  
nt, *because He is the Son of man.*’

ure, then, to take the words as having reference—not  
perhaps, but direct—to *human* being in the Person of

But if to human being in the Person of Christ, then, in  
some sense at least, to the consummation, and therefore to the  
ideal, of what human being is. I do not stay now to ask in  
what precise way the relation ought to be stated between  
humanity in us and Humanity in Him. At the very least, there  
is an instructive analogy between the two; so that what is  
a leading principle of humanity in Him has in it a lesson about  
our humanity, and for us. At some risk, then, of seeming abrupt-  
ness, I must venture to begin by assuming that the words of the



text have a direct application to humanity, even our humanity, in its true ideal meaning, as designed and discerned by God.

Any such *a priori* assumption is greatly strengthened when we begin to observe what it is that the words assert. They assert two things, and the two make a paradox: for they seem, on the face of it, to contradict each other. 'Even so gave He to the Son also'—it is, then, a gift, derivative and dependent. 'To have life in Himself—as the Father hath life in Himself': it is, then, an inherent possession, and compared, in this point of its inherency, to the inherency of the life of God. It is Life—at once given *and* inherent: at once dependent *and* distinct: at once an outcome of the Father's being, an act or expression of the Father's love, *and* an existence over against the Father, like in sovereign self-completeness to the Father's own. Such a paradox contains, in fact, an exactly true account of the actual reality, or at least the full ideal reality, of human conscious being.

The two sides are both present together, and the two sides are both to be taken account of. Logic may or may not succeed in correlating them: but to ignore either is to fly in the face of experience. It is easy for thought so to emphasize either side of the reality as to exclude the other altogether. It is easy to think of the inherent possession as everything. It is easy to see nothing, as characteristic of man's conscious selfhood, except the independence; to find its whole *differentia* in distinctness; to imagine that separateness is the great reality. One man is distinct from another: and both are distinct from God. I am what I am apart, alone; for good or for evil an object, a centre, and a goal, to myself. Now no doubt very much of *prima facie* consciousness is like this. And no doubt also this sense of self-sufficing independence may be said to have been closely connected, as condition, with not a little of human enterprise and of human excellence.

On the other hand it is not difficult, nor unnatural, at least to reflective thought, to conceive of created consciousness as a mere mode or part of universal consciousness, of the particular as but a partial presentment, a rendering in detail, of the general purpose or mind, of man at his most as a mere element in God. This is the opposite extreme. So far from finding the whole *differentia*

of particular being in distinctness, it really breaks down all distinction whatever. It explains the wonder of created personality quite simply by explaining it away. It merges the individual in the absolute. Whether, on those terms, it would ultimately succeed in conserving any conception of personality at all, even as applied to God, is a question which we need not now ask. Human personality it certainly does not conserve. No doubt it has been at many times usual for thinkers to conceive of personal consciousness, for all purposes, in terms too exclusively of conscious intelligence,—of thought, that is, rather than affection, of mind rather than will. Now it is much easier to think of the particular mind than of the particular will as a mere part or reproduction of the universal. It was therefore perhaps no very unnatural result of this exclusive over-emphasis upon thought or intelligence, if men were unduly disposed to let the idea of real individuality go: or at least if they found themselves in some intellectual difficulty, when they tried to show that their system of thought would not end in the loss of it.

These are the two extremes. But in point of fact either of these by itself is really one-sided. It may be easier, no doubt, as far as simplicity goes, to adopt either view by itself, than to bring the two into harmony. But it would be (what is often tempting to the thinker) a simplicity purchased at the cost of truth. A truer fidelity to experience would make impossible the exclusion or exclusive adoption of either. The logical dilemma is here, as it is so often, out of place. Each may have, indeed, in some sort, to be explained by the other. But the reality, on the one side, of individuality distinct and inherent, and on the other, of fundamental union with, and dependence on, God,—seeing that both are certainly, in some sense, true—cannot constitute any real or final antithesis.

It is to be noticed that they seem most opposed to each other in the earlier and more imperfect stages of consciousness; the consciousness, that is, of children; or of many, it may also be, of us, who are apt to remain as children in things like these. We seem to begin with feeling ourselves wholly by ourselves and to ourselves. This life within,—with its capacities, and its aims, its records, and its hopes,—it is all *my* secret. I know: and no other knows or can know but I. If there be risk run, it is my

risk. If there be achievement, it is my achievement. If there be weakness or wrong, it is alone, it is apart, it is mine, only mine. This sovereign separateness is the very essence and prerogative of my being.

How different from this is the later consciousness—especially of the noblest and the holiest of men. If we look to the picture of them, as it has been again and again unfolded to us,—Behold ! there are no secrets jealously shut off ; but rather every inmost motive and thought laid bare. There is the growing sense of an eye which sees and has seen through every secretest veil ; of a power which has guarded and guards every step of the path ; of a wisdom which has revealed itself to and in the soul with consummate wisdom of patience ; of a power and a love, not originated from within, which have more and more made the consciousness of the very self what it has been, and is, and is capable of becoming. Till the end is at least a conscious approximation towards real union of thought and of spirit—the man characterized through and through by the reality of the indwelling Spirit of God.

Such union is not for a moment the dissolution but the consummation, not the merging, but the crowning, of the several self. Never is the man so perfect in insight and wisdom as when he sees as God sees, and knows according to the truth itself : never is the man so perfectly free as when he can will and does will in absolute accord with the meaning and will of God, which is the highest harmony and perfectness of the nature, made in God's image, which God has bestowed upon him : never is he, as self, so completely all that self had meant, or been, or aspired to mean or become, as when he is at last a conscious and living and willing and joyous reflection of the very being and character of God.

It is true of course that this is transcendently beyond what any man has realized in his experience here and now on earth. The best man, perhaps, has but glimpses,—and his glimpses, though real, may be fitful and overclouded,—even of what he himself really is, and is to be. But it is true also that this is the end towards which the experience of saints is, even visibly, tending in present experience : saintliness is, even here and now, however incompletely, a growth towards the capacity of real



mirroring, through God's gift of power, of the character of God. And it is at the same time true that it is in the final end or goal, it is in the consummation, unattained, indeed, yet more or less certainly discerned—it is not in the essential imperfectness of its first, weak, rudiments—that we shall rightly distinguish the real *differentia* and the true definition of the conscious selfhood of man.

No doubt our language, at its best necessarily figurative, may sometimes, and to some minds or in some parts, obscure the truth which it can but roughly represent. We may speak, as S. Paul spoke, of created human being as, in its ultimate reality, 'reflecting, as a mirror, the glory of the Lord'<sup>1</sup>; but reflection and mirror are metaphors which require to be guarded very carefully. So if we speak of human being as an echo, or a likeness, a reproduction, or an image, or a response: our best words not only say at most but a part of the truth, but with that part they are apt to say also, verbally at least, something else which is not quite true. Take such words, for instance, as 'reflection' or 'response.' We need to make quite clear to our thought the contrast between an active and a passive reflection, between a living and a dead response. The response we speak of must be one of living will: the reflection we mean must be an activity of willing love. Our words will fail at the pinch, unless these things, will, love, life, are found to be implied within the words.

But, if we think, we shall find that they are so implied. There is a sense, indeed, in which all created being is a reflection of something of the Being of God. The snowflake and the crystal have the impress of Him: they are a real part of His revelation. So, in other ways, are the sunset, and the thunder. So, in other ways, are the unconscious growth of an infant, or the instincts of animals, or the motions of the stars. Something there is—a real being, a real beauty, which is *given* to them: which is stamped on them: a stamp, a gift, from the beauty of the being of God. But there is in them no inherent life. There is expression, Divine expression, *through* them: and yet it is not really *they* who express. They? There is no real 'they.' They are but channels, methods, fragments, glimpses, through which God indicates some separate aspect or detail of the expression of Himself.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. iii 18.

How far different is it with the living self of man! It is the prerogative of his created being to have a life which, though none the less absolutely given, is yet given as inherent, when given. It is the true meaning of man's nature not only passively to reflect, as a mirror, some fragment of God's being; not only metaphorically to respond to some isolated attribute of God; but to be a living image—radiating as He radiates: willing as He wills: loving as He loves: nay, even willing with His will, and loving with His love, animated by His spirit, and radiating the very glory of His Person: a response to His essential being; a reflection of His inmost character: a living image of His very self. 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God: and such we are. For this cause the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not. Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is. And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as He is pure<sup>1</sup>.' . . . 'And he that keepeth His commandments abideth in Him, and He in him. And hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He gave us<sup>2</sup>.'

The reflection of the crystal and the snowflake is partial, is passive, is dead. But the reflection of will as will, of life as life, of character as character, of love as love, of sovereign personal being as personal and as sovereign: this cannot be less than personality—royally complete in love and character, in life and reason and will. These are the very things in respect of which man is, in his ideal, the living image, the response to the being, the mirror of the glory, of God. As response, the response would fail, as reflection, the reflection would be untrue, if it did not necessarily contain and imply the livingness of these things.

The union with God, for which man yearns, and which is the consummation and ideal meaning of man's being, is no mere selfless merging in the Divine. The goal of man's being is union, not extinction. 'I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one<sup>3</sup>'; this is the crowning of the perfectness, it is not the obliteration, of man. Merge man's selfhood in the being of God, make him a mere part or mode of

<sup>1</sup> 1 John iii 1-3.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 24.

<sup>3</sup> John xvii 23.

absolute existence: and it would be idle to talk of either reflection or response. The very words necessarily imply such living distinctness as is essential to the possibility of communion and unity. Oneness of Spirit is not mere unity of number. There can be no reality of communion, there can be no living oneness, in simple identity. 'As the Father hath life in Himself, even so gave He to the Son also to have life in Himself.' The ideal goal of man's being is life, a life inherent, with inherency like to the inherency of the life of God: for to image God, to reflect His very being, is the ideal end, which is the real meaning, of man. There would be no living reflection, no radiating, no willing, no intelligence even, if the individual were absorbed within, were a mere part or aspect of, one divinely self-conscious whole.

And yet all this inherency upon which we insist, is itself, as we no less insist, essentially givenness. It is derived, relative, dependent, creaturely. It is not—cannot be—apart, either by itself, or for itself, any more than it is from itself. Its whole excellency depends upon its relativity, upon its reality of communion, upon its oneness of thought, will, love, with God who is its goal as truly as He is its source. It is self, not maintaining its selfhood by separateness, or by the possibility of separating, but rather perfected in the final surrender of all that tends really to separate, glorified in the attainment of a union never again to be impaired or qualified, at rest in perfect harmony with Wisdom and Righteousness and Love, at rest, in oneness of Spirit, in Christ and in God.

In God because in Christ. What is there in the ideal Christian consciousness which is not, to a S. Paul or to a S. John, *in Christ*? The directness of the phrase may stagger us. We may set ourselves to soften it; we may explain what it actually says away: but however we deal with it mentally, we cannot deny that it pervades the thought of the New Testament, and pervades it in this form.

The phrase must needs be the right phrase. But how much does the phrase mean? The question is sometimes raised,—and it is at least a legitimate, if it is hardly an illuminating, question,—whether created persons are to be conceived of as within God, or without? Is God limited by them? Is their being an addition



to the Being of God? and does the addition constitute some existence, besides God, which is not God? The question is a question of logic rather than of reality; a question, that is, not so much of what *is*, as of what human distinctions, of thought and of phrase, are subtle enough to define.

In the light of what has already been said I hope that we shall recognize that there is something really artificial in a question like this; artificial, that is, in the antithesis which it implies, and upon which it depends. But if the question be raised, then neither the simple 'yes' nor the simple 'no,'—neither the simple 'within' nor the simple 'without'—is wholly true as answer without the other. If there is indeed a sense in which created persons are without, yet almost all that is ordinarily meant by that withoutness is in fact a departure from the true law of their being, and is therefore no part of the ideal truth. If there is assuredly a sense in which they are within, that withinness, even in its ideal consummation, leaves them not the less, but so much really the more, self-identical as themselves. There is indeed a true sense in which it may be said of us all, from the beginning, that we are within God: for 'in Him,' as S. Paul preached to the Athenians, 'in Him we live, and move, and have our being'<sup>1</sup>. But the truth here expressed is but shadowy, incomplete, unrealized, when compared with that to which S. Paul looked forward as the far-off ideal, the perfectness which shall be consummated at last, 'when all things have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all'<sup>2</sup>.

Are created persons an addition to God's being, so that His being can be said to be limited,—limited by what they are? In so far as they can be said to be an addition at all, they are certainly an addition which can be said to utter and so to enrich, to express, and to glorify by expressing, rather than in any sense to limit Him. Limitation of God? It would be far nearer to the truth to conceive of them as constituting a new outpouring and enrichment of Divine self-expression through the willing and living reality of selves—of Him, by Him, and unto Him,—of selves whose meaning and whose glory it is—each in his several part, or aspect, or quality—to image faithfully, and to make

<sup>1</sup> Acts xvii 28.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xv 28.

adequate response to, the very character and reality of His being.

It is indeed only too true that though, in divine idea, and in dim underlying possibility, men may be, from the first, within God: there is in them also that which tends to withoutness, and does set them without and apart in some painfully real measure of experience, in proportion as they have rebelled, and have identified themselves with sin. Sin is, in its essence, withoutness. We all, who know what sin is, have some dim instinct at least as to what such withoutness means. And the tendency of sin, progressive and habitual, is towards that consummated separation from the being and nature of God, which is spiritual death. But the sense of withoutness, with which our self-consciousness begins, and which sin terribly accents and tends to make more and more real, is no proper reality—it is rather the contradiction of the proper reality—of what human life means. Only sin is the real withoutness. Very different from this is that element of withoutness (if so it is to be called) or quasi-withoutness, that negation of mere self-destroying identity, that gift of inherency of being, which gives meaning and life to unity. If men's first rudimentary and most imperfect experience lays a wholly undue emphasis on their separate distinctness, as distinctively separating, yet on the other hand, as men grow in divineness of character, and learn more and more how the true meaning of their being is to be One in the Oneness of the Spirit of God; more and more obvious is the sense in which they are not without, but are within, Him,—‘their life is hid with Christ in God’<sup>1</sup>. They are without just so far as to be really,—that is, livingly and lovingly—within. They are without in the sense that they are not self-identical with Him. They are not God, that their surrender, through Him, to union with Him, may be real. They are within more vitally by far than without: yet with a withinness no doubt, of which a sort of withoutness—the distinction which makes mutually conscious relation possible, the distinction implied in every real unity of Spirit—is itself a necessary aspect or condition.

If there is difficulty in this, the difficulty lies in the application of logical distinctions and dilemmas to the complex simplicity of

<sup>1</sup> Col. iii 3.

life. Logic fits perfectly only to things which human thought can wholly analyse and comprehend. Very rarely can human thought so compass (as it were) all round as to comprehend and formulate wholly anything so fundamental as conscious life,—uncreated or even created. But whatever the difficulty of statement may be, to experience at least the reality, if complex, is not perplexing nor difficult at all. Experience knows that both sides of the truth are true, whether logical forms can correlate them fully or no. It would not be after all very profoundly philosophical to explain away either side of a complex experience because it seems hard to adjust it logically with the other.

Christian life, then, our own life, our life in this University, or elsewhere,—is it pitched high enough? Its view of itself, its aspirations for itself, the meaning of its own work, the upshot of its own being,—do they not fall continually below the dignity which is inherently theirs? Men feel sometimes the significance and the solemnity of dying: do they feel the intense solemnity, the divine significance, of living,—of being men? Remember that it is not only immorality or wilful rebellion: it is not only religious indifference or contempt: but it is all pride and bitterness of spirit, or levity of life, or idleness, or unworthy conversation and amusement, it is every form of self-concentration or self-worship, which gives the lie to the true meaning and purpose of human life. In real right, and in real power, are we not more, far more, than we are willing to be? Is it hyperbole if S. Peter speaks of our becoming 'partakers of the Divine nature'? Is S. John's conception of 'fellowship with the Father' or of being 'in Him that is true,'—is our Lord's supreme teaching about inherence in Himself,—so much high-flown and misleading metaphor? The real meaning of you is not to be found so much in your imperfect rudiments as in your ideal consummation; not in your worst but in your best; or rather in that transcendently better, which your best can as yet but faintly adumbrate. In the imperfect stages of human consciousness the meaning of created personality is obscured, and discernible only most imperfectly. In its consummation it is what only the Incarnate has revealed in Humanity: so that even the opening phrases of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or such words as I have taken for my text, are



found at last to have a degree of relevance to it which at first we should never have even dared to dream.

This is the goal and the ideal. It may be that the method of reaching it has some sore surprises and perplexities. Of these we do not speak to-day. Discipline, Sacrifice, Crucifixion,—or, what may be even harder to understand,—confusion, conviction, even (as it seems) utter mental or spiritual overthrow: all these have a place, a strange place sometimes, even a staggering place, in the education of saints. Yet do not, even for these, lose the meaning, or lower the aim, of your own human being. It is hard, through gathering darkness, to keep the ideal very high. Yet in the height of the ideal, there is hope, and there is life. To be men is—as it seems—to be capable of suffering, of sorrow, of perplexity, of remorse, and of shame. Yet to be men *indeed*—is, after all, to be as gods; echoes of God; adequate responses to God; not illustrations only of some attribute of Divine power or beauty, but rather—alive with His life, and aflame with the brightness of the Spirit of His love, and possessed through and through with the fire of adoration towards Him—light of His light, and fire of His fire, and righteous will of His righteous will!—real, personal, living reflections, or images, of Himself: of His character, and of His Being.

R. C. MOBERLY.

## THE CODE OF ḤAMMURABI, FRESH MATERIAL FOR COMPARISON WITH THE MOSAIC CODE<sup>1</sup>.

THE French Government have long been subsidising explorations at Susa, the ancient Persepolis, and capital of an old Elamite Kingdom. These explorations have been conducted by M. De Morgan, and have resulted in some extraordinarily valuable discoveries. Not only have a multitude of inscriptions been found belonging to the native rulers, but also many very perfectly preserved monuments of Babylonia. These seem to have been carried away as spoil to Susa, in some of the Elamite invasions of Babylonia. With a promptitude that is of priceless worth to the student, the French Minister of Public Instruction publishes, at frequent intervals, the *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*, in a style worthy of the most enlightened people of Europe. The fourth volume has just appeared and contains an almost complete text of the celebrated Code of Laws, already ascribed to Ḥammurabi, but hitherto known only from small disjointed fragments.

The monument itself, from which this text is taken, is a block of black diorite, about eight feet high, once containing twenty-one columns on its obverse, of which sixteen remain, with 1,114 lines of writing; and twenty-eight columns on the reverse, almost perfectly preserved, with 2,540 lines. At the top of the obverse is a very fine representation of Ḥammurabi, king of Babylon, circa B. C. 2285, receiving his laws from the seated sun-god Šamaš. Copies of this monument were set up in Babylonia, as the king himself says, 'that any one oppressed or injured, who had a tale of woe to tell, might come and stand before his image, that of

<sup>1</sup> Paper read before the Cambridge Theological Society, October, 1902. (Abridged by W. E. B.)

a king of righteousness, and there read the priceless orders of the king and from the written monument solve his problem.' The king devotes some 700 lines of his inscription to the commemoration of his own glory, and that of the gods whom he worshipped; to blessing those who should reverence and protect his monument, and to cursing those who should deface or remove it. This portion is intensely interesting for its historical and theological bearings, revealing to us the varied cults of the different cities subject to Hāmmurabi's control. We read of Assyria, and perhaps also of Nineveh, though the city meant may be the old Babylonian Nina. Very interesting too, is the position of supremacy ascribed to the god Ilu, doubtless the Hebrew El.

The Elamite monarch who carried off this monument clearly intended, in defiance of the curses recorded upon it, to place his name and titles there. At any rate, five columns were erased and the stone repolished for the purpose; but, as he had gone so far, it is a matter of regret that he did not leave any clue to his identity. Nothing has been inscribed on this space. Hence it is impossible to date its removal to Susa. Nor do we know from what part of Babylonia it was removed. Indeed, as Hāmmurabi conquered Elam, he may himself have set up the monument in Susa. He doubtless set up a duplicate in each town of his empire. A fragment, found in Susa, is part of one such duplicate.

The scribes of Ašurbānīpal, king of Assyria, B.C. 668-625, had somewhere found a copy, for there are preserved in the British Museum many fragments which give portions of the text of this Code, and even furnish part of the lost five columns. Copies made in the later times of the New Babylonian Empire also exist in the British Museum and the Berlin Museum. One such fragment at Berlin shews that the scribes had divided the text for the purposes of study into a series of about twelve tablets. The title which they gave to the series was *Nbu Ilu širum*, actually the first words on the Susa monument. A tablet in the British Museum suggests that in Assyria the series had fifteen tablets and had a different title, perhaps 'the judgements of Hāmmurabi.' These many fragments had long been recognised as forming something very like a code of laws; were correctly assigned—from their peculiar forms of expression, and, above all, from the scales of land and corn measures used in them—to the time of the First Dynasty of



Babylon; and even termed provisionally the Code Hammurabi.

Beside these fragments thousands of deeds of sale, contracts, memoranda, letters and other documents have reached our museums from Babylonia, which belong to the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon about B.C. 2400-2150. These have been partly published and studied by scholars, among whom we may mention Strassmaier, Révillout, Meissner, Peiser, Pinches and King; and we already knew a great deal about the civil law of Babylonia. But we were hitherto almost entirely uninformed about the criminal law. Further, this Code now systematises the scattered hints, often obscure, which had to be acquired by research and deductive reasonings.

We are still without a code of ritual and ceremonial law for this period. But amid the treasures of our museums lie unpublished materials for these also, and much can be made out from the copies of the later scribes. We have now a wonderful opportunity of estimating the care and accuracy with which the scribes of Assyria and Babylonia reproduced from the monuments themselves, or from earlier copies, documents written fifteen centuries before. They preserved, with the utmost fidelity, even archaic orthography which had no meaning for them, and measures which they did not understand. Their copies, it is true, do not exactly reproduce our monumental text, but the variants are few, and probably due to the fact that their copies were made from a duplicate of our text. Such variants are extremely valuable as they help to restore or understand damaged or obscure places. The monument itself was probably engraved by a stone-cutter from a clay tablet containing a draft of the inscription, and if it was engraved by the order of Hammurabi, by an Elamite in Susa, this may account for a few slips which are evident in the text.

The text of the monument is superbly reproduced by photogravure from the monument itself, or from 'squeezes.' It is accompanied by an admirable transcription into Roman letters, and a translation by Father V. Scheil, O.P., *Professeur à l'École pratique des Hautes Études*. He has divided the Code into sections, according to subject-matter, there being no indication of such sectional division on the monument. In many cases,

exception may be taken to the division, and it certainly does not agree with that of the scribes of Assyria and Babylonia, but until prolonged study has settled all points, it seems futile to attempt a revision, and the editor's division will be adopted here.

The first two sections are devoted to penalties against witchcraft or rather the abuse of it. In the very home of magic and sorcery this is at least remarkable. The first section enacts the death penalty against any one who shall put a death spell upon another, without justification. This justification is a special feature of the Code. Complete liberty of trial, the whole economy of a law court appears in full force. Judges, witnesses, the reception of evidence upon oath, reasonable delay for the production of evidence, enactments against tampering with witnesses, against false judgements, all the modern securities for justice, except perhaps the presence of professional lawyers as advocates, are referred to, assumed to be well known. In many cases the procedure is further systematised and controlled.

The death penalty is liberally awarded, as in other early codes. We are nowhere told how, or by whom, it was executed. But it is clear that the time when the injured party exacted vengeance had long passed away. Usually the penalty of death is stated in the formula *iddak*, 'he shall be killed,' or impersonally, 'one shall put him to death.' In the cases where the impersonal use appears, we may have either a singular or plural form, leaving us in complete ignorance as to whether there were a judge, an executioner, or the people of the city as a subject. The few cases where we might imagine the injured party to be the subject are just as well taken to be impersonal uses also.

In considering the relation of the Code to others, it is natural to pass in review first the cases where the death penalty is enacted. Usually this is set down without any specification of its nature. Besides the case of witchcraft above, it is awarded for threatening a witness in a capital case, § 3; for sacrilegious entry of, and theft from, temple or palace, § 6; for kidnapping a free-born child, § 14; for housebreaking, § 21; for brigandage, § 22; for rape of a betrothed maiden living at home, § 130; for building a house so badly as to bring about the death of its owner, § 229; for striking a pregnant woman, if of gentle birth, and causing her death, § 209.

Special forms of the death penalty are attached to crimes of an exceptionally exasperating nature, or with a view to make the penalty more impressive, or as perpetuating ancient custom. These are in a few cases specified by accompanying circumstances as especially appropriate to the crime. Thus a housebreaker, who tunnelled through the walls of a house (a peculiar peril where the walls, as in Babylonia, were built of adobes or unburnt bricks), was not only to be killed, but 'enholed.' One can hardly regard the penalty as referring to mere burial in the earth, opposite the tunnel's mouth, for the verb is also used of a flock passing within a gate. But the man might be buried at the mouth of the tunnel he had made, probably leading from the interior of an adjoining house. This would have the effect of desecrating that house, which may be imagined to be the house-breaker's, and rendering it uninhabitable, a standing monument of his crime. However, the question is not easily decided, till we know whether burial in the earth was a disgrace.

Actual mention of the manner of death is rare. Drowning is referred to, probably, by the expression 'he shall be thrown into the waters.' The fatal result is implied. The literal meaning of the verb is 'to lay down,' and perhaps the method adopted implied a previous binding, or weighting, so as to ensure drowning. This penalty was inflicted upon a wine-seller who sold wine too cheap, or cheated her customers, § 108; on a wife, who in her husband's enforced absence, as a captive, although provided with maintenance, should desert his home for another, § 133; for a ruinous bad wife, § 143. These are all penalties for women. Drowning, perhaps as less painful, seems to have been the woman's death penalty. But if a woman was caught in adultery, she and her paramour were tied together and so drowned, § 129. Perhaps the disgrace of a woman's death, or more likely the appropriateness of both sharing the same penalty, decided this use. A man who had intercourse with his son's wife was drowned, § 155. This seems aberrant, but may be due to old custom. Burning was the penalty of the votary who opened a wine shop, or entered one, § 110. As a Šamaš devotee she was probably a vestal, and penalty by fire may have been peculiarly appropriate. A mother and son who committed incest were to be burned, § 157. Crucifixion, or rather impalement, was



the penalty for a wife, who, for love of another man, procured the death of her husband, § 153.

As likely to result in death, the ordeal by water must be considered next. This was to be submitted to by a man who was charged with laying a disabling spell upon another, § 2. He was to jump into the holy river, probably the Euphrates, and if he sank the charge was considered to be proved, and his accuser was to take his house. But if the holy river preserved him, he was taken to be absolved by the river god, and his accuser was put to death, while he took his accuser's house. So, too, if a woman was suspected of infidelity by her husband, but not caught in the act, she must submit to this ordeal for the satisfaction of her husband, § 132.

Mutilation as a penalty comes into the Code in two ways. First, as a mere retaliation for a mutilation. Eye for eye, § 196; tooth for tooth, § 198; limb for limb, § 197, are examples of this principle. The second seems to have its root idea in the punishment of the offending member. When a surgeon through want of skill or care causes the death of a patient under an operation, his offending hands are to be cut off, § 218. If a son struck his father the same penalty was inflicted, § 195. More remote is the case of the wet nurse, who substitutes another child for the child confided to her care, which has died through her neglect; her breasts, as the symbols of her office, are to be cut off, § 194.

If a slave repudiated his master's authority his ear, as the organ of hearing and understanding, and therefore of obedience, was cut off, § 282. If a slave broke the crown (?) of a gentleman he suffered the same penalty, § 205. The actual motive of the form which the punishment took, in the case of an illegitimate child of a votary, or palace guard, who, being adopted into an honourable family, dared to repudiate his adoptive parents, is obscure. His tongue, perhaps as the offending member, was cut out, § 192. If he found out his real parents and went back to them his eyes were torn out, § 193. A man taken to look after a field, provided with all needful means to carry on his work, was condemned to have his hands cut off if he stole the crops, § 253.

Scourging is only once named, § 202. It was to be done with a cowhide whip, and if a gentleman broke the crown (?) of another

above him in rank, the penalty was sixty lashes, laid on before the assembly, or in public.

Branding on the forehead was the punishment for slander of a votary or a married woman, § 127.

Banishment from the city was the penalty of incest with a daughter, § 154.

Having passed in review the severer penalties, it remains to notice other forms of penalty, many of which are alternative to the above when the crime admits of more or less palliation.

Confiscation to the state can hardly be said to exist, except in § 41, where the fencing put in by a man who has taken possession of an official's endowment holding is taken by the official on his return to his property.

The cases where, as in the case of witchcraft, § 2, the victorious party enters into possession of the defeated, and now deceased, party's house, seem more like it, but are rather compensation for vexatious disturbance.

Restitution plays a considerable rôle in the machinery of justice. It may be simple or manifold. Simple restitution appears in the case of a purchaser, who buys lost or stolen property from the thief or finder, but, being made to restore the property to its rightful owner, receives back his purchase money from the estate of the thief, § 9.

Far more common is multiple restitution. For a false judgement, involving the exaction of a penalty, the false judge had to restore the exacted sum twelvefold, though the penalty was not paid to him, § 5. For theft from the estate of a temple, or palace, a gentleman had to restore thirtyfold, a plebeian tenfold, either in default being put to death, § 8. In the case above named of sale of lost or stolen property, reclaimed from the purchaser, if the thief was dead, and so could not suffer penalty, the defrauded purchaser was repaid fivefold his purchase money from the thief's estate, § 11. For loss or misappropriation of goods entrusted for carriage fivefold, § 112. For repudiation of money entrusted to sell on commission threefold, § 106; for extortion of more than is due from an agent sixfold, § 107.

Lesser penalties, chiefly entailing fines or the payment of damages, are very common. They are restitutions, simple or multiple, but do not imply a wrongful profit or gain taken by the offender.



If a man lets out the canal waters and floods a field, he shall pay 10 *GUR* of corn per *GAN* of land, § 56. It is probable that this was the *šimdat šani*, or royal standard rate, so often referred to in the contracts. Here there seems to be a suggestion of malice or at least mischief.

If a shepherd puts his sheep to feed on the green corn, without agreement with the owner of the field, and has eaten up the field, the owner shall harvest his crop, but the shepherd shall pay over and above 20 *GUR* of corn per *GAN*, § 57.

The Babylonian was a business man and keenly attached to his money. Doubtless it was no light penalty which made him lose his money in some cases. It was forbidden to certain officers, whose offices were endowed, to part with any of the endowment, house, field, land, garden, sheep, or cattle, which the king had given them. A buyer, who, in face of this enactment, was foolish enough to buy what the officer was forbidden to sell, must return his purchase, and as a penalty lose his money, §§ 35, 37.

The Code, however, was by no means occupied solely with criminal law; it laid down many duties and defined responsibilities. Even these were largely prohibitory in character. Only once is a reward mentioned, two shekels being offered for bringing back a runaway slave, and that seems to be inserted to settle disputes as to how much the service rendered was worth. The Code fixes the reward at one-tenth of the average value.

The Code regulated the conditions of deposit for safe keeping, which must be done before witnesses and a sealed receipt taken for the goods deposited, otherwise no claim could be set up. But if the deposit was made in proper form, return of the goods on demand was enforced, and no plea of loss or diminution allowed.

A woman was not married unless there was a marriage contract *riksditi*, properly 'bonds.' On this point the Code is explicit. If a man take to wife a woman and has not laid down her bonds, that woman is not a wife, § 128. The ceremony denoted by *asšatum ahđzu* was not legally sufficient. Something of the nature of this ceremony we may gather from the *Tablet of the Wedding Ceremony*, published by Dr. T. G. Pinches, where it seems that the officiating minister placed his hands and feet in contact with the hands and feet of the bridegroom. Then the bride laid her neck on the bridegroom, who repeated a formula,



'Silver and gold shall fill thy lap, thou art my wife, I am thy husband. Like the fruit of a garden will I give thee offspring.' Then followed a ceremony which seems to have consisted in binding sandals on the feet of the newly wedded pair, and delivering to them a shoelatchet (?), and a purse of silver and gold. The celebration of the ceremony seems not to have been a priestly rite, but could be performed by any freeman.

But the marriage contract was a duly certified document. It might contain provisos to the effect that the wife should not be liable for debts contracted by the husband before marriage. This was held to be mutually exclusive of the debts contracted by the wife before marriage. The husband would not be liable for them. But both were liable for all debts contracted after marriage. The contract might contain further stipulations that if the husband took another wife, or a concubine, he was to allow his wife to go away, and must resign her marriage portion to her, or if she had none pay her a mina of silver.

Unjust suspicions on the part of the husband were met by an oath on the part of the wife that she was faithful; she might then return to her house, § 131.

The Code recognises three distinct classes of the whole population, apart from such professional elements as were separated by their function. These differed in status in the eye of the law. They had different privileges and penalties.

The first class was the *amêlu*, or aristocrat. The word is used again and again as a distinct title, like the word *bêlu*. It may be connected with a word *nêmalu* meaning 'property.' At any rate, it denotes a man who was free, and possessed of lands, houses, slaves, and other property. He was always fined or punished more severely than either of the other classes. Whether really more numerous than the rest of the population, or not, the term *amêlu* is used continually to denote 'a man,' in general, a person, and may then be rendered 'one.' From the usage of the Code we might conclude that, in general, only the *amêlu* was legislated for, and that a side glance at the others was enough. In later times the sign *LU*, read *amêlu*, is the common determinative of officials, if not of personality, being used before every title of office, trade, or occupation, even before the word *ardu*, 'slave,' or *mâru*, 'son.' But some recollection of *amêlu* as aristocrat lingered

in the use of *LU-GAL*, properly *amēlu rabū*, as ideogram for *larru*, 'king,' who was thus the First Gentleman of Babylonia. In many tablets of the First Dynasty *amēlu* denotes the king himself. In the Code, the *amēlu*, when contrasted with the other classes, is assigned 'a palace.' In every town there was one or more of these 'great houses.' From the ranks of these persons of distinction were drawn all the officials, and probably the officers of the army. But many seem to have held no office at all. It seems that they paid taxes consisting of imposts on land. Some held land subject to the obligation of furnishing a quota to the army, which they discharged by means of slaves. They also were under obligations to furnish certain contributions to temples. Whether they paid tithe is not yet made out clearly.

The second class was the 'poor' man, the *mukēnu*. It is difficult to devise a name for him which does not carry with it some implications, either foreign to the Babylonian so designated, or, at least not clearly made out for him. The 'abject' is too pronounced, 'commoner' might do very well if we could forget that there were slaves also. This person was quite free, but supposed not to be able to meet such heavy obligations as the *amēlu*. He seems to have had an obligation to serve both on public works and in the ranks of the army. His fines and penalties were assessed as low as one-third of those due from an *amēlu* for the same offences. His offerings were also expected to be much less. But he was not absolutely destitute. He could hold slaves of his own, and might have lands, houses, and property as an *amēlu* had. He had no civil disabilities, as far as can be seen. The name by which he is designated, *mukēnu*, passed into Hebrew as *miskēn*, thence through Arabic into French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese with small change. He never appears in office, nor does he earn his living by a trade; but he sometimes worked for hire.

The poverty of his condition may be the explanation of the fact that, while injuries done to an *amēlu* were punished by exact retaliation, the same injuries done to a *mukēnu* were paid for. But when an injury was done him, for which an *amēlu* could have claimed a fixed compensation, the *mukēnu* had to be content with less. He, however, paid lower fees to the doctor for his cure.

The slave was not a person, but a thing; as was also a son

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The following is a summary of the main points of the article. The author discusses the importance of the study of the history of the church in the modern world. He argues that the church has a duty to be relevant to the needs of the present. The author also discusses the role of the church in society and the importance of the church's witness to the world. The author concludes that the church must be a church that is both faithful and relevant.





rule of Babylonia, and must have moulded the development in Canaan before the Tell-el-Amarna period. Whatever view we take of the history of Israel, and however strongly we hold to an independent source for its institutions, we cannot deny that there was direct influence from Babylonia. Recalling all that Europe owes to the Hebrew race and the Phoenician trader, we cannot but feel an awe and reverence for the great world power that lay behind both, one of whose most striking monuments must ever be the Code of Ḥammurabi.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

## THE PASSOVER AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IN the April issue of THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES there appeared an article by the Rev. G. H. BOX on 'The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist,' in which he advocated the theory that the real antecedent of the Lord's Supper was the weekly Kiddûsh and not the Passover. The theory is interesting as an attempt to derive some fresh light upon an obscure subject from Jewish institutional and religious history, a quarter which, as Mr. Box justly remarks, has been too much neglected of late, to the frequent detriment of critical conclusions. Mr. Box, however, is not quite correct in his surmise that the explanation he suggests is one which has hitherto been overlooked in all discussions of the subject, for in an article by Canon Foxley in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1899, a similar suggestion was thrown out as to a connexion between the Christian Eucharist and the weekly Sanctification, or Kiddûsh, of the Jews<sup>1</sup>. Canon Foxley, however, did not develop the idea; and, so far as we are aware, Mr. Box is the first to elaborate what may be called the Kiddûsh theory of the Supper.

### I.

There can be little doubt that any theory which proposes to set aside the traditional view of the Church, that Jesus instituted the Supper at a paschal meal, must not merely show its own applicability to the historical situation, but first adduce very strong reasons against the tenableness of the ordinary opinion. Quite properly, therefore, Mr. Box begins his article by setting forth the grounds on which he has been led to the conclusion that the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Spitta, *Urchristentum*, p. 247; Drews, *Eucharistie*, in Hauck-Herzog, *Real-Encyc.* v 563.

Last Supper was not a Passover Supper. These grounds are all the more worthy of attention that they are fairly typical of those which have been urged, not infrequently of late, by various writers who have sought to maintain that no historical connexion can be established between the Passover and the Eucharist. In my opinion, however, it is precisely at this important preliminary stage that the weakest links in Mr. Box's argument are to be found. He does not do anything like justice to the Synoptic statements that Jesus actually observed the Passover on the night before He died.

1. In the first place, he rests his proof on the self-contradictory character of the Synoptic evidence, and in support of this refers specially to Chwolson's contention, in his *Letztes Passamahl Christi*, that the expression 'the first day of unleavened bread' has always been understood by Jewish writers, both ancient and modern, to refer to Nisan 15th, whereas the Passover lamb was always sacrificed on Nisan 14th, so that the words 'on the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrificed the Passover,' really contain a contradiction in terms. This argument Mr. Box holds to be absolutely decisive. But if all Jewish writers from the earliest times down to the present day have understood that the first day of unleavened bread was the 15th Nisan, it is very difficult to believe that in the Synoptic tradition, which comes to us from Jewish sources, so glaring and self-evident a blunder could be made. It is much more natural to conclude that the self-contradiction is due, not to the Synoptic tradition, but to a later error that has crept into the text. And this, be it remarked, is Chwolson's own view, for, though Mr. Box does not make this apparent, it is only the first half of Chwolson's argument that he quotes, while he arrives at precisely an opposite conclusion from that learned Hebrew scholar. Chwolson's point is that the phrase 'on the first day of unleavened bread' is a manifest textual blunder; and assuming that the narrative in Matthew is based upon an Aramaic source, he shows how, by the mere dropping out of one of two groups of four identical letters, which would be found in immediate conjunction in the Aramaic rendering of the statement, 'The day of unleavened bread drew near, and the disciples drew near to Jesus,' that statement would be transformed into what we now find in Matt. xxvi 17, viz. 'On the first



THE PASSOVER AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

...of the *JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* ...  
...by the Rev. G. H. ...  
...of the Eucharist in which he ...  
...of the Lord's Supper ...  
...the Passover. The theory is ...  
...light upon an obscure ...  
...and religious history, a ...  
...has been too much neglect ...  
...of critical conclusions. Mr. ...  
...that the explanation ...  
...has been overlooked.

day of unleavened bread the disciples drew near to Jesus<sup>1</sup>. And this simple explanation of the difficulty, he points out, is confirmed by the reading of the Sahidic Version of Luke xxii 7, which runs, 'The day of unleavened bread was near, on which the Passover must be sacrificed<sup>2</sup>.'

2. Mr. Box's next ground is what he calls the 'significant' omission in all the Synoptic accounts of any mention of the paschal lamb. But is the omission in the least significant, after all? It would be so only on the supposition that the Evangelists would naturally have given some account of the progress of the Passover Supper, if it was a Passover Supper, out of which the Christian Sacrament sprang. But they had already indicated quite unmistakably that the meal to which Jesus sat down with His disciples was a paschal meal; and this being so, it was not necessary for them to give any account of the proceedings, since all Passover Suppers were perfectly alike. What they were concerned with, and what they reported, were those new and significant acts and words of Jesus by which He instituted that holy Sacrament, which sprang indeed out of the preceding paschal meal, and yet completely transcended it.

3. Further, Mr. Box draws attention to the fact that only *one* cup is mentioned in the accounts of the Supper, and that this cup was partaken of by *all*, whereas at the paschal meal each man had his own cup to drink from. But this objection, like the preceding one, appears to be suggested by a confusion between two things which, though closely related, are perfectly distinct—the Passover Supper and the Eucharist. If every participant in the Jewish meal did drink out of his own cup, that is no reason, surely, why Jesus in the institution of the Christian rite should not have taken one cup and passed it round to each of the disciples. The fact that it is called τὸ ποτήριον by St. Paul and St. Luke does not necessarily imply that only one cup was on the table, but simply designates this particular cup, from the point of view of the writers and their readers, as the familiar Cup of the Lord's Table.

<sup>1</sup> *Das letzte Passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Willoughby C. Allen, in a recent article in the *Expository Times* (April, 1902, p. 330), on 'The Aramaic Element in St. Mark,' agrees with Chwolson that it is probable that Mark xiv 12 and parallels present a corruption which is due to translation from the Aramaic.

4. The fourth ground of objection is the discrepancy between the Lucan account and that of the other Synoptists. But this discrepancy is arrived at only by means of the assumption that 'according to the true text' the shorter form of St. Luke's narrative of the Supper is the proper one, and that it 'is now generally agreed' that this is the case. It is hardly legitimate, however, to make such an assumption, although, no doubt, it is frequently made<sup>1</sup>. The deservedly great authority of Westcott and Hort has certainly weighed heavily in this matter, especially with English students. But even Professors Sanday and Plummer, two eminent and careful English scholars who have recently discussed the question, while themselves deciding in favour of the 'Western' reading, do not go the length of describing it as the true text. Dr. Sanday says of the two types of text that there can be no doubt that both of them existed early in the second century, and adds, 'either may be original<sup>2</sup>.' And Dr. Plummer does not go further than to maintain that, in any discussion of the accounts of the institution, the whole passage in Luke should be treated as doubtful<sup>3</sup>. In Germany, on the other hand, it is the marked tendency of recent critical opinion, especially in the case of those who have made a special study of the Lord's Supper, to go back to the reading of the *Textus Receptus* as the correct one after all. Jülicher regards the decision of Westcott and Hort as a mistake<sup>4</sup>, while Schmiedel describes the variant reading of the 'Western' text as 'an abnormality of no significance<sup>5</sup>.' And Lutheran, Neo-Lutheran, Roman Catholic and advanced critical scholars in the majority of cases now range themselves on the same side<sup>6</sup>, so that Professor Menzies is by no means over-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Wright, for instance, in his *New Testament Problems* (p. 136), uses the very same expression as Mr. Box, 'according to the true text,' to describe the shorter reading of the Lucan narrative.

<sup>2</sup> Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii 636.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* iii 146.

<sup>4</sup> 'Doch halte ich die beiden Verse aus äusseren und inneren Gründen für echt lucanisch, und ihre Streichung für einen methodischen Fehler.' *Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weisäcker gewidmet*, p. 235.

<sup>5</sup> *Protestantische Monatshefte*, 1899, Heft iv, p. 125.

<sup>6</sup> Besides Jülicher and Schmiedel, quoted above, reference may be made to the following among recent writers: Cremer ('Abendmahl,' in Hauck-Herzog, *Real-encyclopädie*, i 33); Schultzen (*Das Abendmahl im N. T.* p. 112); Schaefer (*Das Herrenmahl nach Ursprung und Bedeutung*, p. 148); Clemen (*Der Ursprung des heiligen Abendmahls*, pp. 21 f.); Schweitzer (*Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem*



stating the case when he says that criticism on the whole is inclined to decide against the reading adopted by Westcott and Hort<sup>1</sup>. Undoubtedly it is true that, on grounds of pure text-criticism, there is a great deal to be said for the 'Western' reading, but the textual arguments against it are not less weighty. And when we fall back, as we are entitled to do in such a case, upon broader considerations of a contextual and psychological kind, it seems much more likely that the variant text represented by Cod. D is due to the error of a copyist, than that it is the original text of the Evangelist himself. If it is difficult, as Westcott and Hort insist, to see how a copyist, with the longer text before him, could produce the shorter form which we find in Cod. D, it seems much more difficult to explain how St. Luke himself could have given us an account of the Lord's Supper which differs so widely from the accepted tradition of his time, and especially from that form of the tradition which is represented by St. Paul.

## II.

Mr. Box's negative criticism, then, is far from convincing; and when he comes to the more constructive side of his task, and endeavours in support of the Kiddûsh theory to give an explanation of the origin of the accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper which we find in the first two Synoptists and St. Paul, he does not appear to be more successful. He admits that in the narratives of Mark, Matthew, and 1 Corinthians the paschal features are pronounced, but suggests that these features have been developed under the influence of the symbolism of the Passion. 'Christ being the Christian's true paschal lamb (1 Cor. v 7), the memorial of the Last Supper naturally developed into the Christian Haggada—the "showing" (A. V.) or "proclaiming" (R. V.) of the Lord's death till He come (1 Cor. xi 26).' But is there not here, to say the least, a possibility of circular reasoning? The fact that Christ is the Christian's true paschal lamb is assumed as the secret of the development of the idea that the Last Supper was a paschal supper. But how was it, we have to ask, that Christ came to be regarded so universally as the true paschal lamb? Was it not, above all, because under the symbols

*Leben Jesu*, Erstes Heft, p. 46); Berning (*Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistia*, pp. 42 f.).

<sup>1</sup> *Expositor*, October, 1899, p. 243.

of the bread and wine He had set Himself, at the Last Supper, side by side with the symbols of the preceding paschal feast? This is a hypothesis quite as credible at all events as the other, and is not affected by the fact that according to St. John's narrative Jesus died at the hour when the paschal lambs were sacrificed in the temple, or by St. Paul's words, 'For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ' (1 Cor. v 7).

It is difficult, too, to see how the influence of the symbolism of the Passion, however that symbolism is to be accounted for, can have operated so powerfully within the very first Christian generation as to transform the historical tradition regarding a plain matter of fact. Mr. Box admits the marked paschal features of St. Paul's account of the Supper, though he suggests that 'the stereotyped character of the language—so unlike Paul's usual manner,' points to the conclusion that we have here, in fact, a citation by St. Paul of a liturgical formula already current when he wrote. It is extremely unlikely that there were any liturgical formulas, in the proper sense of the word, at the time when 1 Corinthians was written. But in any case, Mr. Box's supposition implies that when St. Paul wrote his narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper, the tradition as to the paschal character of the preceding meal had already become definitely fixed. And how, we must ask, are we to account for the growth and prevalence of such a tradition at the very centre of primitive Christianity, and during the lifetime of those who had sat down with Jesus at the table in the upper room?

Still further, Mr. Box seeks to support the thesis that Kiddûsh and not the Passover was the antecedent of the Christian Sacrament by arguing that, both at the original institution and in the observance of the Lord's Supper in the primitive Church, the cup was passed before the bread, and also by maintaining that, in the 'bread-breaking' of the early Christian communities, the Eucharist preceded the Agape, and not the Agape the Eucharist, as is commonly supposed. With regard to the first point the New Testament evidence is certainly against him. Leaving out St. Luke's statement as doubtful, we have the Apostle Paul and the first two Evangelists all testifying quite expressly in their historical narratives of the original institution that the bread was passed before the cup. Against this it is vain to set the fact that in 1 Cor. x 16,

where he is not speaking of the order of the institution at all, Paul refers to the cup of blessing before speaking of the bread which is broken. This unusual arrangement may be held to be balanced by the fact that in the immediately preceding paragraph Paul puts the eating of the spiritual meat before the drinking of the spiritual drink (1 Cor. x 3, 4). And if a special explanation is required, it will be found naturally enough in the circumstance that he is about to trace a parallel between the celebration of the Lord's Supper and the sacrificial meals of the heathen, and that in the latter the blessing of the cup stood in the very forefront of the proceedings as the most significant act of all.

As for the view that originally the Eucharist took place at the beginning and not at the end of the common meal, it may safely be affirmed that the New Testament gives little support to it, and that it finds hardly any favour at the hands of historical scholars. Our historical critics are much divided at present as to whether or not there was at first any distinction between the Agape and the Eucharist, some holding with Jülicher and Spitta that there was no real distinction<sup>1</sup>, others with Harnack and Zahn that there was<sup>2</sup>. But those who distinguish between them almost without exception maintain, just as Bishop Lightfoot did, that the Eucharist came in as the culminating point of a preceding common meal. A quotation from Chrysostom as to the custom in his time is of little value as bearing upon the original practice, for by the fourth century the custom of fasting communion had taken firm root, owing to the gradual growth of the feeling that it was unbecoming to partake of the Eucharist after other food<sup>3</sup>. But it is difficult to see how, with the order of the original Supper before them, the apostles would place the Eucharist before the common meal. Is it not probable, too, that when Paul used the words *μετὰ τὸ δεיπνήσαι* (1 Cor. xi 25), he did so, not for historical reasons alone, but because the expression had a bearing upon the proper procedure in the observance of the Lord's Supper as he himself was familiar with it<sup>4</sup>?

<sup>1</sup> Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 232; Spitta, *Urchristentum*, p. 246.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vii 2, p. 140; Zahn, *Brot und Wein*, &c. p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharist in the Early Church*, pp. 167 f.

<sup>4</sup> See Meyer and Schmiedel (*Hand-Commentar*) *in loco*; cf. Keating, *op. cit.* p. 167.



## III.

And now to come back to the problem of the apparent discrepancy between the Synoptic and the Johannine accounts; it seems better to be content, with Professor Sanday, to confess our ignorance than to adopt a theory which would involve the rejection of the Synoptic narratives as altogether unreliable<sup>1</sup>. And if we are unwilling to rest in a mere confession of ignorance, there are provisional theories open to us, on the lines of a reasonable harmonistic, for which much more can be said than for any theory which has to begin by throwing aside the Synoptic evidence that the Last Supper was a Passover. To one of these, the theory of an anticipated Passover, Mr. Box refers, but says that it 'will not bear examination.' It is significant, however, that the two scholars who have most recently made a careful and scientific examination of the history of Jesus, Professor Sanday in England and Professor Zöckler in Germany, are by no means disposed to treat this theory so cavalierly. Professor Sanday's opinion on this point is of special interest, because, as his various writings show, his mind has been attracted throughout the whole course of his life as a critical student of the New Testament by the problems that surround the chronology of the Passion. And he says, in rejecting a view which at one time he was tempted to entertain, viz. that the Passover of which John speaks was not the Passover proper, but the eating of the Chagigah: 'It is more likely that for some reason or other the regular Passover was anticipated'<sup>2</sup>. And Zöckler, again, adopts the opinion quite positively that the Last Supper of Jesus was 'certainly an anticipated passover-meal, resembling the ordinary Passover in form and order, but held a day before the statutory date'<sup>3</sup>.

There are still difficulties, however, attaching to this theory, although Chwolson seems to have removed the more serious objections to it<sup>4</sup>. And so it is interesting for those who, with Professor Sanday, are unwilling, until due cause is shown, to believe that the contradiction between St. John and the Synoptists is final to find that quite recently a solution of the problem has

<sup>1</sup> Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, p. 634.

<sup>2</sup> *op. cit.* ii 634.

<sup>3</sup> Article 'Jesus Christus' in *Real-Encyc.* (Hauck-Herzog), ix pp. 32, 42.

<sup>4</sup> *op. cit.* pp. 37 ff.

been proposed from the very quarter to which Mr. Box himself looks hopefully, the sphere, viz. of Jewish religious institutions. The Rev. Matthew Power, S. J.,<sup>1</sup> has recently suggested a theory which, if established, would prove that while the Synoptists are correct in their statements that Jesus celebrated the Passover, St. John also is right when he represents that the Jews of Jerusalem did not keep the feast till the evening of the Crucifixion day; and yet neither was the Passover of Jesus an anticipated one, nor that of the Jews a postponed one, at least in the ordinary sense of the words 'anticipated' and 'postponed.' Mr. Power claims to have discovered the secret of the operation of that hidden rule of the Jewish Calendarists which is known as 'Badhu,' according to which the Passover never falls on a Friday (counted, i. e. according to the Jewish style of reckoning, from sunset on Thursday to sunset on Friday). Save for the furtive disturbing influence of this rule, the Passover would, of course, naturally fall from time to time on the *προσάβατον*; but, in point of fact, such a thing as a Friday Passover is unknown to Jewish history. The working of this rule, it would appear, has been kept a profound mystery by the Calendarists, in whose hands the appointment of the date of the Passover lies, the reason probably being that no Jew is willing to admit that there are any exceptions to 'the age-long boast of the children of Israel that the new moon is the sole ruler of their liturgical year.' But the rule, when discovered, is exceedingly simple. When it is foreseen that, without arbitrary intervention, the Passover would fall on the Jewish Friday, one day is added to the eighth month (Hesvan) of the preceding year, in accordance with the traditional prescription of 'Badhu,' and so the next Passover is transferred from the Friday to the Saturday. This was what happened in the year of our Lord's death. By strict chronology and in harmony with the Scriptural law, the Passover, Mr. Power seeks to prove, should have fallen that year on the Jewish Friday. But 'Badhu' forbade; and so it had been transferred by the rulers of the Jewish year to the Saturday, i. e. the Jewish Sabbath (cf. John xix 31: 'the day of that Sabbath was a high day'). But Jesus disregarded the arbitrary operation of the traditional rule, and kept the Passover on the proper Scriptural and scientific date, the real fifteenth moon of Nisan. Hence

<sup>1</sup> *The Anglo-Jewish Calendar for every day in the Gospels* (Sands & Co, 1902).



the Synoptists are right in affirming that Jesus kept the Passover on the night before He died, while St. John also is right in placing the general Passover observances a day later.

There are weak points in this theory, no doubt, even supposing that it should turn out that a real discovery has been made with regard to the rule 'Badhu.' But some of the difficulties that at first suggest themselves are such as have already been met by Chwolson, in his very able presentation of the case for the theory of an anticipatory Passover. On the other hand, the chief remaining objection to that theory, the fact, viz. that no ground can be discovered in Old Testament history for such a thing as an anticipated observance of the feast, if it is not solved by our Lord's spirit of freedom in dealing with the Old Testament Law, is met, according to Mr. Power's theory, by the claim that Jesus did not anticipate the Passover, but held it on the strictly legal date, while the Jewish authorities, by their manipulation of the Calendar, had transferred it beforehand to the day following.

The final explanation of the problem may still be to seek. But it seems, on the whole, more reasonable to look for it in some such direction as is suggested by Chwolson's theory when combined with Power's than in a theory which has to assume the worthlessness of the Synoptic evidence and to maintain that the Last Supper of Jesus was not of a paschal character. 'That it actually was,' says Weizsäcker, 'there is no doubt. It was on account of the Passover that Jesus went to Jerusalem that evening. It was the Paschal feast which was actually held that caused His death to be compared with the killing of the Paschal Lamb'<sup>1</sup>.

JOHN C. LAMBERT.

<sup>1</sup> *Apostolic Age*, ii 179.



## A PARTITION THEORY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

As the substance of the Fourth Gospel has fascinated and stimulated religious minds ever since its appearance, so during the last century the literary problem of its genesis has exercised an equal fascination on students, and has called forth theory after theory in the attempt to explain it. One such theory has lately been developed by Dr. Wendt, which, if not wholly new, is presented with a thoroughness, an attractiveness, and an acuteness which it has never received before<sup>1</sup>. The theory is, in rough outline, that the discourses recorded in the Gospel are Johannine and historical, but the narrative is in the main the work of a later editor and cannot be relied upon as a trustworthy source of history. The suggestion had been made as long ago as 1838 by C. H. Weisse, and had been adopted for a time by D. Schenkel, but afterwards abandoned by him; and Dr. Hort, though indeed with no intention of disparaging the narrative, wrote in 1879 to Dr. Ezra Abbott, 'The discourses seem to me to have the ring of solid fact even more than the narratives<sup>2</sup>.' Dr. Wendt has arrived independently at the same point; he assumed it in 1886 in *The Teaching of Jesus*, and has now elaborated it, with a detailed examination of the whole Gospel, into the following view.

i. St. John himself, acquainted with the synoptic tradition and with the definite intention of supplementing it, collected two groups of the Lord's discourses, the discourses being in some cases introduced with a very slight historical note (e.g. ix 1 served to introduce ix 4, 5, and 39, 41, but the whole of the rest of the chapter was absent). The first was a group illustrating the Lord's proclamation of Himself, 'of His inner communion with God and of His unique importance for human salvation,' to the representatives of Judaism in Jerusalem; the second giving His

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel according to St. John: an enquiry into its genesis and historical value*. By Dr. H. H. Wendt. Translated by E. Lummis, M.A. (T. & T. Clark, 1902).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wendt, p. 32; Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 247; Hort, *Life and Letters*, 6 p. 278.

inner teaching, at the most sacred and secret moment of His life, to the chosen Apostles. These discourses were, doubtless, altered in form in passing through the Apostle's mind, but the substance of them can be trusted, for it is protected alike by its essential agreement with the Synoptic teaching and by its own intrinsic value: they moved on the highest spiritual plane, the Lord dwelling on His own ethical and spiritual communion with the Father, appealing not to 'signs' but only to His works, 'His labours as a teacher,' 'the whole of that practical activity by which He set Himself to fulfil His Messianic call,' and calling upon His hearers to accept by faith the spiritual life which He offered them.

To this collection the Apostle prefixed the Prologue, wishing to guard the Christians of Asia Minor against some false teaching about the Logos—probably the teaching of Philo introduced from Alexandria—in opposition to which he emphasized the Jewish conception of the Word, as being alike one with God, and also one with creation which had been made through Him and was upheld by Him, and as having been most fully manifested in the historic life of Jesus the Messiah. The whole of this document was then published, and is the only document that was known to Ignatius and to Justin Martyr.

ii. At some later date, probably between 100 and 125 A. D., after St. John's death, some Asiatic Christian, of the school of St. John, wishing to make his master's work more complete and more widely known, edited it and treated it in much the same way as St. Matthew and St. Luke treated the Logia.

He compiled a narrative framework, and he re-edited the discourses, introducing touches more suitable to the beliefs of the sub-apostolic age. For the narrative he was partly dependent on oral traditions, whence he drew many of the traits of the individual Apostles, partly he borrowed from the Synoptic narratives (e.g. the Cleansing of the Temple and the Feeding of the Five Thousand), but partly he drew upon his own imagination; spiritual metaphors were transformed into material facts, and such events as the turning of the water into wine, the healing of the man born blind, and the raising of Lazarus were the result of this process. The desire to guard against an exaggerated estimate of John the Baptist, to exalt St. John at the expense of St. Peter,

## THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

fresh incidents: and the second-century belief in the  
of miracles and its harder and more material view of  
ments led to greater stress being laid on 'signs,' on  
predictions of the future, on the introduction of the  
water in the process of new birth, and of the idea of  
future resurrection of believers side by side with the  
spiritual teaching of their present resurrection from  
belief to life eternal.

riter is called 'The Evangelist,' in contrast to 'The  
the author of the original source.

some later date still, another member of the Johannine  
ed c. xxi as an appendix, for the sake of the proper  
ion of the saying about John's 'tarrying'; in v. 14,  
n behalf of the circle of John's disciples in Asia Minor,  
their formal attestation to the truth of the Gospel  
annize authorship, and concluded with his own word

the theory; it is excellent on its positive side, in its  
n of the Prologue, its comparison of the substance of  
ses with those in the Synoptists, in its argument for



evidences of power, which ought to win belief; they are for him essentially 'signs' (ii 11, 23, iv 54, vi 2, 14, vii 31, ix 16, x 41, xi 47, xii 18, 27, xx 30), whereas the Lord Himself does not use this word but only appeals to His 'works,' which seem, at least in some cases, almost identical with His 'words,' His teaching. These facts are true, except that, in order to reach them, Wendt has arbitrarily to set aside vi 26; yet there is no ground whatever for limiting 'works' to teaching; it is the natural phrase for the Worker to use of all His work, whereas 'signs' is more natural to the disciple whose faith had been awakened by wonderful deeds and who had watched their effect on others; and the fact that the Lord did appeal to His miracles as 'signs' is as firmly attested as any fact can be by the narrative of the healing of the paralytic which was contained in the earliest Synoptic tradition (*ἴνα εἰδῆτε*, Mk. ii 10 and parallels). There is a real difference in the point of view, but it is not such as to necessitate a difference of authorship; it is quite adequately accounted for by the difference between the words of one and the same author, at one time reporting discourses, at another making his own comment.

The charge of discrepancies between the narrative and the discourse in chapters v and vi is equally unsuccessful. It is urged that the discourse in chapter v is based on the charge that Jesus Himself had broken the Sabbath by healing a lame man, whereas the narrative only implies that the healed man had broken the Sabbath by carrying his bed and that it was this which had given offence. But this is mere hair-splitting; the charge against the man was that he carried his bed on a Sabbath: he throws it back upon Jesus who had healed him, and the charge against Him is that He not only taught the healed man to violate the Sabbath by carrying his bed but violated it Himself by healing; in a word, He was by precept as well as by example relaxing the obligation of keeping the Sabbath day (*ἔλυε τὸ σάββατον*).

Again, it is urged that in chap. vi, it is inconceivable that when challenged for a sign like that of the manna Jesus did not appeal to the miracle just wrought (v. 31); that the words of v. 36, 'I said unto you that ye also have seen Me, and yet believe not,' words spoken in Galilee, can only refer to v 17 ff., words spoken in Judaea; and that the mention of *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* (v. 41, 52) does not suit a narrative whose scene is Galilee. But the miracle of the

feeding was not a sign 'from heaven,' such as the Jews were expecting; the reference in *v.* 36 may be equally well to *vi.* 26, and indeed need not be tied down to any particular speech recorded in the Gospel; it may refer to the whole revelation of Himself and protest against their failure to believe; and the title *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* may well be applied to the scribes from Jerusalem who had followed the Lord into Galilee to watch His work there. This would fall in well with the gradual narrowing of the circle of hearers to which the Evangelist seems purposely to draw attention (*ὁ ὄχλος*, 22; *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, 41, 52; *πολλοὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν*, 60; *οἱ δώδεκα*, 67).

On the other hand, there seems much more solid ground in the argument that the text shows dislocation and possibly interpolations. The *Pericope adulteræ* and the comment in *v.* 3, 4, illustrate the ease with which such interpolations were made (though, indeed, these have left their mark on the MSS), and Dr. Hort was inclined to suggest that *xxi.* 25 originally stood after *xx.* 31, and was transferred by the Apostle himself to its present place after the introduction of the Appendix<sup>1</sup>. Following in the same lines, Wendt points out the awkwardness of the insertion in the Prologue of the references (*vv.* 6-8 and 15) to John the Baptist, and regards them as later additions. But the exclusion of all mention of John the Baptist in a document which *ex hypothesi* was written by one of his disciples and accumulates all the evidence that can be given as to the character and work of Jesus, is very unlikely; nor does the insertion of *vv.* 6-8 in this particular place seem unnatural: on the other hand the second reference comes in most awkwardly between 14 and 16. There is indeed nothing to suggest that it is an interpolation of a later writer: indeed the tenses *μαρτυρεῖ* and *κέκραγε* suggest one who had heard the witness and the cry, rather than a later historian: but the continuity of the paragraph would be greatly improved if we could assume that the verse originally stood after *v.* 18.

Again, the reference to the healing of the lame man in *vii.* 21-24 may be thought unlikely after an interval of more than six months, such as the text evidently implies. The difficulty would be obviated if, with Wendt, *vii.* 15-24 were transferred to *v.* 47, or if, as Canon Norris (*Journal Phil.* iii p. 107) suggested

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Letters*, ii p. 114.



on this and other grounds, vi were placed before v. Yet the difficulty is not insuperable, as that miracle of healing had constituted a real epoch in the opposition to our Lord and would have stood out very clearly in the minds of the leaders at Jerusalem. There are other similar cases urged with more or less probability by Wendt; thus xii 36<sup>b</sup>-43 would seem more appropriate after than before 44-50: xiii 18-19 have but a slight connexion with their immediate context: some surface inconsistencies suggest a disarrangement of the last discourse: e.g. the apparent ending of the discourse in xiv 31, ἐγέλροσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν, and the apparent inconsistency of xvi 5 οὐδέλς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐρωτᾷ με, Ποῦ ὑπάγεις; with St. Peter's question in xiii 36 Κύριε, ποῦ ὑπάγεις; would be avoided if xv, xvi were transferred to some point in xiii, as Wendt suggests and Spitta had suggested before. Yet this would upset the natural order of the tone of these discourses, which first is of the character of a conversation, the disciples first interrupting their Master with questions and He answering them (xiv): then it becomes a monologue; they listen in silence to His teaching, no longer needing to ask the question which Peter had asked before, but satisfied with the plainness of His words (xv, xvi): while at last their presence seems ignored as He speaks to His Father alone (xvii). And it is well to remember that we cannot justly transfer the exact methods of modern literary composition to an Oriental, especially to one who is professedly not writing a complete history, but painting a few tableaux, which illustrate a spiritual truth: at the outside such inconsistencies may be due to the carelessness of a scribe and do not necessitate the theory of a double authorship.

(2) It is urged again that there are certain facts which are inconsistent with Apostolic authorship. One such fact is supposed to be the way in which the writer is dependent on the synoptic Gospels: 'the whole nature of his employment of the synoptic literature is symptomatic of the secondary character of his history.' This is an extraordinary charge from one who admits that the writer has treated this literature with independence and freedom and has boldly and rightly supplemented and corrected it in respect to the Judaean ministry and the date of the death. The only arguments adduced are certain verbal coincidences, never



sufficient, as Wendt himself admits, to lead us to believe that he had the actual Gospels before him as he wrote; and also the fact that in the anointing at Bethany he has combined the account of St. Matthew and St. Mark with that of St. Luke, who had already made the mistake of identifying the Mary of this narrative with the woman who was a sinner: but the only proof of this is that John states that Mary anointed Jesus' feet (xi 2, xii 3, cf. Luke vii 38), whereas Matthew and Mark only mention His head. Which is the more probable, for a writer who has already proved his independence, that he has been misled or that he is adding an additional and perfectly consistent trait from his own knowledge?

A more interesting point is that, when the writer adds explanations of our Lord's statements, the explanations seem inadequate or wrong.

Thus ii 19, 'destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,' is said to have no real reference to the Resurrection, but to mean, 'If you destroy the place of the worship of God, I in the shortest space of time will raise in renovated state that worship which you have abased.' This interpretation of the words seems quite true, and I have often thought that it is what St. John meant, that '*the temple of His body*' did not mean the literal body but the spiritual body, the Church, which had become the new scene of worship. This will meet the objection that Jesus is nowhere else said to raise Himself, but always to be raised by God. This is not, indeed, conclusive, as the claim does not go beyond that of x 18 (which is included in Wendt's 'source') 'I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again': yet on this interpretation the words might legitimately be paraphrased, 'Destroy yonder scene of worship, and when raised by God from the dead I will raise another temple in its place.' Certainly whether He meant the literal or the spiritual body, it remains true that the Resurrection was the fact upon which the new worship was built.

Again, vii 38 is said to be unduly narrowed down to the gift of the Spirit after the Lord's death; but to any one who had experienced that gift it must have seemed to dwarf and throw entirely out of sight all previous inchoate gifts of the Spirit; the words *οὐτως ἦν Πνεῦμα* do not negative the existence of the Spirit before, but do say that the gift then was so great that all previous gifts

were as nothing (cf. for this use of the negative sentence ix 3, xi 4, 2 Cor. iii 10).

Once more, xii 32 *ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς* is said to be wrongly applied to the death, whereas it must refer to the exaltation of the Lord. I would rather call this inadequate than wrong: the words (*ἐκ τῆς γῆς*) must reach their richest fulfilment in the exaltation (cf. Acts ii 33, v 31), but the analogy of the brazen serpent (iii 14) and the fact that the Lord speaks of this 'lifting up' as an act done by the Jews themselves (viii 28 *δοταν ὑψώσητε*) shows that the death must be included, and make it probable that He purposely used a word which should suggest the double meaning. Considering that the death on the cross was the ground of the exaltation (cf. Phil. ii 8, 9 *ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. διὰ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε*), it cannot be wrong to apply the words to the death.

Lastly, in xviii 8 'the Evangelist' is said to apply to literal death words ('of them which thou gavest Me have I lost none') spoken by the Lord Himself (xvii 12) of spiritual loss; this is true, yet he does not limit their application, and the quotation of the words here would only illustrate the fondness of a disciple for finding fresh meanings and happy accidental fulfilments in a loved Master's words. However much we may feel the inadequacy of some of these applications, there is nothing to make us think them not the work even of a loved Apostle.

(3) But a more serious class of objections consists of those which arise from the apparent inconsistency of some of the representations in the Gospel with those in the earliest basis of the Synoptic narrative. These resolve themselves into two, the description of the feelings and teaching of the Baptist and the Lord's proclamation of His own Messiahship. In the fourth Gospel the Baptist is described as convinced by a Divine sign that Jesus is the Messiah, as pointing Him out as the Lamb of God and as having come from above; there is a ring of certainty about the proclamation: whereas in the Synoptists, he only speaks of Jesus as one mightier than himself, he does not call Him the Messiah, and is represented at the end of his life as doubting whether Jesus is He who should come. But really there is no fundamental inconsistency here: Wendt admits that John 'meant the Messiah by the one mightier than himself';



but if he meant that, can he have failed to recognize Jesus as the Messiah and to speak of Him as such to his disciples? The difficulty is not a literary one; it is the problem of human inconsistency, of

‘that most difficult of tasks, to keep  
Heights that the soul is competent to gain’:

indeed this difficulty lies within the narrative of the ‘Evangelist’ itself: who, though recording this ring of certainty in the Baptist’s teaching, yet also records that the Baptist himself never became a disciple of this Messiah, but remained outside the kingdom still baptizing disciples after Jesus had begun to baptize. What we have then is no inconsistency, but a closer insight given by one who had himself passed from discipleship to John to discipleship to Jesus, an account perhaps coloured in form, like the discourses of Jesus, by his own later teaching and meditation, but essentially trustworthy. This same consideration has a bearing on the care with which the Gospel is said to guard against an exaggerated estimate of the Baptist. The narrative of Acts xix 17 shows that such an exaggeration was possible as late as the time of St. Paul’s work at Ephesus; the existence of the Hemero-baptists probably implies that it was possible in the second century (cf. Lightfoot, *Colossians: Excursus on the Essenes*): but the contrast between the Baptist and the Lord is drawn in such a way as to reflect not so much contemporary controversy as the remembrance of a real struggle in the writer’s own mind between his allegiance to his first leader and that to his second; he is justifying to himself—and perhaps in thought to those friends who had been with him in his first allegiance and had not followed him to his second—the fact that he had not remained a follower of John. As St. Paul in a similar spirit pleaded that it was through the law he died to the law, so St. John seems anxious to prove that it was through John the Baptist that he forsook John the Baptist.

Very similar are the facts about the Lord’s own proclamation of His Messiahship or acceptance of the recognition of it by others. In the earliest Synoptic narrative He does not call Himself the Messiah; He rebukes the evil spirits who recognize Him as such; there are many various opinions as to who He is; gradually



St. Peter is drawn to the recognition of the Messiahship; the disciples are told not to make it known; it is only on His trial that He formally declares it. In our Gospel He is recognized at once by Andrew as the Messiah; He reveals Himself as such to the Samaritan woman, and His claims are already known to the crowds in Jerusalem at the feast of Tabernacles. Yet even here it is remarkable how seldom the actual word is used; the conversation and appeal of the crowd in x 24, 'If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly,' show how little He had proclaimed Himself, and St. Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi is exactly parallel to his confession in vi 69. Neither implies a recognition made for the first time: each implies a loyal adherence, in the face of the opposition of others, to a recognition made long before. As far as there is a difference, it arises out of the difference of circumstances. In each narrative Jesus is evidently conscious from the first of His Sonship and of His mission as God's representative: in each He does what we should expect of any one with such a consciousness; He accepts adherence to the fact from individuals whom He can trust: He refuses recognition proceeding from the opposition of evil to His work: He discourages all premature disclosure: He will not speak plainly: He will have a faith drawn out through sure conviction; only when the right moment is come does He speak openly and before the challenge of the High Priest disdain to be untrue to His own consciousness. 'Nowhere in more marked degree than in the Lord's method of education is respect shown for the spontaneous growth of true conviction, nowhere is greater care taken to avoid compulsory adherence'<sup>1</sup>; and this is equally true of each narrative; but St. John, writing from the inner circle of those who had given a complete adherence, has naturally the larger number of instances of the recognition and its acceptance.

Such are the main lines of objection, and along these Wendt has not succeeded, unless it be in proving the existence of dislocation of text and of interpolations. But there is another region in which he is even less successful, the attempt to show that certain second-century presuppositions have affected the narrative; of one of these, the desire to depreciate the Baptist,

<sup>1</sup> A. J. Worlledge, *On Prayer*, p. 43.

I have spoken already: another, the desire to exalt the disciple whom Jesus loved at the expense of St. Peter, seems to me entirely baseless; the attempt to show that Ignatius and Justin only knew 'the source' and not the narrative part of the Gospel is unsuccessful; the argument must be the precarious argument from silence; the amount of material is too slight on which to build any clear conclusion.

Wendt has to explain the reference to John the Baptist in Dial. 88 *οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος* as compiled from Matt. iii 11 and Acts xiii 25, though the reference to John i 20, 23 is easier: and he admits in Dial. 69 an allusion to the man blind from his birth. It would seem as if it were in order to avoid this inference that he had introduced ix 1 into the text of his 'source,' but this does not avail him, as Justin speaks of the healing of those maimed from birth, whereas the 'source' had no mention of healing; nor is it clear why the 'source' should have laid any stress on *ἐκ γενετῆς*, as it did not contain *vv. 2, 3*.

The chief evidence, however, that is alleged of a later non-Apostolic thought is the presence of the material aspect of religion, the introduction of water as well as of the Spirit in the new birth, the doctrine of a literal resurrection of the body, the occurrence of miracles in the material world side by side with the deepest and most universal spiritual teaching. Certainly Wendt has proved the co-existence of these two sides; but on what ground does he treat it as impossible in the first century and in the writings of an Apostle? If the basis of the Synoptic narrative proves anything, it proves the existence of a belief in the miraculous in the earliest stage of Apostolic history. The co-existence indeed goes back, as far as all evidence carries us, behind the Apostles to their Master. It may be thought by some that in this more material side He was in self-adaptation accommodating Himself to men trained in the practice of frequent lustrations and material sacrifices, steeped in expectations of a literal day of judgement and in a belief in the miraculous nourished on the Old Testament history. But perhaps the truth lies deeper still, and in no mere 'economy,' but in the simplicity of a Divine worker He moved among material things, filling them too with a Divine Presence, and making them subserve the purposes of spiritual truth. Such a view of the relation



of the spiritual to the material is at least natural to one who had already conceived and formulated the great thought, 'The Word became flesh.'

In dealing with the relation of the Johannine to the Synoptic teaching Wendt shows great literary *επιείκεια*, a willingness to consider differences of time and place, a readiness to make allowances for the circumstances of the narrator, and adroit skill in reconciliation. But these qualities fail him when he deals with the narratives; he minimizes the facts that the strongest marks of the presence of an eye-witness occur in the narratives, that the bold independent treatment of the Synoptists points to a first-hand authority; he explains away the striking stamp of literary unity which is impressed upon the whole; he becomes at once not merely subjective, giving insufficient weight to external evidence and Synoptic parallels, but even narrowly subjective, with a subjectivity that is bred of literary study not of the experience of life. The book abounds with the assertion of impossibilities, which would be challenged by any one with a rich experience. For instance, 'such a demonstrative act as the cleansing of the Temple *can only* once be morally justified' (p. 12): 'The question "Art thou He that cometh" *is only intelligible* on the supposition that the Baptist did not conceive until he was in prison the possibility that Jesus might be the Messiah' (p. 16): 'The remark of John iv 54 *can only be explained* by reference to another record in which the miraculous help given to the king's officer at Capernaum appeared as Jesus' first sign in Galilee' (p. 33): 'Jesus *cannot have used* the expression *ἠψώθαι* of the external manner of His death' (p. 60): these are a few of the many instances of this subjective standard. But the chief of all is the attitude to the miraculous. It is this which in the last resort determines his attitude to the narratives: but to discuss this would be to carry the discussion into another region. Putting this aside, it can scarcely be doubted that in the main, apart from minor questions of transposition and interpolation, scholars will tend more and more to feel the extraordinary unity that is stamped upon the Gospel, to whatever author and to whatever century they may assign it.

WALTER LOCK.



THE CONNEXION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND  
NORMAN RITES.

THE Norman conquest influenced ecclesiastical affairs at least as strongly as the political condition of England. It is true that Norman influence was not unknown in the last days of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy, but with the advent of William it at once became paramount. Among the revolutions which it introduced was that by which the organization, that we now know as the Cathedral system, took possession of the mother churches of many English dioceses. It is well known that the organization which now holds the field alone in our Cathedrals was in pre-Reformation days only one of two co-existing systems: for some Cathedral bodies were monastic, and only one half of the English Cathedrals at the time of the suppression of the greater monasteries were served by secular canons according to the plan which is a modified form still holds its place there. The Norman invasion was indeed not without its effect upon the great Benedictine Houses that served at Canterbury, Rochester and elsewhere as Cathedral bodies: and in the transformation by which the old Saxon Bishopstools were removed from small sites to more commanding centres, the monastic system became associated with the East Anglian bishopric at Norwich, while new monastic Cathedral Churches soon after came into existence, Benedictine at Ely and Augustinian at Carlisle. But it was in the other system—the system of secular canons—that the greatest effect was made: for a new model was introduced to supersede the old lax ways, which, in spite of the reforms of S. Dunstan and S. Ethelwold, the Saxon ecclesiastic still loved. The movement began with the foundation, within a few months of one another, of the three great secular chapters of York, Lincoln and Salisbury; and in course of time it affected, or even revolutionized, all the

secular Cathedral bodies in England, as well as others in Wales, Scotland and Ireland.

But though the broad fact of the connexion of these new English institutions with Norman prototypes is indisputably clear, the details of such connexion are much more obscure. The publication by M. Chevalier in his *Bibliothèque Liturgique*<sup>1</sup> of the two principal documents descriptive of the ways of the Bayeux Chapter, both constitutional and liturgical, raises a strong hope of light and information upon this topic. Unfortunately, however, the similarities cannot be traced right back to the point of their divergence. These Bayeux documents are of the thirteenth century, a little later in date than the corresponding documents of Salisbury, whereas the creation of the new form of the secular system belongs to the last decade of the eleventh century. Two documents of that date exist for Salisbury and give in outline the plan as S. Osmund introduced it: probably they were the only documents that were then considered necessary, and the rest of the method was brought as oral tradition from Normandy: and if that is so, then all the things that S. Osmund concerned himself to set down in black and white were the legal and constitutional points on which his scheme for Dean and Secular Canons was to rest, and the whole of the liturgical provision was the importation of the oral tradition. But whether this is so or not, there are at any rate no documents available at present from any Norman cathedral for purposes of comparison with the *Carta* and the *Institutio* of S. Osmund: and the comparison, whether on the liturgical or the constitutional side, must be made in the thirteenth century and not in the eleventh.

The two documents from Bayeux now published are an Ordinal dating from the second quarter of the thirteenth century, and a Consuetudinary drawn up by Raoul Langevin in 1270. The former is an impersonal service-book, such as any methodically minded Chanter might draw up for the Church for whose services he was responsible; and it received additions as time went on, some of them in the form of marginal notes. In this respect it is like the Sarum Ordinal; but in another important respect it differs; for while the Sarum Ordinal was from the first apparently a twin volume with the Sarum Consuetudinary, and was therefore

<sup>1</sup> *Ordinaire et Coutumier de l'Eglise Cathédrale de Bayeux*. 8vo. Paris, 1902.



able to confine itself to its strict sphere of directing the form which the services were to take on any given occasion, leaving to the Consuetudinary the description of liturgical customs in general and the duties of individual persons in regard to those services, the Bayeux *Ordinarius* evidently stood alone at first, and had to combine both functions: hence here, as in the *Ordinals* of many churches other than Salisbury, liturgical *consuetudines* are intermingled with the detailed description of the service. This combination represents no doubt the earlier state of things, as the most ancient Roman *Ordines* show: and the separation of the two provinces of the Consuetudinary and the Ordinal was a later improvement, which was not always followed even by Churches such as Exeter, which followed the Sarum model: for the Exeter Ordinal combines *consuetudines* with Ordinal much as does the Bayeux *Ordinarius*. The convenience, however, of this separation of provinces found recognition at Bayeux; and Langevin in drawing up a separate Consuetudinary extracted the *consuetudines* from the existing Ordinal, combined them with other documents of a less permanent character, utilized particularly the labours of Subdean W. de Tanquarville, who had made tentative efforts in the same direction before his death in 1240, and so produced his orderly code of Customs.

It has been thought for some considerable time now that Bayeux and Salisbury would prove to be the pair of foundations between which a comparison could best be made. The reason for this lay in the recognition of the fact that these two Chapters were alike in their constitution, and that especially the order of precedence within the Chapter of the chief dignities of the body was identical. Agreeably with this we find at Bayeux Dean, Chantor, Chancellor, Treasurer as the four principal persons; then follow the four Archdeacons, and then the Subdean, Subchantor, Scholasticus and Custos or Warden, who are the deputies of the four principal persons: and it appears that the Warden's office is a later addition. The same four principal persons appear in like order at Salisbury, York and Lincoln, and after the Archdeacons come the Subdean and the Subchanter: but here divergence begins: at York there figures a Penitentiary, while there is no mention of such a function at Salisbury, and at



Lincoln it is exercised by the Subdean. In England the Chancellor and the Treasurer had no such deputies, but each was bound to reside and perform his duties in person: and whereas at York a subchancellor and subtreasurer existed, they had no official status. It is true that the Charter of S. Osmund had made provision for an *Archischola* corresponding to the Bayeux *Scholasticus* to be the Chancellor's deputy, but in the later documents all his functions are restored to the Chancellor. Moreover, at Bayeux the Chancellor was the Bishop's officer, not bound to residence but to attendance on the Bishop, more analogous therefore to the Bishop's Chancellor or Vicar-General than to the Cathedral Chancellor of the English system. Thus the analogy between the English and the Norman plan is less or became less, in fact, than it seems to be upon the surface.

The chief duties of the *Scholasticus* abroad, as of the Chancellor in England, are two—to be responsible for the correct reading of the lessons in choir and to take charge of the School: at York as at Bayeux a distinction is drawn between the Grammar-school, over which he presides, and the Song-school which is under the Chanter; but this is not so at Salisbury or at Lincoln. Again, in other respects the duties of these principal officers are differently apportioned in England from the method of Bayeux. There the Dean is responsible for a large part of the ceremonial of the services, in fact for everything but the chant, which belonged to the Chanter, and the reading, which belonged to the *Scholasticus*: in England he was more exclusively the executive officer of the Chapter in business and disciplinary affairs, and the regulation of the services was more entirely in the hands of the Chanter. Again, sermons form a considerable part of the Chancellor's burden at York and at Lincoln, but it is not so stated at Salisbury, and at Bayeux this function seems to belong to the Dean.

The sum of all this seems to be, that while there is a real connexion between the constitution of Bayeux and the constitution of the Norman secular Cathedrals in England, as evidenced by the similarity of the principal dignities of the Chapter, the likeness does not extend far; and there is such variety in detail as to make the differences between the two systems quite as noteworthy as the connexion.

Turning now to the liturgical side of the matter, it soon becomes clear that the divergences far exceed the similarities. There is naturally a strong family likeness between, let us say, the Bayeux *Ordinarius* and the Sarum Ordinal: a large part of the terminology is identical, and indeed the general impression which results from a perusal of the former is that its terminology is nearer akin to that of Salisbury than to that of York; and again, is nearer akin than is the terminology of the Rheims Ordinal or even of John of Avranches as representing the Use of Rouen. The general outline of the apportionment of the parts of the services to the various singers and readers is the same; and the same method exists of recording this allotment of duties on the *tabula*. The arrangement of the choir is much the same, the use of the *pulpitum* or stone screen and of a smaller *pulpitum* or lectern for lessons and responds is the same, though here there is a difference of phraseology; for the position which is described at Salisbury as *ad gradum chori* is here described as *ante genas*; and these doors of the sanctuary *in choro* are contrasted with the *genae in introitu chori* mentioned elsewhere (p. 31).

But the differences of terminology are more remarkable; the Lent veil is *cortina* not *velum*, the chalice veil is *syndon* not *offertorium*, the humeral veil is *pallium* not *mantellum*; while the following terms are strangers to English rubrics, *archichorus* (as the equivalent and alternative of *rector chori*), *incensifer*, *missalifer*, *urcifer*, &c. More remarkable still is the classification of days: the term *feria* is not used at all to express a day which is not a festival, but this is expressed either by the phrase *fit de dieta* or by the phrase *fit sine festo*. The last expression is also adapted to describe what was described at Salisbury by *memoria tantum*, namely a saint's day without a festival service: this here takes the somewhat paradoxical description *festum sine festo*.

Passing from mere terminology to the system of services itself, conspicuous differences appear: the whole method of classification of festivals is simpler than at Salisbury. Simple feasts are of two classes, divided according as the number of lessons was three or nine. Double feasts are divided into three classes; the lowest is *cum duabus cappis*, i. e. with two Rulers, the highest is with four Rulers of the upper stalls, while the intermediate has four Rulers, two of whom are of the upper row and two of the



second row of clergy. Bayeux thus agrees with Salisbury in dividing festivals into two classes—*duplex* and *simplex*—and they differ from other churches such as Lincoln or Exeter, where there was an intermediate class called *semi-duplex*, probably a later refinement, and probably, so far as England is concerned, a method borrowed from Roman Use.

The further that inquiry is made into detail, the greater are the differences that emerge: the allotment of duties at services, though it agrees in main principles at Sarum and Bayeux, differs endlessly in detail. Again, the customs as to dress differ; the Chanter at Bayeux has a magnificent dress of his own, including not only a staff but gloves and a mitre: the alb and amice are constantly ordered where at Salisbury a surplice was customary; and on occasion taperers and thurifers come out in the glory of tunics. But while some of these rules seem contrary to the similar rules of Sarum Use, it is evident that others are not incompatible, and indeed may actually fill up gaps in the knowledge of English ceremonial. It is worth while from this point of view to make a brief comparison of the ordinary ceremonial of the Mass as laid down for the two churches.

Bayeux is more explicit than Sarum as to the actions of Deacon and Subdeacon, but far less explicit as to the other ministers—acolyte, thurifer, &c. At the approach to the altar there is no censuring at Bayeux, but the incense is first blessed before the reading of the Gospel: on the other hand, directions are given for the celebrant (or Bishop) to turn to the people to say the Absolution, and for the Bishop, if he is not the celebrant, to return to his seat after he has said the Confession and Absolution before the altar and kissed the Sacred Ministers: also when they go up to the altar the Deacon and Subdeacon *adornent altare debitis ornamentis, sacerdote interim officium quod sibi incumbit prosequente*. These are directions additional to those of the Sarum rite, and may very possibly represent what was customarily done though not laid down in the books.

The directions given in the books of Bayeux concerning the reading of the Gospel are clearer: for there were innovations in the ceremonial introduced at Salisbury which have somewhat confused the existing directions. On the way to the Screen at Bayeux the Deacon carried the Gospel-book closed



and the Subdiacon carried the *ambrosia*: at Salisbury apparently two books were carried, one, the *liber evangelice lectionis*, by the Subdiacon, and the other, or 'text,' by the Deacon. At these points the Bayeux Use agrees with the older Sarum custom which kept the kissing of the text with its accompanying censuring in its proper place immediately following the Gospel; and does not agree with the later Sarum custom, which deferred these ceremonies (probably out of respect for the Creed) till after the offertory was done, and thus appended them not to the ceremony of the Gospel, to which they properly belong, but to the ceremony of the oblation, from which historically they are quite distinct.

The oblation is more fully described for Bayeux than for Sarum. The Subdiacon on returning from reading the Epistle receives a blessing from the celebrant, places his book on the north side of the altar, and sets there also the Altar desk—called *parvum pulpitum*—and the Missal: he then brings up the super-altar and the corporals *non vultis ut panis ad hoc dedito involvatis*: he leaves them on the altar, setting the rudimentary corporas case on the north side of the altar: he then prepares paten and chalice, which have not hitherto been mentioned, folding up separately the cloths in which they had been wrapped, places paten on chalice, covers both with the chalice veil (*synaxar*), and so holds them out for the blessing of bishop or celebrant, and sets them down again as before. This again agrees with the older more than with the later custom at Salisbury.

After the offertory has been finished—

*'Acolitus transverso pallio preindutus afferat ibidem subdiacono calicem sollempniter, sicut ipse subdiaconus illum dimiserat sindone supertectum: quem subdiaconus discooperiens, reuerenter accipiat in manibus cum sui brachiis manipuli patenam cum oblata: quam diaconus accipiat de manu eius cum suo similiter manipulo et tradat eam sacerdoti: tandem subdiaconus sumens de manu acoliti calicem cum sindone, ipso acolito deosculante manum eius, tradat eum dyacono, dicens Totum; et osculetur ipse subdiaconus manum diaconi. Tunc procedens acolitus stet ante maius candelabrum. Recipiens igitur diaconus calicem similiter cum sindone, tradat illum sacerdoti, dicens Totum, et osculetur manum eius. Tunc sacerdos signans calicem accipiat sine sindone, et ponat*

illum loco debito; deinde diaconus accipiens patenam cum sindone tradat eam subdiacono, qui deosculans manum eius cum sindone recipiat eam et tradat eam acolito ubi ipse stat, parte sydonis supposita ipsi patene et parte alia eandem protegente; et osculetur acolitus manus eius in recipiendo.'

There is, except for the final handing of the paten to the acolyte, nothing in this contrary to the Sarum rules; but there is very much that is explanatory and valuable. The additional censuring which now follows corresponds to the later Sarum Use, and comprises, besides the censuring of the oblations, a triple censuring of the priest, a censuring of altar and relics (the priest meanwhile receiving oblations from any who may be there to offer), and then a fresh censuring of the ministers and of the quire.

The central part of the service is very barely described; and it is not till after the priest's communion that the regulations again become full. Several differences from the Sarum rite are indicated, the acolyte with humeral veil ministers the ablutions, not the Subdeacon, who is busy moving the desk to the south end of the altar, while the Deacon moves the book. A description is given of the renewal of the Reserved Sacrament; and then the restoration of paten and chalice to the place where they were before being in use is very fully described, on the same lines as the description of their presentation at the altar: it is noticeable that in this, as in the handling of the pyx containing the Reserved Sacrament, the Subdeacon uses the *sindon* or chalice veil just as the acolyte uses the *pallium* or humeral veil. These instances will serve to show in what way the Bayeux and the Sarum rites diverge, and in what way they may perhaps explain one another's silences: and this is perhaps as fair an idea as can be briefly given of the relation of the one to the other.

Lastly, one or two instances may be given of ritual divergence as distinct from ceremonial differences: the most interesting are those that exist in the central framework of the hours: thus at Prime it has come to pass that the Bayeux Use groups the *Quicumque* with the rest of the psalms of Prime, omitting the first part of Psalm cxviii (cxix), and uses the antiphon of *Quicumque* for the group and not a psalm-antiphon or the first of the antiphons of Lauds. This latter consequently is used at Terce, the second antiphon of Lauds at Sext, and the third at None,



where Sarum normally uses the second, third, and fifth. The suffrages also present interesting points of difference: those of Prime are rather fuller at Bayeux than at Sarum, while on ferial days the set for Terce, Sext, and None differ there from the set used at Lauds and Evening. The latter set retain a good many, and the former a few, of the triple suffrages, consisting originally of a bidding followed by versicle and response; only one such has survived at Salisbury, and there as here in a mutilated form. The biddings are—'Oremus pro omni gradu . . . Pro pastore nostro . . . Pro rege nostro . . . etc. . .'; but the prayer has been reduced to a single response. The penitential psalms form part of the suffrages at Bayeux in Advent as well as in Lent. In other respects, too, the rite is more elaborate: the antiphons of the Gospel canticles are sometimes repeated before the *Gloria patri* as well as after it, like an Introit Antiphon, tropes are more often used and the processions are elaborated; but in other respects Bayeux is the simpler of the two; its system of Memorials is far less complicated, and the recitation of the secondary service of the B. V. M. is restricted to a smaller number of days.

Here then again in the liturgical sphere, as before in the constitutional sphere, the same general impression is reached, that the two rites, though similar, are also very different; and some of the differences are of a somewhat fundamental sort. The similarity would probably have been found greater, if it had been possible to make the comparison in the eleventh century instead of in the thirteenth: much development took place in the interval, and it is not surprising that even if they had started identical at the earlier date they should find themselves at considerable variance at the later epoch.

W. H. FREER



## DOCUMENTS

## THE NEW SEPTUAGINT FRAGMENT.

THE following is a transcript of the fragment, the discovery of which was announced by Dr. Taylor in the October number of the *Journal*. All that can be read (or inferred from the dots and vestiges of the under-writing which have escaped the eraser) is here printed in uncial type: after many attempts I do not think that any more could be deciphered even by the aid of seasonable sunlight. Missing words and parts of words are supplied from Dr. Swete's text, brackets being used in cases in which a variant has been noted by Dr. Swete: these are printed in minuscule. The Divine names are supplied in the shortened forms  $\bar{\theta}\bar{s}$  and  $\bar{\alpha}\bar{s}$  in accordance with the practice of the writer, who employs also the equally respectable abbreviation  $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{o}\bar{s}$  &c.

The MS consists of two tattered vellum leaves: each page contains twenty-four lines, although in 2 recto it is not easy to see how the first four are related to the three which have been obliterated. A margin of an inch or more is left at the top, bottom and side of the page. Each hemistich is regarded as forming a separate verse; and, if it exceeds one line, the surplus is indented into the body of the page by half an inch, or the space of two average letters—e.g. 1 verso ll. 1, 2.

The writing is that of a good uncial hand closely resembling that of  $\aleph$ : the  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are somewhat disproportionately large and perhaps betray an earlier stage of the tendency exemplified by Codex Marchalianus and the Sinai fragments, published by Dr. Rendel Harris. There is no sign of lateral compression in the case of the letters  $\Theta\theta\text{OC}$ ; and generally I submit (under correction) that there is nothing to stamp the MS as later than cent. vi. The horizontal strokes are very faint: the cross-bars of  $\Pi$  and  $\text{T}$  are helped out by a heavy dot at each end, and often there appears to be a break at the top of the circular letters. There are no traces of accents or breathings.

It is possible that there are still other palimpsests in the Taylor-Schechter collection, but the discovery and the deciphering of such are better suited to a summer number of the *Journal*.

J. H. A. HART.

- 3 ΕΞ ΧΕΙΡΟΣ ΥΙΩΝ ΑΛΛΟΤΡΙΩΝ  
 ΩΝ ΤΟ ΣΤΟΜΑ ΕΛΑΛΗΣΕΝ  
 ΜΑΤΑΙΟΤΗΤΑ  
 ΚΑΙ Η ΔΕΞΙΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΔΕΞΙΑ  
 ΑΔΙΚΙΑΣ
- 10 ὅς ὠΔΗΝ ΚΑΙΝΗΝ ΑΣΟΜΑΣ ΣΤΗΣ  
 ΕΝ ΥΑΛΙΝΩ ΔΕΚΑΧΟΡῶ  
 ΨΑΛΩ ΣΟΙ  
 Τῷ ΔΙΔΟΝΤΙ ΤΗΝ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΝ  
 ΤΟΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΙΝ
- 13 τῷ ΛΥΤΡΩΜΕΝῷ ΔΑΔ  
 ΤΟΝ ΔΟΥΛΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ  
 ΕΞ ΡΟΜΦΙΑΣ ΠΟΡΦΥΡΑΣ  
 ΡΥΣΑΙ ΜΕ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΕΛΘΥΜΑΙ  
 ΕΞ ΧΕΙΡΟΣ ΥΙΩΝ ΑΛΛΟΤΡΙΩΝ  
 ὡς ὡς ΤΟ ΣΤΟΜΑ ΕΛΑΛΗΣΕΝ  
 ΜΑΤΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ  
 ΚΑΙ ἡ ΔΕΞΙΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΔΕΞΙΑ Α  
 ΔΙΚΙΑΣ  
 ὡς (α) υιοὶ ΑΥΤΩΝ ὡς ΝΕΦΟΤΟ

εις τον αιωνα  
 και εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος  
 ΚΑΘΕΚΑΚΤΟΝ ημεραν  
 ΕΥΛΟΓησω σε  
 ΚΑΙ ΑΙΝΕΩ το ονομα σου  
 ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ Α(ιωνα)  
 (και εις τον) ΑΙΩΝΑ ΤΟ(ν αιωνος)  
 ΜΕΓΑC ΚC ΚΑ'Ι ΑΙ'ΝΕΪΤΟC σφοδρα  
 Γ'ΚΑ'Ι ΤΗC ΜΕΓΑΛΩCΥΝΗC  
 αυτου ΟΥΚ ΕCΤΙΝ ΠΕΡΑC  
 ΓΕΝΕΑ ΚΑΙ ΓΕΝΕΑ ΕΠΑ'ΙΝ'Ε  
 CΕΙ ΤΑ ΕΡΓΑ CΟΥ  
 ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ CΟΥ ΑΠΑΓ  
 ΓΕΛΟΥCΙΝ  
 και την ΜΕΓΑΛΟΠΡΕΤΙΑΝ  
 της ΔΟΞΗC ΤΗC αγιωCΥνηC  
 CΟΥ ΛΑΛΗCΟΥCΩ  
 και τα ΘΑΥΜΑCΙΑ CΟΥ Διη  
 γηCΟΝΤΑΙ  
 και ΤΗΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΦΕ[φοβε- ?]  
 ΡΩΝ CΟΥ ΕΡΟΥCΙΝ  
 και ΤΗΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΩCΥΝΗΝ CΟΥ  
 διηΓηCΟΝΤΑΙ

ΟΝ Ε  
 ΑΙ.  
 ΕΝΑΙ ΩC  
 ΑΟΥ  
 ΩΝ ΠΛΗΡΗ ΕΞ  
 ερευ(γ)ομενα εκ του  
 του ειC γ'του'ιτο  
 τα ΠΡΟΒΑΤΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ Πολυτοκα  
 πλθθουνοντα εν ταic  
 εξοδοic αυτων  
 ΟΙ ΒΟΕC ΑΥΤΩΝ ΠΑΧΕΙC  
 ΟΥΚ ΕCΤΙΝ ΚΑΤΑΠΤΩΜΑ φραγμαου  
 ΟΥ ΔΙΕΞΟΔΟC  
 ΟΥΔΕ ΚΡΑΥΓΗ εν ταιc  
 (επαιλεσιν) αυτων  
 Ε'ΜΑΚ'ΑΡΙCΑΝ ΤΟΝ λαου  
 φ ταυτα εcτιν  
 ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC Ο ΛΑΟC ΟΥ κ̄c  
 ΘC ΑΥΤΟΥ  
 γ'ψωcω ce ο θc μου  
 ο βασιλευc μου



## INVENTIONES NOMINUM.

THE first number of the *Miscellanea Cassinese* (1897) contains a document deserving of some study at the hands of the curious. It is called *Inventiones Nominum* (*Findings of Names*) and is printed in full from a St. Gall MS of the eighth century (No. 133); a small fragment of another text of it is also given from a St. Gall MS (No. 913, of cent. vii-viii). The purpose of the author was to collect, for the convenience of students of the Bible, instances of persons mentioned in various parts of the Scriptures, who bore the same name, and to discriminate between them. The task was not an easy one in the absence of concordances and marginal references, and completeness has not been attained. The interest of the tract is, however, not inconsiderable. Uncanonical writings have been used to some extent in it, and various statements occur which stand in need of explanation.

I am not in a position to offer any suggestions as to the date or nationality of the compiler of this text. One thing is abundantly clear, that the Bible he used was not that of St. Jerome. Probably some student of the Old Latin will be able to tell us (if the point has not been already settled) what form, if any, of the Latin Bible lay before our author.

My business in these pages is to publish another form of the same document. This I have taken from a MS in the Town Library at Albi. The volume (No. 29 in the quarto *Catalogue Générale des MSS des Départements*) is of the eighth century, and has a certain claim to fame as containing one of the earliest extant maps of the world. Our tract is one item in a very miscellaneous list of contents, written by several hands. It occupies ff. 69-71, and is in a small minuscule of Merovingian type often very hard to read. The last words of the lines on f. 71 a (the concluding page) are almost wholly obliterated, and after three several visits to the Library in separate years one word still defies my efforts to decipher it.

My plan is as follows. First, I print the St. Gall texts (G<sup>1</sup>, G<sup>2</sup>) as they appear in the *Miscellanea Cassinese*, with some corrections—partly obvious, partly suggested by the readings of a MS (No. 12266) in the Phillipps collection at Cheltenham<sup>1</sup>. These I divide into numbered

<sup>1</sup> The Phillipps MS 12266 is one of the interesting series that come from the Abbey of S. Stefano di Fossa Nuova. It is a quarto volume of cent. ix-x clearly written, and is of some celebrity as being the source whence Mommsen published the well-known *Stichometry and Indiculus* of the works of Cyprian. Like the

paragraphs and show their correspondence with the Albi text (A). Side by side with them I give the Albi text also divided into numbered paragraphs, whose correspondence with G<sup>1</sup> is indicated. To these texts are added (i) references to passages where the names mentioned in G<sup>1</sup> may be traced, those cases being omitted where a reference seemed either wholly needless or impossible: (ii) the variants shown by the kindred Phillipps MS 12266 in comparison with the text of G<sup>1</sup> in *Miscellanea Cassinese*, with a record, where corrections have been made in the latter text, of its discarded readings. These are placed in square brackets and distinguished by the symbol MC. In both divisions of these notes the numbering of the sections answers to that of the paragraphs in G<sup>1</sup>. The references to the first, second, and other instances of a name are distinguished in each section by (a), (b), &c.<sup>1</sup> Last of all follow my own notes on the text.

St Gall MS 133, it contains the tracts on prophecy and on the miracles of Elisha, which are printed in the *Miscellanea Cassinese*. The text of these I had no time to collate. I would desire to record my sense of Mr. Fenwick's great kindness in allowing me the opportunity of collating as much as I did.

It will be seen that the Phillipps text is essentially the same as the St. Gall text. In several passages, e.g. §§ 47, 59, it has preserved the true reading: in others, e.g. §§ 27, 29, it has introduced, or tried to introduce, new corruptions. It does not explain the riddles of §§ 58 and 66, but it suggests a curious point in § 69. Here it gives the names of the elders who accused Susanna as Theostes and Symmachus (for Simeon). Is it possible that for Theostes we ought to restore Theodotion, and that some dim recollection of the existence of widely different Greek versions of the Book of Daniel and of the supposed unorthodoxy of Theodotion and Symmachus may lie at the root of the nomenclature?

<sup>1</sup> [The variants of the Phillipps MS are taken from Dr. James's collation, which was made after the greater part of this paper was in type: but he is not responsible for the precise form in which they are here presented, or for the precise extent to which use has been made of them for the correction of the text printed in *Miscellanea Cassinese*.—H. A. W.]

INCIPIIT INVENTIO NOMINUM

(Ex codice Sangallensi 153 saec. VIII.)

1. Duo sunt Adam, unus est protoplastus, alius est Adam qui percussit Madian in campo Moab. Inter ambos autem dicitur. Hoc invenitur in generationibus Esau, in Parat in Iob.

2. Duo sunt Enoc, unus est de Cain, alter de Seth.

3. Duo sunt Mabeles, unus est de Cain, alter de Seth.

4. Duo sunt Matuslam, unus de Cain, alter de Seth.

5. Duo sunt Lamech, unus de Cain, alter pater Noe. Uno re fuerunt.

6. Duo sunt Arfaxat, unus est filius Sem nepos Noe, alter rex Mesorum, quem occidit Nabuchodonasor minor essestem (h)onis, iaculatus est eum in montibus Ragan, et mortuus est. autem sunt anni M DCC LXX VII.

7. (Quattuor sunt) Abimelech, primus est Abimelech rex braham uxorem suam sororem suam esse; secundus est rex Gerarum cui dixit Isaac de uxore sua sororem suam et filius Iedeon; tertius est Abimelech qui et (Accus, ante) quem



## III.

## INCIPIT EXPOSITIO PATRUM.

(Ex codice Albiensi xxix saec. viii f. 69 b-71 a.)

1 (= G 1). Duo sunt Adam unus prothoplaustus alius filius Barach quem percussit Machar In campo Moab. Inter ambos sunt anni III DC XCII. hoc inuenitur in generationibus Esau in libro pharalipomenon.

2 (= G 2). Duo sunt Enoc unus de Seth alius de Cain.

3 (= G 3). Duo sunt Malalael unus de Cain alius de Seth.

4 (= G 4). Duo sunt Matusale unus de Cain alius de Seth.

5 (= G 5). Duo sunt Lamec unus de Cain alius de Set, pater Noe. uno tempore fuerunt.

6 (= G 6). Duo sunt Arfaxat unus filius Sem alius rex Medorum quem hoccidit Nabuchodonosor minor. inter ambos sunt anni II DCCC L.

7 (= G 7). Quattuor sunt Abimelec Primus ad quem uenit [Ad]habraam secundus rex Gerare Tercius filius Gedeon quartus qui dictus est *taccus* (*i. e.* et Accus) ad quem uenit Daud.

8 (= G 11). Duo sunt reges Saul unus qui regnabit in Edom alius rex filiorum Israel. inter ambos sunt anni DC L.

*Variants of Phillipps MS as compared with G<sup>1</sup>.*

*Tit.* Incipiunt con̄p̄tationes nominum.

1. ...filius Barao qui percussit maziam...anni III DC XLV.

2. ...alter est de Seth. Duo sunt Cainan unus est de Cain alter est de Seth.

3. ...Maleel...alter est.

4. ...unus est...alter est.

5. ...unus est...

6. ...Arfaxat...nepus...ab ecbathanis iugulatus est eum...II DCCCL.

7. Quattuor sunt [*om* MC]...Gerari...Abraam...Ysaac...Ac̄hus ante [*accusante* MC]...finxit [*fixit* MC]...demonem.

8. Tres sunt Ioseph primus est Ioseph filius Iacob secundus...desponsavit...tertius ab arimathia.

9. ...Mannasses (*bis*)...regis Iude...maritus Iudit.

10. ...pet̄fres...petefres (*cum* Hept. Lugd.)...socer ipsius Ioseph uno sane...

11. ...regnauit in īl̄l...Inter ambos autem sunt anni DC<sup>4</sup>L.

12 (= A 9). III sunt Raguel, unus est filius (Esau). II est socer Moysae qui et Iothor dictus est. Tertius est Raguel socer Tobie.

13 (= A 10). III sunt Ihesus, unus est Ihesus filius Nave; II filius Iosedech sacerdotis magni; III est Ihesus Domini Nostri Iesu Christi.

14 (= A 11). Sex sunt Eliazar: primus est filius Aaron, secundus est filius (M)athathiae, III est de sacerdotibus in Hesdra, IIII est mendicus qui iacebat ante domum divitis, quintus est (E)leazar (filius) Dudi, hoc et in secundo libro Regnorum scriptum est. Sextus est Eleazar nonaginta annorum qui noluit manducare carnes suillarum, hoc est inter Machabeis scriptum.

15 (= A 12). Duo sunt Finees, unus filius Eleazar sacerdotis, alius (Finees) filius sacerdotis Heli. Inter ambos autem sunt anni DL.

16 (= A 13). Duo sunt Caleph, unus Caleph filius (Iephoniae), alius est Caleph de nepotibus Israel filius (Esrom). De ipso natus est Gebal, et de nepotibus eius (Z)eppei qui produxerunt David Sauli. Cineus autem et Chenezus de Amalecitis (sunt). Inter ambos autem sunt anni DC. Gabaonitae et Evaei de Chan sunt. Annanias Azaria(s) et Mis(a)hel de tribu Iuda sunt.

17 (= A 14). Duo sunt Ioab, unus Ioab qui dictus est Iob patriarcha, filius Zara, qui habet librum. Alius est Ioab filius Raguel, qui et Iothor dictus est, socer Moysae cui dixit Moyses in Numeris: *Veni nobiscum et bene tibi faciemus, qui(a) Dominus bona locutus est in Israel.* Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme c.

18 (= A 15). Tres sunt Balaac reg(e)s, primus est qui regnavit in Segor, secundus est qui regnavit in Edom, filius Beor (post quem) regnavit Iob. Hoc in Iob et in Genesis scriptum est. Tertius regnavit in Machan, id est in campo Moab filius Sepphor. Hoc in Numeris scriptum est.

19 (= A 16). Duo sunt Nadab, unus est Nadab filius Aaron, alius Nadab (in) Tubia qui vivum obruit (Achiacaron, eum) qui se nutrierat. Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme DCCCCXX.

20 (= A 17). Duo sunt Eliezer, unus Eliezer filius Moysae, alius Eliezer prophetavit Iosaphat rege Iuda quia salvum illum faciebat Dominus de pugna. Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme DCCCLXXX.

*References for names in G<sup>1</sup>.*

12. (a) Gen. xxxvi 4, 1 Paral. i 35. 13. (b) Agg. i 1.  
 14. (a) Ex. vi 23; (b) 1 Mach. ii 5; (c) 1 Esd. viii 33, 2 Esd. xii 42; (d) Luc. xvi 20; (e) 2 Reg. xxiii 9; (f) 2 Mach. vi 18, 24.  
 15. (a) Ex. vi 25; (b) 1 Reg. i 3.  
 16. (a) Num. xiii 6; (b) 1 Paral. ii 18; Gebal, 1 Paral. ii 49 (LXX); Ziph, 1 Paral. ii 42; Cineus, Chenezus, Gen. xv 19; Evaei, Gabaonitae, 1 Paral. i 15, Jos. xi 19. 17. (b) Num. x 29.  
 18. (a) Gen. xiv 2; (b) Gen. xxxvi 32, Job xli 17 d (LXX); (c) Num. xxii.  
 19. (a) Ex. vi 23; (b) Tob. xiv 10 (LXX N).  
 20. (a) Ex. xviii 4; (b) 2 Paral. xx 37 (+ xx 14).

9 (= G 12). Tres sunt Raguel unus filius Esau, alius socer Moysi, alius socer Thobie.

10 (= G 13). Tres sunt Ihesu unus filius Nabe alius filius Iosedec sacerdotis magni Tercius dominus Ihesus.

11 (= G 14). Sex sunt Eleazari primus Haa filius ronh (*i. e.* filius Haaron) secundus Mathie Tercius sacerdos in Esdra quartus filius Dudi in regnorum. quintus In Macchabeis sextus in euangelio.

12 (= G 15). Duo sunt Fines unus filius Eleazari sacerdotis, alius filius Eli sacerdotis. Inter ambos sunt anni DC LII.

13 (= G 16). Duo sunt Caleph unus filius Gepphone alius Esdrom. Inter ambos sunt anni DC.

14 (= G 17). Duo sunt Iobh unus patriarca filius Zari alius filius Raguel. Inter ambos sunt anni c.

15 (= G 18). Tres sunt Balahac unus qui regnabit in Segor alius in Edom filius Beor Tercius qui regnabit in Midian.

16 (= G 19). Duo sunt Nabat unus filius Haaron alius in Thobia qui uibum obruit Acicharonem qui se nutrierat. Inter ambos sunt anni DCCC XX.

17 (= G 20). Duo sunt Eliazer unus filius Moysii alius qui prophetabit regi Iude Iosafat. Inter ambos sunt anni DCCC LXXX.

*Variants of Phillipps MS as compared with G<sup>1</sup>.*

12. ...Raguhel...Esau [Esai MC]...Iethor...Raguhel...

13. ...Iosedech [Iosedeho MC]... iii. Ihesus Dominus noster Ihesus Christus.

14. ...Eleazari...Mathathiae [Nathathiae MC]...Eleazar filius Dudi. [Aleazar Dudi MC] Sextus est...carnem suillam hoc in Machabeis scriptum est.

15. ...unus est filius Eleazar sac. alius Finees [(Finceis) MC] fil. sac. Heli...anni ferme DL.

16. ...Chaleb (*ter*)...Iephonie [Iephploniae MC]...Esrom [Errom MC]...Zephei [Ieppei MC] qui prodixerunt...de Amalechitis sunt [*om.* sunt MC] Inter ambos... anni ferme DL. Gabaonite et Euei...Azarias et Misahel [Azaria et Mischel MC].

17. ...Iobab unus est Iobab... Iobab filius Raguel...Iethor...Moysi...quia [qui MC] Dominus bona locutus est de ih̄l.

18. ...Balach reges [regis MC]...post quem [postquam MC] regnauit...in Maziam (*cum* Hept. Lugd., Num. xxii 4)...fil Sephor.

19. ...alius Nadab in Tobia [*om.* in MC]... Achiam Caroneum [Achiam(m) Caroneum MC]...DCCCXL.

20. ...unus est E. fil. Moysi alius est E. propheta qui...regi...



21 (= A 19). Tres sunt Zambri, unus est in Numeris quem occidit Finees filius Eleazar cum Casmen Mazianitide, quando invenit illos simul concubentes; secundus est Zambri; alius est Achar filius Acharmi; tercius est Zambri pater Achab.

22 (= A 20). Quattuor sunt Ionathae; primus est filius Saul, secundus est filius Samae fratres Davit; tercius est Ionatha rex Iuda, quartus est filius Mathathiae.

23 (= A 21). Duo sunt Baruhc, unus est princeps militiae Deborrae prophetisse; alius est Baruch pater Iezabel uxoris Achab.

24 (= A 22). Duo sunt Iohel, unus est filius Samuhel, alius est propheta de duodecim qui habet librum. Inter ambus autem sunt anni ferme cclx.

25 (= A 23). Duo sunt Goliae (allofili) Geth, unus est quem occidit David de fundibulo; alius est quem occidit Elana et ipse de fundibulo filius Dudri. Uno sane tempore fuerunt.

26 (= A 10). Tres sunt Ioas, unus est Ioas in (Iudicum) pater Iedeom, secundus est pater Ieroboam regis Israel, tercius est Ioas rex Iuda filius Ocho(z)iae.

27 (= A 25). Tres sunt Orniae, unus est Ornias Iebusaeus, in cuius area David obtulit sacrificium pro confraccione populi, in qua area iussit Salomon(i) filio suo aedificare templum in monte Amorra, secundus est Ornias filius David, (qui) voluit usurpare, tercius est Ornias princeps demoniorum.

28 (om. A). Tres sunt Chusi, unus est filius Archi amicissimus David; secundus est pater Soffoniae prophetae; tercius est Chusi pater Hesdrae prophetae maioris.

29 (= A 26). Duo sunt Oziae, unus est Ozias qui misit manum suam continere arcam quia declinaverat illam vitulus, et occidit illum Deus, quia laicus erat. Alius est Ozias sacerdos (in Iudith). Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme cccxx.

30 (= A 27). Duo sunt Amessias, unus est sacerdos Bethel, alius est rex Iuda.

31 (= A 28). Duo sunt Ioadae, unus est pater Beneu, alius est Ioadae pater Zachariae maioris prophetae. Inter ambos sunt anni ferme c.

*References for names in G.*

21. (a) Num. xv 14; (b) cf. Jos. vii 1 (LXX); (c) 3 Reg. xvi 29 (LXX).  
 22. (b) 1 Reg. xxi 21; (c) 4 Reg. xv 32 (LXX); (d) 1 Mach. ix 31.  
 24. (a) 1 Reg. viii 2. 25. (b) 2 Reg. xxi 19 (+ xxiii 24).  
 26. (a) Judic. vi 11; (b) 4 Reg. xiv 23; (c) 4 Reg. xi 2.  
 27. (a) 2 Paral. iii 1; (b) 3 Reg. i 5.  
 28. (a) 2 Reg. xvi 16; (b) Soph. i 1.  
 29. (a) 2 Reg. vi 5; (b) Judith vi 11.  
 30. (a) Amos vii 10; (b) 4 Reg. xii 21.  
 31. (a) 2 Reg. viii 18; (b) 2 Paral. xxiv 20.

18 (= G 26). Tres sunt Iohas unus in iudicum pater Gedeon alius pater Ieroboam Tercius rex Iuda.

19 (= G 21). Tres sunt Zambri unus in numeris quem hoccidit Fynes astu alius Abasacar filius Acahn Tercius pater Acabh.

20 (= G 22). Quattuor sunt Ionate unus filius (S)aul alius filius Samna frater Daniel Tercius rex Iuda quartus filius Matthie.

21 (= G 23). Duo sunt Barac unus princeps militie Debbora alius pater Zezabel uxoris Aab.

22 (= G 24). Duo sunt Ioel unus filius Samuel alius profheta. Inter ambos sunt anni cc LXII.

23 (= G 25). Duo sunt Golie unus quem occidit Daniel alius quem occidit Elaman filius Hasdri. uno tempore fuerunt.

24 (= G 47). Duo sunt Nabuchodonosor unus (qui) regnabit in Babylonia || f. 70 a || qui dictus est Astriages alius qui regnabit in Ninnibe super Assirios qui dictus est Cambusius. Inter eis anni sunt c xx reges septe(m).

25 (= G 27). Duo sunt Ornie alius (l. unus) Gebuseus alius filius Daud.

26 (= G 29). Duo sunt Ozie unus qui ostendit manum continere arcam et aruit manus eius alius in Betulia. Inter ambos sunt anni cccc xx.

27 (= G 30). Duo sunt Amessias unus sacerdos domini de Bethlem alius rex Iuda.

*Variants of Phillipps MS as compared with G'.*

21. ...cum Chasmin...secundus est Zambri fi (*sec. man.*) alius Achar fil. Acharmi...

22. ...Daud...Ionathas...

23. ...Barach (*bis*).

24. ...Ioel...ambos.

25. ...allofilii [adlofilii MC]...fundibalo (*bis*)...Ellana...

26. ...Iudicum [iudicii MC]...Gedeon...Ieroboam...Ochodiae...

27. <sup>iiii<sup>us</sup></sup> sunt O-nig...Ornias Iebusaeus...confractione...Salomoni [Salomone MC]  
al. moria.

...edificare... monte mamorsa...Ornias fil. Daud qui [quem MC] uoluit usurpare  
.lace.

regnum ante Salomonem tercius est Ornias princeps demoniorum [*additum est lace man. sec., ut legatur Lacedemoniorum (cf. I Mach. xii 7)*]. <sup>iiii<sup>us</sup></sup> Onias sacerdos [*add. in marg. man. sec.*].

28. ...Sophoniae...

29. ...qui aladecus erat [*gloss. al. tetigerat*]...in Iudith [Miudith MC]...

30. ...Amesias...

31. ...pater Bancu alius Ioadae...Inter ambos autem...

32 (= A 29). Tres sunt Sadoch, unus est Sadoch qui portabat efo<sup>di</sup> ante Davit, secundus est sacerdos temporibus Ioram, tercius est Sado<sup>c</sup> pseudosacerdos quem misit Salmanasar rex Assiriorum, qui dixit non esse angelum, neque Spiritum sanctum, nec resurrectionem.

33 (= A 30). Tres Orias, unus est maritus Bersabeae quem iussit David occidi in bello Amanitarum, secundus est Orias propheta qui prophetavit falsa Achaz rege Iuda, tercius est Orias propheta quem occidit Ioachim rex, de quo dixit Isaias propheta: *Fac mihi duos testes fideles homine(s), Oriam et Zachariam filium Barachiel.*

34 (= A 31). Duo sunt Samae Elamitae. Unus est Samea propheta qui prophetavit Roboam regi filio Salomonis ne ascenderit pugnare cum filiis Israel, alius est Sameias Elamitis pseudopropheta in Hieremia, qui prophetavit falsa captivis in Babillonia. Inter ambo autem reges xviii, et ferme anni ccclxxx.

35 (= A 32). Duo sunt Michee prophetae; unus est qui prophetavit Achab regi Israel et Iosaphat regi Iuda, ut non ascenderint in Remoth Galaad in pugna, iste est filius Gemneu; et alius de duodecim qui habet librum, iste filius est Morathiten. Inter ambos autem sunt reges vii, et ferme ann(i) c.

36 (= A 33). Duo sunt Abdiu, unus est qui temporibus Agab a persecucione Zezabel reginae abscondit centum prophetas in duabus speluncis, et pavit eos pane et aqua; alius est Abdiu propheta de duodecim qui habet librum. Inter ambos autem sunt reges vii et ferme anni cxx.

37 (= A 34). Tres sunt Celchiae sacerdotes, primus est qui invenit librum maledictionis in latere (arcae), et misit eum Iosiae regi, secundus est pater Hieremiae prophetae, tercius est pater Susanne.

38 (= A 35). Duo sunt Hieroboam reg(e)s Israel; unus est Hieroboam filius Nadab servus Salomonis qui fecit vacas aureas, alius est Hieroboam filius Ioas. Inter ambos autem reges sunt duodecim et anni ferme cc.

39 (= A 37). Duo sunt Ieu, unus est propheta, alius (est) Ieu Rex.

40 (= A 39). Quattuor sunt Ioachim. Unus est Ioachim rex qui ante dictus est Eliachim filius Iosiae. Secundus est Ioachim rex qui dictus est Ieconias filius Ioachim et nepus Iosiae. Tercius est Ioachim maritus Susanne. Quartus est Ioachim pater Mariae matris Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi.

*References for names in G<sup>1</sup>.*

32. (a) 2 Reg. xx 25; (b) 1 Paral. vi 12; cf. 4 Reg. xvii 27.

33. (a) 2 Reg. xi; (b) 4 Reg. xvi; (c) Hierem. xxvi 23, Esai. viii 2.

34. (a) 3 Reg. xii 22; (b) Hierem. xxix 24.

35. (a) 3 Reg. xxii 8; (b) Mic. i 1.

36. (a) 3 Reg. xviii 3, 4.

37. (a) 4 Reg. xxii; (b) Hierem. i 1, Dan. xiii 2.

38. (a) 3 Reg. xi 26; (b) 4 Reg. xiv 23.

39. (a) 3 Reg. xvi 1; (b) 3 Reg. xix 26.

40. (a) 4 Reg. xxiii 34; (b) 4 Reg. xxiv 6, Hierem. xxiv 1; (c) Dan. xiii 1.



28 (= G 31). Duo sunt Ihoade unus pater Bene alius Bel pater Zaccharie maioris profhete. Inter ambos sunt anni i.

29 (= G 32). Tres sunt Sadoc unus qui portabit etpot ante Daudid alius sacerdos tercius seudosacerdos qui dixit non esse angelum neque spiritum.

30 (= G 33). Tres sunt Urie unus maritus Uessabe alius profheta mendax tercius profheta quem hoccidit Ioacym rex.

31 (= G 34). Duo sunt Same Elemechei unus profheta temporibus Roboam alius seudoprofheta. Inter ambos reges xviii anni ccc lxxx.

32 (= G 35). Duo sunt Miche profhete unus filius Gemne qui fuit temporibus Acap alius de profhetis Maratetes. Inter ambos reges vii anni i.

33 (= G 36). Duo sunt Abdie unus maior domus Acap alius unus ex duodecim. Inter ambos reges septem anni i xx.

34 (= G 37). Tres sunt Celcie sacerdotes primus qui inuenit librum maledicit (= maledictionis) in latere arce testamenti alius pater Iheremie tercius pater Susanne.

35 (= G 38). Duo sunt Iheroboam reges unus seruus Salomonis alius filius Iohas. Inter ambos sunt reges xii anni cc.

36 (= G 48). Tres sunt Tobie unus filius Tobi alius Ammuniates tercius qui deposuerat talenta custodienda in templo.

37 (= G 39). Duo sunt Ieu unus profheta alius rex (I)srabel.

38 (= G 46). Tres sunt Sedecie unus profheta falsus alius seudoprofheta tercius rex Iuda.

39 (= G 40). Quattuor sunt Ioacym unus rex qui dictus est Eliacym filius Iosie secundus rex qui dictus est Geconias tercius maritus Susanne quartus pater sancte Marie.

*Variants of Phillipps MS as compared with G<sup>1</sup>.*

32. ...Sadoc (*bis*)...Daudid...Salmanassar...neque resurrectionem.

33. Tres sunt Uria...Urias (*bis*)...Achab regi...Esaias...michi...homines [homine MC] Uriam...

34. ...Sameas...Roboam filio...ascenderet...Sameas Elamites...Babylonia...sun reges...

35. ...ascenderent in Ramoth Galaad iste est filius iemneu et alius est...anni [annos MC]...

36. ...Achab...Iezabel...

i

37. ...Chelchie...maledictiones in latere arcae testamenti [om. arc. test. MC]... Susannae.

38. ...reges [regis MC]...Nabath...om. aureas...sunt reges.

39. ...alius est [alius et MC]...

o

40. ...Iechonias...nepus...

40 (= A 40). Quatuor sunt Zachariae sacerdotes, unus est filius Iosue qui vocatus est inter sedem et altare, secundus est filius Simeon (quod plura, de diversis, tertius est in Hierem. Quartus est pater Iudaeus Bagabae.

41 (= A 41). Sex sunt Simonae, primus est propheta qui prophetauit Iosue regi, secundus est propheta in Hieremias, tertius est Simonius in rebus iudicis, iv est in Actibus Apostolorum noster Supplente, qui furatus est de pecuni possessionem amicum suam, v est discipulus Ioseph Chama qui baptizavit Paulum, vi est Simonius ubi supra, qui noster / prima, petenti Paulum.

42 (= A 42). Sequuntur sunt Aarone: i est Aarone sacerdos qui in dedicationem templi de manu Salomonis tulit sacrificium, et obtulit super altare; ii est propheta qui dixit Aegyp regi: *paravimus quatuordecim medicos et non invenisti Dominum, in lingua patrum nostrorum*; et iii est sacerdos qui dixit Orabe regi: *Discede de iure Domini. Non enim licet tibi offerre sacrificium, sed filius Aarone imitit iure potestatem*; iv est sacerdos eius Ezeria reg/e); v est de tribu (iudaeis). vi est Aarone sacerdos pater Elm patr/e) Esdrae sacerdotis; vii est Aarone in Iudaea qui est et Rafael angelus Domini.

43 (= A 43). Duo sunt Abacuch prophetae, unus est de duodecim quibus / habet librum, alius est qui obtulit Danielo prandium in lacum leonum. Inter ambos autem sunt reges xv et ferme anni cccxxx.

44 (= A 44). Duo sunt Matthiae, unus est Matthiaeus pater Iosue prophetae, alius est Matthias in Actibus Apostolorum, super quem cecidit vix et ordinatus est. Inter ambos autem sunt anni dcclxxx.

45 (= A 45). Tres sunt Sedechias, unus est falsus propheta, alius Sedechias rex Iuda qui captivatus est in Babylonia a Nabuchodonosor rege, tertius est Sedechias propheta in Heremia collega Achab.

46 (= A 24). Duo sunt Nabuchodonosor reges, unus regnavit in Babylonia qui dictus est Astyages. Hic transmigravit populum et templum Domini incendit, et vasa dominica captivavit. Post huius mortem regnavit Baldasar filius eius qui (cum biberet) in iisdem vasis cum concubinis suis eadem nocte a Dario rege maiore occisus est. Alius est qui regnavit in Ninivem super Assirios qui dictus est Campises. Hic miserat Olofernem ad evertendas gentes in Bethuliam, quem occidit

References for names in G.

41. (a) 2 Paral. xxiv 20; (b) Zach. i 1; (c) 1 Esd. viii 16; (d) Luc. i.  
 42. (a) 2 Paral. xvi 7; (b) Hierem. xxviii 1; (c) Dan. iii 88; (d) Act. v 1; (e) Act. ix 10; (f) Act. xxiii 2.  
 43. (a) 1 Paral. vi 10; (b) 2 Paral. xv 1, xvi 7, xvi 12; (c) 2 Paral. xvi; (d) 2 Paral. xxxi 10; (e) Dan. iii 88; (f) 1 Esd. xiii 1; (g) Tob. v 13.  
 44. (b) Dan. xiv 33. 45. (a) Ion. i 1; (b) Act. i 26.  
 46. (a) 3 Reg. xxii 11; (b) 4 Reg. xxv 7; (c) Hierem. xxix 22.  
 -- (a) 4 Reg. xxv; (b) Judith i 10.

40 (= G 41). Quattuor sunt Zaccharias sacerdotes unus filius Baracie qui occisus est inter uelum et altare secundus filius Sadoc profhete tercius in Esdra quartus pater Iohannis.

41 (= G 42). Sex sunt Ananie unus profheta Asa regis alius pseudo-profheta tercius de tribus pueris quartus in hactus apostholorum quintus discipulus domini qui Paulum babtizabit sextus in actus apostholorum qui crepuit.

42 (= G 43). Septem sunt Azarie unus sacerdos in templo Salomonis alius profheta sub Agar rege tercius sacerdos sub Ocyra rege quartus sub Ezechia rege quintus de tribus pueris sextus sacerdos pater Eliu septimus qui et angelus Rafael.

43 (= G 44) ff. 70 b ff. Duo sunt Abbacuc profhete unus de duodecim profhete alius qui Daniel obtulit prandium. Inter ambos sunt reges xlii anni i c lxxxii.

44 (= G 45). Duo sunt Matthie unus Iohanne prophetisse alius in actibus apostholorum qui in loco Iude successit. Inter ambos sunt anni dcc xxi.

*Variants of Philipps MS as compared with G.*

41. ...inter aedem et sacrarium...propheta [prophetae MC]...in Esdra.

42. vi [septem MC] sunt Annaniae primus est A. propheta qui proph. Asaph regi secundus est A. pseudopropheta...Saphyrae...possessionis...baptizauit Paulum apostolum...palmam [sic etiam MC].

43. ...optulit...Agag regi [rege MC]...langore...Discede...post dedit add. Dominus <sup>ti</sup> ~~mar. sec.~~...Ezechia rege [regi MC]...de tribus pueris [om. pueris MC]...Eliu patris

[patres MC] Hesdrae sacerdos...Azarias in Tobiae...Raphahel ang. sanctus.

44. ...Abacuc...habet [abet MC]...optulit Danielo...reges L.V.

45. ...Mathiae...Mathias (*bis*)...ordinatus est in locum Iude traditoris...

46. ...Sedechiae...alius est...Babilonia...falsus propheta in Hieremia...

47. ...Nabuchodonosor—Babilonia...Astiages...populum de Hierusalem...Bal-

<sup>i</sup> ~~temar~~...qui cum biberet [om. cum biberet MC]...Dario maiore...Ninque...Cambises... <sup>o</sup> ~~templum~~ [templo MC] post restaurationem...Timebant...recentes enim ascenderunt

de captiuitate sed et Achior amanita desolacionis...regressionem [sic etiam MC]... in fine libri...centum quinque annis...



Iudit. Eodem tempore iam et templ(um) post restauracionem fuerat dedicatum, et vasa sanctificata, sicut in libro Iudit dicit. Timebat enim templo et vasis, recentes enim ascenderant, sed et Achior admonet ad desolaciones templi et captivitatis et regression(is) populi de captivitate apud Olofernem facit mentionem. Nam et in finem libri dicit quod *centum quinque annos Iudit vixerit, cuius temporibus et ultra non fuit qui exterreret filios Israel*. Inter ambos autem sunt reges vii et anni ferme ccxx.

48 (= A 36). Tres sunt Tobiae, unus est Tobias filius Tobii, secundus est Tubias Ammanitis qui contradicebat Hesdrae sacerdoti ne aedificarent templum, tercius Tubias qui deposuerat in templo talenta custodienda Iechoniae sacerdoti ad eadem missus erat Heliodorus diripienda, quique flagellatus ab Angelo sem(i)animis de templo sublatu(s) est. Hoc in Machabeis scriptum est.

49 (= A 45). Duo sunt Hesdrae, unus est propheta filius Chusi ad quem Dominus de rub(o) sicut ad Moysen locutus est, quique memoria sua renovavit divinas scripturas quas Nabuchodonosor incenderat. Litterasque hebraeicas Iudeis inmutasse, et fecisse eis litteras Assirias, ut non conmiscerentur Samaritanis. In diversa manu scribuntur, ipse dictus est iure peritus. Alius est Hesdra filius Helia, scriba, sacerdos et doctor, qui cum reliquo populo de captivitate Babilloniae ascendit. Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme c.

50 (= A 46). Duo sunt Nicanor(e)s, unus est Nicanor in Machabeis princeps militiae Anthioci maioris quem occidit Iuda, alius est Nicanor in Actibus Apostolorum, unus ex septem qui ordinatus est diaconus cum Stephano. Inter ambos autem sunt anni cc.

51 (= A 47). Duo sunt Lusiae, unus est Lusias in Machabeis princeps militiae Anthioci maioris, alius est Lusias tribunus in Actibus Apostolorum qui eripuit Paulum de manibus Iudeorum. Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme cc.

52 (= A 48). Quinque sunt Anthioci in Machabeis. I est filius Philippi qui obses fuit Romae. II est filius Antiochi et (III est) nepus Anthioci qui dictus est Eu(p)ator; IV est Anthiocus filius Alexandri. V est Antiochus filius Demetrii.

53 (= A 49). Sex sunt Ptholomei in Machabeis. I est Ptholomeus filius Filadelfus. II est Ptholomeus Dorimeni, III est Macro, IV est Filometor. V est est socer Alexandri, qui occidit ipsum Alexandrum dolo, et abstulit ei filiam suam Cleopatram, et dedit eam Timotheo, VI est Ptholomeus filius Abubi, (qui) occidit Sim(e)onem et filios eius.

*References for names in G<sup>1</sup>.*

48. (a) Tob. i 1; (b) 2 Esd. ii 10, 19; (c) 2 Mach. iii 11.

49. (a) 4 Esd. i 11, xiv 1; (b) cf. 1 Esd. vii 1, 3 Esd. viii 1.

50. (a) 1 Mach. vii 43; (b) Act. vi 5. 51. (a) 1 Mach. iii 32; (b) Act. xxiii 26.

45 (= G 49). Duo sunt Esdre unus profheta filius Cusi ad quem dominus de rubo locutus est qui et legem renobabit alius sacerdos scriba et doctor legis qui reuersus est de captibitate Babylonis. Inter ambos sunt anni I.

46 (= G 50). Duo sunt Nicanores unus in Macchabeis quem hoccidit Iudas, alius in hactus apostholorum unum ex septe(m) diaconibus. Inter ambos sunt anni cc x.

47 (= G 51). Duo sunt Lisie unus in Maccabeis alius in actus apostholorum tribunus.

48 (= G 52). Quinque sunt Antiochi in Macchabeis primus filius Philippi alius filius Antiochi tercius filius Antiochi quartus filius Alexandri quintus filius Deamatri (Demetrii).

49 (= G 53). Septem sunt Ptholomei unus in Maccabeis filius Filadelfi alius Dorymini tercius Macron . quartus filius Omethohri (Philometor) quintus socer Alexandri.

*Variants of Phillipps MS as compared with G<sup>1</sup>.*

48. ...Tobias Amanitis...tercius est Tobias...in templo [ + ea *sec. man.*] custodiendo  
Oniae sacerdoti ad qui...<sup>ae</sup>semanimis [semanimis MC]...sublatus [sublatum MC]...
49. ...de rubo [rubu MC]...qui ex memoria...<sup>a</sup>diuinjs <sup>a</sup>scripturjs...<sup>a</sup>habrēicas...immu-  
tasse...Assurias...*post* Samaritanis *add.* quae *sec. man.*...<sup>a</sup>filius Helii scriba et doctor  
legis...Babyloniae...
50. ...Nicanores [Nicanoris MC]...Antiochi...anni cc. x.
51. ...Lisiae...Lisias (*bis*)...Antiochi...
52. ...Antiochi [*hac forma semper utitur scriba*]...Primus est... ii. est fil. Antiochi.  
iii. est [*om.* iii. est MC] nepus Antiochi...Eupator [Eufator MC]. iv. est  
Antiochus...
53. ...Ptolomei...Ptol. Filadelfus...Ptol. Doromeni...Macron...Philometor...Ptol.  
fil. Abubi qui [que MC] occidit Symeonem [Simonem MC] filium Mathathie.

Indi: Hic sunt reges qui in tempore (100) post resurrectionem sunt defuncti, et non resurrexerunt, sicut in libro Iudic dicitur. Tunc enim reges et reges, reges non occiderunt, sed et factus est rex ad desiderium regum et cupiditatis et appetitus (101) populi de civitate quod Hierosolymam vocant. Nam et in libro Iudic dicitur quod reges quique reges sunt Iudic reges, cum regibus et alio non sicut per unumquemque Iudic. Inter ambos autem sunt reges vi et non ferme c.

48 (= A 36). Duo sunt Tarsis, unus est Tarsus filius Tobit, secundus est Tarsus Hierosolyma qui construxit Hierosolymam secundum se adstruxit templum, tertius Tarsus qui depositus est in templo talis custodiens Ierosolymam sacerdoti ad unum unum erat Hierosolyma diripienda, quique flagellatus est (102) propter deum de templo ablatum est. Sic in Machabeis scriptum est.

49 (= A 45). Duo sunt Hierosolyma, unus est propheta filius Chai ad quem dicitur de rebus (103) sicut ad Hierosolymam locutus est, quique memoratus est unumquemque scripturas quas Nabuchodonosor incendit. Latinasque hebreaeque Iudaeis interpretans, et factus est Ierosolyma, et non commiserunt Samaritanis. In diversis vero scribitur, ipse genus est iure gentium. Alius est Hierosolyma filius Helia, scriba, sacerdos et doctor, qui cum reliquo populo de civitate Babiloniae ascendit. Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme c.

50 (= A 46). Duo sunt Nicanor (104), unus est Nicanor in Machabeis princeps militiae Antiochi maioris quem occidit Iuda, alius est Nicanor in Actibus Apostolorum, unus ex septem qui vocatus est diaconus cum Stephanus. Inter ambos autem sunt anni cc.

51 (= A 47). Duo sunt Lusias, unus est Lusias in Machabeis princeps militiae Antiochi maioris, alius est Lusias tribunus in Actibus Apostolorum qui cepit Paulum de manibus Iudeorum. Inter ambos autem sunt anni ferme cc.

52 (= A 48). Quinque sunt Antiochi in Machabeis. i est filius Philippi qui obitus fuit Romae. ii est filius Antiochi et (iii est) nepos Antiochi qui dicitur est Eupator; iv est Antiochus filius Alexandri. v est Antiochus filius Demetrii.

53 (= A 49). Sex sunt Ptholomei in Machabeis. i est Ptholomeus filius Philadelphus, ii est Ptholomeus Dorimenei, iii est Macro, iv est Philometor, v est est socer Alexandri, qui occidit ipsum Alexandrum Aetolo, et abstulit ei filiam suam Cleopatram, et dedit eam Timotheo, vi est Ptholomeus filius Abubi, (qui) occidit Sim(e)onem et filios eius.

*References for names in G.*

48. (a) Tob. 1 2; (b) 2 Esd. ii 10, 19; (c) 2 Mach. iii 11.

49. (a) 4 Esd. i 11, xiv 1; (b) cf. 1 Esd. vii 1, 3 Esd. viii 1.

50. (a) 1 Mach. vii 43; (b) Act. vi 5. 51. (a) 1 Mach. iii 32; (b) Act. xxiii 26.



45 (= G 49). Duo sunt Esdre unus profheta filius Cusi ad quem dominus de rubo locutus est qui et legem renobabit alius sacerdos scriba et doctor legis qui reuersus est de captibitate Babylonis. Inter ambos sunt anni I.

46 (= G 50). Duo sunt Nicanores unus in Macchabeis quem hoccidit Iudas, alius in hactus apostholorum unum ex septe(m) diaconibus. Inter ambos sunt anni cc x.

47 (= G 51). Duo sunt Lisie unus in Maccabeis alius in actus apostholorum tribunus.

48 (= G 52). Quinque sunt Antioci in Macchabeis primus filius Philippi alius filius Antioci tercius filius Antioci quartus filius Alexandri quintus filius Deamatri (Demetrii).

49 (= G 53). Septem sunt Ptholomei unus in Maccabeis filius Fildelfi alius Dorymini tercius Macron . quartus filius Omethohri (Philometor) quintus socer Alexandri.

*Variants of Philipps MS as compared with G.*

48. ...Tobias Amānitis...tercius est Tobias...in templo [+ ea *sec. man.*] custodiendo  
Oniae sacerdoti ad qui...semianimis [semanimis MC]...sublatus [sublatum MC]...
49. ...de rubo [rubu MC]...qui ex memoria...diuinjs scripturjs...habreicas...immu-  
tasse...Assurias...*post* Samaritanis *add. quae sec. man.*...filius Helii scriba et doctor  
legis...Babyloniae....
50. ...Nicanores [Nicanoris MC]...Antioci...anni cc. x.
51. ...Lisiae...Lisias (*bis*)...Antioci...
52. ...Antioci [*hac forma semper uhitur scriba*]...Primus est.... ii. est fil. Antioci.  
iii. est [*om.* iii. est MC] nepus Antioci...Eupator [Eufator MC]. iv. est  
Antiochus....
53. ...Ptolomei...Ptol. Filadelfus...Ptol. Doromeni...Macron...Philometor...Ptol.  
fil. Abubi qui [que MC] occidit Symeonem [Simonem MC] filium Mathathię.

34 (= A 50). Undecim sunt Simonis; i est Simon filius Marthanae; ii est accleratus in Machabeis qui discivit sacerdotia. Hic detulit Antiocho rege plenus esse thesaurus in templo Domini. *Hic, ad, Jus debere proficere.* In (qua) causa missus est Elnodorus dispendia, quique flagellatus ab angelo sem(7)animis de templo sublatus est. iii est filius Ouzar sacerdotis, iv est Simon Petrus, v Simon Magus, vi est hereticus collega Cleobii, vii est Simon apostolicus collega Cleopae, (quibus) post resurrectionem apparuit (Dominus Ihesus Christus euntibus ad Emaum castellum ubi apparuit) eis in panis (fractione). viii est Simon Zelotis. ix est Simon Coriarius in cuius domum manebat Petrus apostolus. x est (fr)ater Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi, xi est Simon ab Arimathia qui tulit crucem post Dominum nostrum Ihesum.

55 (= A 51). Quattuor sunt Iacobi Apostoli in Novo Testamento. i est frater Domini Ihesu Christi qui primus Hierosolimis episcopus fuit. Hunc lapidaverunt Iudei primo anno episcopatus sui, et martirio coronatus est; ii est Iacob frater Iohannis filius Zebedei, quem occidit Herodes; iii est pater Iudae Apostoli; iv est filius Alfei.

56 (= A 59). Duo sunt Herodes, unus est Herodes filius Antipatri cui tricennio tercio anno regni sui natus est Dominus Ihesus Christus, et alius est Herodes filius Archelai. Inter ambos sunt anni (XLII).

57 (= A 55). Duo sunt Adae mulieres, una est Ada uxor (Lamech) de Cain, cuius maritus(m) gladio occidit et duxit illam uxorem, alia est Ada uxor Esau. Inter ambas autem sunt anni duo milia.

58 (= A 56). Duo sunt Selle, una est Sella quae peperit Thobel quem dicunt Pl(u)tonem quasi Deum (infern), alia est Sella uxor (Lamech) de Cain. Inter ambas autem sunt ferme anni III CCCI.

59 (= A 57). Quattuor sunt Seruch. Una est Seruch mulier uxor Iafeth. ii est Seruch in Iudicum quem suscepit in Gaba Micha Levi. iii est in Exodo quae l(iti)gavit cum Salam filium Israhelitidis. iv est Seruche avus Abrahae pater Nachor.

60 (= A 58). Duo sunt Sepphorae, una est Sepphora obsetrix qui obsetrigabat filios Israel in Egypto. Alia est Sapphora uxor Moysae. Inter ambas autem sunt anni ferme LX.

61 (= A 59). Duae sunt Sarrae una est Sarra uxor Abrahae, alia est uxor Tubiae filia Raguel. Inter ambas autem sunt anni CCCCL.

*References for names in G'.*

54. (a) 1 Mach. li 3; (b) 2 Mach. iii; (c) Eccles. li; (d) Matt. x 2; (e) Act. viii 9; (f) Luc. xxiv; (h) Matt. x 4; (i) Act. ix 43; (k) Matt. xiii 55; (j) Matt. xxvi 34.

55. (a) Gal. i 19; (b) Matt. x 3, Act. xii 2; (c) Jud. i; (d) Matt. x 3.

57. (a) Gen. iv 19; (b) Gen. xxxvi 2.

58. (a) Gen. iv 22; (b) Gen. iv 19.

59. (c) cf. Lev. xxiv 10, 11; (d) Gen. xi 22.

60. (a) Ex. i 15; (b) Ex. li 21.

61. (b) Tob. iii 7.

Cathacie alius  
 virtus Petrus  
 timus Symon  
 Arimathia.  
 domini alius  
 her.  
 regem Persarum  
 patri alius filius  
 te accusata alia  
 anni D L.  
 alia uxor Esau.  
 sor Lamec.  
 iudicum.  
 Egypto alia uxor  
 uxor Thobie.

---

G.

o  
 aru templum...In  
 nimis MC]...filius  
 Cleobi. vii est  
 tionem apparuit  
 it [om. Dominus  
 ix est Symon  
 Christum.  
 t *add. man. sec.*  
 es rex [*sequitur*  
 tercio...Dominus  
 in sunt anni xlii  
 ritus MC]....  
 amech [Samech  
 egavit MC] cum



62 (= A 60). Tres sunt Debborae, una est Deborra nutrix Rebechae, II est Deborra iudex et prophetissa, III est avia Tubi.

63 (A = 64). Sex sunt Mariae, una est Maria soror Aaron, II est Maria mater Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi, III est Maria Magdalenae de qua excluserat Dominus Noster Ihesus Christus septem demonia, IV est soror Marthae et Lazari, V est mater Iohannis et Iacobi, VI est mater Cleopae.

64 (A = 63). Quinque sunt Annae, prima est mater Samuhelis, II est Anna uxor Raguhel socrus Tobiae, III est Anna mater Tobiae, IV est in Novo Testamento filia Fanuhel de tribu Aser, V est uxor Ioachim mater Mariae matris Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi.

65 (= A 65). Duae sunt Abissaac puellae, una est Abissaac Summanitis quae dormiebat cum David rege ut calefaceret eum, quia praesenectute obr(i)guerat corpus eius, sed (non cognouit) eam hanc postea voluit accipere uxorem Ornias filius eius, in ipsa causa occidit eum Salomon. Et est alia puella Abisaac quae captivata est ex Israel in Siria, ipsa (dixit) domino suo Naman, *est propheta Eliseus in Samaria, qui potest curare dominum meum*. Inter ambas autem sunt anni ferme LX.

66 (om. A). Duae sunt Meneriae, una est uxor Areze quae genuit Trispon quem dicunt Neptunum quasi deum maris, et alia est Meneria Summanitis uxor Mathiae quae genuit Iona, ipsum resuscitavit Eliseu(s.) Inter ambas autem sunt anni II.DL.

67 (= A 66). Duae sunt Bersabeae, una est provincia ubi regnavit Salomon, alia est Bersabeae mater Salomonis.

68 (= A 62). Duae sunt Abigiae, una est quae fuit uxor Nabal, quam postea duxit uxorem Davit. Alia est Abigia filia Iesse soror Davit, quae genuit Amessa quem occidit Ioas dolo. Uno sane tempore fuerunt.

69 (= A 54). Duae sunt Susannae, una est quae falsae accusata est a presbiteris Theostes et Simeon, alia est Sussanna in Evangelio uxor Chuzae procuratoris Herodis, quae post passionem Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi cum mulieribus venit ad monumentum, ubi positum fuerat corpus eiusdem Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi. Inter ambas autem sunt anni CCCCLX.

(70 (om. A). Quinque sunt sacerdotes apostate in Machabeis, Simon primus, II Iason, III (Menelaus), IIII Lisima(cus), V Alcimus.

*References for names in G.*

62. (a) Gen. xxxv 8; (b) Judic. iv 4; (c) Tob. i 8 (LXX).  
 63. (e) Matt. xxvii 56; (f) Joan. xix 25.  
 64. (a) 1 Reg. i 2; (b) Tob. vii 8; (c) Tob. i 9; (d) Luc. ii 36.  
 65. (a) 3 Reg. i 3, ii 17; (b) 4 Reg. v 2. 67. (a) 3 Reg. iv 25; (b) 2 Reg. xii 24.  
 68. (a) 1 Reg. xxv 3; (b) 1 Paral. ii 16, 17.  
 69. (a) Dan. xiii; (b) cf. Luc. viii 3, xxiv 10.  
 70. (a) 2 Mach. iii 4; (b) 2 Mach. iv 7; (c) 2 Mach. iv 24; (d) 2 Mach. iv 29; (e) 1 Mach. vii 5, 9.

60 (= G 62). Tres sunt Deborrae una mater Rebecche alia in iudicum tertia abia Thobie.

61 (= om. G<sup>1</sup>). Duo sunt Elizabet una uxor Haaron alia uxor Zaccharie. Inter ambas sunt anni DC.

62 (= G 68). Due sunt Auiagde una uxor Daudid alia uxor [*end of line*].

63 (= G 64). Quattuor sunt Anne prima mater Samuelis secunda uxor Raguel tertia mater Tobie quarta uxor Ihoacym mater Marie.

64 (= G 63). Quinqué sunt Marie una soror Haaron alia mater domini tertia Macdalene quarta Lazari quinta mater Cleophe.

65 (= G 65). Due / <sunt Abisaac>h una Sunammitis in cuius sinu dormiebat Daudid secunda que captibata / . . . qui dixit domino suo Neeman est propheta Eliseus qui te curet.

66 (= G 67). Due sunt Uersabe una <pro>uincia ubi regnabit Salomon alia mater eius qui fuit uxor Urie.

*Variants of Phillipps MS as compared with G<sup>1</sup>.*

62. ...Deborrae...Rebecca...Deborra auia....
63. ...Prima est...exclut... iv est Maria...Cleophę.
64. ...prima est Anna...Raguel... iv est Anna...Phanuel....
65. ...Abisac (*trr*)...<sup>u</sup>Sonamites...<sup>i</sup>quę <sup>e</sup>cafeaceret...obriguerat [obreguerat MC]...  
sed eam non cognouit [sed nonne eam MC]...Onias...Syria...dixit [om. MC]...<sup>e</sup>Neman  
...Heliseus....
66. ...genuit risbon...<sup>u</sup>sonamitis uxor Mattiae...Eliseus...ferme IIDL.
67. ...regnaui<sup>t</sup> Galomon alia est Bęersabeac....
68. ...Abigeae...Daudid (*bis*)...Abigea...occidit Ioab....
69. ...Theoste et Symmacho...Susanna...uxor cuzze...post pass. Dom. I. C.....
70. ...Menclaus [Menaclarius MC]...Lisimachus [Lisimachus MC]...Alchimus.

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

1. (Iosephus) viri (1) filii Agapoda  
dest. Alexander uxoris. Himmenn, Hicta, Pigele

2. Dese sunt Phasa, una est obecta quae obstruabat  
in Aegypto, et alia est Phsa quae manducabat filios eius ab  
ter umbra unum sunt anni 1000.

3. Dese sunt Mathan una est filia Lot maior, alia est filia  
Iaco. Inter umbra unum sunt anni 1000.

4. Dese sunt Tomes, una est Tomes maior, quae vocat  
Pervaria et Mediana, et regnavit per illa Darius maior  
est Darius vir, sponsa(1) Tetha. Inter umbra unum  
1000.

II.

UTRIUSQUE FRAGMENTI INDEX.

(Ex Cod. Sangallensi 903 saec. VII-VIII.)

14) 7 sunt Mariae, alia mater Dei, tertia Magdalena, quarta  
ita mater Cleope.

16) 11 sunt Berrabe (una) provincia ubi regnavit Salamon  
ius iuxta Dei Cetha.

15) 111 sunt Aose, una mater Samueli alia uxor Raguel,  
116, 111 uxor Ioschim mater Mariae.





## NOTES.

1. *The relations between the texts.*

The complete St. Gall text (G<sup>1</sup>) contains 74 sections: the Albi text (A) contains 66. G<sup>2</sup>, which is a mere fragment, need not be discussed as yet: and G<sup>1</sup> shall be simply called G.

The sections contained in G and not in A are:

- 8 (Joseph).
- 9 (Manasses).
- 10 (Puthifar).
- 28 (Chusi).
- 66 (Meneria).
- 70 (Sacerdotes apostate).
- 71 (Apostate).
- 72 (Phua).
- 73 (Multha).

One section occurs in A and not in G, viz. 61 (Elisabeth).

Next, G does not preserve the same order as A. The principal divergences concern the paragraphs on Joas (G 26 A 18), Nabuchodonosor (G 47 A 24), Tobias (G 48 A 36), Sedecias (G 46 A 38), Esdras (G 49 A 45), Tomires (G 74 A 52), Susanna (G 69 A 54), Abigia (G 68 A 62), Anna (G 64 A 63), Maria (G 63 A 64).

Thirdly, G presents a far longer text than A, not merely in virtue of possessing certain sections not in A, but also because its form of the sections which are common to both is a substantially longer form.

The matter peculiar to G consists largely of clauses which serve to explain and define the personalities of various individuals by means of quotations from the Bible, or short narrative passages.

Besides this G adds to the number of persons mentioned in several sections. Where A has ten Simons, G has eleven (A 50 G 54). In A 64 G 63, A has five Maries, G six: in A 25 G 27, A has two Orniae, G three: in A 57 G 59, A has two Seracs, G four.

It is not easy to decide whether G or A has the best claim to represent the original text of our tract. I am at present inclined to believe that the truth lies with neither, but that G gives us an expanded text and A a shortened one.

On the one hand, the sections which are present in G and absent from A have every appearance of genuineness: on the other, very many of the explanatory clauses in G are just such as might have been added by a glossator. Some of them are so long as to destroy the scale of the whole: a good instance is the section on Nabuchodonosor (G 47), where a quantity of matter from the Book of Judith is drafted into the text. Others are §§ 16, 17 on Caleb and Joab.

Further, there is at least one instance in which G presents a correct statement in place of a distinctly incorrect one, which is common to A and G<sup>2</sup> (though mutilated in the latter). This is in the paragraph on Ozias (G 29 A 26).

Here A G<sup>2</sup> read: (Duo sunt Ozie, unus) qui ostendit manum (suam) continere arcam et aruit manus eius.

G<sup>1</sup> has: unus est Ozias qui misit manum suam continere arcam quia declinauerat illam uitulus et occidit illum deus quia laicus erat.

Here G<sup>1</sup> appears to be following the LXX of 1 Chron. xiii 9 (καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Ὁζὰ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τοῦ κατασχεῖν τὴν κιβωτὸν ὅτι ἐξέκλιεν αὐτὴν ὁ μάγος), and not 2 Sam. vi 6 (ὅτι περιέσπασεν κ.τ.λ.). It is difficult to doubt that here at least the text of G is later than that of A G<sup>2</sup>. It has corrected an evident mistake: a mistake which oddly enough recurs in the mediaeval Greek *Palaea* (the counterpart of the Western *Historia Scholastica*): this, with a wonderful disregard of the written word, places the occurrence in the period of the Exodus, and allows Uzzah to escape with a withered hand (Vassiliev, *Anecd. Graeco-Byz.* p. 249).

There are, however, cases in which it seems to me that A must have made corrections of its original. It has, I think, omitted, as being uncanonical, matter which G has retained. It has not eliminated everything of the kind, but only what was readily recognizable. This will appear in the course of the notes upon the text which, in order to avoid repetition, I will give in the next place.

2. *Notes on the text.*

§ 13 (A 10). Note that the name of the beggar in the parable (Lc. xvi) is given as Eleazar.

§ 15 (A 13). G has a long insertion derived from 1 Chron. ii 42, 49, 55, and ends the section with a sentence about the Three Hebrew Children, which is not at all relevant.

§ 18 (A 15). Hoc in Iob . . . scriptum est. This is a reference to the LXX supplement to Job.

§ 19 (A 16). Qui uiuum obruit Acicharonem. The source of this expression is evidently the N-text of Tobit (xiv 10), which has οὐχὶ ζῶν κατηνέχθη εἰς τὴν γῆν; whereas the ordinary LXX text has no suggestion of burying alive.

§ 27 (A 25). Tercius est Orniat princeps demoniorum. This clause is not in A, and must be derived, so far as I can see, from the Testament of Solomon, in which alone mention of a demon Orniat occurs. He plays a not unimportant part in that work<sup>1</sup>.

§ 28 (peculiar to G). Tercius est Chusi pater Hesdrae prophetae maioris. Apparently here, and certainly in § 49 (A 45), Ezra, the author

<sup>1</sup> [The attempt at emendation in the Phillipps MS is interesting, but probably does not supply the key.—H. A. W.]



of the canonical Ezra, is distinguished from the *señalado* author of 4 Esdras. Moreover, in both places this latter person is made to be the son of Chusi, in accordance with that text of 4 Esdr. i 11, which I have provisionally called the Spanish text (see *Introduct. to the Fourth Book of Esdras*: Bensly and James). Our document is thus a new accession to the scanty list of authorities which support that text. Further, in an important copy of 4 Esdras now at Leon, and as yet imperfectly known, there is a prologue which coincides in language with our tract. The passages of it known to me are as follows:

Incipit premium prefatio in libro Esdre filius Chusi prophete.

Hesdre filius Chusim hystorias librorum scribens . . .

. . . de captiuitate. Sunt ferme inter ambos anni quinquaginta.

It will be interesting to know what relation this preface may bear to our text.

§ 32 (A 24). The third Sadoc, founder of the Sadducean sect; I am unable to point out the ultimate source of this assertion.

§ 40 (A 39). The mention of Joachim, the Virgin's father (and of Anna, in § 64), need not be derived immediately, but must come ultimately, from the *Protevangelium*.

In § 42 (A 41) a mistake has been made somewhat like that in the case of Uzzah. A tells us 'the fourth Ananias is in the Acts of the Apostles, the fifth is the disciple of the Lord, who baptized Paul, the sixth is in the Acts of the Apostles, who burst (*qui crepuit*).'<sup>4</sup> G corrects this, or at least gives a truer statement, making the fourth Ananias the husband of Sapphira, and the sixth the high priest who commanded Paul to be smitten. The misstatement in A may be merely due to a careless confusion between the fourth and sixth Ananias, or else the word *crepuit* may be a false reading for something like *percussit*.

§ 43 (A 42). The Azarias who officiated at the dedication of Solomon's temple is derived from 1 Chron. vi 10.

§ 45 (A 44). Mattheus (Matthias) is represented in A as the father of the 'prophetess Johanna.' This is corrected (as I think) by G to 'father of the prophet Jonah.'

In § 54 (A 50) is some confusion, and also some trace of uncanonical matter. G<sup>1</sup> gives the fifth Simon as Simon Magus, 'the sixth the heretic, companion of Cleobius, the seventh the apostolic, companion of Cleophas (at Emmaus), the eighth Simon Zelotes, the ninth the tanner (of Acts x), the tenth the brother of the Lord, the eleventh Simon of Arimathea, who carried our Lord's cross.'

A has 'the fifth Simon the heretic, the sixth the disciple (the

<sup>4</sup> [I venture to suggest *incepuit*, the reference being, as in G, to the episode in Acts xxiii 2.—H. A. W.]

companion) of Cleophas, the seventh Simon Zelotes, the eighth the tanner, the ninth the brother of the Lord, the tenth of Arimathea.'

G<sup>2</sup> agrees exactly with A, but omits the ninth Simon.

The difference between A (G<sup>2</sup>) and G<sup>1</sup> amounts to this, that the former omit and the latter retains (or inserts) the clause 'vi est hereticus collega Cleobii.' There are two reasons which might lead to the omission of this. First, there is the similarity between the words *collega Cleobii* and *collega Cleophae*; and next, the source of the clause is not Biblical, and is very likely uncanonical. Simon is coupled with Cleobius, and with him alone, in the Acts of Paul (in the letter of the Corinthian Church to Paul). In another series of passages, headed by a fragment of Hegesippus, Simon, Cleobius, and Dositheus form a trio closely connected with each other.

The giving of the name Simon to the companion of Cleophas at Emmaus, if not unique, is very uncommon. He is more usually called Luke. It is quite possible that this whole clause may have grown out of a mistake. The name *Cleobii* was unknown, and was converted by a too ingenious scribe into the better-known *Cleophae*.

The confusion of Simon of Cyrene with Joseph of Arimathea is one of those careless mistakes which G<sup>1</sup> might have been expected to set right.

§ 58 (A 56). The identification of Tubal with the god Pluto (absent from A) is of a piece with a similar identification in § 66. The source of both may be some chronicle of the world.

§ 59 (A 57). Seruch the wife of Japhet is new, so far as I can tell. The names given to this person in the *Book of Jubilees*, &c., are quite different, as we shall see.

The Levite of Judges xvii, who became Micah's priest, and the Levite of Judges xix are not the same person, though G confuses them. In the Bible neither has a name. In the chronicle of Pseudo-Philo the second of the two is called Beel, and his host Bethac.

The identity of the third Seruch in G is very obscure. The text is 'III est in Exodo quae legavit cum Salam filium Israhelitidis.' The nearest thing I can get to this is the incident in Lev. xxiv 10, 11, where the son of the Israelitess Shelomith (Σαλωμειθ) was stoned for cursing.

The LXX has a clause which somewhat resembles our Latin: καὶ ἐμαχέσαντο ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ὁ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραηλιτίδος καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Ἰσραηλίτης. The Latin is obviously corrupt. Can it be that it originally ran thus: 'qui iurgavit cum filio Salam(ith) Israhelitidis'?

§ 65 (A 65). The second Abishag is the 'little maid' of 2 Kings v. The name is not elsewhere to be found, as I believe. It may very probably be due to the source which in § 66 assigns the name Meneria to the Shunammite (2 Kings iv), and in § 72 the name Phua to the woman of 2 Kings vi who devoured her child.



In § 66 'Meneria uxor Areze, quae genuit Trispon' (Trispon being equated with Neptune) is one of the puzzles of the piece. A comparison with § 58 suggests that she must belong to the antediluvian period, and this gives me confidence in identifying Areze with Jared. In the *Book of Jubilees*, and other such documents, I do not find anything like the name Meneria given to Jared's wife (who is usually called Baracha), nor any explanation of Trispon. The son of Jared was, of course, Enoch; but neither Enoch nor any other name in the patriarchal genealogies can be twisted into a resemblance to Trispon. The equation Trispon = Triton = Oannes = Enoch is desperate.

In § 69 (A 54) G, but not A, gives the names of the elders who accused Susanna as Theostes and Simeon. A, in a supplementary note, calls them Celcias and Sedecias, approaching in this to the Jewish tradition (known to Origen), which identifies them with the false prophets Ahab the son of Kolaiah and Zedekiah the son of Maaseiah (Jer. xxix 21). A Syriac text calls them Amid and Abid.

In § 73 (not in A) Multha (Milcah) is the daughter of Job by Dinah, daughter of Jacob. The Pseudo-Philo makes Dinah Job's only wife. The Targum calls her his first wife, the Testament of Job his second. In the Pseudo-Philo the names of the daughters are given as Meru, Litaz, Zeli.

§ 74 (A 52) is peculiar. It speaks in the first place of Tomyris, who is not mentioned in any Biblical (or apocryphal) book; and then of Thamyris, who occurs only in the Acts of Paul (and Thecla). The second clause is absent from A.

It will be noted that G gives us here and in § 54 two allusions fairly assignable to the Acts of Paul, and that A gives neither. It will also be remembered that A omits (or does not give) several of the more distinctly apocryphal details (Ornias, Meneria, Phua): others (Abissaac, Seruc) it does give.

### 3. Additions in A.

The Albi manuscript adds to the *Expositio Patrum* a few detailed notes on the identity of some scriptural personages. These are obscurely written and obscurely expressed, but they have some points of interest.

(a) 'The name of the woman with the issue of blood is Beronice.' This is in agreement with the *Gesta Pilati*.

(b) 'The name of the rich man at whose gate Eleazar (Lazarus) lay is Do . . . re (?) This you will find in Josypus.'

Harnack has shown that the traditional name, sometimes corrupted to Ninive (and occurring in the Sahidic and Old Latin Versions), is properly Phinees. Priscillian confirms this (Tract. ix p. 91 'et Fines in misericordis diuitis gehennae ignis habitaculum repperitur').

Whatever the name in the Albi MS may be it certainly is not Phinees.



I would hazard a guess that it may have been Domires. The *Collectanea Bedae*, remembering the thirst of the rich man in Hell, calls him Tantalus.

The reference to Josephus (whether the historian be meant, or the author of the *Hypomnesticon*) is without justification.

(c) Of the names of the Elders who accused Susanna enough has been said already.

(d) 'The name of Lot's wife is Melusade.' This is amusing enough: it explains a riddle in the *Coena Cypriani*. In that curious work the following clauses occur:

Salem misit Molessadon  
 Salpam (sustulit) Molessadon  
 Molessadon salem misit  
 (Procedit) in stupido Molessadon.

It has been usual to identify Molessadon with Melzar the eunuch of Dan. i. This, however, cannot be right, for Melzar appears twice in the *Coena* under his proper Greek designation of Amelsad. Rabanus Maurus, in his expurgated edition of the *Coena*, retains Melzar, calling him Malassar, but expels Molessadon. We now see from the Albi MS that Molessadon is Lot's wife; and this explains why Molessadon has so much to do with salt and also with the *salpa*, whose name suggests salt. The source of the name is yet to be found. It is not the chronicle of Pseudo-Philo, the *Jubilees*, or the book Yaschar. I have searched the *Onomastica* in vain. The only name given by Jewish tradition to Lot's wife is Edith! (Fabr. *Cod. Pseud. V. T.* i. 432).

(e) 'The thieves of the crucifixion, one Ioaras, the other Gamatras.' This agrees with various Old Latin glosses: e. g. Cod. Colbertinus gives Zoathan and Cammatha, and Cod. Rehdigeranus Joathas and Maggattras. The *Collectanea Bedae* has Matha and Joca. The dialogue of Adrian and Ritheus (Kemble, *Salomon and Saturn*, p. 213) Jonathas and Gomatras.

(f) 'The wife of Noah was named Set (?) The wife of Shem Nora, the wife of Ham Sare, the wife of Japhet Serac.'

In the *Book of Jubilees* Noah's wife is Emzarah, Shem's is Sedukatelbab, Ham's Neelata-Mek, Japhet's Adalenses.

Euty chius gives the four names as Haical, Salit, Nahlat, Arisisah.

Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxvi) gives a tradition that Noah's wife was Noria.

In the prose Anglo-Saxon *Salomon and Saturn* (Kemble, p. 105) we have for Noah's wife Dalila, for Shem's Jaitarecta, and for Ham's Catafluvia: and, as alternatives, Olla, Ollina, Ollibana. Shem's wife has slipped out.

In the Master of Oxford's *Catechism* (*l. c.* p. 218) practically the same names are given, viz.: Dalida (Noah), Cateslinna (Shem), Laterecta

(Ham), Aurca (Japhet): with the alternatives Ollia, Olina, Olybana, for the last three.

In the Anglo-Saxon *Heptateuch* (Cotton Claudius, B iv) a note on one of the pictures on f. 14 gives Noah's wife Phiapphara, Shem's wife Parsia, Ham's wife Cataphua, Japhet's wife Fura.

An illustrated Genesis of the thirteenth century (Brit. Mus. Egerton, 1894) assigns the name Puarphara to Noah's wife.

(g) The last note is much disordered. Its general purport seems to be the interpretation of some of the names given above.

I explain the presence of the words 'Sabba dies' by the fact that Sabbethe or Sambethe was a traditional name for the Sibyl who was Noah's daughter-in-law.

For the rest, the writer seems to say that *sare* may mean in Hebrew *sun* and also *moon*. שרם means sun, ירח moon.

On 'samma iurabat septe(m) celi' be it noted that שבוע stands for *swearing* and also for *seven*, and that שמים is *heaven*.

Our author perhaps wished to tell us that *sabba* (the name of one of Noah's daughters-in-law) meant the *sabbath day* and also *swearing* and *seven*, and that *samma* meant *heaven*. If so, he has not succeeded very well.

M. R. JAMES.

## NOTES AND STUDIES

## THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF JEREMIAH.

IN this note I shall attempt to show (1) that the Greek version of the book of Jeremiah falls into two nearly equal portions, which have been rendered by different translators, possibly from two separate collections of prophecies : (2) that the hand of the translator of the second portion is to be traced in the first part of the book of Baruch : (3) that the first portion of the Greek Jeremiah has a close affinity with the Greek versions of Ezekiel and the minor Prophets, whereas the Greek Isaiah stands outside the group thus formed.

## (1) THE TRANSLATORS OF JEREMIAH.

In attempting to prove a plurality of translators in any book or group of books in the LXX, there are two facts in particular which one must bear in mind. The first is that the translators did not, for the most part, rigidly render each Hebrew word by a single Greek equivalent. The rendering varies in the same book and in the same context<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, in the Pentateuch, variety of rendering in the same context seems to be the rule with the translators, who sought thereby to avoid the monotony of the Hebrew<sup>2</sup>. The second fact to be taken into account is the corrupt state of the text, due to the mixture of several types of text, and particularly to the intrusion into the LXX of the renderings of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion from the parallel columns in Origen's Hexapla. If, however, after making due allowance for these two facts, we find that the same Hebrew word is rendered with fair consistency in one way in one part of a book, and in another way in another part, we are justified in inferring a change of translators. And this is what we find in the Greek Jeremiah.

The indications that more than one hand was employed in the rendering of this book into Greek have not escaped notice<sup>3</sup>. But

<sup>1</sup> Swete, *Introd. to O. T.* p. 317.

<sup>2</sup> Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi Vers. Alex. libri tres*, pp. 52 ff. His list of examples might easily be increased. They cannot, I think, be entirely accounted for by Hexaplaric influence.

<sup>3</sup> See e. g. Streane, *The double text of Jeremiah*, p. 1 and *passim*; Workman, *The*



the commentators appear to consider that this variety of rendering is spread over the whole translation, and have failed, so far as I am aware, to observe that the change in style and vocabulary takes place at a definite point in the middle of the book. I find that the two portions of the translation are composed of chaps. i-xxviii (according to the Greek arrangement of chapters) and chaps. xxix-li, which I shall call respectively Jeremiah  $\alpha$  and Jeremiah  $\beta$ . The final chapter lii forms an appendix and the Greek is probably by a third hand ( $\gamma$ ): of this I will speak later. It will be worth while to indicate by a rough plan the portions into which the Greek translation falls and the different arrangement of matter in the Greek and in the Hebrew.

<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Hebrew.</i>
a. (1) i-xxv 13 Prophecies mostly of an early date, forming the oldest nucleus (i-xx): prophecies of various dates against kings of Judah and false prophets (xxi-xxv 13).	i-xxv 14 = $\alpha$ (1) of Greek
(2) xxv 14-xxviii. Against Elam, Egypt, Babylon	xxv 15-xlv = $\beta$ (2) of Greek
$\beta$ . (1) xxix-xxxi. Philistines, Edom, Ammon, Kedar, Damascus, Moab	
(2) xxxii-li. Summary list of the nations to whom 'the cup of fury' is to be sent. Prophecies mostly of the period preceding the taking of Jerusalem intermixed with history of the same period. Supplementary prophecy to Baruch (li).	xlvi-li = $\alpha$ (2), $\beta$ (1) of Greek, the prophecies being in this order: Egypt, Philistines, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar and Hazor, Elam, Babylon
$\gamma$ . lii Historical Appendix (= 2 Kings xxiv, xxv)	lii = $\gamma$ of the Greek.

It will be seen that, in regard to *structure*, the difference between the Greek and Hebrew texts consists in the position assigned to the group of prophecies against the foreign nations, and the arrangement of these prophecies among themselves. In the Greek they are placed in the middle of the book, immediately after the words in xxv 13, 'And I will bring on that land [Babylon] all my words which I have pronounced

*text of Jeremiah*, p. xxvii 'Although in general this book is characterized by great consistency in the use of many specific terms, yet sufficient irregularity appears in certain portions of it to justify the supposition that several persons were employed in making the Greek version'; Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 83 (note), remarks that the Greek of Jeremiah 'appears to be translated by at least two hands'; Scholz, *Der masord. Text u. die LXX Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias*, p. 14, gives a useful list of examples; Frankl, *Studien über die Septuaginta u. Peshito zu Jeremia*, pp. 5 ff.

against it, even all that is written in this book'; in the Hebrew they are relegated to the end of the book, being followed only by the historical appendix. In the Greek they appear to be arranged according to no system; in the Hebrew they are arranged in an orderly geographical sequence, beginning with Egypt and continuing eastwards to Babylon. There are, of course, also considerable differences of *text* between the Greek and Hebrew books, the Greek text being much the shorter of the two; into these differences I do not propose to enter.

As regards the divisions into which the Greek translation falls, it may be noted at once that the break does not come at the point (xxv 13) where the Hebrew and Greek arrangement of chapters diverges, but rather later. 'Jeremiah  $\alpha$ ' includes a small group of three prophecies against foreign nations.

In the following table I give the renderings of various Hebrew words and phrases in the two parts of the translation, placing first those which most clearly indicate the point where the break comes. Some of the instances are selected from the list of Hebrew expressions characteristic of Jeremiah given by Dr. Driver<sup>1</sup>. I have placed in square brackets those passages where an  $\alpha$  rendering occurs also in the  $\beta$  portion or *vice versa*, and have generally noted the renderings of the Hebrew word in the other prophetic books of the LXX. The references, where it seemed necessary to give them, are to the chapters and verses of the Greek text as edited by Dr. Swete.

TABLE I.

<i>Hebrew</i>	<i>Jeremiah</i> $\alpha$ (i-xxviii)	<i>Jeremiah</i> $\beta$ (xxix-li)
י. כה אמר יהוה	τάδε λέγει Κύριος <i>passim</i> about 60 times in chaps. ii-xxviii [Also xxix 1, 8, 13 AQ] So Is. Ez. Min.	οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος <i>passim</i> about 70 times (xxx 1-li 34) τάδε εἶπεν Κ. xxix 13 B

In chap. xxix we thus get a combination of the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  renderings, and two instances of the  $\alpha$  rendering. It might be thought from this instance that we should place the break in the middle of chap. xxix. Other usages, however, go to show that no part of that chapter belonged to the  $\alpha$  portion. A certain amount of mixture of the two vocabularies is seen in the three opening chapters (xxix-xxxi) of the  $\beta$  portion. Apart from these passages in chap. xxix,  $\epsilon\delta\epsilon$  does not occur in Jer.  $\beta$ , except as an equivalent for the similar-sounding  $\epsilon\delta\epsilon$  (xxx 33  $\alpha\delta\epsilon$ , xxxii 16  $\alpha\delta\epsilon$ ), where the Greek may be a corruption of an original transliteration  $\alpha\delta\alpha\delta$ .

<sup>1</sup> *Introd. to O. T.* pp. 257 ff.



ἀλλοθεν	Ἰερωνίμ 4.4 (= 1005)	Ἰερωνίμ β (1215-6)
1. τοῦτο ἄλλοθεν ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἄλλοθεν (ἀλλοθεν) ἐστὶ ἀποκατάστασις
(1005) 1005	τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	[ἀλλοθεν, ἀλλοθεν occur in both groups]
(1005) 1005	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἀλλοθεν (= 1005) 13 times
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἀποκατάστασις 14-15 21
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	

The word *allogen* occurs four times in α, but always as an *adverb*, with *ἐκ* or *ἐξ* (except in two passages) it is used almost as an abstract noun. (Cf. the verb *allogen* next p.)

3. (1007) 1007	ἀλλοθεν ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἀλλοθεν ἀποκατάστασις
"without"	(1007) (1007) (1007)	9 A (ἄλλοθεν ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις) xxxii 9
(1007) 1007	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	A (ἀλλοθεν ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις) li 2
1007	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	A (ἄλλοθεν ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις) B
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἀλλοθεν ἀποκατάστασις li 22
	(ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις)	[ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	li, 12]
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	

Under this head it may be noted that the verbs *ἀποκατάστασις* and *ἀποκατάστασις* are confined respectively to Jer. 4 and Jer. 8.

	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἀποκατάστασις xxxix 2 A, 19,
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	xxxix 1, xxxi 9 A,
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	xxxii 9 A, xxxiv 9,
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	xxxviii 24, xlix 17,
	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	li 2 A, 8 & A
4. 1008 B	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις	ἀποκατάστασις ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις
	(ἀποκατάστασις) xxx 17, xxi 14,	xxx 16
	xxxii 32	
	ἀποκατάστασις also in chaps. ix, xi,	ἀποκατάστασις renders different
	xxi, xxvii [xxx 9 A]	Hebrew words in
	Lam. Ex. Min.	α and in β
5. 1009 γδ	ἀποκατάστασις ἀποκατάστασις ἢ 30, γ 3,	ἀποκατάστασις ἀποκατάστασις xxxix
	vii 28, xvii 23	33, xlii 13
	Zeph. <sup>9</sup>	
6. 1010	ἀποκατάστασις (chaps. iii, vi, xv,	ἀποκατάστασις (chaps.
	xvii, xix, xxviii)	xxxvii, xl). [Also
	Lam. Min.	xxviii 9 ἀποκατάστασις
		... καὶ οὐκ ἀποκατάστασις]



<i>Hebrew</i>	<i>Jeremiah</i> <i>a</i> (i-xxviii)	<i>Jeremiah</i> <i>β</i> (xxix-li)
7. נַע	καιρός <sup>27</sup> (from ii 27 to xxviii 18)	χρόνος xxix 8, xxxvii 7, xxxviii 1 (xlv 28 = 21')
8. כַּן	κατασκευοῦν <sup>4</sup> (vii 12, xvii 6, xxiii 6, xxviii 13)	καταλύειν (chaps. xxix, xxx, xxxii)
9. (חַי) הוּ	νομή <sup>8</sup> (chaps. x, xxiii, xxvii) ? τρίβος ix 10	τόπος [xxvii 44 A Q = ] xxix 20, xxxii 16 κατάλυμα xl 12 κατάλυσις xxix 21
10. נָב	νότος xiii 19 (πόλ. αἱ πρὸς νότ.), xvii 26	νάγεβ xxxix 44 = xl 13 (ἐν πόλεσιν τῆς ν.)
11. חַי הִי	παροργίζειν vii 18 f., viii 19, xi 17, xxv 6 Ez. <sup>8</sup> Min. <sup>3</sup>	πικραίνειν xxxix 32 B, xl 9, xlv 15 παραπικραίνειν xxxix 29, 32 NA
12. 'his soul shall be for a prey' (לַשָּׁמַיִם)	ἔσται ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς σκύλα xxi 9 (cf. εἰς προσημῆν xxvii 10)	ἔσται ἡ ψ. (αὐτοῦ) εἰς εὐρεμα xlv 2, xlv 18, li 35
13. תַּשׁ	ταλαιπωρεῖν iv 13 (οὐαὶ ἡμῖν ὅτι ταλαιπωροῦμεν), 20 bis, ix 19, x 20 (ἐταλαιπώρησεν, ἄλετο: a doublet), xii 12 (xxviii 48 Q <sup>ms</sup> ) Min. <sup>7</sup>	ἄλλυσθαι xxix 11, xxx 3, xxxi 1 (οὐαὶ ἐπὶ N. ὅτι ἄλετο), 15, 18, 20, xxxviii 2 Verb only elsewhere in Job and Prov. ? πλήσσειν xxx 6 Q
13. תַּשׁ, שׁ	ταλαιπωρία (iv 20 = תַּשׁ), vi 7, 26 (ἦξει ταλ.), xv 8, xx 8, xxviii 35, 56 Ez. <sup>1</sup> Min. <sup>8</sup>	ἄλεθρος xxxi 3, 8 (ἦξει ἄλ.), 32
14. תַּשׁ } שׁ }	χαρά xv 16, xvi 9, xxv 10	χαρμοσύνη (χαρμονή) xxx 33 (-μονή N <sup>c.a</sup> Q), xxxviii 13 Q (-μονή BN), xl 11 (-μονή A)

In the following instances the distinction between the two portions of the book is not quite so well marked. We here find one of two renderings confined to the *a* or *β* portion, while the second is represented throughout the book; and again we have some peculiar rendering, almost

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

unique in the LXX, confined to the chapters xxix-xxxii, rendering reappears towards the end of the  $\beta$  portion.

*Jeremiah*  $\alpha$

$\beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma$

xvii 5, xxi 25, xxviii 14  
[xxxix 17, 21]

*Jeremiah*  $\beta$

$\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\sigma$  (=  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta$ )

xxii 25, xxxiv 4  
( $\beta\rho\alpha\chi$ . Q)

The Lexicons:

(Schleusner excepted)

only quote the

plural, meaning

'wages.' In the

only other pas-

sage where the

word occurs in the

LXX (2 Macc. iv

33  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\rho\alpha$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$

$\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma$ ) the context

makes it probable

that the meaning

intended is 'arm'

(Vulg. *manum*)

[ $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\omega\sigma$  in both parts]

$\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\omega\sigma$ <sup>10</sup>

(from ix 16 to xxviii 23)

<i>Hebrew</i>	<i>Jeremiah a</i>	<i>Jeremiah β</i>
		Only else thus in Bar. ii 25 <i>ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν βομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν ἀπ.</i>
22. כּבֵּר pi. (כּמֵשׁ)	[λαλεῖν throughout the book]	χρηματίζειν (of utterances of God and of His prophets) xxxii 16 <i>δὲς</i> , xxxiii 2 <i>δὲς</i> , xxxvi 23, xxxvii 2, xliii 2 A Qms (λαλ. Bκ), 4 A Q (λαλ. Bκ)
23. מִנּוּ ni.	μετανοεῖν iv 28, viii 6, xviii 8, 10 [xxxviii 19] Min.	παύεσθαι (ἀπό) xxxiii 3, 13, 19, xxxviii 15 (ἐπί) B* (παράκληθῆναι al.) ἀναπαύεσθαι (ἐπί) (ἀπό KA) xlix 10. Verb used four times in the β portion
24. עָר	πλησίον 13 times in chaps. v-xxvi [xxxviii 34 A = Γκ. xli 15, 17, xliii 16] Is. Ez. Min. &c.	πολίτης (= 'fellow-citizen') xxxvi 23, xxxviii 34
25. מִבֵּי	[προφήτης <i>passim</i> in both parts]	Only else in Prov. <sup>3</sup> ψευδοπροφήτης ('Mid-rashic, 'Streane') [vi 13], xxxiii 7, 8, 11, 16, xxxiv 7, xxxv 1, xxxvi 1, 8
26. עָרָב	[ἴνα in both parts]	Only else in Zech. <sup>1</sup> πρὸς τὸ only in xxxiv 12, xxxix 29, 35, xliii 25
27. מִבְּלֵ	[τοῦ μή in both parts]	πρὸς τὸ μή only in xxxix 40, xli 9, xlii 8 f, 14, xlv 26, xlix 13, li 5, 7
28.	Anarthrous infinitive rare: inf. with τοῦ usual.	Anarthrous inf. common, but inf. with τοῦ is also used, esp. from chap. xxxix onwards.





for the purposes of translation, divided more or less at haphazard into two nearly equal parts, which were then assigned to different translators? In favour of a haphazard division may be urged the parallel case of the LXX of Ezekiel. Since I first became aware of the distinction between the two portions of the Greek Jeremiah, further investigation has revealed the interesting fact that the LXX of Ezekiel also is not homogeneous. Here again the hand of a second translator makes its appearance half-way through the book, in the middle of the long prophecy against Tyre. This second hand begins at Ezek. xxviii 1 and continues to the end of Ezek. xxxix, where the first hand apparently resumes the task. The proofs of this statement must be reserved till later. It is sufficient to note here the remarkable fact that a break occurs at almost the same point in the Greek versions of each of these two prophetic books. The facts are, however, not quite identical in the two cases. In Jeremiah the work of the first translator seems to represent a distinct whole; he ends with the denunciation of Babylon, a section which, when the chapters came to be rearranged (as I believe they were) by the Massorettes, was still kept as the most suitable conclusion for the whole book. There are, as we shall see, other phenomena to be accounted for here, and it may be argued that the division in this case was not merely an arrangement made for convenience and expedition in translation, but that we have in the LXX of Jeremiah a testimony to at least two collections of his prophecies.

I have suggested that the evidence points to the existence of *at least two* collections of prophecies of Jeremiah. For the portion which I have called Jeremiah  $\beta$  almost certainly embraces more than one collection of *Hebrew* matter, and it is just possible that some of these smaller collections had been rendered into Greek independently, and that these earlier renderings were made use of by the redactor of the whole Greek collection 'Jeremiah  $\beta$ .' Roughly speaking, the subdivisions of Jeremiah  $\beta$  may be said to be (1) xxix-xxxi, (2) xxxii-xxxviii, (3) xxxix-li. (1) is the second group of prophecies against foreign nations. This group forms a kind of link between the two collections. While there is a general agreement with the  $\beta$  vocabulary, many of the words characteristic of the  $\alpha$  portion also reappear. But it may be noted that the use of these words is often differentiated in some way from their use in  $\alpha$ , as if the translator of chapters xxix-xxxi had read the existing rendering of the first twenty-eight chapters, and had imitated its vocabulary. An instance of this is the use of the word \**irapia*<sup>1</sup> (xxix 17 *irapia kardia*, xxx 4 *thyarep irapias*), which is confined in the LXX to these chapters. The word \**irapias*, as the rendering of אַרְפִּיּוֹס, is confined in the LXX

<sup>1</sup> I use an asterisk to denote that a word occurs in the LXX only in the passages referred to.

to Jeremiah α (vi 23, xxvii 42). The substantive is due to imitation of Jeremiah α: it does not appear to be due to identity of translator, because the equivalent in α for צַבָּא, rendered (θύγατερ) ἱταρίας in xxx 4, is (υἱοὶ) ἀφεστηγότες (iii 14) or ἐπιστρέφοντες (iii 22). Other instances of α words occurring in β (1) are \*ἀμφοθον (xvii 27, xxx 27), \*συμφῶν (xxii 19, xxix 21, xxxi 33), τρυμαλιά (α² and, representing another Hebrew word, xxix 17). But I cannot claim to have satisfactorily worked out the divisions of the second half of Jeremiah in the Greek, if such exist: and it is possible to carry such arguments from style too far. The two main divisions of the book are well marked, and a certain amount of mixture of the two styles was inevitable when they came to be welded together, and the difference of the styles was noted by redactors or scribes.

Turning to the question of the priority of the Hebrew or Greek text in the position and arrangement of the 'foreign nations,' I would call attention to certain introductory clauses and editorial notes occurring in the Massoretic text (and partially in the LXX), which, I believe, find their true explanation in the arrangement of chapters in the Greek text. These are as follows:—

<i>Hebrew</i>	<i>Greek</i>
xlvi 1. The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah the prophet concerning the nations. Of Egypt: concerning the army of Pharaoh-neco, &c.	xxv 14 xxvi 2
13. The word that the Lord spake to J. the prophet, how that Neb. king of Bab. should come and smite the land of Egypt.	xxvi 13
xlvii 1. The word of the Lord that came to J. the prophet concerning the Philistines, before that Pharaoh smote Gaza.	xxix 1 (beginning of Jer. β) Ἐστὶ τοῖς ἀλοφίλοις
xlviii 1. Of Moab.	xxx 1
47. <i>Thus far is the judgement of Moab.</i>	(not in the Greek: Moab is the last of the nations in the LXX)
xliv 1. Of the children of Ammon.	xxx 1
7. Of Edom.	xxix 8
23. Of Damascus.	xxx 12
28. Of Kedar and of the kingdoms of Hazor which Neb. king of Bab. smote.	xxx 6
34. The word of the Lord that came to J. the prophet concerning Elam in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah.	xxvi 1



*Hebrew**Greek*

l 1. The word that the Lord spake concerning Babylon, concerning the land of the Chaldaeans, by J. the prophet.

li 64. *Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.* (clause not in the Greek; end of Jeremiah a)

The points to which I would call attention are (1) that the introductory clause, 'The word of the Lord which came' or 'the word that the Lord spake' is only found in the case of the three prophecies (Elam, Egypt, Babylon), which belong to Jeremiah a, and (in the Hebrew, but not in the LXX) in the section concerning the Philistines which opens Jeremiah β: (2) that the two glosses in the M. T., no doubt emanating from the same hand, which indicate the end of the judgement of Moab and the end of the words of Jeremiah, coincide in the Greek with the close of the second group of foreign nations, and with the close of Jeremiah a respectively. The inference to be drawn from this is that the section-headings came into existence when the chapters were arranged as in the LXX, and that the LXX arrangement, explaining, as it does, these short prologues and epilogues, is older than the arrangement of the M. T.

It is somewhat remarkable that at the very point in the Greek, at the close of the denunciation of Babylon, where we have found that the vocabulary alters, the M. T. appends the words, 'And they shall be weary. Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.' It is true that in the M. T. the denunciation of Babylon is placed practically at the close of the whole book, being followed only by the historical appendix (chap. lii), which appears to be taken from the end of the second book of Kings. The note would therefore appear to stand in an appropriate place in the M. T., and to indicate that, in the opinion of the editor or redactor who added it, this historical appendix was no part of the work of Jeremiah (Streane, *Camb. Bible*: Payne Smith, *Speaker's Commentary*). The words 'And they shall be weary' are out of place here, but they occur just before in verse 58; this would seem to show that at one time the note occurred after verse 58, and that the brief notice of the sending of the book of 'the words that are written concerning Babylon' to that city, and the symbolical sinking of it in the river Euphrates was, along with chapter lii, excluded by the editor from the writings properly belonging to Jeremiah (see Streane, *Double text*, p. 305: Driver, *Introduction*<sup>2</sup>, p. 252). But the scholion must be considered together with the only other note of the kind which we find in the whole book, namely that occurring in the M. T. at the end of chap. xlviii Heb. (xxx1 Greek) 'Thus far is the judgement of Moab.' There is no

particular reason in the M. T. why the close of the prophecy against Moab, which there stands third among the prophecies against the nations, should be so conspicuously marked. But, as we have seen, in the Greek Moab is the last of the nations. Since, then, we have found the first subscription to the Moab prophecy is more intelligible with the LXX order of chapters, I venture to think that the explanation of the similar note at the end of the Babylon prophecy is also to be sought in the LXX.

The theory, then, which I would tentatively suggest to account for the facts is as follows. In the third century B. C. the prophecies of Jeremiah had been collected into two main groups. The first of these (i-xxvii in the Greek) comprised prophecies mostly of an early date, to which had been appended the prophecies directed against the three world-powers, Elam, Egypt, and Babylon. The second (xxviii-5 in the Greek) contained the prophecies and historical narratives for the most part belonging to the latter part of Jeremiah's life, and referring to the capture and the events preceding the capture of Jerusalem. The second collection was specially connected with Baruch; it closed with the brief prophecy addressed to him, and the older portion of the book of Baruch was attached to it by way of appendix. The prophecies against the lesser nations probably at first circulated separately, and were afterwards grouped together without regard to systematic arrangement and prefixed to the second collection. When the Greek translation of the prophetic books was undertaken, at Alexandria, probably in the second century B. C., these two main collections had not yet become united. The two Hebrew collections were rendered by different translators. These translations may have been made at the same time as parts of a single undertaking, or possibly the second translation may have been made at a slightly later date than the first. But it is not necessary to suppose that the Greek Jeremiah was ever in circulation in the form of two distinct books. The second translator's work would probably, as soon as it was made, be attached to the other portion. The second collection was rendered from a text considerably shorter than the Massoretic text<sup>1</sup> by an unskilled translator<sup>2</sup>, employing a peculiar phraseology, which is illustrated most often (where any Biblical illustration is found at all) by the sapiential and other late books of the LXX. In the second group of foreign nations (xxix-xxx) he seems to have had before him a Greek translation made by some one who was acquainted with the first collection (i-xxviii), and to have incorporated it with slight alteration in his own work. The note 'hitherto are the words of Jeremiah'

<sup>1</sup> The divergences between Hebrew and Greek are most marked in the second half of Jeremiah, especially in chaps. xxxiv-xxxvi (Streane, *Double text*, p. 194).

<sup>2</sup> Streane, *ibid.* p. 211.



was added at the end of the first Hebrew collection whilst it still circulated as a separate book, and a similar note was appended at the end of the group of prophecies against the lesser nations. When the collections were fused together, these notes remained in some copies of the Hebrew text. The Massorettes, finding the first of these glosses standing in the middle of the book, naturally supposed that there had been a disarrangement of subject-matter and transported the denunciation of Babylon to the close of the whole book. This carried with it the rest of the prophecies on foreign nations, and the opportunity was at the same time taken to rearrange these in a more systematic order.

I am aware that the latter part of this theory, as regards the editorial note in chap. xxviii (li), is open to objection, but some such theory is required to account for the facts. My proposed solution explains the somewhat singular fact that a fresh translator begins at the very point where a note in the M. T. states that the prophecy ends, and it offers an explanation of the relegation of the 'foreign nations' to the end of the book in the M. T. It does not, it is true, carry us back to the earliest collections of Jeremiah's prophecies. The prophecy on Babylon, which closes the first collection, was, according to all recent critics, not the work of Jeremiah (see e. g. Driver, *Introduction*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 250 ff.). It may be noticed that each group has its appropriate conclusion. The first ended with the anathema upon Babylon and the story of the symbolical act by which its doom was foretold. The second ended with the prophecy to Baruch, the scribe and reputed literary executor of the prophet.

The theory that our book of Jeremiah is a compilation from older collections is no new one. The opening verses of the book, as commentators point out, bear witness to its gradual growth. 'The words of Jeremiah . . . to whom the word of the Lord came in the days of Josiah the son of Amon, king of Judah, in the thirteenth year of his reign. It came also in the days of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, unto the end of the eleventh year of Zedekiah the son of Josiah, king of Judah; unto the carrying away of Jerusalem captive in the fifth month' (i 1-3). The third verse or the last part of it may have been added when the two main collections were united<sup>1</sup>. Dr. Driver says 'the large amount of variation between the LXX and the Massoretic text may be most readily explained by the supposition that in some cases Jeremiah's writings were in circulation for a while as *single prophecies, or small groups of prophecies*, in which variations might more easily arise than after they were collected into a volume' (*Introd.* 254 f.).

Nor is the theory of two (or three) main collections entirely new,

<sup>1</sup> Bertholdt regards the verses as introductory to the first twenty-four chapters only. But verse 3 b finds its explanation in xlvii 2, lii 5, 12.



cannot be passages which have gone without notice, Josephus of Galilee's writings do support it more or very abundantly.

There is no disagreement among L. G. Eichhorn and his school as to differences between the arrangement of chapters in the Hebrew of the LXX, to mention also the position of Genesis, were held as a text-book. These consisted according to Eichhorn, of (1) chaps. 1-22 (the first part) followed by the 'foreign nations' group of (2) chaps. 22-41 (the second part) and the whole of the 'foreign nations' group in the first part.<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn's theory was followed by the noble 'Berlinist'. Eichhorn writes (op. cit. pp. 227 f.) 'There is one way that seems to lead that takes the fragments together and fill up of the present book of Jewish three separate collections, if they were already so numerous, and that by the conglomeration (Zusammenfügung) of them with the addition of a few separate pieces the present book has arisen, and moreover in a twofold form, an arrangement in the Hebrew text and in the Alexandrian version. Down to Dejean's the Josephus of Jewish according to the Alexandrian version consisted of two distinct parts, of which the first encompassed chaps. 1-22 and the second the rest of the book in the order of the Alexandrian version. About Josephus speaks of two books of prophecies of Jewish. He goes on to argue that the division was not first made by the Greek translators, but was found by them in their Hebrew original. He the earlier collection are: (1) chaps. 1-22, (2) the foreign nations (on different collections made in different places), (3) chaps. 22-41; the later additions were chaps. 22-23 and 22-41 (= 22-23-24 of the Heb.). I cannot find what evidence Eichhorn and Berthold add for the statement that a twofold division existed in the LXX does in Origen's time. But the theory of such a division finds a remarkable confirmation in the double vocabulary, which appears to have escaped their notice. This confirmatory evidence is a strong testimony to the accuracy of these older critics.

The passage in Josephus, on which both Eichhorn and Berthold rely, occurs in *Ant. Jud.* 3 § 2. After describing the death of Josiah the historian proceeds: *Ἰουδαίῳ δὲ ἡ καταβολὴ ἐπαύσατο αὐτοῦ ἀναγιγνώσκοντος (ἀποφασίζοντος), ἡ δὲ αὐτοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἐπαύσατο, ἀλλὰ ἡ καταβολὴ αὐτὸν εὐδαιμονοῦν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἀποφασίζοντος ἢ ἡπαύσατο ἀναγιγνώσκοντος αὐτοῦ εὐδαιμονοῦντος ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἀποφασίζοντος*

<sup>1</sup> *Reperitorium für biblische u. morgenländische Literatur*, Leipzig, 1777, pp. 16 ff.; Eichhorn, *Einl. in das A. T.*, Leipzig, 1803, pt. II, pp. 246 ff. See also *Dept. Hist.* vol. II, pt. 'Jewish' (to which I owe these references). The writer of the *Dept.* seems to be wrong in giving Eichhorn's divisions as chaps. 1-22 and 22-41.

<sup>2</sup> *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in . . . Schriften des A. u. N. T.*, Erlangen, 1826, pt. II, pp. 110-18.

διωσιν τὴν τε Βαβυλωνίαν αἵρεσιν. οὐ μόνον δὲ οὗτοι προεθέσπισε ταῦτα τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ προφήτης Ἰεζεκιήλος, ὃς [ὅς om. SLVE Lat.] πρῶτος περὶ τούτων δύο βιβλίου γράψας κατέλιπεν. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ δύο τῶ γίνεαι ἱερείς, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἰερμίας ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις διῆγεν κ.τ.λ. The passage appears to state that *Ezekiel* wrote two books concerning the captivity and the fate of Babylon, and that he wrote before *Jeremiah* (πρῶτος). But the difficulty of this interpretation is that *Josephus* could not have considered *Ezekiel* the earlier writer of the two, nor can the reference be to the early division of *Ezekiel* into chaps. i-xxxix and xl-xlvi, as the latter chapters contain no reference to the exile. The writer of the article 'Jeremiah' in the *Encycl. Bibl.* thinks it probable that the words are a later gloss, but the phrase γράψας κατέλιπεν recalls the style of the historian rather than of the glossator. The difficulty of referring the words to *Ezekiel* has convinced *Eichhorn* and *Bertholdt* that *Jeremiah* is the subject of the verb κατέλιπεν. *Eichhorn* would accordingly regard οὐ μόνον δὲ . . . Ἰεζεκιήλος as a parenthesis. The meaning of the passage is very obscure, and it can only be adduced with very great hesitation in support of the theory of the division of *Jeremiah* into two books. Still, in the absence of any satisfactory explanation of the words as referred to *Ezekiel*, I should be inclined to think that *Eichhorn's* explanation is not impossible, either adopting his punctuation or regarding ὃς πρῶτος as a corruption.

A passage in the Midrash entitled 'Sifré,' a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy dating from the second century A. D.<sup>1</sup>, has also been quoted in support of the theory which is here advocated. *Edersheim* in his article on *Josephus* in the *Dict. of Christian Biography* (vol. iii, p. 454), after referring to the passage in *Josephus* which we have been considering, says, 'A similar arrangement of *Jeremiah* into two books is also mentioned in Jewish tradition (Sifré, ed. Friedmann, 64 a), although it is difficult to explain the division, as the Rabbins do, on the same ground as that of the book of *Ezekiel*' (i. e. as a division of the prophecies into those which predicted destruction and those which conveyed hope and comfort). The passage in *Sifré* is a commentary on Deut. i 1, 'These are the words which *Moses* spake,' &c., and the writer is arguing that wherever the phrase 'these are the words of' such and such a person occurs in Scripture, it always refers to a rebuke. After quoting *Amos* i 1, the *Sifré* proceeds<sup>2</sup>, 'Huic simile tu dicis, Et haec sunt verba quae locutus est *Jeremias* super *Israel* et super *Jehuda* (= xxx 4, Heb.). Num haec duntaxat prophetavit *Jeremias*? Nonne duos libros scripsit *Jeremias* (והלא ב' ספרים כתב דרמיה)? Dictum est enim, Huc usque verba *Jeremiae* (= li. 64 Heb.). Et cur dictum est "Haec sunt verba"? Sed hinc

<sup>1</sup> *Schürer, H. J. P.* i 1. 145.

<sup>2</sup> I quote from the Latin version in *Ugolini, Thesaurus Ant. Sacr.* vol. xv, col. ccccl (= *Friedmann* (M) 70).

docemur fuisse verba increpationum. Dictum est enim, Vocem terroris . . . ex ipsa salvabitur' (= xxx 5, 6 Heb.). It was at first sight rather remarkable, in view of the evidence of the LXX given above, to find the passage 'Hitherto are the words of Jeremiah' apparently quoted in support of the statement that Jeremiah wrote two books. I have, however, had the advantage at this point of the opinion of Mr. Israel Abrahams, Reader in Talmudic at Cambridge, who has kindly gone into the whole passage of Sifré and a parallel passage in the Midrash Yalkut, and has convinced me that the reference here is not to any division of the prophecy of Jeremiah, but to the two books traditionally assigned to him, viz. the prophecy and Lamentations. The passage li 64 appears to be cited because it contains a definite statement that Jeremiah wrote much more than is contained in chapter xxx, and not in support of the statement about two books, the words  $\text{הלא בני ספרים ירמיה}$  being as it were in parenthesis.

But though external evidence is lacking, I think the internal evidence given above for the division into two books has considerable weight. It must, however, be admitted that the parallel case of the two translators employed in the rendering of Ezekiel, where the break does not coincide with a break in the subject-matter, renders the interpretation here given of the facts somewhat doubtful.

In concluding this part of my subject, I would add a few words with regard to chap. lii. The Greek of this chapter is, I am inclined to think, by yet another (a third) translator<sup>1</sup>. The chapter is evidently in the nature of an appendix, being placed at the end of both Hebrew and Greek texts. It is wanting in Cod. 41 of Holmes and Parsons, a MS of the ninth or tenth century. The Hebrew has little in common with the rest of the book of Jeremiah, so that a comparison of renderings in this chapter and in the other parts of the book is difficult. But I would call attention to the use of the Attic  $\tau\tau$  in the verb  $\text{φωλάττειν}$ , which occurs in this form only in this chapter in the whole of the LXX (verse 24 in MS B, verse 31 A), and to the rendering of  $\text{בגד}$  by  $\text{στολή}$  in verse 33: it is rendered by  $\text{ἱμάτιον}$  in chaps. xliii, xlvi and l. It should be added that the Greek is not taken from the Greek of 2 K. xxiv, xxv.

PS. I find that the Codex Alexandrinus contains a slight indication of a break at the end of Jeremiah a. The closing words of chap. xviii do not occupy a whole line, and the remainder of the line is occupied by a rough arabesque thus:

ΕΠΑΓΩΕΠΑΥΤΗΝ > > > > > > > > >

These arabesques are usually inserted only at the end of a book, not at the end of an ordinary section. Codex A has them, however, in Jeremiah also at xli 11, xlii fin., xlii fin.; I do not find any other instances of them in this book.

<sup>1</sup> So Bertholdt (op. cit. p. 1478).



(2.) THE RELATION OF THE GREEK JEREMIAH TO THE  
BOOK OF BARUCH.

The book of Baruch, although only five chapters in length, is clearly a composite work. It falls into two main sections i 1-iii 8 and iii 9-v 9. The former of these sections is a translation from a lost Hebrew original. This is shown not only by the style and by the occurrence of mistaken renderings which can only be explained by retranslation into Hebrew, but also by the express mention of a Hebrew original in certain marginal notes in the Syro-hexaplar text, stating that words in i 17 and ii 3 are 'not in the Hebrew'.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, there can be little doubt that in the second part of the book the Greek is original. Schürer's conclusion as to the formation of the book is that 'its first half was originally composed in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and completed by the addition of the second half'.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Ryle and Dr. James have shown, I think conclusively, that in the closing section of Baruch (iv 36-v 9) use is made of the fifth of the Psalms of Solomon, the Greek version of which is assigned by them to the last decade of the first century B.C. They have thus been led to place the 're-edition' or final reduction of the book of Baruch to its present form in the period following the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.<sup>3</sup> The date of the first portion is more doubtful. From the apparent use made of the book of Daniel<sup>4</sup> it would seem to be not earlier than the Maccabean period, to which date many commentators would assign it. Ewald, however, followed by J. T. Marshall (art. 'Baruch' in Hastings' *Bible Dict.*), would place it as early as 320 B.C., while on the other hand Schürer, Kneucker and others place it after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., i. e. at about the same time at which the latter portion was written and the whole book was re-edited. It is, however, much more likely, and in accordance with the practice of the time, that a writer wishing to console his countrymen after the events of A.D. 70 would select an older and not a contemporary writing to which to append his own composition; and moreover the early and unhesitating acceptance of the book by Christian writers is difficult to explain, unless some portion at least of the work is earlier than the close of the first century A.D.<sup>5</sup> I should then on a priori grounds be inclined to assign to the first portion of Baruch a date considerably earlier than that given by Schürer and Kneucker.

<sup>1</sup> Ceriani, *Monum. Sacra et Profana*, tom. i, fasc. i (Milan, 1861).

<sup>2</sup> *H. J. P.* div. ii, vol. iii, 191.

<sup>3</sup> *The Psalms of Solomon*, lxxii ff.

<sup>4</sup> This, however, is disputed by J. T. Marshall (art. 'Baruch,' Hastings' *Bible Dict.*), who finds merely a use of an ancient form of prayer which has been incorporated in Daniel ix.

<sup>5</sup> Swete, *Introduction to O. T.* p. 275.

The following evidence will, I think, prove that the Greek of Baruch (first part) must be at least a century earlier.

The affinity between the Greek of the first portion of Baruch and the Greek version of Jeremiah has been pointed out by several critics, e.g. Nestle<sup>1</sup>, J. T. Marshall<sup>2</sup>, and Knencker<sup>3</sup>, the only question being whether this is due to identity of translator or to imitation. What has not been noticed is that the resemblance is practically confined to that portion of the Greek Jeremiah which I have called Jeremiah I. To show this I have appended what is, I think, a fairly complete list of the LXX passages which illustrate the first two chapters of Baruch.

## TABLE II.

Bar. i 9. The verse is almost identical with the LXX of Jer. xiv 1, except that *τοὺς δυνατοὺς* takes the place of *τοὺς πλουσίους* (*εὐποροῦντας* F) and the words *καὶ τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς* are added. *Δυνατοὶ* in Jer. only occurs in the β portion (4 times in chaps. xxxix–li), as does also the phrase *ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς* (xl 9, xlv 2, li 5, 25 *δὲς*). *Δυνατοὶ* is a misrendering of *לודים* ('locksmith') occurring also in Jer. xxxvi 2.

10. *μίση* = *שנא* as in Jer. [xvii 26] xlviii 5, but in the former passage (*καὶ θυμολογῶ καὶ μίση*) the words *καὶ μίση* are possibly a doublet. Elsewhere the usual transliteration is *μισῶ*.

11. *Ναβουχ. . . καὶ . . . Βαλτασάρ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Dan. v 2 ff.

12. *ὅς ἀπέστρεψεν ὁ θυμὸς κ.* Cf. Jer. xliii 20.

14. *ἐξαγορεύσαι*. Cf. Dan. 9 ix 20.

15–18. The opening of the confession reads like a fusion of Daniel ix 7–10 (with some of Theodotion's renderings) with Jer. xliii 13 (*ἀνθρώπων Ἰούδα καὶ τοῖς κατοικ. Ἱερ.*: in Jer. α [five times, also in xxxix 32] the phrase is *ἄνθρωποι Ἰ. καὶ οἱ κατοικ. ἐν Ἱερ.*) and Jer. xxxix 32 (*καὶ τοῖς ἱερῶσιν ἡμ. καὶ τοῖς προφ. ἡμῶν*, not in Dan.).

17. (*ἀσχύνη . .*) *ὡν ἡμάρτομεν*. Cf. Jer. li 23 *ἀπὸ προσηύτας ἐν ἡμέραις.*

19. Cf. Dt. ix 7, 24 (*ἀπειθοῦντες ἦτε*).

*πρὸς τὸ μὴ δε. τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ* (also in ii 5): Jer. xlix 13. For *πρὸς τὸ μὴ* (peculiar to Jer. β) see Table I.

*σχεδιάζω* not in LXX, used by Polyb. and Diod. in the sense of 'to be negligent.'

<sup>1</sup> Swete, *Introduction to O. T.* p. 276, note 1, 'Dr. Nestle points out that Baruch and Jeremiah seem to have been translated by the same hand, unless the translator of Baruch deliberately copied the translator of Jeremiah.'

<sup>2</sup> Hastings' *B. D.* 'There can be little doubt that he who translated Jeremiah also translated Baruch i 1–iii 8, and probably found it in Hebrew attached to Jeremiah.'

<sup>3</sup> *Das Buch Baruch* (1879), p. 83.



20. ἐκολλήθη . . ἡ ἀρά: cf. Dt. xxix 20. ἀρά: Jer. β (xlix 18, li 22). Μουσ. παιδί αὐτοῦ (cf. ii 20, 24, 28): Jer. β uses *παῖς* in this connexion, but Jer. α *δοῦλος* (Table I). The Pentateuch uses *θεράπων*, *δοῦναι* . . ὡς ἡ ἡμ. αὐτῆ: the anarthrous inf. is characteristic of Jer. β. Contrast Jer. xi 5 τοῦ δοῦναι . . καθὼς (ὡς Α) ἡ ἡμ. αὐτῆ.

22. διανοῖα: in Jer. only at xxxviii 33. Contrast Jer. xxiii 17 πορεύεσθαι τοῖς θελήμασιν αὐτῶν (πλάνη καρδίας αὐτοῦ). ἐργάζεσθαι θεοῖς (ii 21 f., 24 τῷ βασι. Βαβυλωνος) = 737: so Jer. β (xxxiv 5, 7, 9 *δῖς*, 10, xxxv 14, xxxvii 8 f., xli 14, xlvii 9). Jer. α uses *δουλεύειν*.

Bar. ii 1. (Cf. ii 24, 35) στήσαι τὸν λόγον: Jer. xxxv 6.

2. καθά (also in i 6, ii 28): peculiar in Jer. to β portion (xxxix 42, xl 11 A, li 17, 30).

3. τοῦ φαγεῖν ἡμῖς ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ.: cf. Jer. xix 9 (where however *ἕκαστος* is used for *ἄνθρωπος*). Also Lev. xxvi 29, Dt. xxviii 55.

4. ὑποχείριος: Jer. xlix 18. εἰς ὀνειδισμόν καὶ ἄβαστον: a use of *ἄβ.* peculiar to Jer. β (Table I). οὐ δῖσπειρ, αὐτ. ἐκεῖ (ii 13, 29): Jer. xxxix 37.

5. ὑποκάτω καὶ οὐκ ἐπάνω: cf. Dt. xxviii 13.

6. Dan. ix 7.

7. ἃ ἐλάλησεν Κ. ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, πάντα τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα ἃ ἤλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. For the relative sentence standing without any construction, cf. Jer. xlix 19 ἃ ἐλάλ. Κ. ἐφ' ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.

8. δῖσθαι τοῦ προσώπου Κυρίου: J. xxxiii 19.

9. γρηγορεῖν ἐπὶ (c. dat.): J. v 6, xxxviii 28 *δῖς* (c. acc.).

10. = i 18 repeated.

11. Καὶ νῦν Κύριε: J. xlv 20. δε: ἐξήγαγες . . αὐτῆ: J. xxxix 21, 20.

12. ἡμέρα. ἡσεβ. ἡδικ.: Dan. ix 5 (LXX).

13. ὅτι κατελείφθημεν ὀλίγοι: J. xlix 2.

14. δέσις: Jer. α<sup>3</sup> (not β).

15. τὸ ἄν. σου ἐπεκλήθη ἐπὶ Ἰ. καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ (cf. ii 26 ἐπ' αὐτῶ): J. xxxix 34 and xli 15 (ἐπὶ c. dat.). τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ (= 77): J. xxxvi 32, xxxviii 1, 35, 37, xliii 31 [xlviii 1]; but in Jer. α (xxiii 8) τὸ σπέρμα Ἰ.

16. Dt. xxvi 15, Is. xxxvii 17 = 4 K. xix 16. κλίειν τὸ οὖς: Jer. β<sup>3</sup>, also in xvii 22. In Jer. α the usual rendering of the Hebrew is *προσέχειν τὸ οὖς* (τοῖς ὠσίν), vii 24, 26, xxv 4.

18. οἱ ὀφθ. οἱ ἐκλ. καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ πεινώσα: from Dt. xxviii 65, but with the reading *πεινώσα* (as in J. xxxviii 25) in place of *τηκομένην* of Dt.

19. καταβάλλειν τὸν ἔλεον: cf. πίπτειν (τὸ) ἔλεος J. xliii 7, xlv 20, xlix 2, ῥίπτειν τὸν (τὸ) ἔλεον J. xlv 26, Dan. ix 20 (θ'). This use of *ἔλεος* (= 737 'supplication') is confined in Jeremiah to the β portion.



21. *ὄσους ἔσται ἑἷρας*: in Jer. confined to β portion (Table I) *ἀργυροῦσθε*: see above.

22. *ἀδελφῶν ποιῶσα*: cf. J. xxvi 28 *ποιῶσα ἐδελτικῶν*. ἐκ πύλ. Ἰουδα καὶ ἐξωθεν Ἱερ.—*φωτῶν τέρψης*: cf. Jer. xl 10 f. *ἐξωθεν* = יצא (‘in the streets’) in Jer. β (xl 10, li 6, 9, 17, 21), also in xi 6 (cf. xxviii 4); in Jer. α the Hebrew is usually correctly rendered by *δίοδοι* (or ὁδοί) Ἱερ. (i 28, v 1, vii 34, xiv 16). *Χαρμοσίγη*: Jer. β (Table I) *εἰς ἄβυσσος ἀπὸ ἐνοουσίτων* = J. xxxi 9 (A).

23. τοῦ ἐξουχθῆσαι ε.τ.λ.: a definite reference to J. viii 1, but with the variant reading *τίσους* for *τῶσαν* of Jer.

24 a: J. xliii 30. *ἐν λαμῶ καὶ ἐν βόμφ. καὶ ἐν ἀποστολῆ*: ἀποστολῆ only thus (= 𐤒𐤓) in J. xxxix 36 (Table I). *Ἐν βόμφ. καὶ ἐν λ.*: J. xlv 2, xlix 17, 22, li 12, 18, 27. In Jer. α the phrase is *ἐν μαχαίρῃ καὶ ἐν λαμῶ καὶ ἐν θενίρῃ* (xiv 12, &c.).

25. *ἐν ἡμέρῃ ἐντεταλαμένον σου*. For the construction of participle with pronoun dependent on *ἡμέρα* cf. J. xxxviii 32 *ἐν ἡμέρῃ ἐπιλαβόμενον μου*, xliii 2 ὅφ’ ἤρ ἡμέρας λαλήσωτός μου (*sic*), xlviii 4 τῆ ἡμέρῃ τῆ δευτέρῃ παραίξαστος αὐτοῦ; and contrast J. xi 4 *ἐν ἡμέρῃ ἢ ἀήγγαγον*.

26. *βλαβῶσαι* is a *ἀπὸξ λεγόμενα*: the cognate verb *βλαβῶν* is only found in LXX in J. xxxi 36, xxxviii 35, and once in 1 Chron.

27. *λαῖν φεληγορμίχλος*: Ex. Dt. ἀποικισμός in LXX only elsewhere in Jer. [xxvi 19], xxxi 11, l 11; ἀποικία, which is also common in Jer. β, occurs below in Bar. iii 7, 8.

28. The first half of the verse is taken from Jer. xxxvii 3 with the insertion of the names of the patriarchs; with the latter half cf. J. xxxvi 6 (*σμερῶσαι* there only in LXX).

29. Cf. J. xxxiv 40, xxxviii 33.

After this point in Baruch the only noteworthy coincidences with the LXX of Jeremiah seem to be *χαρμοσίγη* iv 23 and *ἀγαπῶντα* iv 34 (the latter word also occurs in Isaiah and Job). The Greek of the latter part of Baruch is of an entirely different character, and is certainly by another hand.

What we find then in the first half of Baruch is that it contains a large number of peculiar or mistaken renderings which are confined to the latter half of Jeremiah. Where Jeremiah α and β have rendered a constantly recurring phrase in different ways, it is always the β rendering which is selected by the Baruch translator. Not only so, but the peculiar constructions of Jeremiah β (Bar. ii 7, 28), and its particles (*καὶ*) are repeated, and a derivative of a rare word in Jer. β is created (*βλαβῶσαι*). Even where the writer of the Hebrew Baruch is borrowing from the first part of Jeremiah, the translator introduces words characteristic of the second part (Bar. i 9), or indicates a variant reading (ii 24). He inserts a phrase of Jer. β into a quotation from Deuteronomy

(ii 18). The phenomena admit, I think, of but one solution, namely that the translator of Baruch is identical with the translator of the second portion of Jeremiah. It must be remembered that he had before him a Hebrew original which was a mosaic of phrases taken from Jeremiah. It is out of the question to suppose that in the course of his work he carefully consulted an existing Greek version of the prophet to see how every phrase had already been rendered. It is no doubt conceivable that he might have made a very close study of the Greek version and could produce a very faithful imitation of the style from memory. But even so it remains unexplained why the imitation should be confined to the latter part of Jeremiah, unless the version which he knew was restricted to that portion of the prophet; and it is highly improbable that the imitation should have extended to constructions such as we find in Baruch ii 7 and 28, and to such a phrase as οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος<sup>1</sup>.

If, then, as I think must be acknowledged, the translator of Baruch (part I) is identical with the second of the translators of Jeremiah, we have a clue to guide us towards the date when the Greek Jeremiah was completed. The writer of Baruch was, I think it must be admitted, acquainted with the book of Daniel, and the translator seems to have used a Greek version of Dan. ix 5-10. This brings our translator down to about the close of the second century B. C. A certain *terminus ad quem* is afforded by the long quotation from Jer. xxxviii 31 ff. in the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii 8 ff.). The writer of the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (about 132 B. C.) makes an indirect allusion to the existence of a translation of 'the prophecies' in his day<sup>2</sup>, but we are left in doubt as to the extent of the collection. The second half of Jeremiah may have been just rendered when the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus was written: at any rate it was probably completed and attached to the other portion not very long after that date<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Kneucker (p. 84) denies the identity of the translators of Jeremiah and Baruch. But he has failed to distinguish the two translators of Jeremiah, and most of the instances which he quotes are therefore not to the point. The most noteworthy instance of dissimilarity quoted by him is κλίνει τὸν ἄμρον (Bar. ii 21) as contrasted with εἰσάγειν (ἐμβάλλειν) τὸν τράχηλον Jer. xxxiv 6, 9, &c.

<sup>2</sup> οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα.

<sup>3</sup> The absence of early quotations from the second part of Jeremiah is somewhat remarkable. In the N. T. besides the passage in Hebrews the only certain reference is Matt. ii 18 (= Jer. xxxviii 15, with variants from the LXX text). In the Apostolic Fathers, according to the index in the smaller edition of Lightfoot and Harmer, there is no quotation from any chapter later than the twenty-fourth. Justin only quotes from the earlier chapters. Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus, while quoting freely from the first part, have about five quotations each from the second part.

Whatever date we assign to the latter half of the book of Baruch, we must, it seems, give a much earlier date to the first portion than that proposed by Kneucker and Schürer.

H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY.

(To be continued.)

### A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE (ISAIAH xli 5-7).

<sup>5</sup> *The isles saw, and feared; the ends of the earth trembled: they drew near, and came.* <sup>6</sup> *They helped every one his neighbour; and every one said to his brother, Be of good courage.* <sup>7</sup> *So the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer him that smiteth the anvil, saying of the soldering, It is good: and he fastened it with nails, that it should not be moved.*

LAGARDE's conjecture that the passage Isa. xli 6, 7 is misplaced in all our present texts, and that its original context is to be found in ch. xl 18-20, has of late met with marked favour. Profs. Duhm (2nd edit., 1902) and Marti (1900) accept it without hesitation in their commentaries; Dr. Cheyne follows it, with some corrections of reading, in his *Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*, 1899; and Prof. Skinner in the *Cambridge Bible* (1898), who does not adopt it, shows plainly that it appears to him to be a suggestion of weight.

And yet there is much to be said in favour of the present position of the two verses, and possibly not all has yet been urged which might be reasonably urged against their transposition. In the first place, though hospitality may be found for Isa. xli 6, 7 with the earlier passage, xl 18-20, it cannot be said that the new position provides a perfectly obvious context. There is, indeed, no gap for these verses to occupy; the Dutch scholar Oort and Dr. T. K. Abbott placed them *after* xl 20 (Cheyne, *Introduction*, p. 299), but the present tendency is to place them *before* that verse. But neither position can they take without discomfort; the words לֹא יִמָּוֶה ('not be moved') have an awkward sound at the end of successive verses, and Dr. Cheyne accordingly omits them from xli 7 in his *Critical Text*. Moreover, on the theory that the passage xli 6, 7 originally stood after xl 19 or 20 no good reason can be given for its removal to its present place. Presumably it was a pure accident with nothing to explain it.

One more difficulty—a serious one—remains. *Ex hypothesi* xli 5 is an insertion the purpose of which is to connect the misplaced verses (6, 7) with their new context. But I hope to show later on that on the one hand ver. 5 stands in a definite relation to ver. 2, and on the other that it is followed very appropriately by verses 6, 7. If ver. 5 be an



insertion, it is, I believe, the work of an interpolator who was capable of actually improving a passage of the second Isaiah.

The theory of transposition rests in the main on two consecutive assumptions; it falls to the ground if either assumption is disproved. It is assumed

(i) That verses 6, 7 are a 'peep into the image-smithy' (*Blick in die Götzenschmiede*), and

(ii) that as such they do not agree with verses 1-4.

(i) The clearest and earliest statement of the first assumption so far as I know is found in Rashi's commentary on the passage. He says that חרש ('carpenter' E.V.) means the *founder* of molten images (נוטך הפסל); that צורף ('goldsmith' E.V.) is the one *who plates* the image with gold (המרקעו בזהב); and that קָבַץ ('soldering' E.V.) is in Romance (בלע"ז) *solder* (שולד'ורא). Kimkhi also introduces the image, only a carved wooden one. Ibn Ezra (*in loco*), ed. Friedländer, also sees a reference to idolatry. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion keeping close to the Hebrew do not mention idols, but they agree with Rashi as to the interpretation of קָבַץ (ῥή κολλῆν Α'Θ'; εἰς κολλῆσιν Σ'). Ewald in modern times in commenting on this passage says that the isles 'stellen in der Angst ihre neugebildeten und verzierten Götter auf, die lächerlichen!' He then adds with enigmatic brevity, 'v. 5-7 nach 40. 19 f'; by which he means no doubt that xli 5-7 is to be interpreted with the help of xl 19 f. Dillmann and Kittel (1890 and 1898) take the same view of the meaning of ver. 7, without, however, agreeing with the theory of transposition.

But if we accept the view of the meaning of the passage taken by Rashi, Ewald, Dillmann, and Kittel, it is somewhat hard to resist the transposition theory of Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti. One is forced to go at least as far as Dr. Skinner, and to confess that 'the transition from the assembling of the nations to the inside of an idol factory is extremely abrupt.'

But must we accept Ewald's principle: 'v. 5-7 nach 40. 19 f'? The words חרש and צורף can be used in the quite general senses respectively of 'smith' and 'metal-founder.' In xl 19 we know that the two words are applied respectively to one who makes and to one who overlays *images*, because the context expressly tells us so. But the case is otherwise with xli 7, where we have no mention of idols in the context. We are left free indeed to take the two words in a general sense. Similarly we are free to give a general sense to the words 'not be moved' (לא ימוט) in xli 7, for though they are applied to an image in xl 20, an image is not the only thing fashioned by a smith which is in danger at times of slipping from its place.

The verse is a simile, but not an idol-simile. But the objects of answer, 'Something is being made in the smithy, and if it is not an idol, what else is it?' Let us look at ver. 7 again: 7 a shows us a smith at a metal-founder at work; 7 b shows us the nature of their work, I could even say the object on which they are working. Now in 7 b the stress falls without doubt on the word פָּדָה ('saying of the soldering, It is gold' R.V.). If then the English Version and the many authorities which agree with it be right, all the stress falls on the action of soldering of nailing an unknown object, and the temptation to remove these verse to a context in which some important object is mentioned becomes very strong.

Before, however, we consent to the transposition we must at least examine carefully the meaning of the word on which the stress falls in 7 b. Must פָּדָה mean 'soldering'? The word is treated practically as a *deut. ἀρρηκτός* by the lexicographers, for they do not attempt to illustrate its meaning from the פָּדָה of 1 Kings xlii 34, which in form at any rate is the plural of פָּדָה. We may presume that there are three reasons for accepting the translation 'soldering':

- (a) The root פָּדָה means 'to cleave to.'
- (b) Some very important ancient authorities support the rendering (A' or [2'] Rashi).
- (c) The context, understood in the narrower sense of the *paradigma*, is favourable to it.

On the other hand if we take פָּדָה as the singular of פָּדָה (1 Kings xli 34 = 2 Chron. xviii 33) we avoid making a needless *deut. ἀρρηκτός*, and we obtain a sense which suits the context of Isa. xli 7 perfectly. We render 'armour-joint' or 'armour-plate.' (For the scale-armour or jointed armour of Old Testament times see Nowack, *Hebräische Archäologie*, vol. i, pp. 365, 6.)

The other reasons besides suitability to the context in favour of rendering פָּדָה 'armour-joint' or 'armour-plate' are:

- (a) In Job xli 17 [9 Heb.] the root פָּדָה is used to describe how the armour-like scales of Leviathan fit closely together.
- (b) The LXX gives *συναρτήματα* ('joint'); Peshitta *ܕܘܫܟܝܢܐ* ('joint') as in 1 Kings xlii 34.

Thus interpreted ver. 7 means that the fear of the 'sword' and 'bow' of Cyrus (ver. 2) stirs up the Isles and the Ends of the Earth to defensive preparations; they *had to their armour!* The metal-founder brings the plate or armour-joint to the smith, who approves it and proceeds to fasten it on to the leathern shirt (which formed the framework of a coat of mail) with nails or rivets, namely that it should not be removed by the first hostile weapon which might assail it.

- (c) Looking now at the passage (xli 1-7) as a whole we find that



ver. 1 is an introduction announcing a challenge to judgement or rather to a trial by combat. Two great facts balancing one another on the stage of history become at once apparent, each expressed by a perfect tense in Hebrew, and each attended by results which are for the most part expressed in imperfects. On the eastern side Jehovah has stirred up (העיר) His champion to perform His will (ver. 2). On the western side fear has seized (ירא) even the dwellers on the distant Mediterranean coastlands (ver. 5). Without human aid the champion wins his triumphs, Jehovah alone upholding him (vers. 3, 4). With mutual encouragements and preparations for war his enemies hope to stand against him (vers. 6, 7). Surely there is literary unity in Isa. xli 1-7!

W. EMERY BARNES.

#### ON THE LXX OF ISAIAH v 14, 17, 18.

IN verse 14 b, the Hebrew text has: 'and her glory, and her abundance, and *her uproar*, and *he that rejoiceth*, shall descend into her' (or, 'he that rejoiceth in her shall descend').

The LXX, keeping as usual closely to the order of the Hebrew words, has *καὶ καταβήσονται οἱ ἔνδοξοι καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ λοιμοὶ αὐτῆς*. The first part of this presents no great discrepancy. *Οἱ πλούσιοι* (cf. xxxii 9 *γυναικες πλούσιοι*) points to נְיָנִי for נְוָנִי as the reading of the LXX; but with *οἱ λοιμοὶ* the difficulty becomes more acute, and the idea of paraphrase is absolutely excluded.

I suggest that for לַע the LXX here read יַעֲי, which is rendered by *λοιμοὶ* several times in Ezekiel; xxviii 7, xxx 11, &c. (The O. L. in Ezekiel has *pestes*: see Mr. F. C. Burkitt's *Tyconius*, pp. 44, 77, 79.) Compare the use of *λοιμός* in 1 Macc. xv 21; Acts xxiv 5.

In verse 17, 'the waste places of the fat ones (מִחִים) shall strangers eat,' appears in the LXX as *τῶν ἀπειλημμένων ἄρνες φάγονται*. \**Ἄρνες* probably represents נְרִים for נְרִים (so Ewald, though Prof. Cheyne, in the fourth edition of *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, appears to lean towards כְּרִים). But the error in *ἀπειλημμένων* is of another kind, and has not, I think, been previously pointed out. What the Greek translator must have written is *ἀπηλειμμένων* (or *ἀπηλιμμένων*) from *ἀπαλείφω*, taking מִחִים from מַחֵ, *wipe* or *blot out*: as in 2 Kings xxi 13, where the word is rendered three times by *ἀπαλείφω*. The corruption to *ἀπειλημμένων* would be very natural, and has apparently affected all known MSS; the only variants recorded being *ἀπηλημμένων* BQ\* (*ἀπειλ.* Q<sup>a</sup>) and *επειλημμένων* in the cursives 239, 306 (Holmes and Parsons).

Incidentally, this confirms the present Hebrew text, in which the מ and the division of the words have been suspected: see Prof. Cheyne's



critical note on the passage : vol. II, pp. 138, 139, of the edition referred to above.

In verse 18, 'cords of vanity,' is represented by *σχοινία ματαιῆς*. It is pointed out by Lowth that the Peshitta also has 'long'; and he suggested that for *κῶ* the LXX read *πῶ* (Lev. xxx 18, xxxii 23, 'περισσῆς' 'overgrown,' A.V. 'superfluous'). It is, however, possible that *ματαιῆς* is a corruption of *ματαίω*, the oblique strokes of the *α* having been misread with the upright of *τ* into *κ*. The rendering of *κῶ* is vouched for by Exod. xx 7 *κῶ*, *ἐκὶ ματαιῆς*; and in fact Symmachus renders the present passage *ὡς σχοινία ματαύτητος*<sup>1</sup>.

R. R. OTTLEY

### THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION.

THE attempts to explain the mystery of our Lord's Transfiguration have been innumerable. And many of these, no doubt, have been valuable contributions towards its solution. As a rule, however, they have dealt mainly with one side of the solemn occurrence. The question usually investigated has been, What did the Transfiguration mean for our Lord? what bearing had it on His earthly career? was it intended to be, in some marvellous way, a solace to Him in the dark hours when He began to go forward unflinchingly to the agony of the Cross? Many answers can be given to such questions as these. But they will always be, in the highest degree, provisional. It will ever be beyond the bounds of our limited penetration to discover the hidden movements of the consciousness of Jesus. That falls within the scope of the unique fellowship between Him and His Father. But there is another side on which we can approach the Transfiguration. And it lies nearer to us, at least in the light of the New Testament. What was the meaning of the Transfiguration for the disciples? Obviously this was a scene intended to impress their minds. The three Synoptists detail the fact that Jesus took Peter, James and John apart to be witnesses of the extraordinary event. There was a purpose in His action. Had the Transfiguration been only an intensified condition of spiritual exaltation for our Lord, or an experience given to encourage and strengthen Him for the awful ordeal through which He had to pass, it would be by no means needful that the disciples should be spectators. Jesus had no partiality for spectacular demonstrations. He avoided them. Unless there was some important discipline for them

<sup>1</sup> [The Peshitta in Isaiah contains several instances of borrowing from the LXX, e. g. for *נשׁוּ עַן עַתָּה* in xxx 7 Pesh. has *vain is this your confidence*!—a rendering very like *ματαία ἢ παράλητοι ὑμῶν αὐτῆ*.—EDD.]

involved in this amazing scene, we may be sure they would never have been there. And the accompaniments of the occurrence bear out the idea. There was a definite appeal made to their senses. It was what they saw—that primarily—which left an abiding impression. Their view of Jesus in the brightness of His altered semblance, their view of the figures who talked with Him, this, judging by the narrative, was the central point of the whole experience. At the same time, this was the element in the incident which startled them most. No face, no figure was so familiar to them as that of the Master. As they gazed upon His altered form and visage, *ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα* (Matt. xvii 6). The change in His appearance overawed them. The three Evangelists emphasize their terror. That was what they recalled most vividly. And yet there can have been nothing to create panic in their minds, for quickly they become reconciled to the change. St. Peter can say, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here.'

Can we suppose that this sight which fell upon their vision had no deeper meaning than the inspiring of awe in the presence of Jesus? Was it merely an additional assurance that He was in truth the Christ whom St. Peter had so lately confessed Him to be? One can scarcely imagine that this was necessary at the particular time. So sure were they that He was the Messiah that they refused to let their minds believe clearly in His announcement of approaching death. But the Cross was the burden of His thoughts during these weeks. And they could not understand the possibility of the Cross, far less the associated Prediction of His Resurrection from the grave. How could He prepare their unwilling and dull minds for appreciating and intelligently confronting His death and resurrection? Necessarily He must use different methods in connexion with the different events. The fact of His death would be painfully plain to them. Some of their number would behold Him hanging lifeless on the Cross. What they required was an interpretation of this overwhelming disaster, as they must count it, the shattering of all their hopes. And this interpretation He gave them in the upper room at the institution of the Supper. That was the great lesson on His death, a lesson which they would take some time truly to apprehend. But the Resurrection stood in a different category. Death was familiar enough. Resurrection lay outside the bounds of their experience. It could only appeal to them, if they recognized their Lord as risen; if they were convinced that He whom they saw was the same Jesus whom they had followed in the days of His earthly ministry. But the Resurrection began a new epoch in the history of Jesus. It was the entrance to His exalted life. And the fact that He was glorified involved, from the New Testament point of view, changes in His whole being. For one thing, His outward semblance

was altered. He had now entered *eis tēn δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (Luke xxiv 26). The Evangelists show great reserve in dealing with the appearance of Jesus after His Resurrection. Evidently there was a remarkable transformation. St. Luke tells us that when Jesus came into the midst of a company of disciples gathered together in Jerusalem, *ἔδρακον αὐτοῦ θεωρεῖν*. St. Matthew notes that even among those to whom He showed Himself, *οἱ δὲ ἐδίωκσαν* (Matt. xxviii 16). The later conclusion to St. Mark's Gospel, which must, in any case, be very early, states that He *ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρῃ μορφῇ*. St. Paul, doubtless as the consequence of his own meeting with the risen Jesus, spoke of *τὸ σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*. That was the kind of organism which awaited the Christian in his resurrection-life.

But was not this precisely the kind of manifestation which was made to the disciples in our Lord's Transfiguration? The terms used in the Synoptic narrative are most expressive. The word which sums up what actually happened is *μεταμορφώθη*. It reminds us vividly of the hints afforded by the Gospel records regarding His post-resurrection appearances. It recalls most strikingly the verb which St. Paul uses when describing the change which the power of Christ will effect in the bodies of believers, *ὡς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμφωνα τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* (Phil. iii 21). The general effect of His appearance is designated as *δόξα*: *εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (Luke ix 31). Moses and Elijah, the heavenly visitants, are also spoken of as *ἐφάνησαν ἐν δόξῃ*. Both St. Matthew and St. Mark lay stress on the brightness which emanated from Him: *ἠλασθη τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς τὸ φῶς* (Matt. xvii 2); *τὸ ἵμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἔγένετο σπυρίδιον λευκῆ λίαν* (Mark ix 3). And we know that *δόξα* was the term used in the Apostolic Age to denote the appearance, if we may so say, of the risen life, whether of Christ Himself or of His followers.

But further, it is very noteworthy that Jesus commanded His disciples to tell no one what they had seen 'until the Son of man be raised from the dead' (Matt. xvi 9). St. Mark also narrates this injunction (ix 9), but he has a remarkable addition, *καὶ τὸ λόγος* (i. e. the command) *ἀπαγορεύει τοῖς ἀκούουσιν μηδενεῖν εἰπεῖν τὸ ἃ ἑώρακον ἀποκρυφῶν* (rev. 10).

This seems to hint that in the early Church they somehow associated the Resurrection of Christ with the Transfiguration. But is there not a natural link binding them together? May not the Transfiguration have been intended as it was being on the disciples was concerned, as a lesson on the Resurrection? May it not have pointed forward to the nature and splendour of the risen life of the Lord? May not its purpose for the disciples have been to make it easier for them to recognize Him when they had loved and lost Him in whose grave their own spiritual lives had been extinguished?



For their conviction of His Resurrection and all that was involved in that depended on their recognition of the risen Lord when He appeared to them. They did recognize Him in spite of some mysterious transformation, which seems to have made it difficult. St. John was the first to discover Him on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. He had been a witness of that which had come to pass on the mountain side. It was he who could affirm with confidence, *ἰθεωράμεθα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* (John i 14).

Of course we feel that this can only be an hypothesis. And such hypotheses have to be put forth with great delicacy and caution in a region so obscure and transcendent as that which embraces the resurrection-life of our Lord. But if it does anything to suggest an aspect of the Transfiguration which is apt to be overlooked, it may not have been stated in vain.

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

#### A POSSIBLE VIEW OF ROMANS X 13-21.

THE late Professor Jowett said of this passage, that in style it was one of the most obscure portions of the whole Epistle. He particularly referred to the fact that the argument was founded on passages from the Old Testament, without the relation of those passages to the argument being clearly brought out. This is true, but there is a further difficulty in the exact value to be assigned to verse 17.

- v. 13. 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be  
 v. 14. saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?  
 v. 15. and how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things!  
 v. 16. But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?  
 v. 17. So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.  
 v. 18. But I say, Did they not hear? Yea, verily,  
     Their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.  
 v. 19. But I say, Did Israel not know? First Moses saith,  
     I will provoke you to jealousy with that which is no nation,  
     With a nation void of understanding will I anger you.  
 v. 20. And Isaiah is very bold, and saith,  
     I was found of them that sought me not;  
     I became manifest unto them that asked not of me.

v. 21. But as to Israel he saith, All the day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.'

It is usual to divide v. 16, 'but they did not all hearken to the glad tidings; for Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?' into two parts: making 16 *a* an objection 'yet in spite of the fact that the message was sent, all did not obey the Gospel'; while 16 *b* is considered to be S. Paul's answer, couched in the words of Isaiah, and with some such clause understood as 'But this fact does not prove that no message had been sent, for Isaiah describes also the failure of the people to receive the message.'

And verse 17, 'So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ,' receives scanty treatment.

Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam comment on the verse thus: 'Hence may be inferred (in corroboration of what was said above) that the preliminary condition necessary for faith is to have heard, and to have heard implies a message.' They continue: 'This sentence is to a certain extent parenthetical, merely emphasizing a fact already stated, yet the language leads us on to the excuse for unbelief suggested in the next verse.'

Is it possible that such a parenthetical explanation should be given of what had only just been said in the preceding verses 14-15? There has been no long digression, necessitating a reminder of a distant conclusion which S. Paul is anxious his hearers should not forget. And we fail to see that the language can be really said to lead up to the excuse for unbelief.

Moreover, according to Sanday and Headlam, v. 17 merely asserts that faith comes by the hearing of a message, a statement which, however true it may be, has already been made by the Apostle, and consequently for them v. 17 marks no advance upon S. Paul's previous thought; and it is hard to reconcile the statement that 'hearing (cometh) by the word of Christ' (whether this refers to the divinely commissioned preaching of Him, or be a mere parenthesis), with v. 21, where Christ is represented as saying: 'All the day long did I spread out My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.' This should, according to the above explanation, have been sufficient, and the Apostle has assigned no cause for their want of belief.

That there is one thought dominating the whole passage, ought, we think, to be conceded. The Apostle has shewn in vv. 4-13 that faith is the requisite; now he wants to shew that it is the Jews' *own fault* if they have not had this faith. vv. 14-17, which in themselves constitute a syllogism, may also be considered as a major proposition laying down the two essential requisites for shewing the truth of S. Paul's contention that it is their own fault if they have not believed. In vv. 18 and 19, the minor proposition, he asks whether the Israelites have had these



requisites, and he answers in the affirmative, leaving his readers to draw the evident conclusion that they in consequence have only themselves to blame if they have not believed. Now what are those two requisites? They are given us in the two parts of the minor proposition. In *v.* 18, 'But I say, Did they not *hear*?' In *v.* 19, 'But I say, Did Israel not *know*?'

These two requisites for proving that their want of faith was their own fault, must be somewhere in the major proposition, viz. in *vv.* 14-17.

Now in this major proposition which, as we have suggested, is itself a syllogism, S. Paul has shewn in *vv.* 14-15, that in order to call upon the name of Christ, men need to believe in Him, and therefore to have heard of Him, and therefore to have received a preacher, and therefore that the same Christ should have sent that preacher.

We can trace then in these *vv.* 14-15, the first of the later requisites, namely:—'did they not *hear*?' But where is the second 'did Israel not *know*?' After *v.* 15, S. Paul objects to himself in *v.* 16 that these cannot be *all* the requisites for faith, since all would in consequence have believed, which is obviously not the case, as Isaiah declares. And this difficulty enables the Apostle to shew that, besides listening to a preacher, there is a still further requisite, namely *that Christ should speak to their hearts and call them*. 'No man can come to Me, except the Father which sent Me, draw him'; and again, 'He that is of God heareth the words (*ῥήματα*) of God: for this cause ye hear them not, because ye are not of God.'

And this, it seems, is the second requisite insisted on again in *v.* 19 *a*, 'did Israel not *know*?'

Is there any ground for such a view? In other words, are we justified in rendering *v.* 17, 'So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing has its effect, viz.: acceptance of the preacher's message, i. e. faith, *through the word or calling of Christ in the hearer's heart*'?

In the first place, as we have seen, the explanation hitherto current seems to be lame, it makes the argument end in a parenthesis; it itself requires some forcing of the text by the introduction of a long suppressed clause in *v.* 16; and, what is more important than all, it makes the Apostle come to a full stop in the middle of his proof. If *v.* 17 is a parenthesis, it is very hard to see how it is a connective link between *vv.* 14-16 and *vv.* 18-21, and it is impossible in this view to explain the question in *v.* 19, 'Did not Israel *know*?'

But in the view now put forward, *v.* 18 is a question arising from the requisite laid down in *v.* 17 *a*, 'So belief cometh of hearing'; and *v.* 19 similarly is a question arising from the further requisite demanded in *v.* 17 *b*, 'And hearing by the word of Christ'—that is, *by Christ's voice in their heart*.



We would first of all draw attention to the prepositions used:—“*ἢ ἀπὸ ἢ πίστεως ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἢ δὲ ἀκοῆ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ.*” ‘Faith arises indeed *from* the preaching, but the preaching reaches us (our hearts) *through* the instrumentality of God’s life-giving voice.’ ‘For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, . . . quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart.’

If, in the passage just quoted from the Epistle to the Hebrews, the ‘word’ were the equivalent of *ῥῆμα*, we might claim a very high probability for our view. As a fact, the word used is *λόγος*.

But does *ῥῆμα* never mean this hidden voice of God to the soul? We might refer to the strikingly parallel passage quoted above from S. John:—‘He that is of God heareth the words (*ῥήματα*) of God: for this cause ye hear them not, because ye are not of God.’ In this passage it would be difficult indeed to say that any external preaching was necessarily meant.

Compare too such passages as S. Matthew iv 4, S. Luke i 37, S. John vi 69, xvii 8, and Ephes. v 26. But in S. Luke ii 29, ‘Now lettest Thou Thy servant depart, O Lord, according to Thy word, in peace,’ we feel that the probability is in favour of an internal message; similarly in iii 2, ‘the word of God came unto John.’ This probability becomes almost a certainty in S. John xv 7, ‘If ye abide in Me, and My words abide in you.’ Compare 2 Cor. xii 4, ‘He was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.’ And Heb. i 3, ‘Upholding all things by the word of His power.’ And vi 5, ‘Those . . . who have tasted the good word of God.’ In all these passages ‘word’ is the equivalent of *ῥῆμα*, which in consequence must be accepted as frequently signifying God’s hidden, secret, but none the less real message, of which David spoke when he said:—

‘The spirit of the Lord spake by me,

And His word was upon my tongue.’ 2 Sam. xxiii 2.

Note also such passages as S. John iii 34, and vi 69.

And lastly we feel that the view which makes *v. 17* parenthetic does not do justice to the illative force of the particle *ἄρα*. It is true that when S. Paul is expressly drawing conclusions, he generally uses the strongly illative expression *ἄρα οὖν* as in v 18, vii 3, 25, ix 16, 18; but in viii 1, which opens up the doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as the natural climax of the freedom from the Law and from sin treated of in chaps. vi and vii, the illative force of the particle *ἄρα* is noticeable ‘*Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.*’

So here in x 17 the Greek implies necessarily two things, a conclusion which is a *concession*, ‘*ἄρα ἢ πίστεως ἐξ ἀκοῆς.*’

‘Faith *then* is from hearing,’ but also, and this is important, a *reservation*; ‘*ἢ δὲ ἀκοῆ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ.*’

Now if we were to see in this verse nothing beyond a resumption of *v. 14-15*, it would be difficult to explain the illative particle *ἀρα* which affects the whole sentence, and still more difficult to explain the adverbative *ἢ δὲ ἀκοή*, which marks a new departure, precisely something *not* enumerated amongst previous requisites for faith.

There are three points in the Apostle's argument, namely, the requisites for faith, the question as to their fulfilment, and finally the answer.

There must then be a connexion between the requisite insisted on in *v. 17 b*, 'and hearing by the word of Christ'; the question asked in *v. 19 a*, 'but I say, Did Israel not know?'; and lastly, the answer given in *v. 19 b-21*.

It is to be noted too that the Apostle is silent about that alone which could establish such a connexion, namely patent proof by miracles of such authorization. The connexion which he does establish is to be found in *v. 19 b-21*, and must determine for us the precise meaning of the two terms thus connected, namely 'the word of Christ' in *v. 17 b*, and the 'knowledge' of Israel in *v. 19 a*.

To establish this connexion S. Paul appeals to something affecting their own intimate individual convictions; first of all, to a prophecy which said that their *hearts* should be moved to jealousy; secondly, to one which amplified this, and insisted that it was not to those who sought Him by outward works that the Messiah would appeal; and lastly, he quotes the prophet's words expressly directed to Israel:—'But as to Israel He (Messiah) saith, All the day long did I spread out My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.' This shews us that the knowledge of which the Apostle speaks was that of an intimate conviction due to an appeal to the *hearts* of each one, a conviction which many must have had, and which *all could* have had if they had 'searched the Scriptures' in the true spirit, and had been willing to be 'taught of God.'

To sum up then, in *v. 14-15*, the necessity of a preacher is shewn; and at the same time, by means of a familiar quotation from Isaiah and from Nahum, it is skilfully implied that such preachers have been afforded in plenty.

In *v. 16* the objection is raised that a preacher is not sufficient, as is evident from Isaiah the great preacher, who himself complains that none have believed upon his preaching. In *v. 17* this objection is met by a concession that, besides the preacher, something more is needed, not merely his authorization or Divine commission (for that, of course, is presupposed, as is evident from the example chosen, namely Isaiah) but further the word of Christ to the hearer 'searching the hearts and reins' is required.

As if—supplementing their own conditions, "But I say, I did say, 'I did say'—you say, how had the opportunity, for the Apostles had provided for and said, "Did I say, 'I did say'—not have?" This our corrected text (17) and should have been: "Have they first experienced the voice of Christ speaking within them, and admiring themselves as saying, 'I did say'?"

That is, in addition to the mere sound of the speaking voice, had they had the opportunity of true knowledge which arises from an interior admission? And the answer follows at once in *rom.* 10: 19-21, you just naturally they must have had the work of conscience, for all the prophets had warned them; for they had seen Moses' prophecy fulfilled in the conversion of the Gentiles whom they despised; cf. *Act* 10: 45. Secondly, Isaiah had foretold that the Messiah would rise, even for those who sought Him not. And, lastly, the Messiah Himself had declared by His prophet that all the day long He had spoken to their heart. They have heard then and they have known, they have had all the requisites for faith, it is their own fault if they have not believed. Compare this with 21: 7-10.

This may be rendered clearer thus:—

- | TEXT.  | PARAPHRASE.   |
|--|---|
| 14. How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him whom they have not heard? and how shall they                                  | 14. They need a preacher.   |
| 15. hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things! | 15. And the preacher must be authorized.  |
| 16. But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?  | 16. An objection—the requisites you propose cannot be sufficient, for Isaiah was a preacher, and authorized, yet they did not believe him.  |
| 17. His belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.   | 17. Yes, quite so, and that shews that we need another requisite; faith cometh indeed by hearing as we have said, but the acceptance of that very hearing is caused by Christ's word to our hearts. |



## TEXT.

## PARAPHRASE.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>18. But I say, Did they not hear?<br/>Yea, verily, Their sound went<br/>out into all the earth, and their<br/>words unto the ends of the<br/>world.</p> <p>19. But I say, Did Israel not know?<br/>First Moses saith, I will provoke<br/>you to jealousy with that which<br/>is no nation, With a nation void<br/>of understanding will I anger<br/>you.</p> <p>20. And Isaiah is very bold, and<br/>saith, I was found of them that<br/>sought me not; I became mani-<br/>fest unto them that asked not<br/>of me.</p> <p>21. But as to Israel he saith, All the<br/>day long did I spread out my<br/>hands unto a disobedient and<br/>gainsaying people.</p> | <p>18. And did they not hear, i. e.<br/>have authorized preachers?<br/>Yes, the Apostles preached<br/>far and wide.</p> <p>19. And did they not have the<br/>further requisite, namely<br/>Christ's word, knocking at<br/>their hearts? Yes, they have<br/>been warned that they were<br/>not the exclusively chosen<br/>people.</p> <p>20. And Isaiah's words must<br/>have pricked their con-<br/>science.</p> <p>21. And Messiah expressly says<br/>that He has appealed to their<br/>hearts.</p> |
|---|--|

After perusing the above, there may arise in many minds the feeling that this view supposes too stilted, too artificial, too nicely antithetical a style in this chapter.

This is not the place for examining the difficulty, but I feel assured that none who have been at the pains carefully to analyse the Epistle and trace out the Apostle's line of argument will give one moment's thought to such an objection.

HUGH POPE, O.P.

### NOTES ON THE BIBLICAL USE OF THE PRESENT AND AORIST IMPERATIVE.

It is necessary to state the distinctions of use, which are assumed in the third of the following notes.

The present is used for (1) present time (i. e. immediate future), (2) continued action, (3) general commands, (4) such as call up a less definite picture, especially those enjoining a mental state or activity.

The aorist for commands intended as definite; e. g. special commands (though not confined to them) more particularly those which have a material side.

I. For the general words of praise we have as a rule (anyhow in the 2nd person) *αἰνεῖτε, εὐλογεῖτε, ἑξομολογήσθε*; but for definite concrete methods almost always the aorist, *ᾄσατε, ψάλατε, ἀλαλάξατε, κροτήσατε χεῖρας*. A rare exception in Ps. Sol. iii 2 *ψάλλετε, ψάλλε*; and in the context the *αἰνεῖτε* of Ps. cl may need explaining. Perhaps we might infer that the aor. of general words *ἐπαινέσατε, εὐλόγησατε, κ.τ.λ.*, points to definite expression of praise in words. Sometimes this is evident, 1 Chron. xxix 20 *καὶ εἶπε Δαυεὶδ πάση τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, Εὐλογήσατε Κύριον, ἢ μεγαλύνετε σὺν ἐμοί.*

II. In addressing the Almighty only the aor. is used. This is the rule of LXX, N. T., the Greek in Hammond's Liturgies (except *συμπάρο* in St. Mark's), and is I believe still with rare exceptions observed by the Greek Church; the present being occasionally used to the Saints, especially in the word *πρίσβευε* (whether the rule is a recognised one is another matter; possibly as would be natural it is so to foreign students rather than native Greeks).

The exceptions in the Bible are very few.

(1) 1 Kings iii 9, 10 *Ἄλῃ* not a request but acceptance of God's pleasure (cf. 1 Kings xxii 12; 3 Kings ii 15 (16)).

(2) Job x 2 *μή με ἀσεβῆν διδάσκει.*

(3) Job xiii 21 *ἀπέχου.*

(4) Job xiv 15 *μή ἀποποιού.* An exceptional idiom in such a matter is not out of place in Job.

(5) Isa. lxiv 9 *μή ὀργίζου.* The pres. would be the ordinary tense for deprecating actual anger, Exod. xxxii 22. Here the *Pater Noster* of v. 8 may bring with it something of the *audemus dicere*.

(6) Sir. xxxiii 11 (13) *σύναγε.* Possibly this word (apart from the variant *συνάγαγε*) might do duty for an aor. (v. below).

(7) In the N. T. most noticeably Luke xi 3 *δίδου.* The only question is was the writer breaking a rule purposely and consciously. It can hardly bear on the tense that *τὸν ἀρτὸν—δίδου* forms an iambic trimeter. In any case it bears out the *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* as opposed to *σήμερον* of St. Matthew.

III. In tenses so nearly convertible other causes than of tense may sometimes determine the choice.

Presents of a light handy form seem sometimes treated as aor. in meaning, especially those like 2nd aorists in ε.

*φέρε* Gen. xlvii 16; 2 Kings xvi 20; Matt. xvii 17.

*ἔχε* Esther iii 11; 2 Macc. iii 33; Luke xiv 18.

*λέγε* 3 Kings xviii 8; Sus. 58 (parallel 54 *εἰπόν*); Isa. lvi 3: *συλλέγετε* Gen. xxxi 46.

*βλέπε* 1 Kings xxv 35; 3 Kings xvii 23.

*νεμέσθωσαν* Exod. xxxiv 3; Jonah iii 7.

Compounds of *στρέφω*:—*ἀνάστρεφε* 2 Kings iii 16; *ἀποστρέφετε* 2 Chron.

xi 4, Ezek. xxi 30; *ἐπίστρεψε* 2 Kings ii 23, Cant. vi 12 (unless these are presents of going, a special case of continued action. The aor. sometimes as a variant).

Conversely *μείνουν*, *μείνατε* and compounds where presents would rather be expected.

In *α*—*ἄγω*, *πάραγε* Eccles. xi 10 (parallel to *ἀπόστησον*); *ἄγε* 2 Tim. iv 11.

Other short stems *χρῶ*, *χρῶσθε* Gen. xvi 6; Esth. iii 11.

*ἔγχει* 4 Kings iv 41 (but following v. 40 imperfect *ἐρέχει*); *ἔκχεε* Judges vi 20; *ἐκχέετε* Ps. lxii 8 (unless these are aorists); *ἔατε* Luke xxii 50.

*κάθου* a present (*μὴ κάθου* 1 Kings xxii 5; Sir. ix 9). But where = take thy seat, the aorist seems generally more suitable; James ii 3 (parallel *στῆθι*).

IV. Perhaps when the root is repeated the present is preferred. Num. xxxi 2 *ἐκδικεῖ τῆν ἐκδίκησιν*. The present is most frequent in this case, but the meaning will generally explain it.

V. *Be thou, ye* commonly (especially in narrative) = *γίνου*, *γίνεσθε*. *Be not* = *μὴ γίνου*, *μὴ γίνεσθε*. Without saying there is nothing of the *become* in it, or of the special force of the tense, *be* is the natural rendering of *γίνου*, and *γίνου* would be the most frequent rendering of *be* (2nd pers. imper.) in the style of LXX (except the prophets) and of N. T., and so with the negative.

E. g. Gen. xvii 1 *γίνου ἄμεμπτος*, 1 Tim. iv 12 *τύπος γίνου*, enjoin no change or modification of character, or none beyond what the mere fact of command sufficiently indicates.

There is often variety of reading (Job xiii 8, the Cambridge Manual differs from the Oxford LXX and HR Concordance). *γίνου* or *γίνεσθε* occurs about forty times in O. T. and twenty-seven in N. T. (about thirteen in Sir., but only three in Prophets).

Equivalent forms are less frequent.

*ἔσθι* Num. v 19 (in a formula), Prov. iii 5, vi 3 (*ἔσθι μὴ*), [vi 6], xxiii 17; Sir. v 10; Matt. ii 13, v 25; Mark v 34; Luke xix 17 (with participle and parallel to *γίνου* v. 19), 1 Tim. iv 15; *μὴ ἔσθι* Prov. iii 7, v 20, xxii 24, xxiii 20, xxiv 28; Sir. iv 30.

(Proverbs and Sirach stand apart from the rest of the O. T. in frequency of present imperatives.)

*ἔσπε*, *μὴ ἔσπε* no instance.

*γενεῶν* in prayer (v. note II) seven times (four of these *ἕλεως γενεῶν*); otherwise twelve times more (of which five have alternative readings). No instance in N. T.

*γίνεσθε* Isa. xxxii 11; Jerem. xxvii 8, and (with alternative *γίνεσθε*) Job xiii 8; Isa. i 16, xliii 10; 1 Macc. iii 58; and (with alternative *ἔσεσθε*), 1 Pet. i 16.

*μὴ γένη*, *μὴ γένησθε* no instance.



γενήθητε Judith xii 17; γενήθητε 1 Pet. i 15; μὴ γενήθῃς (prayer) Je. xvii 17; μὴ γενήθητε<sup>1</sup> Josh. xxii 19.

(In the 3rd person ἔστω, γενέσθω, γενήθῃτω are common.)

F. W. MOZLEY.

### THE XXXII CANON OF HIPPOLYTUS.

THE study of ancient Oriental Canon Law and of the relation between its different collections is made especially difficult by the fact that we have mainly to do with Latin, Syriac, Bohemian, Sahidic, Aethiopic, and Arabic translations. A minute and careful rendering of each text is almost a first requisite, lest difficulties and divergencies be seen where there are none. An instance in point is a passage in the XXXII Canon of Hippolytus.

« إذا دفع قربان لتدفع الصدقة الى الفقراء يعطوا من قبل ان يغرب الشمس للفقراء من الشعب فاذا فضل شئ ضرورة فيدفعوا كالغد فاذا فضل منهم شئ اليوم الثالث فلا يُغْتَب شئ منهم بمن هو في بيته بل الرحمة كلها تُعْتَب لصاحبها وحده الذي يدفع لا يقال لان خبز الفقراء بات في بيته بتوانا »

(Canones S. Hipp. ed. Haneberg. 1870, p. 56.)

Haneberg (*ibid.* p. 91) translates: 'Si distribuitur communio, distribuatur etiam eleemosyna pro pauperibus, haec autem dispertiat pauperibus ante occasum solis a populo; si quid de necessario reliquum est, distribuatur altera die; et si iterum quid restat, tertia die. Ab eo autem in cuius domo (eleemosyna distribuatur et reliquum) asservatur, nihil (ad compensationem laboris) computatur ex iis rebus (quae traditae sunt pro pauperibus); sola misericordia eaque tota afferat ei, qui eam exhibet, computatam mercedem. Qui distribuit, nihil inde obtineat, quando panis pauperum diutius moratur in domo eius per negligentiam.' H. Vielhaber (*Texte u. Unters.* VI 4, p. 104 ff.) substitutes 'oblatio' for 'communio,' omits 'pro' before 'pauperibus,' changes 'distribuatur altera die' into 'distribuatur postero mane,' and omits all that Haneberg had put in brackets. W. Riedel (*Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alex.* 1900, p. 221) translates: 'Wenn ein Opfer gegeben wird, soll auch ein Almosen für die Armen gegeben werden: sie sollen es vor Sonnenuntergang den Armen der Gemeinde geben. Wenn etwas über

<sup>1</sup> This is the received accentuation, judging from a number of editions, from Walton's Polyglot to the Cambridge Manual and Oxford Concordance: but Chandler does not seem to explain.

die Notdurft hinaus übrig ist, sollen sie es am folgenden Tage geben. Ist dann noch etwas übrig, am dritten Tage. Nichts davon wird dem angerechnet, in dessen Hause es sich befindet, sondern das ganze Almosen wird seinem Spender allein angerechnet, welcher es gibt. Jener hat keinen Anteil, weil der Aufenthalt des Brotes der Armen in seinem Hause sich verzieht.' Surely neither translation is clear and correct. Yet the Arabic is not very obscure and may be translated as follows: 'When an offering is made for alms to be given to the poor, they shall give it before sunset to the poor of the congregation. And when there is more than is wanted, they shall give it on the morrow, and when something is [still] over, on the third day. Nothing is to be charged by him, in whose house it is, but the whole charity shall be reckoned [to be] for the person concerned alone. He that distributes, shall not get anything for [the fact] that the bread of the poor has been kept for a time in his house.' (i) قرآن is certainly not 'communio,' but 'a gift,' see Haneb. p. 122. (ii) يُذَقِّع must be read, ل with the conjunctive expressing the purpose (Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, vol. i. p. 291). Haneb., Vielh., and Riedel read the jussive, which destroys the sense and forces them to bring in the particle *etiam*, *auch*, which is not in the Arabic. (iii) للشعب من الفقراء means: 'to the poor from among the congregation,' not 'pauperibus . . . a populo,' as the others have. (iv) صاحبها does not mean either the 'Spender' nor 'qui eam exhibet,' it means: 'the person concerned,' and actually refers to the receiver not to the spender of the alms. (v) الذى يذفع is the subject of what follows, not the qualification of what precedes, as Riedel has it. It refers to the distributor, not to the original giver. (vi) لأن does not mean 'quando.' (vii) بتوانا need not mean 'per negligentiam.' Riedel rightly renders *Versögerung*. The *Testamentum Domini* (p. 132) has only  $\text{بِحسب حسابهم}$ . I have translated 'charged' and 'reckoned,' as English idiom does not allow otherwise, hence also بمن = 'by him who,' instead of 'with him who.'

٢ اذا كان وليمة او عشاء صنعوا واحد للفقراء وهو كيرياكى ويكون الاسقف حاضر وقت وقيد السراج يقوم الشماس ليقده ويصلى الاسقف عليهم وعلى الذى دعاهم ويجب للفقراء الاوارسدية التى فى اول القديس ويصرفهم لينفردوا من قبل ان يكون الظلام ويصنعوا مزامير من قبل مضيمهم ♦

Haneberg [ibid.] translates: 'Si Agape fit, vel coena ab aliquo pauperibus paratur, die dominica, tempore accensionis lucernae, praesente Episcopo surgat diaconus ad accendendum lumen, episcopus autem oret super eos (qui invitati sunt) et eum, qui invitavit illos.'



Pauperes autem adsint quando in initio missae Eucharistia agitur. Missos autem faciat eos (Episcopus vel benefactor invitans), ut separatim recedant, antequam tenebrae oboriantur. Psalmos recitent, antequam recedant.' Vielhaber has *κυριαῖ* instead of 'die dominica,' 'accensus' for 'accensionis,' omits 'lumen,' changes 'Pauperes . . . agitur' into 'Et necessaria est pauperibus *εὐχαριστία*, quae est in initio missae' and omits all Haneberg puts in brackets. Riedel has: 'Wenn ein Mahl oder ein Abendessen stattfindet, welches einer den Armen gibt, und es ein *κυριακόν* ist, so soll der Bischof während des Anzündens der Lampe zugegen sein. Der Diakon soll das Anzünden derselben besorgen und der Bischof soll für sie beten und für den, welcher sie einlud. Den Armen gebührt die Eucharistie bei Beginn des Sacraments (der Messe) und er soll sie vor Dunkelheit zur Trennung verabschieden. Sie sollen aber vor ihrem Fortgange Psalmen singen.' I would suggest reading *ويوجب* instead of *ويجب* and translate: 'When a dinner or an evening-meal is given by some one to the poor and it be a Sunday one, then the bishop shall be present at the time of the lighting of the lamp, the deacon shall rise to light it and the bishop shall pray over them and over him who invited them, and he shall make the poor say the grace which is [said] at the beginning of the Mass and he shall dismiss them. Let them disperse before dark and sing psalms before they go.' (i) In the other renderings the latter part of the canon is confused and almost unintelligible, but what can be simpler and more natural than this: Towards the end of the Sunday-meal, when it gets dark the bishop comes in, the deacon lights the lamp, the bishop blesses the guests and the host and makes them say grace, using a prayer which they know by heart from the liturgy of the Mass and dismisses them? (ii) *ويجب* I. is construed with *على*, meaning 'it is incumbent on one, it is one's duty,' in I. it is not used with *ل* and certainly does not mean *gebühren* in the sense 'it is due to one.' (iii) *ويجب* IV. is always construed with *ل* and means: 'to impose, to order, to make one do something.' (iv) *يوجب* is masculine in form and therefore more naturally refers to a masculine subject, moreover it is both preceded and followed by a verb in masculine form of which the bishop is certainly the subject. (v) Eucharistia is feminine and therefore less likely to be subject of *يوجب*, of course it *could* be but it would be 'unusual' [see Wright's *Gram.* vol. ii. p. 289], especially if we bear in mind that it is translated from the Coptic, where, quite as much as in Arabic, the form of the verb changes according to the gender of its subject. The words *اذا كان وليمة* cannot be quoted against this, because of the addition *او عشاء صنع*; compare *ان كانت انا لمس*, but also Riedel p. 205, note 5. (vi) The word *الواخارسدية* occurs but once more in the canons of Hipp. (c. xix 12) where the 'oil of thanksgiving' is mentioned. The Blessed Eucharist is men-



tioned some twenty-four times and called *القرآن* or *السرائر* or circumscribed by a form of *نال*,—an additional reason for translating *الوفاة* here also 'thanksgiving,' 'grace.'

J. ARENDZEN.

### A RUSSIAN VIEW OF THE CREED OF CONSTANTINOPLE<sup>1</sup>.

THE views advanced by the late Dr. Hort concerning the origin of the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed and its relation to the second General Council have obtained a large amount of acceptance not only in England but also among German scholars. Adopted by Harnack in his article on the Creed in the *Realencyclopädie* of Herzog and Hauck, they have been accepted also, with slight modifications, by Kattenbusch (1892), by Loofs (1893), by Seeberg (1895), by Hahn and Nösgen (1897), and lastly by Kunze (1898). All these authorities agree in the opinion that the Creed was neither composed nor confirmed by the Council of Constantinople. Indeed, save for a few remarks by Kelling in his *Geschichte der Arianischen Häresie*, no voice was raised in Germany against the theory till 1899, when Professor Wilhelm Schmidt of Breslau took in hand the discussion of the question from another point of view, upholding the substantial accuracy of the traditional account, and maintaining that while the Creed of Jerusalem and the shorter Creed of Epiphanius were steps in the process which led to the formation of the Constantinopolitan Creed, the true basis of that Creed is to be found not in either of these forms, but in the Creed of Nicaea; that it was composed and confirmed by the Fathers of the Second Council, and proclaimed by them as an oecumenical Creed, and that the fact that it did not at once acquire universal authority in the Church was due to special circumstances of the time<sup>2</sup>.

In Russia Professor Lebedeff, a distinguished teacher of Church History in the University of Moscow, who has on several occasions treated of the subject, and in particular of the expositions of it by Harnack and Kunze, has recently published, in the *Theological Messenger* for 1902, an article 'On our Creed,' which appears to be of sufficient interest and importance to warrant an attempt to present its substance, in a much abridged and summary form, to English students.

Professor Lebedeff, while he agrees with Schmidt in upholding the traditional view that the Creed was actually the product of the Council

<sup>1</sup> [In this Note the material supplied by Prof. Orloff has been considerably abridged and to some extent rearranged.—H. A. W.]

<sup>2</sup> *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1899, pp. 935-85.

of Constantinople, and pays due tribute to his diligent labours and to his skilful presentation of the facts, differs from him in respect of some of the concessions which Schmidt is willing to make. He rejects the idea that the Jerusalem and Epiphonian Creeds are to be regarded as intermediate steps between the Nicene and the Constantinopolitan, and maintains that the Nicene Creed was not only the true, but the immediate basis of the new formula set forth by the Second Council.

He remarks that the question under what precise historical conditions the Creed was elaborated is one which cannot fail to interest every student of the Creed. The apparent silence of the Church historians, and of S. Gregory Nazianzen himself, seems to leave us without data: and it is not surprising that the question has not been raised. Lebedeff's own suggestion points to a clue which is to be found in S. Gregory's poetical description of the period during which he was attending the sessions of the Council, after the differences which led to his retirement from the archbishopric of Constantinople and his release from the labours of the Council had already begun<sup>1</sup>. Gregory speaks of some attack on the Nicene Faith: and it seems not improbable that what he thus reproaches was the determination of the Council, in spite of the ideas as to the immutability of the Nicene Creed entertained by the Alexandrian theologians, and by Gregory himself, to subject the Nicene formula to a process of editing and revision. The attempt to improve the Creed would seem to him to be practically an attack upon it: and who concurred in such an attempt would be 'going over to the enemy'; the resulting discussions and debates would give ample scope for such charges of inconsistency and vacillation as are contained in his somewhat obscure comments on the members of the Council. Elsewhere, Gregory suggests that the real object of the attack really upon himself may have been 'the Spirit conceived as God' and that the true aim for which he found himself suddenly 'disposed of his throne' lay far from the confusion which he vainly renews<sup>2</sup>. In this passage, and in the expression of indignation with which he writes regarding himself, it is hard to trace the result of discussion in the Council upon the expression of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in which Gregory had engaged, without seeing, the employment of the word *homo* in the final words of the Creed.

The point, however, which Lebedeff seeks to establish is that the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed may be so called, not only because it was the result of the labours of these two Councils, but because the Constantinopolitan Creed is an immediate extension of the Nicene in the words of Creeds of subsequent generations. The discussion of the

<sup>1</sup> *Opuscules de S. Grégoire de Nazianze*, t. i., p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, t. i., p. 100.



Creeds known as those of Jerusalem and of Epiphanius he desires to set aside: those documents should not be looked upon as steps leading from the Nicene Creed to the Constantinopolitan. It is not possible so to forget the great qualities and abilities of the leaders and members of the ancient Church as not to admit that the Second Council was in a position to elaborate the Creed of Constantinople from that of Nicaea without the intervention of any 'preliminary works.'

The Jerusalem Creed, Lebedeff urges, has not come down to us in its complete form. The title-words of S. Cyril's *Catecheses*, however carefully they may be collected, would yield but a meagre result: it is agreed that they were not written by the author, and no one can say whether they include the whole contents of an undoubted Jerusalem Creed. The device of amplifying them by adding sentences from the *Catecheses* themselves, though it may be called a process of restoration of the exact words of the Creed, is not distinguished from the process of original composition: and the Creed which is thus produced, shows, according to Schmidt's computation, very little similarity to the Creed of Constantinople, beyond those words which are also common to the Nicene Creed. Can such a document, so compiled, be accepted as a 'preparatory stage' in the development of the Creed of Constantinople? His opinion is that to represent it in this character is unwarranted. The fact that S. Cyril was present at the Council and showed himself to be a defender of the term *ἁποστόλων* is no sufficient basis for any definite, decisive, conclusion as to the influence of the Creed of Jerusalem. Nor can any argument in favour of the emanation of the Creed of Epiphanius from Jerusalem be drawn from the mention of the Apostles and the 'holy city' in the words appended to that Creed in the *Ancoratus*. The 'holy city' there referred to is not Aelia, but Nicaea, as appears from the mention, immediately following, of 'the Fathers there assembled to a number exceeding 310.'

Nor, Lebedeff proceeds to argue, can the Creed of Epiphanius be rightly regarded as an intermediate stage. The date at which the *Ancoratus* appeared has been taken to be 374: but the point is by no means certain. The year 374 is indeed the last date of the period during which, in the words of the writer, 'other heresies have successively made their appearance.' But it does not follow that it was the date at which the book was written or issued. The book, indeed, presupposes some knowledge of the heresies which fall within the period ending in 374, and was therefore probably itself published after that year: it may be in point of time actually later than the Second Council, while it is by no means impossible that the Creed, which appears only in an appendix to the book, is a later addition. This, as Lebedeff reminds his readers, is no new theory: it was advanced in the last century by Franzelin;



while Vincenzi argues that the Creed is a post-Conciliar addition to the book made not by the author, but by another and a less skilful hand. In his argument, Vincenzi points out that the Creed is actually described in terms which imply that it is Nicene—whereas Epiphanius must have been well aware that it was not identical with the Creed ‘delivered by more than 310 Fathers’: that *both* the Creeds contained in the Appendix are prescribed for invariable use at Baptism, where one Creed only could be employed: and that in the *Panarion*, a work written by Epiphanius after the *Ancoratus*, the only Creed which is cited is that of Nicaea.

Lebedeff himself, in an article published in 1882, had pointed out that in the longer Creed of Epiphanius, entitled ‘Exposition of the faith made in conformity with the faith of those holy Fathers who proclaimed the foregoing exposition’ (the exposition which precedes being the so-called Creed of Epiphanius), the first portion recites, not the Creed of Epiphanius, but that of Nicaea, to which the additions directed against the heresies of Macedonius and Apollinaris are attached. This discordance suggests that the place now occupied by the Creed of Epiphanius was formerly filled by the Nicene Creed pure and simple, and that for this the Creed of Constantinople was substituted by the action of copyists at a time after the Second Council, when the revised form of the Creed had already attained wider publicity and acceptance.

There are, then, serious grounds for thinking that in the *Ancoratus* a substitution of one Creed for another has taken place; that the Creed of Epiphanius is not an original part of the contents of the book. It is to be observed, moreover, that, as a Creed, this formula has never had any real existence: no Church appears to have used it, no catechumen to have recited it: its composition cannot be referred to any definite origin. It may, however, be examined experimentally. Strike out from it all the words characteristic of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and as a result you have the Nicene: strike out the words which make up the Nicene Creed, and the residuum consists of those expressions which the traditional view regards as the work of the Second Council. Strike out all the words which make up the Creed of Constantinople, and the remainder consists of fragments of the Nicene Creed, disjointed and without consecutive sense. This remainder is, in fact, made up of the passages which Professor Schmidt supposes the Council of 381 to have removed from the Creed of Epiphanius, before adopting and promulgating the revised form of that Creed. It is hard to suppose that an oecumenical council would have busied itself with changes of so slight a character: but it would have been impossible for it to deal in this way with the document, since, as a Creed, the Epiphanian formula had no real existence. Professor Schmidt’s opinion, which represents this

formula as the immediate antecedent of the Constantinopolitan, must therefore, in Lebedeff's judgement, be rejected.

On the other hand, he declines to accept the view that the Epiphonian Creed is a later and interpolated form of the Creed of Constantinople. It contains two elements, one Nicene, the other Constantinopolitan. How came these elements to be combined? Lebedeff's theory is that the combination is the indirect and unintentional result of the substitution of the Constantinopolitan for the Nicene formula in the Appendix to the *Ancoratus*. That the Nicene Creed formerly stood there is attested by the description of the Creed which still remains, though it does not apply to the formula which now precedes it: it is clear also that the Nicene formula can (with the one exception of the words *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*) be easily restored from the text of the Epiphonian form, by the process of striking out the phrases characteristic of the Creed of Constantinople. The present text of the Epiphonian Creed is, according to Lebedeff, the result of simple interpolation, by which the Constantinopolitan element has been combined with the Nicene. He argues that this process probably took place at a time later than the Council of Chalcedon, when the Creed of Constantinople first appears with the unquestioned authority of a universal Creed: and suggests that a scribe instructed to substitute in a copy of the *Ancoratus* the 'Creed of the 150' for the Creed of Nicaea, had inserted in the margin of a book already written, or incorporated in the text of a copy which he was making, the clauses added at Constantinople, without removing or altering any part of what he found in the text of the *Ancoratus*<sup>1</sup>. Thus the Nicene phrases of the first portion of the Creed, the anathema at its close, the postscript ascribing it to the Fathers of Nicaea, all remained untouched. The labours of those scholars in England and Germany who have endeavoured to explain the appearance of the Constantinopolitan Creed in the *Ancoratus* at a date earlier than that of the Council has been labour in vain. They have, as Professor Lebedeff says, adopting the phrase of Kryloff's fable, 'devoted themselves so much to the smallest creatures in the museum

<sup>1</sup> The omission of the words *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* is, as Prof. Lebedeff allows, at first sight against this theory; but he argues that the omission is not of the first importance; the Nicene Creed, without these words, would still be Nicene: and his view is that they were not contained in the text of the Nicene Creed which Epiphanius included in the *Ancoratus*. The form of the Nicene Creed which was read, without objection, at Chalcedon shows that changes by way of addition had at an early date been made in the text of the Creed. The variations of that form must have been familiar to those who heard it read; and the omission of these words may be simply a similar variation, not affecting the Nicene character of the form as a whole. He draws attention to the fact that on the other hand, in the portion of the Creed most influenced by the form of Constantinople, the *Ancoratus* retains the Nicene order of the words *ἀγιον πνεῦμα*.

that the elephant has escaped their notice.' But though the interpolator of the *Ancoratus* has caused much trouble and produced much confusion, his punctilious desire to preserve what Epiphanius wrote has made it possible to show that the so-called Creed of Epiphanius is the result of his own work ; that it is posterior, not only to the Second, but perhaps even to the Fourth oecumenical Council.

The conclusion which Professor Lebedeff draws is that neither the Creed of Jerusalem nor that of Epiphanius can properly be employed, as they have recently been, in the investigation of the process by which the Nicene Creed took the form presented by the Creed of Constantinople. The Creed of Jerusalem has no substantial existence : it is not an original document, but the product of modern scholars. The Creed of Epiphanius is a text of early date : but it is the product of a process in which the Creed of Constantinople was part of the material employed: it is not a source from which that Creed drew any part of its contents, or a step in the process by which that Creed was formed.

N. ORLOFF.



## REVIEW

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

*The Philosophy of the Christian Religion.* By A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (London: Hodder & Stoughton.) 1902.

'THIS book is neither a philosophy nor a history of religion, but it is an endeavour to look at what is at once the central fact and idea of the Christian faith by a mind whose chief labour in life has been to make an attempt at such a philosophy through such a history<sup>1</sup>.' Such, Dr. Fairbairn tells us, is the design of his work on *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*. If in the following review we seem to find not a little in that work which is open to criticism, it is to be observed that the less satisfactory pages of it are almost without exception—indeed with only one exception of any moment—those which deal, not with the author's main theme, but with matters which, however important in themselves, are, from the point of view chosen by Dr. Fairbairn, no more than subsidiary. There is, however, as we shall see, one problem which lies at the heart of his subject for which we could have desired a more adequate treatment.

The dominant thought in Dr. Fairbairn's discussion of his subject may be gathered from the following passages, which occur early in the course of the book before us. 'Two things are certain, viz. (α) that without the personal charm of the historical Jesus the oecumenical creeds would never have been either formulated or tolerated; and (β) without the metaphysical conception of Christ the Christian religion would long ago have ceased to live<sup>2</sup>.' 'The very essence of the matter is that the Gospels do not stand alone, but live, as it were, embosomed in universal history<sup>3</sup>.' We see from such sayings as these that we are to expect from Dr. Fairbairn a genuinely concrete treatment of the history of our religion; that he is neither disposed to allow the dogmatic interpretation of the life of Jesus to destroy the sense of historical perspective in the criticism of its records, nor yet, in a manner more characteristic

<sup>1</sup> *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. x.

<sup>2</sup> p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> p. 13.

of our generation, to dismiss as irrelevant, not only temporarily for the purposes of the investigator of origins, but permanently for the theologian also, that course of philosophical reflexion upon the universal significance of that life by means of which it triumphed in the past and triumphs still to-day. Nothing is more noticeable in *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* than its constant protest against the tendency to which, in a remarkable presidential address delivered in 1896 to the Society of Historical Theology, and afterwards published in the *New World Review*, the present Master of Balliol called attention when he spoke of 'some writers who are so zealous against the idea of a Christianity without Christ, that they are in danger of teaching a Christ without Christianity.'

It is quite in accordance with this characteristic note of Dr. Fairbairn's work that the most original and important contribution to theological science which it contains should be a remarkable discussion—in the eighth chapter of Book I and the introductory portion of Book II—of the general relation of the Founder in a 'founded religion' to the religion of his founding, and of the distinctive features which are to be observed in the relation of Jesus Christ to the religion which takes its name from Him. The rare combination in this discussion of a comprehensive view to which it is perfectly clear that 'the question as to the relation between the religion and its founder is not peculiar to Christianity, but is common to the class as a whole, and so belongs to the province of comparative history and philosophy',<sup>1</sup> with a genuine insight into the peculiar characteristics which distinguish the attitude of Christians towards Him who is not only the author but the finisher of their faith, give to the conclusions reached a special value. Dr. Fairbairn finds that 'while' in the case of a 'founded religion' 'an historical person and his creative acts' are 'presupposed in the religion, yet it could not in any real sense begin to be without some form of apotheosis by the community'.<sup>2</sup> This is true, as he shows, not of Jesus only, but of the other founders of religions—of Buddha, for example, and of Mohammed. But while we may use 'apotheosis,' in a vague sense of the word, to express the conception formed by Buddhists of the dignity of Gautama, by Mohammedans of the dignity of their prophet, nay, by the Franciscans of the dignity of the saint of Assisi,<sup>3</sup> yet, in none of these three instances, not even in that of Buddha, which comes the nearest, has the founder for his community—to use a Ritschlian expression—'the value of God'; whereas Jesus held and still holds for Christians

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> It is to be regretted that Dr. Fairbairn has not anywhere dealt with the case of St. Francis, on which so much light has lately been thrown, enabling us to observe this process of 'apotheosis' more closely than is usually possible.

no lower rank than this. In the reaction from a prejudice which isolated Christianity from other religions to the recognition of the need of using the comparative method in dealing with the history of our faith, it has often been forgotten that, while other great religious communities beside the Christian Church have invested their founders with superhuman dignity, they have not invested them with godhead, still less with godhead conceived in such a way that there can be but one God. Nor is this all; for the worship of Christ as God has, as a matter of historical fact, been found not only compatible with a nominal monotheism—indeed it is quite possible to show that even under monotheistic forms the real object of religious devotion may be a being not regarded as properly God at all—but has actually promoted (not merely, be it noted, failed to hinder) the development of what is, if we judge it aright, at the least a far deeper and more universal conception of deity than was current in the country or the age which saw the rise of Christianity. Dr. Fairbairn is therefore fully justified in insisting that the problem of the Person of Christ is not solved when we recognize—though we must recognize—that the Christian community has dealt with its Founder in a manner analogous to that in which other religious communities have dealt with theirs; but that there remains still unanswered the question what it was in Him that made the special form which this treatment took in the case of Christianity not only possible, but (judged by the point which it has played in the world's history) successful as well. We must, with Dr. Fairbairn, consider the historical Jesus not in abstraction from what He has been to His followers and, through them, to the world—'after the flesh,' to use the phrase of St. Paul—but 'in the spirit,' in the full reality of the life of His Church, in which His Presence dwells and works 'always, even unto the end of the world.'

When, in this way, we look back upon the record of the Gospel in the light of the impression made upon the Church and the world by the events which they record, one thing especially draws our attention. Here is a life, a character, the imitation of which has seemed to thousands in many generations of men the highest purpose that they could set before themselves, the one thing supremely worth living for. From very early times nothing, or practically nothing, more was known, in an historical sense, of that life and character than we know to-day; no doubt there have been times at which the Gospel record has been comparatively neglected, but there has been no other to compete with it, as the authoritative picture of the Lord. Now it lies on the surface of the evangelical narrative that the Master is presented there as living in an assured confidence of divine favour and sonship, without memory or sense of moral failure or of sin, or even (apart from one word upon the Cross) of alienation from God. The self-tormenting, the passionate



asceticism, which are so characteristic of other great saints within and without Christendom, are singularly absent. Even the story of the forty days' fast and of the subsequent temptation by the devil (which moreover lies outside of the period of the ministry which formed the theme of the apostolic preaching) scarcely presents an exception. Whatever be the antecedents of this story or its parallels elsewhere, nothing is hinted in it, as we have it, of conviction of sin or (as in the accounts of Buddha) of disillusionment with the world as being the ground of the withdrawal and fast of Jesus; the temptations are described as of a kind which presuppose the certainty of divine sonship; nor is there the least suggestion of yielding upon the part of Christ. The words ascribed to Him in the Fourth Gospel—'The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me'—fit very well the Synoptists' account of His early encounter with the power of evil. The gracious serenity of Jesus, the ready participation in feasts which earned Him from His enemies the reproach of a 'gluttonous man and a winebibber,'—the life, according to His own similitude, of a bridegroom with the children of the bride-chamber about him, upon which Renan has dwelt with so much beauty of thought and expression, the 'sweet reasonableness' of which Matthew Arnold so often spoke—all these characteristics are at once obvious to readers of the Gospels; they are the salient features of the picture which the evangelists draw of our Lord. The torments of His Passion are not described as self-inflicted, though voluntarily undergone for a righteous cause. The character of Christ is one thing; the Christian character, recognizable amid many varieties through the ages of Christian history, is another; yet the latter always regards itself as founded upon the former. It is not simply that it is an imitation, where the former is the original; or even affected and artificial, where the former is natural and spontaneous. Rather it does not affect to reproduce what is most salient in its model. On the contrary, it is marked by the contrition, the sorrow, the self-distrust which in that model are markedly absent. Christ's character is put before us as that of one who had no sin of His own of which to repent; but the revelation of this character has, as has been well said, 'filled the world with a wail of penitence.' The Christian is always a penitent, and counts that in being so he is the follower of his Master who (in the literal sense) was none. Christ teaches the secret of divine sonship by the exhibition of His own filial attitude towards God; but the intuitive instinct of Christian reverence has distinguished between what in that attitude is communicable to the sons by adoption, what peculiar to the Son by nature. It is not a question of degree; for then we should be acquiescing in a standard lower than the highest set before us to copy; it is a difference in some sense of kind. And thus is solved for the

Christian a great ethical problem : how a sense of divine sonship can be won, not discordant with the sense of sin and imperfection, and compatible with humility. The Stoic knows himself of the family of God ; but that by nature ; so that if he be but wise, Zeus has no superiority but his longer continuance. Now this pretension must become grotesque when the man enters into the chamber of his heart, and recognizes his infinite distance from the perfection which is his ideal. The Jew, too, knew himself for God's son ; but because of an arbitrary choice of his race among the families of the earth, so that his sonship depends upon a privilege, and is abolished unless his fellow men are excluded from it. The secret of the universal *mediate* sonship is reserved for the Christian. No one ever felt that the attitude of Christ towards God was the boastfulness of the man without self-knowledge ; on the contrary, it has always quickened, not by reaction, but as its direct effect, the sense of self-abasement in His followers ; who know themselves sons indeed, but sons in and through Him. It has only been possible within our limits to indicate imperfectly this line of thought as to the 'imitation of Christ,' which means something so different from literal imitation ; and as to the impression made by Christ upon His followers to which this testifies, and which is in fact the impression of a unique divine sonship. Enough, however, has been said to show that the belief in Christ's perfection is not due to mere ignorance of many of the details of His life. It has been said, I think by Francis Newman, that if one of James the Just's Jerusalem disciples chose to set up a claim for that apostle to sinlessness, it would be hard to disprove it. It would ; but the belief in the sinlessness of Christ rests on no such precarious ground as this. The problem presented by the peculiar relation between the character described in the Gospels and the Christian character which it has created, would remain, even although the facts about the Founder of our religion which will bear critical investigation were as few as Dr. Schmiedel in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* supposes them to be.

Dr. Fairbairn touches upon the ground we have been traversing in such passages as we find where he speaks (on p. 372) of 'Sin feared and Sanctity loved through the Vision of God.' Christ, he says there, 'has created two things which seem opposites, but are correlatives and counterparts, the deepest consciousness of sin and the desire for the highest sanctity. Man knew sin before Him. . . . Yet it is true that there was before Christ no such consciousness of sin as He, by His very sinlessness, created. . . . Sin has become to us not a ceremonial accident which the only sort of sacrifices man could offer might atone for, but an offence so awful in its guilt as to involve the passion of God and the death of His Son. Hence comes the tragedy of Christian experience—the co-existence and conflict in the same soul of a double sense, a fear



of sin that almost craves annihilation, and a love of holy being which yearns towards the vision of God. Yet these are both due to the action in us of the ideal sinless personality, and express the love by which He guides man into the light of life<sup>1</sup>. This could not, as we have seen, have happened, but for the instinctive sense in the Christian's soul of an intrinsic difference between himself and Christ. While, in knowing Jesus, he knows at once what holiness is, and how far he is from it, so that he can rest content with nothing short of it, yet he indulges in no fantastic dream that, by doing as Christ did, he can attain to standing in his own right where Christ stands. The moral achievement which was, as we saw, reserved for Christianity, of uniting the virtue of humility, that characteristically Christian grace of character so little esteemed in antiquity, in which the consciousness of finitude and imperfection finds full expression, with the consciousness of divine sonship, was made possible by the introduction of the no less characteristically Christian idea of a mediate or adoptive sonship belonging to the Christian in and through the direct or natural sonship of his Master.

It has already been hinted that there is much in Dr. Fairbairn's book which seems to me considerably less excellent than his leading conception, or than his discussion of Christ's relation as Founder to the religion of His founding. This less excellent matter is to be found for the most part in the first part of the book, in which the author lays the philosophical foundations of his view of Christianity. Of comparatively trifling importance are the inaccuracies which are not unfrequent in his reports of the opinions of philosophical writers. Surely Mill did not reduce 'both the subject and the object of knowledge' to 'the permanent possibilities of things *unknown*'<sup>2</sup> but to things unknown, whereof one, 'matter,' is a permanent possibility of *sensations*. Nor did Schopenhauer 'conceive thought as essential to the ultimate Being'<sup>3</sup>. Rather this is just the main point in which Von Hartmann's theory differs from his master's. Much graver objection may be taken to Dr. Fairbairn's metaphysical discussions. For he here completely ignores the difficulties connected with the reality of time—difficulties never far away in philosophy, and especially serious in the philosophy of religion, above all in the philosophy of an historical religion such as Christianity. When early in the book one read of God, that He 'was moved to create . . . that He might through creation find a richer beatitude'<sup>4</sup>, one was moved to hope that Dr. Fairbairn had it in his mind to discuss the reality of time and the difficulty involved in this account of creation. But this hope was destined to disappointment. No perception could be discovered anywhere of the importance of this question of

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 372.<sup>2</sup> p. 52.<sup>3</sup> p. 124.<sup>4</sup> p. 59.



the reality of time. Instead of any genuine attempt to deal with it, there were only phrases which suggested that Dr. Fairbairn was apt to surrender at discretion to the charms of an antithesis or epigram. Thus we come upon such a remark as this: 'Thought is transcendence as regards the phenomena of space, Will is transcendence as regards the events of time'.<sup>1</sup> I can make nothing of this; for surely Thought has to do with time just as much as with space. But still more puzzling is another similar sentence which speaks of 'extension which denotes' God's 'behaviour in space, and thought, which describes His action in time.' We see here, in fact, in a less innocent form (because his thought suffers from it), a defect which sometimes betrays the writer into remarks which, sounding well enough, contain obvious logical fallacies—so obvious that they do but little harm—as when he begs the question of the historical reality of the picture in the Gospels by saying, 'Literary art has never yet succeeded in embodying it,' that is, ethical perfection, 'in an actual person';<sup>2</sup> or when he observes that 'lordship of the heroic order is not a difficult thing to attain, for men of marked moral inferiority have attained it'.<sup>3</sup> Here he can mean no more than that it is attainable by men of marked moral inferiority. For it is surely absurd to say that what Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon attained is not difficult to attain, because they were immoral. Yet Dr. Fairbairn's rhetorical turn of mind has misled him into saying this.

One defect in Dr. Fairbairn's thought may be said to lie nearer than any we have yet mentioned to the heart of his subject:—his failure to recognize the importance of that view of sin as taken up into a larger purpose of grace which seems to some of us to lie at the heart of Christianity, and which finds its classical expression in the Holy Saturday hymn *O felix culpa*. In the use of such language as we find in the section on 'Why Evil has been Allowed to Continue',<sup>4</sup> or of the expression, 'the accident of sin',<sup>5</sup> this view is not criticized but merely ignored. The omission of any serious consideration of it is indeed not unfrequent among theologians; but we might have hoped for more recognition of its existence from one so exceptionally well versed in philosophy as Dr. Fairbairn. The publication of *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* followed by only a few months that of Professor Royce's profound discussion of this topic in the second series of his Gifford Lectures on *The World and the Individual*. The whole treatment of the question of evil by Dr. Fairbairn contrasts strikingly, in its comparative lack of depth and even of insight into the religious consciousness, with that of the American metaphysician.

Not entirely unconnected with this lack of profundity in the author's

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> p. 357.

<sup>3</sup> pp. 406-7.

<sup>4</sup> p. 165 foll.

<sup>5</sup> p. 483.

treatment of the problem of evil is his lack of sympathetic understanding of pessimism—of which, however, he speaks with respect, and which he describes very fairly<sup>1</sup>. He greatly under-estimates, however, its attraction for some temperaments, when he says of Schopenhauer's philosophy that it is 'without any fascination for the heart'.<sup>2</sup> Certainly it is true that Schopenhauer himself could not become an object of worship like the Buddha; but that is a different matter from his view of the world being unable to touch the religious emotions.

Pessimism is, however, not the only form of thought with which Dr. Fairbairn is conspicuously out of sympathy. He is also out of sympathy with Catholicism. We understand here by Catholicism not the system of the Roman Church only, but a certain turn or habit of mind in religious matters which is easier to recognize than to describe. It is the turn of mind which is passionately sensible to the solemn atmosphere of a sacramental system charged with the sacred associations of an ancient ritual, wherein the sorrows and the aspirations, the penitence and the triumph, of a fellowship to which we ourselves also belong, are as it were enshrined. It is perhaps nowhere described with a more delicate truthfulness than in the description of the mass in Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*. Beyond question, as it seems to me, this temper, like all others, needs care and watchfulness in its indulgence. It is not the Christian temper, and may become in certain persons a hindrance to the full development of the Christian temper. But neither is the opposite turn of mind, to which these things do not appeal, in itself the Christian temper; and it is an unfortunate circumstance that from both sides religious thinkers should find it so hard to be just to those whose temperament or training gives to their piety a type different from their own. The chief flaw in Professor Harnack's admirable book *Das Wesen des Christenthums* seems to lie in the fact that its treatment of Catholicism, learned and fair-minded as it was, revealed the man who did not know the Catholic spirit from within. A similar criticism might be applied to a very different work, the exceedingly able and original treatise of Mr. A. E. Taylor on *The Problem of Conduct*. Few recent books on moral philosophy have shown a more genuine insight into some forms of religious experience. But with what we may call Catholic asceticism he is too much out of sympathy to say anything valuable. When he is led to touch upon it, his observations present in their singular lack of appreciation a strong contrast to the intelligence which characterizes most of his discussions of religion. One feels that something is gained by belonging to what Mr. Taylor in one place calls, with more than a touch of contempt, that 'eminently common-sense institution' the Church of England. It is more possible perhaps there

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> p. 126.

than elsewhere to win at least an acquaintance with both those main types of devotion which may, for want of better names, be designated Catholic and Evangelical respectively. Dr. Fairbairn's treatment of Catholicism fails, as we have seen, in good company; but it certainly fails. It is not of good omen for a critic of this form of piety that he begins by saying, 'Nothing fills me with darker horror or deeper aversion than the apotheosis of wounds and death which the Roman Church offers as the image of the Christ<sup>1</sup>.' And his treatment of the Eucharist is almost paradoxical. He denies that it is an institution for worship at all<sup>2</sup>, and asserts that preaching has more of worship in it than the Sacrament<sup>3</sup>. But here Dr. Fairbairn is not true to his own principles. For the question before us, as of Christianity in general, so of the rite in which Christian worship is concentrated, is not what, if we ignore its subsequent development, we can descry it to have been in its beginnings, so much as what in the life and thought of the community it has become. To hold, with Dr. Fairbairn, that the view which makes 'positive' ceremonial institution, as such, part of the content of the Christian religion, is excluded by the distinctive principles of that religion, is by no means inconsistent with the recognition of an historical element, the necessity of which is (as with the historical in general) beyond our powers of insight or construction. I should myself (though I do not know how far Dr. Fairbairn would assent), unreservedly agree with Kant that the historical element is, as such, indifferent. I should not say that the historical events of Christ's life were, as such, the objects of religious faith. But the spiritual realities which are the objects of religious faith did, as a matter of fact, dawn on the world in connexion with those events. Why it should have been so, we cannot tell; any more than we can tell why idealism arose at Athens or the critical philosophy at Königsberg. Yet it is impossible to deny that these things did so take place and not otherwise; nor can we hold that this historical order is ultimately irrational, though we may not succeed in construing it *a priori*. In the case of the life of Christ, Dr. Fairbairn would not disparage, rather he would earnestly insist, upon the significance of the historical event which as a matter of fact did receive that interpretation, did initiate that movement, apart from which it would be without the significance which through that interpretation and that movement it actually possesses. In a secondary way we may say of the Eucharist, too, that in fairness this too should be contemplated, not as an isolated rite, but in the light of the meaning which it has gathered around it, of the ideas which it has come to symbolize: and what is true of the Eucharist in particular is true of the system of which it is the centre. The more keenly conscious one is of the mischief which superstition has done in

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 556.

<sup>2</sup> p. 561.

<sup>3</sup> p. 562.



the Church, by re-materializing those conceptions of sacrifice and worship which Christianity had spiritualized, the more important it is to do justice to the element of truth which gives even to superstition its vitality. This is not done where to the childish notion that substance and reality are what can be seen and handled is opposed the interpretation that the significance thus attributed to what is material is something which is only figurative, a 'mere idea.' It *is* done when the truly substantial and real is found *always*, not in what is seen and handled, but in what, upon occasion of such seeing and such handling, is thought and felt. I am not venturing to attribute to Dr. Fairbairn the abstract view which I am contrasting with the true; but it may be that his treatment of the Eucharist has not been fully considered in the light of the higher notion of what is spiritual, which his whole treatment of the historical element in Christianity seems to me to presuppose.

It is because Dr. Fairbairn has given us so much, that one is inclined here and there to ask for more. It is tantalizing to find him passing over, where it would be natural to discuss them<sup>1</sup>, the post-prophetic speculations of Judaism as to the nature and dignity of the Messiah; perhaps even more to read in a note on p. 482, 'This is not the place to examine Dr. Frazer's learned and ingenious argument' about the origins of Christianity in the second edition of his *Golden Bough*. For it would seem to be just the place for such an examination; and a detailed discussion of the argument in question would certainly have been welcomed by those who find in the brief judgement of it given by Dr. Fairbairn in the same note a confirmation of their own view as to its merits and defects.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 473.

## CHRONICLE

### NEW TESTAMENT (ENGLISH BOOKS).

- (1) *The Earliest Gospel: a historical study of the Gospel according to Mark.* ALLAN MENZIES, M.A., D.D.

PROF. MENZIES' volume answers strictly to its title: it takes no account of philological and textual problems, but attempts simply to expound and appreciate St. Mark's Gospel as an historical book. The thankless labours of the textual critic will meet with a real reward if Prof. Menzies' example is widely followed, and scholars born for exegesis put textual work aside, and content themselves with accepting the results that others have won from that arid field.

Prof. Menzies' introduction is chiefly concerned with the conditions under which the 'earliest Gospel' was produced. The first problem which the subject suggests is that of the comparative lateness of the Gospels in the literary history of Christianity. The solutions suggested by Bishop Westcott—the expectation of the Parousia, the prevalence of oral teaching, the illiterateness of the first Christians—do not seem adequate to explain the 'strange silence of the early Christians as to the incidents of their Master's life.' Prof. Menzies is doubtless right in pointing out that 'the Christ of the Epistles and of the Apostolic age is not an earthly but a heavenly figure.' In other words, Christianity was always a religion, and not a reminiscence. St. Paul, for instance, had made up his mind not to 'know Christ after the flesh': and in this respect Prof. Menzies regards him as 'representative of early Christendom.' Yet the purely theological interest in our Lord (we notice that it is not maintained that St. Paul was its creator) might be stronger in some parts of the Church, weaker in others: where it was weaker, the earthly memories of His acts and teaching would be more prominent. And in fact the Gospel tradition did grow up where belief was simplest; hence the extreme contrast between the Gospels and the Epistles: they belong to different worlds; we do not find doctrine on the one side, nor detail on the other.

This is all comparatively obvious: and yet in dealing with St. Mark it must be remembered that we are dealing with an admittedly Western

ness of the originally Oriscian narrative. The earliest reader of St. Mark had a fact in each of the worlds: our 'earliest Gospel' Eastern though its ancestry may have been, was brought to its present shape for the enrichment of lives that were excited in the Gnostic aspect of the faith, in the world of the Epistles. How had the text maintain, without coalescing from scattered particles of narrative or discourse, and free from any doctrine beyond that of the Messiahship of Jesus, space to stand unembarrassed by the side of the voluminous writings of theology? Many causes, as Prof. Meinies points out, not have stimulated the demand for Gospel-writing—curiosity as to the origin of institutions, the necessities of controversy, the personal devotion of Christians to their Lord: and with these demands came the necessity of equating the figure of Christ worshipped with the figure of Christ historically known. 'The human Jesus tended to be translated into a Being all powerful and all-knowing': 'much was made sacred that at first perhaps was natural and human, while much that was not truly wonderful was never apprehended, or was apprehended too late to be put down as it really was.' The Gospel, that it could take its part with the Epistles, because its narrative had caught many reflections for their world, and was no longer too historical to be accepted by a Christ as history.

This, we believe, is a fair though rough sketch of the sense which Prof. Meinies adopts towards the miraculous elements in St. Mark. There are three ways of dealing with such problems: we may say that the facts of the unique Life created Christian faith and theology; or that theology created the facts; or that a *modus vivendi* created a theory which created some fictions. No student can help making some use of the third of these methods: as historical judge he must all be sceptic. Prof. Meinies commits himself to it with little reserve; and as a serious and dispassionate attempt to reduce the Gospel by this means to the simplicity from which he believes it to have expanded, his work will command at least the respect, though not the assent, of all his readers.

(i) *The Works of Jesus*. GEORGE DEISSMAN; translated by D. M. KAY, B.D.

The two most obvious directions in which knowledge of the New Testament is making real advances are the study of the *evangelium* and the study of *Antiquae*. That the work of Prof. Deissman on the one hand and Prof. Hilgenbrant on the other, should now be within the reach of English readers is most satisfactory. In chronicling the apparent progress of the work it may be sufficient to indicate the main principles on which Deissman's work is based.

For certain prayers and daily benedictions, Hilgenbrant was by



the time of our Lord a dead language: it is not certain that it was always spoken even in the legal schools. Literary compositions in Hebrew are not unknown even after this time: but since the native language of our Lord was undoubtedly Aramaic, we should require strong evidence before believing that the story of His life would first be written in any other language. It has been customary indeed to speak of many expressions in the Synoptic Gospels as 'Hebraistic': but the actual Hebraisms, as apart from Aramaisms, which they contain, are extremely few and almost entirely confined to St. Luke; and in his case it is clearly impossible to speak of Hebraism: the phrases which might be so classed are due to St. Luke himself and not to his sources, and they are all in reality 'Septuagint-Graecisms.' No successful attempt has as yet been made to reconstruct a Hebrew original for the Synoptic tradition: that of Resch breaks down when tested in detail. The hypothesis of an Aramaic original, on the other hand, has both ancient tradition and antecedent probability in its favour: and yet when our Gospels are tested with reference to this hypothesis, we find that it cannot be called more than highly probable. We must therefore go behind all hypotheses to the only fact which can be called entirely certain, namely, that our Lord spoke in Aramaic to His disciples: and our task will be to examine the Words of Jesus in the light of the Aramaic language, and the circle of ideas to which His phraseology can be traced.

That part of Prof. Dalman's work which has already been published contains a first instalment of his *vindematio* from these axioms. He does not attempt a retranslation of our Lord's discourses, but considers some of the main ideas which recur throughout them, such as those of the Sovereignty of God, the Future Age, the Names of God, and the terms applied by our Lord to Himself. He hopes subsequently to publish a discussion of the Words of Jesus in relation to their collective import.

3) *The Study of the Gospels.* J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D. (Hand-books for the Clergy.)

The success of the series to which this volume belongs, and especially that of Dr. Swete's 'Patristic Study,' are encouraging signs: we hope that Canon Armitage Robinson's admirable introduction will be equally well received.

4) *The Acts of the Apostles.* R. B. RACKHAM, M.A. (Oxford Commentaries.)

Mr. Rackham's exposition, like the other volumes of the series to which it belongs, is meant to be read by the educated English public who are not technically speaking 'scholars' or 'students.' For their use it is an excellent edition: it is full and clear in its exposition of the text,

learned and generally accurate in its explanatory notes. 'Scholars' will probably find it a little too homiletic, and Mr. Rackham is apt sometimes to put a little strain upon his materials in the interests of orthodoxy. For instance, the difference between the historical quality of the first and second parts of the Acts is perhaps greater than he allows. Mr. Rackham recognizes, it is true, the difficulty of a literal interpretation of Acts ii 1-13; but St. Luke's account of the 'gift of tongues' is more clearly divergent from the *γλωσσολαλία* of 1 Cor. than would appear from his exposition: it is not only 'the *prima facie* impression given by the narrative,' but its sole point, that the disciples spoke in languages with which they were not in a natural way acquainted. 'The effect produced on the hearers was perplexity and amazement': but they were not perplexed like the Corinthian *ἰδιώτης*, by purely ecstatic utterances. The 'tongues' at Jerusalem were miraculously comprehensible: at Corinth they were miraculously unintelligible. Again, we doubt whether parallels from the Old Testament theophanies, and the story of the flame on the head of Iulus in the *Aeneid*, tend at all to support the literal interpretation of the phrase *γλώσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς*. We should remember the parallel phrase *ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος* and its strangely general misinterpretation. But Mr. Rackham's use of the Old Testament is generally rather homiletic than critical. What, for instance, is the point of the reference to Uzzah in the note on v 13? 'In the church *none of the rest*, after the punishment of Ananias, *dare* join himself to the body of the apostles, i. e. venture to usurp their authority or encroach upon their functions. The fate of Ananias conveyed the same warning as that of Uzzah.' Surely neither Ananias nor Uzzah was in St. Luke's mind here: *τῶν λοιπῶν* is in antithesis to *ὁ λαός* in the following verse, and *κολλᾶσθαι* need not have any other meaning than it bears, e. g. in x 28.

The best attested text of xii 25 presents a well-known difficulty, which Mr. Rackham can hardly be said to solve. The last verses of chapter xi relate the sending of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem at the time of the famine: xii 1-23 deals with the attack of Herod upon the church; and after a reference to Herod's death and the prosperity of the church we read in xii 25 *Βαρνάβας δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ἰπέστρεψαν εἰς* (vll. *ἐξ, ἀπὸ*) *Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συναρπασθέντες Ἰωάννην κ.τ.λ.* Barnabas and Saul were already in Jerusalem at the end of chapter xi: and it seems natural to say, with Dr. Hort, that while transcriptional probability is in favour of *εἰς*, the sense requires *ἐξ*, unless the right reading be, as Dr. Hort conjectured, *ἰπέστρεψαν, τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες διακονίαν*. Mr. Rackham takes refuge in the Lucan use of participles, making *ἰπέστρεψαν* refer to the journey from Antioch to which xi 30 alludes: he translates thus 'they returned to Jerusalem and fulfilled

their ministry and took with them John.' The objection to this interpretation is that having robbed *ὑπέστρεψαν* of its natural reference to the second half of a journey Mr. Rackham has to supply something corresponding to 'and then went away' between *πληρώσαντες* and *συνπαράλαβόντες*. We cannot but think that the Lucan participle is worked rather hard by such exegesis; and we hold that textual criticism is a fair servant but a bad master. Yet Mr. Rackham had abandoned the MSS and *Ἑλλημιστάς* in xi 20, a wavering which is rebuked by the more rigid scrupulousness of Dr. Chase, who prefers *Ἑλλημιστάς* with an emendation to *Ἑλλήνας* and 'common sense.'

(5) *The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles* (Hulsean Lectures for 1900-1901), F. H. CHASE, D.D.

Dr. Chase is engaged upon an edition of the Acts which will appear—we may hope at no distant date—in the *International Critical Commentary*. To this edition the present volume of introductory studies should be a most serviceable companion. It is a characteristic of English scholarship that it studiously follows the maxim of Aristotle, *περί τῶν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λέγοντας τοιαῦτα καὶ συμπεραίνεισθαι*. Nowhere is this caution more necessary than in the exacting task of appraising the historical value of a book like the Acts. The earlier chapters, like those of St. Luke's Gospel, stand apart from the rest; in them the writer compiles traditions, while for the rest he is himself a contemporary authority. Yet the difference between the two parts of his work is a difference not between the incredible and the credible, but between degrees of credibility in particulars. We may not expect so much from the narrative of the Acts of St. Peter as we do from that of the Acts of St. Paul, and the function of the critic is to discover inductively the general value, as it were, the 'specific historicity' of each.

We believe Dr. Chase's work in this sphere to be of real importance. In his last two lectures he analyses the discourses attributed to St. Peter and St. Paul, and shows that the former 'move within the circle of Jewish Messianic hopes, and stand in striking contrast to the presentation of Christian truth found in the Apostolic Epistles.' They 'exemplify a type of Christian thought which was tentative and immature, and which it would have been exceedingly difficult for a Pauline Christian, writing more than a quarter of a century later, to reproduce by an effort of the imagination.' The Pauline discourses are treated with great minuteness, and the treatment is successful in proving that they are profoundly and subtly akin to the Pauline Epistles: that this kinship is not such as to suggest that the speeches are mere centos of Pauline expressions, but that in them 'we handle threads which we trace woven into the doctrinal and devotional fabric of the Apostle's writings,' and



discover' in them 'conceptions of a general and elementary (and a which contained expression is given in the Epistle).

At the same time Dr. Chase would admit that the speeches (especially those of St. Peter) have been edited; and that the strong impression of the general truthfulness of the Acts does not preclude the admission of a considerable margin of error in detail. In the case of the numerous narratives, especially in the earlier chapters, he would not deny that 'the author' of the Acts or his informants, having the events of the life of the Lord vividly before their minds, may have given 'a supernatural interpretation to what were in truth providential interferences within the sphere of the natural order.' We believe this suspension of judgment to be entirely legitimate, and attach more value to it than to the speculative reconstruction by which Dr. Chase once or twice attempts to reach firmer ground.

(6) *An Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles*. By H. ASKWITH, B.D.

This volume is preliminary to a complete commentary on the Epistle with which it deals. Its argument for the genuineness of the letter may be recommended as containing much useful material; and its author's treatment of the eschatology of 2 Thessalonians, if unconvincing, is at least novel. Mr. Askwith diagnoses of the present tendency to look for the solution of this problem in Jewish apocalyptic tradition. He is therefore not inclined to connect the *isomeria* of St. Paul's prophecy with the *Alaw* which, in Jewish belief, must precede the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom: in his view the *isomeria* is probably a political rebellion, i.e. the Jewish revolt against Rome; the *isomeria* is a Roman emperor claiming divine honours, and *isomeria* is Claudius, who by availing the inconstant policy of Caligula might be said to retard the final development of Empire-worship and the Jewish rebellion which it was destined to provoke. The interest of this view lies in the fact that Mr. Askwith takes the whole passage as a deliberate amplification of the eschatological discourse of our Lord recorded in St. Mark xiii c. 4 ff. and parallels. Support for this we may be found in the assurance with which St. Paul argues, deducing as it were, the details of prophecy from a general eschatological scheme assumed as necessarily true. Yet even if it be untrue, the difficulty is only shifted one stage further back. We suspect that at Thessalonica the obscure activities of Christian prophecy had been working upon Jewish material: Mr. Askwith's view would only make it necessary to ask how far that material had already been used by our Lord or His historians.

With reference to the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians unfavourable inferences have often been drawn from the apparent reference to forged letters in ii 2 (*ἡ γὰρ ἐπιτολὴ . . . πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν*).

μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν). Of these inferences Mr. Askwith rightly takes little account. His own view is that the words ὡς δι' ἡμῶν refer not to λόγου nor to ἐπιστολῆς, but to σαλευθῆναι and θροεῖσθαι: the meaning then is 'that ye be not . . . troubled, either through prophesying or through oral teaching or through letter, as though such disturbance came from us.' At the same time Mr. Askwith holds, following Paley, that ἐπιστολῆς refers to the effect produced by the first Epistle. But does not St. Paul's own emphasis upon the form of his own signature—οὕτως γράφω—relieve us from the necessity of finding such an awkward interpretation? St. Paul was not afraid of being misunderstood himself, but of being supplanted by misleading teachers—μή τις ἡμῶς ἐξαπατήσῃ. If the Thessalonian community was disturbed by a wave of eschatological excitement, it is not so very unlikely that the περιεργαζόμενοι to whom the Apostle recommends honest occupation had used letters purporting to come from St. Paul or to represent his views, in order to give weight to their own fancies. The Apostle's quiet reference to the σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ would be the easiest and completest disavowal of such pious duplicity: and apart from some such fraud the reference is not easy to explain.

(7) *The Letters of St. Paul.* H. S. WAY, M.A.

Mr. Way's rendering of the Pauline Epistles, like Dr. Rutherford's version of the Epistle to the Romans, hovers between paraphrase and translation. Such a method serves one good purpose at least: it enables a translator to follow and make clear the modulations by which St. Paul so constantly enriches and obscures the run of his thought. In such elucidation we think that Mr. Way may be said to succeed; though his attempt to emulate the emotional stress of his original, and the curious instinct by which he prints passages of great exaltation as 'Hymns,' will not appeal to every one's taste.

(8) *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. iii, L-P. Edited by the REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D., and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D.

What has already been said in the *Journal* as to the general character of this great undertaking needs no repetition, or qualification, in reference to its latest volume. We have only to marvel once more at the perverse fortune which brings so much solid learning into the company of so much eccentricity.

Of the longer articles in this volume the greater number deal with Old Testament subjects. For a student of the New Testament the numerous contributions of Prof. Woodhouse, dealing with the historical geography of the Acts and Epistles, will be found most valuable. Prof. Jülicher contributes short but noteworthy articles on LOGOS, MYSTERY, and PARABLES; and Canon Armitage Robinson writes on PRESBYTER and PROPHET (NEW TESTAMENT). Prof. Schmiedel con-



ness his career of vigour and rather indiscriminately detests criticism. His long article on *MARCUS* merits special attention as an effort of historical construction on the part of a scholar who is found it necessary to reject most of the materials accessible to his profession. But a still greater interest attaches to the conclusion of Prof. van Manen: we believe that the present position of the entire Dutch left wing has nowhere been put so clearly before English readers. Prof. van Manen writes on *PETER* and *PETER'S EPISTLES*, rejecting both Epistles on grounds which can hardly be called substantial: but his procedure becomes explicable when we turn to his articles on *PAT* and *OLD CHRISTIAN LITERATURE*. The former of these articles begins with a repudiation of that Tübingen superstition which accorded preferential treatment to the first *Hauptbrief*: declares, among its "positive results," that the historical Paul was at all events no Pauline and no author: 'it does not appear that Paul's ideas differed widely from those of the other "disciples," or that he had emancipated himself from Judaism or had outgrown the law more than they.' It does not 'ever transpire that Paul was a writer of epistles of any importance: at all, of epistles so extensive and weighty as those now met with in the Canon.' General principles so strong as these are naturally put against such evidence as might be adduced in favour of Philemon and Philippians. Dealing with *OLD CHRISTIAN LITERATURE*, Prof. van Manen makes himself still clearer. We doubt if there is anything so unique in Christianity as the *rabies pseudopygraphica* which he supposes to have pervaded the early Christian world. Even the earliest gospel came into being as a *Tendenzschrift* in the post-apostolic age: while as for the epistles 'the time seems to be approaching when the question as to genuineness—in the sense now usually attached to the word—will no longer be discussed as regards any of the epistles that have come down from the first Christian centuries.' What we call the Epistle of Clement of Rome is merely a treatise contemporary with the Third Gospel and the Acts, that is, dating from about 140: 'the author is certainly not Clement of Rome': the Ignatian Epistles are perhaps the product of a Roman layman about the middle of the second century (certainly not Ignatius). It is in virtue of a literary judgement such as this that Prof. van Manen declares that 'all representations formerly current—alike in Roman Catholic and Protestant circles—particularly during the nineteenth century—regarding the life and work of Paul the apostle of Jesus Christ' must be set aside, in so far as they rest on the historical character of the Acts and Epistles. All that has been written on Pauline theology, we are told, has 'irrevocably passed away' and 'now possesses only an historical interest' as exemplifying the scientific work of an older school. We doubt whether the triumph of the Dutch



left-wing has as yet been as complete as Prof. van Manen supposes. There are still some scholars who are guided by a principle to which he himself professes his adhesion—that 'it is always better, safer, and more profitable, to know that one does not know, than to go on building on a basis that is imaginary.'

(9) *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv, *Pleroma—Zuzim*. Edited by J. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

The four volumes of Dr. Hastings' Dictionary have appeared with a punctuality which reflects the utmost credit on the editor and his assistants. We are now to expect a volume of supplements and indices: but the original undertaking is completed, and on its completion we may sincerely congratulate both the editor and the many students to whom his work has already become indispensable.

The fourth volume contains articles of importance in every field of New Testament study. Dealing with the several books we have Dr. Robertson's article on ROMANS, that of Prof. Porter (of Yale) on REVELATION, and those of Dr. Lock on I AND II THESSALONIANS, I AND II TIMOTHY, and TITUS. In the region of textual criticism, Dr. Nestle writes on SEPTUAGINT, SYRIAC VERSIONS, and TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, Mr. White on VULGATE, and Dr. Kenyon on WRITING. Biblical Theology is as fully represented as in the earlier volumes; along with Dr. Sanday's important article on SON OF GOD, and its equally notable companion by Dr. Driver on SON OF MAN, we may notice the work of Dr. Bernard on PRAYER and SIN, of Prof. J. V. Bartlet on REGENERATION and SANCTIFICATION, of Prof. Stevens on RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, and Prof. W. Adams Brown on SALVATION and REDEMPTION. On the historical side, together with much work of minor weight, we have Prof. Ramsay's most important articles on PONTUS, SMYRNA, TARSUS, THYATIRA; those by Messrs. Patrick and Relton on ROME, and by Mr. Headlam on SIMON MAGUS.

The whole Dictionary maintains its character as a first-rate work of reference. It is, as it should be, sound rather than brilliant: and while for many subjects, and especially for a study of the most radical positions of the criticism of the moment, we must refer to Dr. Cheyne's parallel work, we believe that for general and permanent utility Dr. Hastings' Dictionary has no serious competitor.

H. N. BATE.

## CHURCH HISTORY.

*Die apostolischen Gemeinden*, by K. v. Dehmel (Leipzig, Hirsch, 1902, 6 sh.).

This is a singularly good, complete, and well thought-out account of the moral state of the Christian communities in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age, down to Ignatius and Hermas. The writer is not deal with moral theory, though he gives a very full critical account with too few references, at the end of his book, but with moral life and practice. If he is sometimes too subjective, and sometimes too national, as when he patriotically clings to the North Galatian text, and compares the conflict of St. Paul against Judaism in the letter to the "gentile" Lutherans and the Pietists in Germany, his judgment generally is sound, and the information upon which he writes is scrupulously accurate. The examination of the evidence current in the Epistles as to the character of the first Christians is in itself a valuable contribution upon those documents; but the best part of the work comes later. The account of the Gnostics, which is a welcome supplement and corrective to Harnack's brilliant description of this and the first theologians, and that of Hermas, especially on the psychological side, are most instructive, and contain much that appears to be new; and these are but specimens chosen almost at random from the pages of the book. There is, however, one matter in which the author falls short of the impartiality which we have a right to expect in a philosophical inquiry. He constantly compares, and always to their disadvantage, the views of mind of the later generations with that of the first Apostles, and hence threaten the purity of the moral life; confidence has been had in the free development of the Spirit, and men substitute regulations for it; organised charity is a proof of degeneracy; the Apostolic Fathers are marked by poverty of mind. Such are some of the author's judgements, and he gives us no clue to the principle upon which they are based. Such statements of a personal preference have their place in an essay or an exhortation, but they add nothing to the value of a philosophical historical work. But this is merely an accidental fault, and does not substantially lessen the merit of Professor von Dehmel's work. We must hope that he will continue his studies and bring out the *Evangelien* of early Christianity.

*Antiquities, Customs and Mores of the Jews*, by H. T. Pochas (London, Methuen, 1902, 1s. 6d.).

Dr. Pochas's work, which is interesting not only for its contents, but for its origin in New Zealand, is a study in exegesis with a practical aim. It is not an historical essay. The author writes gracefully and is in general happy, and it will read in the most recent theories, and if



which he takes too seriously. But unhappily he has framed a theory which it is impossible to accept, though in support of it he has exercised a really remarkable ingenuity. It is that St. John's writings, which are accepted as his, were composed at the end of his life as a protest against the tendencies prevalent in Christianity, and that they were victorious over the 'non-progressive Jewish element' represented by St. Peter, and even more by St. Philip, whose baptism of the Eunuch shows his affinity with St. John Baptist. Mr. Purchas's arguments are not always consistent—he uses St. John's Gospel both as a *Tendenz-schrift* of the end of the first century, and also as the most accurate account of our Lord's life—and many of them only need to be set out in order to be rejected, though his talent for combination gives the structure at first sight a certain air of solidity. It is a pity that his freshness of thought and acuteness of observation has not been better employed, and we must wish him a better planned enterprise for his next attempt. But the beginning and end of the present book were worth writing, and are worth reading.

*Les Martyrs. Tome I: Les temps néroniens et le deuxième siècle*, by Dom H. Leclercq (Paris, Oudin, 1902. 3.50 fr.).

The useful enterprise of publishing a trustworthy and popular account of the martyrs of all centuries has made an excellent beginning. The plan is to give each passion in a French translation, but unfortunately without notes, which would in such a case as that of Perpetua and Felicitas have added greatly to the interest. There is a short introduction to each text, with a good bibliography, which shows that Dom Leclercq has read very widely; but he usually fails to tell us what edition he has followed in his translation. He has had the happy thought of beginning with the Passion of our Lord from Ciasca's text of the Diatessaron, and has included all the genuine martyrdoms of which enough is known to make them worth inserting. But the best part of the work is the general introduction to the martyrdoms of the Roman period, which contains a wonderful amount of information in a moderate space. The writer is both judicious and well-informed, though he should not have spoken of 'Grabe, ce savant anglais,' and there is only one respect in which he could have greatly improved it. He does not distinguish clearly between suffering inflicted in the course of trial, by popular violence, and as a form of execution, and does not bring out definitely the fact that, until the final reign of terror under Diocletian and his successors, persecution had a kind of constitutional history of its own. And like many other writers on the subject he has confined himself too much to the special literature. If he had read such a text-book as Mommsen's *Römisches Strafrecht*, and remembered the distinction between *honestiores* and *tenuiiores*, he would not have expressed



surprise at St. Cyprian suffering nothing worse than decapitation. But these small blemishes scarcely impair the value of the work, which has the further interest of being itself a piece of history in the making. It is a new thing that, in the author's communion, the whole miraculous element in hagiography should be emphatically, and on moral grounds, rejected from a volume composed for the purpose of popular edification.

*The Ancient Catholic Church*, by R. Rainy (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1902. 12s.).

It would have been pleasant to congratulate so able and interesting a writer as Dr. Rainy upon success in the important task which he has undertaken. But a historian must face his subject seriously, in justice to his readers and to himself, and Dr. Rainy has not done so. It is ominous that we are told at the beginning of the book that Mommsen's famous article on the persecutions 'is considered epoch-making.' We have a right to expect that one who undertakes to instruct us should have formed an opinion of his own. It is not surprising to find, after such a commencement, that the account of this important series of events is so meagre as to be in parts actually misleading. Hermas is one of the most important figures in the history of theological thought. We are only told that his views 'have been differently explained.' There is no author concerning whom more has been written, and well written, of late years than Tertullian; it is strange to be referred merely to Kaye and Neander as the literature of the subject. Schepss, we learn, found a lost treatise by Priscillian; as a matter of fact he discovered eleven. But it is not only isolated statements that are carelessly made; the continuous narrative, even in the periods which most interest Dr. Rainy, is perfunctory. For instance, Liberius's return from exile is mentioned; we had not been told of his banishment. But it is needless to multiply examples of defect and error which might easily be corrected in a second edition. The whole structure of the book is at fault; it seems to have been devised in order to conceal the fact that the life of a growing organism is being described. Dr. Rainy is at his best when he discusses the Christological controversies from the point of view of full Cyrillic orthodoxy. Here, and in his account of Montanism, he can study the progress of thought and consider how ideas must have followed ideas, without being embarrassed by the necessity of attending too closely either to the sequence of events or to the text of Scripture. It is characteristic that he is silent as to the passages and interpretations on which the various combatants relied. But such essays, excellent as they are, do not compensate for failure to set out in due proportion and relation the different elements of the history. It is unfortunate that a writer, who could obviously have done better work

in almost any other part of the field of theology, should have been burdened with this task.

*Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, by T. R. Glover (Cambridge, University Press, 1901).

It is an honour to English letters that the valuable work of Mr. Dill should so soon have been worthily supplemented by Mr. Glover. The later work is the lighter in subject and in tone, and has less of the dignity of history, but is equally illuminating to the student of the age of Councils. Mr. Glover, it is true, is not happy in his *obiter dicta* on Church government and history; like Mommsen, he has borrowed and has been unfortunate in his authorities. But he only touches incidentally upon such themes; his true subject, the spirit of the period and its literary expression, is treated with knowledge and insight, and in a singularly interesting manner. We must, however, regret that he has perpetrated an apparent anachronism, by speaking as though the great theological writings of the century belonged to a different class of literature from that which he illustrates. To regard them as a special subject for professional study may be necessary for us, and he may have done well to choose other works rather than any of them for an examination which could only cover a part of the literature of the age. But he should at least have told his readers that the great dogmatic works, dealing as they did with topics of popular interest, were as much part of the general literature of that day as were, for instance, the writings of Carlyle in the last generation, and that they are composed according to all the canons of eloquence of the time. The opening of St. Hilary's *De Trinitate* is, perhaps, the finest piece of Latin prose of the century. But, apart from this omission, Mr. Glover has selected wisely, and has noticed in regard to each author whom he studies the points of moral and literary interest. His occasional notes upon the technical but very interesting topic of ancient rhetoric make us wish that he dwelt upon it at greater length. The increasing employment of natural history for the embellishment of ornate prose—Mr. Glover mentions it in the case of Ammianus—is worthy of study. There must have been a whole literature of excerpts from Aristotle and Pliny, resembling those of Valerius Maximus from Roman and Greek history, which was especially serviceable to the Christian writers, who would not borrow their allusions from Pagan annals, and had a more pungent use than that of mere illustration for the mythical characters. Hence the prominence of gems and worms and the phenomena of the seasons in their works; and hence, perhaps, by ultimate descent the gorgeous bestiaries of the Middle Ages. It is impossible to discuss Mr. Glover's studies in detail, but two remarks may be made about the first of them. His treatment of Ammianus Marcellinus is just, and sympathetic, and complete. But

there is one omission; he fails to notice the evident pleasure with which Ammianus lingers over an execution, especially if it be by fire. Men's hearts, no doubt, had been hardened by the horrors of the last persecution. Similarly the judicial murders of the Tudor period must be responsible for the almost unctuous satisfaction with which Bishop Hall in his *Contemplations* will dwell upon a scriptural traitor meeting his deserts. And Mr. Glover is wrong when he speaks, as an illustration of Ammianus's rhetoric, of the Fortune of the East 'mingling her plait with the shades of Tartarus.' It is the king of Persia who is taking counsel with the shades; in other words, consulting necromancers. But it is ungracious to end with criticism of a most interesting and useful book.

*The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary*, by J. Gairdner (London, Macmillan, 1902. 7s. 6d.).

Mr. Gairdner, whose volume worthily continues the series to which it belongs, has adopted a plan similar to that of the Dean of Winchester in the second volume. He gives an admirably lucid and complete account of the course of political events as they affected the Church; there is little, except perhaps the long account of Hunne's case, with which we could have dispensed, and that serves to introduce a very pertinent criticism of Foxe. The persecutions are excellently treated, and the author's sympathies make it the easier for him to deal out substantial justice to both sides. But if all we find is good, our regret must be the greater at Mr. Gairdner's omissions. No doubt the evidence is very incomplete, and much of it untrustworthy, but he might have made some general survey of the state of the monasteries at their dissolution. How many were in as desolate a state as Selborne was when Waynflete dissolved it, fifty years before the general suppression? We know that the numbers, even of great houses, were low, and their finances in bad order. Mr. Gairdner, in the fullness of his knowledge, might have made some statement, however guarded. And was not the suppression made easier because many of the inmates wanted to be free? A large proportion of the prominent clergy in the earlier days of Elizabeth had been regulars, and, in the next generation, it is well known that Whitgift had imbibed his doctrine as a boy from his uncle, an Augustinian abbot. More might well have been said of the suppression of the colleges and chantries, and surely the great social effect of the throwing upon the world of a multitude of unemployed clergy deserved some comment. And what was the effect of the changes upon the number ordained? Mr. Capes was happily advised to tell us how numerous they were in the previous period, and we want to have the sequel. Another matter of practical impor-



tance is the great transference of ecclesiastical patronage caused by the dissolution, and especially the multitude of advowsons in gross which must then have passed into private hands. The family living is a prominent feature of English Church life, and there are several families to-day which claim to have owned and occupied the same benefice since the sixteenth century. But we shall no doubt hear about this in the Elizabethan period. It may seem ungracious to dwell upon these omissions rather than upon the great and obvious merits of the book, but after all the status and fortunes of the clergy are no insignificant part of the history of the Church, and not the least interesting to the majority of the readers of this series. The book contains an excellent map, showing the limits of the old dioceses and Henry's changes, together with the suppressed monasteries, of which a very welcome list is given. One or two houses which have been overlooked suggest themselves: Edington is the most important of these.

*The Conference between Laud and Fisher*, edited by C. H. Simpkinson (London, Macmillan, 1901. 10s. 6d.).

The plan of the English Theological Library probably allowed the editor little scope for introductory matter. But it is a pity that more has not been made of the opportunity. Some account of the general state of the Roman Controversy in Laud's time, some comparison of this with the other conferences of the same kind was surely possible, and other matters of importance which deserved attention will suggest themselves. The notes are swollen by an English translation of every passage cited, in regard to which we may wonder whether any reader capable of following the argument is unfurnished with Latin, and by an extraordinarily cumbrous system of references. The editor would have done well to inform himself of what is usual in this respect; and if, after such inquiry, he was satisfied with his own method, at least to carry it out consistently. He is unfortunate enough to have chosen for many authors editions which his readers are not likely to have and which are not worth having. For a full generation no serious writer has cited St. Cyprian in any other order than that which Hartel adopted from Fell, or in any text than Hartel's; it is astonishing to be referred to the Benedictine pages. Many other examples could be cited of a waste of space which has painfully limited the author's notes, and prevented him from displaying the knowledge which no doubt he possesses. The volume, however, shows signs of much labour; it is beautifully printed and will be acceptable to many readers.

*The Reformation Settlement*. By M. MacColl. Tenth Edition. (London, Longmans, 1901. 3s. 6d. net.)

Little need be said about a work so well established as to reach its tenth edition. A multitude of readers know by this time how discursive

it is, ranging from the deepest mysteries of religion to the gossip of Rome in the earlier days of Leo XIII, and how remotely connected much of it is with its professed subject. It aims at producing an immediate effect by the most modern methods, and Canon MacColl had doubtless counted the cost when he determined to abandon the spirit and the manner of history and of literature. He is a controversialist, and as such must await the judgement of a generation later than that on which he exerts an influence. But he has certainly assured himself a modest place in the detailed history of ecclesiastical conflict in our day, as the author of one of the few really successful books of controversy.

*Die Aufgabe der theologischen Facultäten.* By A. Harnack. Third edition. (Giessen, Ricker, 1901.)

It may not have been an easy task for a theologian, even one so eminent as Dr. Harnack, to address the University of Berlin as its Rector. But he has accomplished it with brilliant success, and in so doing must have impressed many of his hearers with a new sense of the meaning and value of theological study. With admirable good taste, and, if an Englishman may judge, real eloquence, he demonstrates the practical necessity of confining a University course of theology to the one religion of Christianity, and then shows that nothing is lost by this restriction; that Christianity furnishes all the phenomena that need to be examined by the student of religion. But he goes on to point out, with no lack of fervour, that it is more than a subject of study; that it is, in fact, the one true faith. It is interesting, however, to know that though he will not sacrifice his own subject to that of comparative religion, he looks forward to the employment in his University of experienced and scientifically trained missionaries, and to the inclusion of one among the non-Christian systems on which they will lecture in the course to be taken by the theological students of Berlin.

*RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO  
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*

(1) ENGLISH.

*The Expositor*, November 1902 (Sixth Series, No. 35: Hodder & Stoughton). S. R. DRIVER Specimen of a new Translation of the Prophets—J. STALKER The Basis of Christian Certainty—A. E. GARVIE Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus: X, The Function of the Miracles—E. KÖNIG On the Meaning and Scope of Jer. vii 22-3, III—J. RENDEL HARRIS The History of a Conjectural Emendation—E. C. SELWYN Dialogues on the Christian Prophets, V.

December 1902 (Sixth Series, No. 36). G. S. STREATFIELD A Parish Clergyman's Thoughts about the Higher Criticism—J. MOFFATT The Bright and Morning Star—S. I. CURTISS The Semitic Sacrifice of Reconciliation—E. C. SELWYN Dialogues on the Christian Prophets, VI.

*Jewish Quarterly Review*, October 1902 (Vol. xv, No. 57: Macmillan & Co.). H. FRANK The Jewish May (*a poem*)—J. M. RIGG The Jews of England in the Thirteenth Century—J. D. WIJNKOOP The Neo-Hebraic Language and its Literature—N. SALAMAN Translations from Hebrew Poetry—A. M. FRIEDENBERG Süßkind of Trimberg—I. GOLDZIEHER, Zu Saadyana XLI—S. POZNAŃSKI Ein altes jüdisch-arabisches Bücherverzeichnis—W. BACHER Ein neuerschlossenes Capitel der jüdischen Geschichte—J. H. LEVY The *Tetra(?)grammaton*—W. BACHER Die Staatswagen des Patriarchen—I. FRIEDLÄNDER Das hebräische רַבִּי in einer verkannten Bedeutung—G. A. KOHUT Abraham's Lesson in Tolerance—M. KAYSERLING Zur portugiesisch-jüdischen Literatur—A. BÜCHLER ΣΦΡΑΓΙΣ in Psalm Salomo's, ii 6—L. BLAU Methods of teaching the Talmud in the Past and in the Present—H. HIRSCHFELD Descriptive Catalogue of Hebrew MSS of the Montefiore Library, VIII.

(2) AMERICAN.

*The American Journal of Theology*, October 1902 (Vol. vi, No. 4: Chicago University Press). F. B. JEVONS The Fundamental Principles



of the Science of Religion—G. B. STEVENS Is there a self-consistent New Testament Eschatology?—K. BUDDE The Old Testament and the excavations—T. A. HOBEN The Virgin Birth (ii)—Critical Notes: S. MACCOMB Do we need Dogma? H. G. SMITH 'Adam' in the Revised Version—Recent Theological Literature.

*The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, October 1902 (Vol. xiii, No. 52: Philadelphia, MacCalla & Co.). E. H. GRIFFIN Personality the supreme Category of Philosophy—R. McC. EDGAR The Blessed Trinity—B. B. WARFIELD The Printing of the Westminster Confession, V—N. L. WALKER and A SCOTTISH PRESBYTER The Case of Prof. George Adam Smith—Ecclesiastical Notes—Recent Ethical Literature—Recent Theological Literature.

## (3) FRENCH AND BELGIAN.

*Analecta Bollandiana*, October 1902 (Vol. xxi, fasc. 3 and 4: Brussels, 14, Rue des Ursulines). A. PONCELET Index Miraculorum B. V. Mariae quae saec. vi-xv latine conscripta sunt—P. DE LOË De vita et scriptis B. Alberti Magni (*Pars tertia*)—FR. VAN ORTROY Note sur l'Indulgence de la Portiuncule—H. DELEHAYE Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Neapolitanae—M. FEROTIN La légende de sainte Potamia (Notes additionnelles)—J. VAN DEN GHEYN Miraculum S. Martini episcopi Turonensis—U. CHEVALIER Le 'Repertorium Repertorii' du P. Clément Blume et les droits de la critique—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques—[U. CHEVALIER Suppl. ad Repertorium Hymnologicum (*Nunc, nunc recurre . . . Plaudē, mater*).]

*Revue Bénédictine*, October 1902 (Vol. xix, No. 4: Abbaye de Maredsous). G. MORIN La translation de St-Benoît et la chronique de Leno—J. CHAPMAN Les interpolations dans le traité de S. Cyprien sur l'unité de l'Église (*suite*)—U. BERLIÈRE Les chapitres généraux de l'ordre de St-Benoît (*fin*)—P. DE MEESTER Quelques opinions récentes sur l'union des Églises—Bibliographie.

*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 1902 (Vol. vii, No. 3: Paris, A. Picard). P. LADEUZE L'Eucharistie et les repas communs des fidèles dans la Didachè—S. VAILHÉ Sophrone le Sophiste et Sophrone le Patriarche—S. RONZEVALLÉ L'inscription syriaque de Kradad-Dasiniya, dans l'Emésène—D. GIRARD Les 'Madag' ou sacrifices arméniens—H. LAMMENS Les Nosairis dans le Liban—L. CLUGNET Vie de sainte Marine (vi Texte Haut-Allemand, vii Texte Bas-Allemand)—Mélanges: H. LAMMENS Le Couvent du Mont Sinai—H. LAMMENS Le Séminaire oriental de Beyrouth—Bibliographie.

*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, November–December 1902 (Vol. vii, No. 6: Paris, 74, Boulevard Saint-Germain). P. RICHARD La légation Aldobrandini et le traité de Lyon; (i) La diplomatie pontificale, ses agents au temps de Clément VIII—J. TURMEL Le dogme du péché originel après Saint-Augustin dans l'Église latine; (ii) Essence du péché originel: Progrès, déclin et chute de la théorie augustinienne—A. MEILLET Euthyme, dernier patriarcat de Bulgarie—M. DE WULF Chronique d'histoire de la philosophie médiévale; (5) La mystique orthodoxe et hétérodoxe—P. LEJAY Ancienne philologie chrétienne; (17) La Liturgie: (e) Usages funéraires (*suite*): (f) Rit ambrosien; (g) Le livre d'Aethelwold ou de Cerne et les idées liturgiques de M. Bishop.

(4) GERMAN.

*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1903 (Vol. lxxxv, No. 1: Tübingen, H. Lauppe). GRIMME Ein übersehenes Orakel gegen Assur (Is. xiii)—VETTER Die litterar-kritische Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Gottesnamen—KIRSCH Das wahrscheinliche Zeitalter der heiligen Cäcilia—FUNK Das Alter der Arkandisciplin—SÄGMÜLLER Die Ernennung des Nachfolgers durch die Päpste Ende des fünften und Anfangs des sechsten Jahrhunderts—Reviews—Analecta.

*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, November 1902 (Vol. xii, No. 6: Tübingen and Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr). M. STEINMANN Das Bewusstsein der vollen Wirklichkeit Gottes—FR. TRAUB Die Beurtheilung der Ritschl'schen Theologie in Theobald Zieglers Werk: 'Die geistigen und sozialen Strömungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.'

*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums*, November 1902 (Vol. iii, No. 4: Giessen, J. Ricker). K. FURRER Das Geographische im Evangelium nach Johannes—R. KNOPF Die Anagnose zum zweiten Clemensbriefe—B. W. BACON Heb. i 10–12 and the Septuagint Rendering of Ps. cii 23—R. LICHTENHAN Die pseudepigraphische Litteratur der Gnostiker (ii)—CHR. RAUCH Bemerkungen zum Markustexte—I. FRANKO Beiträge aus dem Kirchenslavischen zu den Apokryphen des Neuen Testaments (ii)—WIESEN Zu Matt. v 17–20—Miscellanea: H. USENER Eine Spur des Petrus-evangeliums—P. v. WINTERFELD Revelatio sancti Stephani—O. HOLTZMANN Zu Lukas xxii 20—E. PREUSCHEN Jesu Geburt in einer Höhle.

*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, October 1902 (Vol. xlv, No. 4: Leipzig, O. R. Reisland). A. HILGENFELD Das Gleichnis von dem verlorenen Sohne—C. HEUSSI Die Stromateis des Clemens Alexandrinus und ihr Verhältnis zum Protreptikos und Pädagogos—W. KARO

Das Lindauer Gespräch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Concordienformel—J. DRÄSEKE Noch einmal zum Philosophen Joseph—A. HILGENFELD Des Chrysostomos Lobrede auf Polykarp—Reviews.

*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1903 (No. 1: Gotha, F. A. Perthes). E. KAUTZSCH Zum Gedächtnis D. Julius Köstlins—BOEHMER Die Eigenart der prophetischen Heilspredigt des Amos—TSCHACKERT Die bisher unbekannte Ulmer Handschrift der deutschen Augsburgischen Konfession—E. FUCHS Wandlungen in Schleiermachers Denken zwischen der ersten und zweiten Ausgabe der Reden—A. EBELING Ueber Ehescheidung und die kirchliche Trauung bei Ehen geschiedener Personen—Miscellanea—Reviews.

*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, November 1902 (Vol. xiii, No. 11: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). M. KOLDE Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert—E. KÖNIG War Jahve eine kanaänische Gottheit?—GRÜTZMACHER Hauptprobleme der gegenwärtigen Dogmatik.

December 1902 (Vol. xiii, No. 12). K. SCHMIDT Gehört Jesus in das Evangelium wie er selbst es nach den Synoptikern verkündigt hat?—M. ZAHN Kleine Beiträge zur evangelischen Geschichte: (ii) Das Land der Gaderener, Gerasener, oder Gergesener—P. TSCHACKERT Das Missionsziel—GRÜTZMACHER Hauptprobleme der gegenwärtigen Dogmatik (ii)—IHMELS Glaube und Erfahrung.



# The Journal of Theological Studies

APRIL, 1903

## PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

THE Church was sent forth from the Upper Room at Jerusalem to preach the Forgiveness of Sins, and provided with the power of imparting it<sup>1</sup>. To those who believed the message and repented of the sins of their past lives Baptism was an absolution in full. Upon this point there is a remarkable *consensus* of Apostolic and other early testimony<sup>2</sup>.

The case of post-baptismal sin was less simple, and it does not seem to have been dealt with at first in a comprehensive way. No definite policy is shadowed forth in the New Testament, although it contains incidental references to the subject. St. John teaches that sins committed by Christians who 'walk in the light' are forgiven, upon the simple condition of being confessed, or through the prayer of a brother; but there is such a thing as 'sin unto death,' for which prayer will not avail<sup>3</sup>. A gross sin which created scandal might be visited by a Divine chastisement, with the result that the offender was overtaken by sickness or death<sup>4</sup>; or he might be expelled from the Church by

<sup>1</sup> Lc. xxiv 47; Jo. xx 21 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For the belief of the Apostolic age it is sufficient to point to Acts ii 38, xxii 16, I Cor. vi 11; but it is implicit in all passages where the forgiveness of sins is represented as possessed by the baptized, e.g. Eph. i 7, iv 32; Col. i 13 f.; I Jo. ii 12.

<sup>3</sup> I Jo. i 7 ff., v 16.

<sup>4</sup> Acts v 5, 10; I Cor. v 5, xi 30.

the judgement of the whole body<sup>1</sup>. In the latter case the society which had expelled a member could reinstate him<sup>2</sup>; both in expelling and in restoring it was believed to act by the power of Christ, but would ordinarily look for the concurrence of its Apostolic founder<sup>3</sup> or his delegate<sup>4</sup>. Some words dropped by St. James<sup>5</sup> suggest that sins which did not need such drastic treatment were sometimes confessed before the congregation, who interceded for the pardon of the sinner. There is, however, no sign as yet of any ordered system of discipline. The busy age which carried the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome had little time for the settlement of details; perhaps it was felt that the matter was one which did not admit of being settled in the infancy of the Church, but must be left to experience guided by the Spirit of Christ.

Nor did the sub-apostolic age proceed many steps further, if we may judge from its literary remains. The Epistle of Clement, though called forth by disorders in the Church at Corinth, has little to say upon the question of discipline. It seems to assume that a healthy Christian life needs no confession of sins but that which is made to God, and no absolution but that which the Atonement offers to the penitent<sup>6</sup>. The leaders of the revolt at Corinth are warned that they must accept chastisement, humbling themselves before the presbyters whom they had unjustly ejected and acknowledging their error<sup>7</sup>; but no formal penance seems to be contemplated. Ignatius uses *μετανοεῖν* and *μετάνοια* only when he refers to the conversion of the heathen or the return of

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. v 2, 13 (a reference to Deut. xxii 24, Lxx).

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. ii 6 f.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. v 4 *συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἰμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ*. 2 Cor. ii 10 *ᾧ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε, καὶ γὰρ κτλ.*; for *χαρίζεσθαι* = *ἀφιέναι* cf. Eph. iv 32.

<sup>4</sup> If, as Dr. Hort thought (*Ecclesia*, p. 214 f.), the laying on of hands in 1 Tim. v 22 is 'the act of blessing by which penitents were received back into the communion of the faithful.'

<sup>5</sup> v 16: *ὅπως ἰαθῆτε* may refer to sicknesses which were Divine chastisements for sin (cf. v 15).

<sup>6</sup> 1 Cor. 2. 3 *ἔξετεινάτε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν παντοκράτορα θεόν, ἰκετεύοντες αὐτὸν ἵλεως γενέσθαι, εἰ τι ἄκοντες ἡμάρτετε*. *Ib.* 7. 3 *ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. . . διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ἐπένεγκεν*. Cf. also cc. 48. 1, 60. 1.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Cor. 57. 1 *ὑμεῖς οὖν οἱ τὴν καταβολὴν τῆς σάσεως ποιήσαντες ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ παιδεύθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*.



schismatics to the unity of the Church<sup>1</sup>, and apparently not in a technical sense. Polycarp briefly refers to certain judicial functions exercised by presbyters<sup>2</sup>, but in alluding to a scandal which had arisen within the presbyterate, he is content to express his grief and to pray that the offender may be brought to 'true repentance'<sup>3</sup>. The *Didache* twice speaks of confession of sins as a necessary preparation for public prayer and the Eucharist<sup>4</sup>, and there is a similar statement in Barnabas<sup>5</sup>. The homily which was long thought to be a second letter of Clement prescribes almsgiving as a means of relieving the soul from the burden of sin<sup>6</sup>.

In the *Shepherd* of Hermas we have the first serious attempt to deal with the whole question of post-baptismal sin. The Shepherd is the 'Angel of Repentance,' and the book might well have borne the secondary title 'ἡ περὶ μετανόιας'.<sup>7</sup> Evidently the subject was attracting attention in the Roman Church at the time when Hermas wrote, i.e. if we are to believe the Muratorian writer, during the episcopate of Pius (c. 140-155). Certain teachers in the Church had asserted that there was no place for a post-baptismal repentance; the one and only μετάνοια was that which was consummated by the baptismal remission of sins. The Shepherd admits that this teaching is theoretically true; those who have received forgiveness of their sins in Baptism ought to 'sin no more'<sup>8</sup>; and in future, it is hinted, this ideal must be

<sup>1</sup> *Eph.* 10. 1; *Philad.* 3. 2, 8. 1; *Smyrn.* 4. 1, 5. 3, 9. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Phil.* 6. 1 καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι δὲ εὐσπλαγχνοὶ, εἰς πάντας ἐλεήμονες . . . μὴ ταχέως πιστεύοντες κατὰ τινος, μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες ὅτι πάντες ὀφείλονται ἕσμεν ἁμαρτίας.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Did.* 4. 14 ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἔξομολογήσῃ τὰ παραπτώματά σου κτλ. 14. 1 προεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

<sup>5</sup> *Barn. ep.* 19. 12.

<sup>6</sup> 'Clem. R. 2 Cor.' 16 ἑλεημοσύνη γὰρ κοίφισμα ἁμαρτίας γίνεται. On the whole passage and its relation to Tobit xii 8 and Prov. x 12 (1 Pet. iv 8) see Lightfoot, *ad loc.*

<sup>7</sup> *Herm. Vis.* 5. 7 ταῦτά μοι πάντα οὕτως γράψαι ὁ ποιμὴν ἐνετείλατο, ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς μετανόιας. *Mand.* 4. 2 ἐγώ, φησίν, ἐπὶ τῆς μετανόιας εἰμι καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς μετανουοῦσιν ἀνέσεις δίδωμι.

<sup>8</sup> *Mand.* 4. 3 ἤκουσα, φημί, κύριε, παρὰ τινων διδασκάλων ὅτι ἕτερα μετάνοια οὐκ ἔστιν εἰ μὴ ἐκείνη ὅτε εἰς ὕδωρ κατέβημεν καὶ ἐλάβομεν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν τῶν προτέρων. λέγει μοι Καλῶς ἤκουσας, οὕτω γὰρ ἔχει· ἔδει γὰρ τὸν εἰληφότα ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν.



realized<sup>1</sup>. But to Hermas and his contemporaries one further opportunity is offered, while they are warned that repentance will be unavailing if sin is repeated with a light heart<sup>2</sup>. Even genuine repentance does not imply immediate forgiveness, or exclude the necessity of self-inflicted penance; it is only under such conditions that the sinner may hope to be healed by the hand of God<sup>3</sup>. Yet Hermas is no advocate for extreme rigour in the treatment of penitents. The Shepherd bids him 'tell all men to repent, and they shall live unto God'; 'as many as shall repent with all their heart, and cleanse themselves from all the iniquities aforesaid and no more add anything to their sins, shall receive from the Lord healing of their former sins<sup>4</sup>.' Even the graver sins are not excluded from the hope of ultimate forgiveness, if repentance is sincere and permanent<sup>5</sup>.

Hermas does not refer expressly to public acts of penitence. But there is evidence that such acts were performed in the Roman Church even before the days of Pius. Under Hyginus, Irenaeus tells us, the heretic Cerdon repeatedly confessed before the congregation his fault in teaching doctrines contrary to the faith of the Church, and presently returned to the practice he had publicly renounced<sup>6</sup>. The fact is a curious commentary on the attitude of Hermas, and may have been one of the circumstances which suggested it. Cerdon's successor, Marcion, who came to Rome from Pontus about this time<sup>7</sup>, had, according to Epiphanius, been excommunicated for a moral offence by his father, who was Bishop of Sinope, and sought in vain for admission to the com-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Vis.* 2, 2; *Mand.* 4, 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Mand.* 4, 3 *ἐάν τις ἐκπειρασθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ἁμαρτήσῃ, μίαν μετάνοιαν ἔχει· ἐάν δὲ ὑπὸ χεῖρα (cf. *Vis.* 3, 10, 5, 5) ἁμαρτάνῃ καὶ μετανοήσῃ, ἀσύμφορόν ἐστι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τοιούτῳ. Cf. 4, 1 δεῖ παραδεχθῆναι τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα καὶ μετανοοῦντα, μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ δέ· τοῖς γὰρ δούλοις τοῦ Θεοῦ μετάνοιά ἐστιν μία.*

<sup>3</sup> *Sim.* 7, 4 *τῶν οὖν μετανοούντων εὐθὺς δοκεῖ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφίεσθαι; οὐ παντελῶς, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸν μετανοοῦντα βασανίσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν . . . καὶ ἐὰν ὑπενέγκῃ τὰς θλίψεις τὰς ἐπερχομένας αὐτῷ, πάντως σπλαγχνισθήσεται ὃ τὰ πάντα κτίσις καὶ ἔνδυναμώσις, καὶ ἱασίη τῶν δώσι.*

<sup>4</sup> *Sim.* 8, 11; cf. *Mand.* 12, 6.

<sup>5</sup> *Mand.* 4, 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Iren.* iii, 4, 3 *Κέρδων δὲ ὁ πρὸ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ Ἐγγίνου, ὃς ἦν ἐννατος ἐπίσκοπος, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔλθων καὶ ἐξομολογούμενος οὕτως διετέλεσε, ποτὲ μὲν λαθροδιδασκαλῶν ποτὲ δὲ πάλιν ἐξομολογούμενος, ποτὲ δὲ ἐλεγχόμενος ἐφ' οἷς ἐδίδασκε κακῶς καὶ ἀφιστάμενος τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν συνοδίας.*

<sup>7</sup> *Epiiph. Haer.* xlii 1 *μετὰ τὸ τελευτήσαι Ἐγγίνον.*

munion of the Roman Church<sup>1</sup>. In Asia Minor, as it seems, certain female disciples of the Valentinian teacher Marcus, on returning to the Church, made public confession of the errors into which they had been betrayed, the state of *exomologesis* lasting in one case to the end of life<sup>2</sup>. Eusebius attributes to Dionysius of Corinth a letter addressed to the Church of Amastris in Paphlagonia and to the Churches of Pontus, in which the Bishop of Corinth recommends that persons who sought to return to the Church after any fall, whether a moral offence or a lapse into heresy, should be restored to communion<sup>3</sup>. There seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the attribution of this letter to Dionysius, whose *floruit* is placed by Eusebius in A.D. 173<sup>4</sup>.

This letter to the Churches on the shores of the Euxine suggests the existence in those parts of a tendency to deal severely with certain offenders who sought reconciliation with the Church. Perhaps there were local reasons for this trend of opinion. Epiphanius notes the prevalence of Encratite views throughout a large part of Asia Minor<sup>5</sup>, and they were probably still more common in the second century. When Dionysius wrote, another movement was in progress which may have been partly responsible for the tendency mentioned above. According to Eusebius Montanism broke out in 173-4<sup>6</sup>; but Epiphanius places it as early

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. *l. c.* αἰτήσας μετάνοιαν οὐκ εἴληφε παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς. On his arrival at Rome, ἦται συναχθῆναι καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ συγκαχώρηκε. The story seems to have come from the lost *σύνταγμα* of Hippolytus (cf. Harnack-Preuschen, *Gesch.* i p. 623); see Salmon, art. *Marcion* in *D. C. B.*

<sup>2</sup> Iren. i 13, 5 αὐταὶ πολλαὶ ἐπιστρέψασαι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξομολογήσαντο (*confessae sunt*) . . . ὥστε καὶ διάκονόν τινα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ τῶν ἡμετέρων . . . περιπεσεῖν ταύτῃ τῇ συμφορᾷ . . . τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ διαφθορήσεως . . . ἔπειτα μετὰ πολλοῦ κόπου τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστρέψάντων, αὐτὴ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐξομολογουμένη διετέλεσε (*omne tempus in exomologesi consummatavit*), πενθοῦσα καὶ θρηνοῦσα ἐφ' ᾧ ἦ ἔπαθεν ὑπὸ τοῦ μάγου διαφθορᾷ. Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι is used instead of the normal ἐξαγορεύειν in Dan. ix 20 (Lxx) and in the N.T. (Mc. i 5 = Mt. iii 6, Acts xix 18, Jas. v 10). The early appearance in the West of *exomologesis* in a technical sense is not easy to account for; the noun is fairly common in the Lxx, but as = πῆψις, 'praise'; in the N. T. it does not occur, or in the sub-apostolic writings, except Herm. *Sim.* 2, 5, where it is used as in the Lxx.

<sup>3</sup> Eus. *H. E.* iv 23 καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δὲ τῇ παροικούσῃ Ἀμαστριν ἅμα ταῖς κατὰ Πόντον ἐπιστείλας . . . τοὺς ἐξ οἴας ὅσων ἀποπτώσεως, εἴτε πλημμελείας εἴτε μὴν αἰρετικῆς πλάνης, ἐπιστρέφοντας δεξιούσθαι προστάττει. It is significant that the letter contained, apparently just before this, πολλὰ περὶ γάμου καὶ ἀγγελίας.

<sup>4</sup> Eus. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, p. 172 f.

<sup>5</sup> Epiph. *Haer.* xlvii 1. The provinces named are Pisidia, Phrygia, Asia, Pamphylia, Cilicia, Galatia.

<sup>6</sup> Eus. *Chron.* l. c.



as the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius<sup>1</sup>, i.e. in 157, and it is possible that the later date is that of its condemnation by the Asiatic Churches. Amastris and the towns of Pontus were not too far from the centre of the movement to have been influenced by its ascetic tone.

At Rome the 'New Prophecy' had been brought to the notice of the Bishop as early as 177, when Irenaeus was commissioned by the Viennese confessors to approach Eleutherus in the interests of peace<sup>2</sup>. According to Tertullian, a later Bishop of Rome, probably Zephyrinus, had actually recognized the Montanists and issued 'letters of peace' on their behalf to the Asiatic Churches, when he was persuaded by Praxeas to recall the letters and, in Tertullian's strange phrase, to 'expel the Paraclete'<sup>3</sup>. It is possible that this sudden and, as Tertullian relates it, inexplicable change of front may not have been altogether unconnected with the question of discipline, and may mark the rise into power at Rome of the party who advocated a relative laxity in the treatment of penitents. From two quite independent sources we gather that the old strictness which Hermas had sought to abate was sensibly relaxed by Callistus, who succeeded Zephyrinus and had been his chief adviser. If we are to believe Hippolytus, Callistus offered absolution unconditionally to all who joined his party, and ruled that a bishop ought not to be deposed, even if he should sin a 'sin unto death'<sup>4</sup>. Tertullian mentions no name, but there can be little doubt that he refers to Callistus when he writes: 'I hear that an edict has been issued from which there is no appeal; the Supreme Pontiff, the bishop of bishops, proclaims: "I remit, after penance done, the sins of adultery and fornication." . . . This edict was read and delivered in the Church: God forbid that the virgin Spouse of Christ should hear such an announcement'<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. *Haer.* xlviii 1.

<sup>2</sup> Eus. *H. E.* v 3 τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης ἕνεκα.

<sup>3</sup> Tert. *adv. Prax.* 1.

<sup>4</sup> Hipp. *philos.* ix 12 καὶ πρῶτος τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἡθονὰς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συγχωρεῖν ἐπενόησε λέγων πᾶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἀφίεσθαι ἁμαρτίας. ὁ γὰρ παρ' ἑτέρῳ τινὶ συναγόμενος καὶ λεγόμενος Χριστιανὸς εἰ τι ἂν ἁμάρτη, φησὶν, οὐ λογίζεται αὐτῷ ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰ προσδράμοι τῇ τοῦ Καλλίστου σχολῇ . . . οὗτος ἔδογματίσεν ὅπως εἰ ἐπίσκοπος ἁμάρτοι τι, εἰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, μὴ δεῖν κατατίθεσθαι.

<sup>5</sup> Tert. *de pudic.* 1 'Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. pontifex scilicet maximus, quod est episcopus episcoporum, edicit: "Ego et moe-



The 'edict' of Callistus is a landmark in the history of Ante-Nicene discipline. But its exact nature and import are not easy to determine. Both the witnesses are prejudiced, and Tertullian, who was now a Montanist, gives free play to the exaggerations of his biting pen. It is as absurd to speak of an actual edict having been issued by a Roman Bishop of the third century, as to suppose that he had assumed the title of *pontifex maximus* or even *episcopus episcoporum*. What happened was doubtless this: sitting in his episcopal chair the Bishop had before the faithful declared his purpose to readmit to communion, after penance, persons who had been guilty of unchastity, whether married or not. But though not an 'edict,' such a statement, whatever may have been the motive of Callistus in making it, is undoubtedly important in more respects than one. In the first place it pledged the Roman See to the support of the less rigorous party as against Encratite and Montanistic severity. The leniency which Hermas had somewhat timidly proposed to show to penitents of a particular class<sup>1</sup>, was now offered from the episcopal chair without reserve. By this act Callistus had, in the view of the stricter disciplinarians, taken upon himself to remit sins which were 'irremissible<sup>2</sup>,' i. e. which must be left to the judgement of God. The lifelong penitence hitherto required in such cases was terminated by a restoration to communion, which was not even postponed to the last extremity<sup>3</sup>. Further, the 'edict' asserted for the first time, so far as we know, the authority of the Bishop as the organ of the absolving voice of the Church. In principle this had been conceded from the days when the episcopate rose into power; it is implied in the refusal of the stern old Bishop of Sinope to absolve his son; it is allowed by Tertullian, Montanist as he was, in the case of lighter sins<sup>4</sup>. But while recognizing the *chiae et fornicationis delicta paenitentia functis dimitto* . . . *sed hoc in ecclesia legitur, et in ecclesia pronuntiatur, et virgo est. absit, absit a sponsa Christi tale praeconium.*

<sup>1</sup> Tert. *de pudic.* 10 'Scriptura Pastoris quae sola moechos amat.' 20 'receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum.'

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 12. The distinction is based on Acts xv 28.

<sup>3</sup> M. Batiffol (*Études d'Histoire*, p. 95) has stated this point correctly: 'La nouveauté de Calliste consistait donc, non point en ce qu'il croyait au pardon en Dieu et à l'efficacité de l'exomologèse . . . mais en ce que Calliste relevait le pénitent de son état de pénitent dans le cas d'adultère, et le restituait après exomologèse à la *communicatio ecclesiastica*.'

<sup>4</sup> Tert. *de pudic.* 18 'Salva illa paenitentiae specie post fidem quae aut levioribus

Church's power in this matter, Tertullian deprecates its exercise; had not the Paraclete by the mouth of the 'new prophets' said, 'The Church can forgive sin, but I will not do it, lest men add sin to sin' ? Moreover, if any Church forgave sins, it should be the 'Church of the Spirit,' the Montanistic Church which possessed 'spiritual men,' and not a Church which was a mere 'company of bishops'. Callistus perhaps laid claim to the grant of the keys made to Peter, but that grant, Tertullian urges, was a personal one, and certainly had nothing to do with the remission of 'capital' sins such as adultery<sup>2</sup>. It may be doubted whether Callistus himself thought of the 'power of the keys' as belonging to him by virtue of the connexion of the Roman Church with St. Peter, as Tertullian suggests; his 'Ego . . . dimitto' is probably no more than the emphatic declaration of a policy the opposite of that which was followed by the rigorists. Still less can it be inferred that Callistus used an indicative form of absolution, or pronounced any sentence of absolution at all. Yet the tone of personal authority assumed in his 'edict' certainly marks a new stage in the history of Penitence. However loudly the Montanists might protest—partly perhaps because they protested—the Bishops kept in their own hands, with rare exceptions, the exercise of the ministry of the Remission of Sin.

From Tertullian the Montanist we will now return to Tertullian the Catholic. His tract *De penitentia* may be taken as fairly representative of Catholic opinion and practice at Carthage in the early years of the third century. He starts with the broad principle that forgiveness is offered, by way of repentance, to all sins both of flesh and of spirit, of will and of deed<sup>3</sup>. Repentance

delictis unicam ab episcopo consequi poterit aut maioribus et irremissibilibus a Deo solo.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tert. *de penit.* 31 "Sed habet," inquit, "potestatem ecclesia delicta donandi." hoc ego magis et agnosco et dispono, qui ipsum paracletum in prophetis novis habeo dicentem, "Potest ecclesia donare delictum, sed non faciam, ne et alia delinquant."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* "Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed ecclesia Spiritus per episcopalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus episcoporum."

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* "De tua enim sententia, quoniam unde hoc has ecclesie usurpavit, si quis dixerit Petrus Dominus . . . tibi deus claves regni caelestis . . . circa praesentis et ad te decessum salvandi et alligandi potestatem, id est ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam, qualis es eventus atque commutans manifestum Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem ?" &c. The whole passage is of great interest in view of later history.

<sup>4</sup> Tert. *de penit.* 4 "Quibus ergo delictis seu carne seu spiritu seu factis seu voluntate



normally precedes baptism, in which sin is forgiven; after baptism there should be no return to sin, and no need of a second penitence or a second pardon<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, if a Christian sins after baptism, the gate of forgiveness is not absolutely closed against him. It is shut and barred, but a second Penitence is stationed at the outer door to open to those who knock, and no one should hesitate to avail himself of the opportunity if he needs it. But this second chance is the last; post-baptismal repentance cannot be repeated<sup>2</sup>. Nor can it be used without effort and personal humiliation; the consciousness of guilt (*conscientia*) will not avail without submitting to the process of penitence (*actus*). This process, which was known as *exomologesis*, was one of confession regarded as a satisfaction for the sin confessed, and accompanied by disciplinary acts of self-humiliation<sup>3</sup>. It carried on its very face an admission of guilt so complete and unsparing as to bring an assurance of pardon. It was made before the Church, and the whole body partook in the grief of the suffering member and in prayer for his restoration. The Church represents Christ; Christ, touched by the sorrow of the Church, intercedes with the Father, and the penitent receives forgiveness. Tertullian does not conceal the fact that reluctance was already manifested on the part of offenders to undergo the ordeal of a public penitence. His answer is that there is no other way of restoration; the alternative is the second death<sup>4</sup>. If the drown-

commissis qui poenam per iudicium destinavit, idem et veniam per paenitentiam sponndit.'

<sup>1</sup> Tert. *de paen.* 6 'Lavaerum illud obsignatio est fidei quae fides a paenitentiae fide incipitur et commendatur. non ideo abluimur, ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desinimus, quoniam iam corde loti sumus.' 7 'piget secundae immo iam ultimae spei subtexere mentionem, ne retractantes de residuo auxilio paenitendi spatium adhuc delinquendi demonstrare videamur.'

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 7 'Deus clausa iam ignoacentiae ianua et intinctionis sera obstructa aliquid adhuc permisit patere. collocavit in vestibulo paenitentiam secundam, quae pulsantibus patefaciat, sed iam semel quia iam secundo; sed amplius nunquam quia proxime frustra.'

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 9 'Huius igitur paenitentiae secundae et unius quanto in arto negotium est, tanto operosior probatio, ut non sola conscientia praeferatur sed aliquo etiam actu administretur. is actus, qui magis Graeco vocabulo exprimitur et frequentatur, *exomologesis* est, qua delictum domino nostrum confitemur . . . quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur . . . itaque *exomologesis* prosternendi et humiliandi hominis disciplina est.'

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 10 'Miserum est sic ad *exomologesin* pervenire!' 12 'si de *exomologesi* retractas, gehennam in corde considera, quam tibi *exomologesis* extinguet.'



ing mariner refuses to cling to the plank<sup>1</sup>, what hope remains that he can be saved?

At Alexandria the same view of the 'second penitence' prevailed as at Carthage. Little as Clement has in common with Tertullian, his treatment of this question is remarkably similar to that which it finds in the *De paenitentia*. 'He who has received the forgiveness of sins ought to "sin no more." The first and only repentance should be that by which the pagan turns from the sins of his past life before baptism. But of His great mercy the Lord has vouchsafed one opportunity of repentance to those who sin after baptism. Repeated and successive repentances indicate a condition which can be distinguished from unbelief only in that the baptized sinner is conscious of his sin. To be compelled to ask for pardon again and again after frequent falls is not repentance, but merely the semblance of it<sup>2</sup>.'

There is here nothing very new; Clement is repeating what Hermas said fifty or sixty years before, only without the tentative and apologetic manner of the *Shepherd*. The 'second penitence' had in the interval taken its place in Christian tradition, as inevitable although undesirable necessity. On that point Carthage and Alexandria were now agreed, and they were also at one in their determination to allow no repetition of the post-baptismal *exomologesis*. With Origen fresh light breaks upon us. He approaches the whole subject from the point of view which was natural to him, regarding it as offering problems for

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *de paen.* 4<sup>o</sup> [Paenitentiam] its amplexare, ut naufragus alicuius tabulae fidem. 12 'quid ego ultra de istis duabus humanae salutis quasi planctis.' The metaphor rooted itself in the terminology of Latin Christendom, cf. e.g. Hieron. *ad Demostrian.* 3 'ignoremus paenitentiam, ne facile peccemus; illa quasi secunda post naufragium miseris tabula sit.'

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Al. *Strom.* II 13 § 56 τὸν οὖν εὐφρότα τῆς ἔρεσος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν οὐκ ἐν ἁμαρτιῶν χρῆ' ἐπὶ γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ μόνῃ μετανοίᾳ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (αὐτῆς ἐν αἰῶ τῶν προσηρξάντων κατὰ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν καὶ πρῶτον βίον τὸν ἐν ἀγαθῶν λόγῳ) οὐσία τοῦ εὐφροῦς πρόκειται μετάνοια ἢ καθαίρουσα τὸν τότε τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν πλημμελοῦμένων . . . ἵστω οὖν [ὁ κύριος] ἄλλην ἐπὶ τοῖς πᾶσι τῇ πίστει περιεπέσει τοὶ πλημμελήματα, καὶ ἄλλαν ἂν, μετάνοιαν δευτέραν . . . μίαν ἐστὶ μετάνοιαν ἀμετανόητον . . . αἱ δὲ συνεχεῖς καὶ ἐπιλήρηται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήρασιν μετάνοιαι οὐκ ἐστὶν τῶν καθάρας μὴ πεπιστευκότων διαφέρουσαι ἢ μόνῃ τῇ συναίσθησιν ὅτι ἁμαρτάνουσι . . . δόξασι οὖν μετανόιας, οὐ μετάνοιας, τὸ πολλὰς αἰτεῖσθαι συγγνώμην ἐφ' ὅς πλημμελοῦμεν πολλάκις. There are indications that Clement has been influenced in this passage by Hermas: cf. Herm. *Mand.* 4. 2. 2 πολυεὐπλαγχοὶ οὖν ἂν ὁ κύριος . . . ἔδωκεν τῇ μετάνοιαν ταύτην . . . ἕαν τις ἐπιμνησθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ἁμαρτήσῃ, μίαν μετάνοιαν ἔχει.

solution by the Christian thinker. In his early<sup>1</sup> work *Περὶ εὐχῆς*, the question of absolution arises in connexion with the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer. 'All of us have authority to forgive sins committed against ourselves. But he who is inspired by Jesus, as the Apostles were, and who may be known by his fruits, forgives whatever sins God has forgiven, and retains such as are past remedy. The Apostles, and those who are made like to the Apostles, being priests after the example of the Great High Priest, and possessing a knowledge of the Divine art of healing, know as they are taught by the Spirit in what cases sacrifices may be offered for sins, and in what cases this ought not to be done. Some there are, who claiming a dignity beyond that of priesthood, though perhaps they are not experts even in priestly science, boast of being able to pardon even idolatry and remit acts of adultery and fornication, as if by their prayer for such presumptuous offenders even the sin unto death could be discharged<sup>2</sup>.' This refers obviously enough to Callistus, and it breathes the spirit of Montanism in so far as it limits the gift of John xx 23 to the spiritual members of the Church, and its exercise to 'remissible' sins; but it does not, like Tertullian's Montanism, go to the length of discouraging the remission of sins under any circumstances. Towards the end of his life Origen, now a presbyter at Caesarea<sup>3</sup>, returns to the subject in his commentary on Matt. xvi 18 ff. 'Since the members of the Episcopate use this passage as if it implied that they, like Peter, had received the keys, and teach that sins bound (i. e. condemned) by them are bound in Heaven, and sins forgiven by them are loosed in Heaven, it must be remarked that their contention is sound if they can show that they do that which

<sup>1</sup> Westcott (*D. C. B.* iv p. 103) places it before 231, adding 'date uncertain.' Batiffol on the other hand (*Études*, p. 109) assigns it to 244-9.

<sup>2</sup> *De orat.* 28 πάντες μόντοι γε ἐξουσίαν ἔχομεν ἀφιέναι τὰ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἡμαρτημένα . . . ὁ δὲ ἐμπνευσθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὡς οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν γινώσκεισθαι δυνάμενος . . . ἀφίησιν ἢ ἐὰν ἀφῆ ὁ θεός, καὶ κρατεῖ τὰ ἀνίατα τῶν ἡμαρτημάτων . . . οὗτοι ποιγαροὺν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἠρωμεῖναι, ἱερεῖς ὄντες κατὰ τὸν μέγαν ἀρχιερέα, ἐπιστήμην λαβόντες τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείας, ἴσασι ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος διδασκόμενοι περὶ ἂν χρῆ ἀναφέρειν θυσίας ἡμαρτημάτων καὶ πότε καὶ τίνα τρόπον, καὶ γινώσκουσι περὶ ἂν οὐ χρῆ τοῦτο ποιεῖν . . . οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἑαυτοῖς τινες ἐπιτρέψαντες τὰ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἱερατικὴν ἀξίαν, τάχα μηδὲ ἀκριβοῦντες τὴν ἱερατικὴν ἐπιστήμην, αὐχοῦσιν ὡς δυνάμενοι καὶ εἰλωλοατρίας συγχωρεῖν, μοιχείας τε καὶ πορνείας ἀφιέναι, ὡς διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς αὐτῶν περὶ τῶν ταῦτα τετολημημένων λυομένης καὶ τῆς πρὸς θάνατον ἁμαρτίας.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Eus. H. E.* vi 36.



Peter did and for which he received the *Tu es Petrus*, and if they are such as Christ builds His Church upon—then this promise may reasonably be applied to them. But if a man is bound with the chain of his sins, it is idle for him to bind or to loose others. If any one who is not Peter and has not Peter's qualifications thinks like Peter to bind on earth and loose on earth, after such a manner that what he binds or looses is bound or loosed in Heaven, that man is 'puffed up,' not knowing the mind of the Scriptures, and in his pride he has fallen as the Devil fell! This is plain speaking for one who was in the communion of the Church, and it shows that even to the last Origen was dissatisfied with the claim of the Episcopate to remit sins without regard to the personal character of the absolver. He would have been content that the Bishops should retain the power, provided that it was exercised only by those of proved sanctity—a touch of Montanism still surviving in the veteran scholar. On the benefits of confession he speaks with more conviction. He holds that there are sinful thoughts which can never be wholly eradicated while they are hidden in the breast, or until they have been revealed to those who can heal these wounds of the soul. Secret sins are like undigested food; confession relieves the soul as the body is eased by vomiting. Christ is the Head Physician, but He has committed the practice of the healing art to the Apostles and those who succeed them in the ministry of the Church. Care must be taken, however, to choose a physician who is skilful and sympathetic, and when he has been found the penitent must be prepared to follow his advice without reserve<sup>3</sup>. The old rule of 'one and only one penitence after Baptism' applies to the graver sins: sins which are not 'unto death' may always be

<sup>1</sup> Orig. *Comm. in Matt.* l. xii 14 ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ τὸν τύπον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐδικούσθη χρόναι τῷ ἡγετῷ, ὡς Πέτρος, καὶ [ *for. leg. ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ καθὼς Πέτρος* ] τὰς ἀλείψας τῆς γῆς οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἀπὸ τοῦ σατῆρος ἐληψότες, διδάσκουσί τε τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν δεδεμμένα (τουτέστι κατεδικασμένα) καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς δεδέσθαι, κ.τ.λ., λεκτικόν ὅτι ἐγὼ λέγουσιν εἰ ἔχουσιν ἔργον δι' ὃ εἴρηται ἵκειναι τῷ Πέτρῳ. Χὺ εἰ Πέτρος, καὶ εἰ ἑτακοῦτοί εἰσιν ὡς ἐν' αὐτοῖς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εὐλόγως τοῦτο ἀναφέρει: ἂν πάλαι δι' ἁδου οὐκ ὀφείλουσι κατωχέειν τοῦ θέλοντος δεσμεῖν καὶ λύειν. εἰ δὲ σειραῖς τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων αὐτοῦ ἐσφιγεται, μάτην καὶ δεσμεῖ καὶ λύει. . . εἰ δὲ τις μὴ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ μὴ ἔχων τὰ εἰρημένα ἐνταῦθα, ὡς περ Πέτρος οἴεται ἄσσειν ἐπὶ γῆς, κ.τ.λ., οὗτος τετάρτατος, μὴ πιστότατος τὸ βούλημα τῶν γραφῶν, καὶ τυφωθεὶς ἐμπίπτει εἰς τὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πτώμα.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hom. in Ps.* xxxvii 1, 1 sqq.; *in Luc.* xvii.



repaired by confession<sup>1</sup>. Yet formal confession is not the only remedy which the Gospel offers to the penitent. When people complained that while the Israelite could offer his trespass offering as often as he would, the Christian was allowed but one *exomologesis*, they should remember that those for whom Christ died might well expect to live under a severer rule than that which prevailed before the Incarnation. Yet, as a matter of fact, the Church could count up no fewer than seven channels through which forgiveness might be obtained. Origen places in this category (1) baptism; (2) martyrdom; (3) almsgiving (Luke xi 41); (4) readiness to forgive (Matt. vi 14); (5) converting sinners (Jas. v 20); (6) fervent love (Luke vii 47, I Pet. iv 8); (7) penitence (Ps. xxxii 5, Jas. v 16). The last means is the hardest to use; the sinner who repents washes his bed with his tears, and he does not blush to tell his sins to God's priest and ask for a remedy<sup>2</sup>. Such a private interview might or might not result in a public *exomologesis*; if it did, the confession was repeated by the offender before the Church, and he must not shrink from the consequences<sup>3</sup>. It was no light matter to make a public confession in the age of growing worldliness which preceded the outbreak of the Decian persecution<sup>4</sup>, and at Caesarea and elsewhere in the East it was now usual to consult the Bishop in private beforehand.

With the persecuting edict of 250 a new chapter in the history of Penitence begins. At Carthage and perhaps everywhere throughout the Empire the edict of Decius found the Church unprepared<sup>5</sup>. In the panic that followed, Christians rushed to the heathen altars to sacrifice, or to the officials to purchase

<sup>1</sup> *Hom. in Lev.* xv 2 'in gravioribus enim criminibus semel tantum paenitentiae conceditur locus; ista vero communia quae frequenter incurrimus, semper paenitentiam recipiunt et sine intermissione redimuntur.'

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii 4; the passage ends: 'est adhuc et septima, licet dura et laboriosa, per paenitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrimis stratum suum, et fiunt ei lacrimae suae panes die ac nocte, et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum et quaerere medicinam.'

<sup>3</sup> *Hom. in Ps.* xxxvii 2 'ut ita demum si quid consilii dederit [sacerdos] facias, et sequaris si intellexerit et praeviderit talem esse languorem tuum qui in conventu totius ecclesiae exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et ceteri aedificari poterunt et tu ipse facile sanari.'

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Cypr. de laps.* 5 sq.; cf. Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 41 ff.

certificate which guaranteed immunity at the cost of total. Either act was obviously equivalent to an abandonment of the faith, excluding the offender *ipso facto* from communion in the Eucharist. When the reaction came and a crowd of the 'lapsed' sought reconciliation with the Church, a grave question of discipline arose. It was complicated by the action of the confessor, who used the privilege of intercession which had long been accorded to them<sup>1</sup>. Producing the *libelli pacis* obtained from the confessor, many of the lapsed presented themselves at the Eucharist, and some of the Carthaginian presbyters admitted them to communion without exacting penance<sup>2</sup>. Against this abuse Cyprian protested, insisting that immediate restoration to communion should be granted only to persons in danger of death, all other cases being deferred until the persecution was over and the Bishops could meet to deal with them one by one<sup>3</sup>. Such a Council met at Carthage as soon as peace was restored to the Church (April, 257)<sup>4</sup>, and decided upon a policy which was a *via media* between licence and severity. While the door of hope was not shut against any of the lapsed, it was resolved to make a broad distinction between the *sacrificati* and the *libellatici*; the former were to be subjected to a life-long penance, and admitted to communion only on the approach of death, while the latter were allowed to make reparation by the usual process of *exoneratio*<sup>5</sup>.

At Rome events took a less favourable course. The conflict between a positive and a concessive policy, which reveals itself in the *Shepherd* and again in the invective of Hippolytus against Callistus, reached a climax in the schism of Novatian. But lamentable as it was that Roman Christianity should be broken up, especially at such a time, into two hostile camps, the secession of the Novatianists served the purpose of setting the Church of Rome free to adopt the moderate counsels which had already prevailed at Carthage<sup>6</sup>. Henceforth the party of extreme rigorism, which left no hope<sup>7</sup> for the lapsed and practically

<sup>1</sup> See *Proc.* 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200.

<sup>6</sup> *Cyprian*, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 200.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 201.



abolished penitence, was openly at issue with the Catholic Church<sup>1</sup>.

At Alexandria, where, through local circumstances, the persecution broke out a year before the publication of the edict of Decius<sup>2</sup>, the policy of Rome and Carthage found warm and able support from the great Bishop Dionysius. His just and kindly nature shrank from the inhumanity of Novatianism; the teaching of Novatian was nothing short of a calumny on the mercy of Christ<sup>3</sup>. Various letters by Dionysius *περὶ μετανοίας*, enumerated by Eusebius and Jerome<sup>4</sup>, conveyed to the Churches his judgements upon the subject. A fragment of one of these, printed by Pitra, pronounces in favour of giving absolution to the lapsed who sought it *in extremis*, and of allowing to persons so forgiven, in case of recovery, the full benefit of their sick-bed penitence<sup>5</sup>. In the diocese of Alexandria the clergy were enjoined to give effect to this policy, at least so far as regards the admission of dying penitents to the communion of the Eucharist<sup>6</sup>. The canons issued by Dionysius' successor Peter<sup>7</sup>, four years after the commencement of the last persecution, fall outside our period, but may be mentioned here as embodying the practical results of the experience gained by the Church during the troubles which followed the Decian edict.

Something may be added in reference to the rite of *exomologesis* as practised during the period.

I believe the process to have generally begun with a public

. . . iacentem vulneratum praeteriret sed . . . potius occideret adimendo spem salutis, denegando misericordiam Patris, respuendo paenitentiam fratris.'

<sup>1</sup> The canons of Elvira show a strong reaction in favour of the puritan view, but the *παλαιὰ καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος* of the Decian settlement is reasserted by the thirteenth canon of Nicaea. On ante-Nicene fluctuations of practice in this matter, see Bright, *Canons*, p. 53 f., and Dale, *Synod of Elvira*, p. 100 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Dionys. Alex. *ap. Eus. H. E.* vi 41.

<sup>3</sup> *Eus. H. E.* vii 8 *Νοουατιανῶ μὲν γὰρ εὐλόγως ἀπεχθανόμεθα . . . τὸν χρηστότατον κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὡς ἀνηλεῆ σκοφαντοῦντι.*

<sup>4</sup> *Eus. H. E.* vi 46; Hier. *de vitis illustr.* 69.

<sup>5</sup> Pitra, *Spic. Solesm.* i p. 15 f. *τοὺς πρὸς τῇ ἐξέδῳ γινομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοντο καὶ ἱκετεύοιεν, ἀφείσται τυχεῖν . . . καὶ τούτους ἐλευθέρους παραπέμπει τῆς θεοπρεποῦς ἑστί φιλανθρωπίας. εἰ μὲντοι μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπιμένοιεν τῷ βίῳ, δεσμεύει μὲν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπαχθίζειν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις οὐκ ἀβλόουθόν μοι φαίνεται.*

<sup>6</sup> *Eus. H. E.* vi 44 *ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης τοὺς ἀπαλλαγτομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ βλοῦντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι, ἢ' εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττανται, κ.τ.λ.*

<sup>7</sup> Routh, *rell. sacr.* iv pp. 23-45.



confession of the fault. When and how such confessions were made it is not easy to make out; that they were made, and before the congregation, seems to be repeatedly implied<sup>1</sup>. Even more humiliating than the confession by word of mouth was the public discipline which accompanied and followed it; the prostrations, the mean attire, the neglect of the common decencies of life<sup>2</sup>. It needed a pen like Tertullian's to describe the horrors of the situation, and a will of iron or a strange insensibility to undergo them. Nor was the ordeal usually a brief one. Cyprian and the African Bishops at the Council of 251, while not debarring the lapsed from the hope of forgiveness, were careful to require a protracted penitence<sup>3</sup>. The canons of Bishop Peter assign various periods according to the nature of the offence. During the early years of the fourth century the graduated scale of 'stations' came into use which the Council of Nicaea recognized and enforced<sup>4</sup>.

In ordinary cases it was reserved to the Bishop to readmit penitents when their *exomologesis* was complete. To forgive sins is specified as an episcopal power in the earliest Church Orders<sup>5</sup>; but the prayer used at the consecration of the Bishop

<sup>1</sup> M. Batiffol (*Études*, p. 199) would eliminate from the ancient *exomologesis* a public confession of sins: 'C'est un aveu de la faute ou des fautes commises, oui, mais un aveu qui n'implique qu'une attitude et point la confession publique de fautes déterminées.' No doubt *exomologesis* almost from the first includes the idea of satisfaction, and covers the whole humiliating process of public penitence. But it will need more evidence than M. Batiffol has produced to show that no verbal confession was made before the congregation in the second and third centuries.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tert. *de paen.* 9 'exomologesis . . . mandat sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare . . . ingemiscere, lacrimari et mugire dies noctesque ad dominum deum tuum, presbyteris advolvi et caris dei adgeniculari . . . cum igitur provolvit hominem, magis relevat; cum squalidum facit, magis mundatum reddit.' Or the terrible picture in *de pudic.* 13 'paenitentiam moechi ad exorandam fraternitatem in ecclesiam inducens conciliatum et concineratum, cum dedecore et horrore compositum, prosternis in medium ante viduas, ante presbyteros, omnium lacrimas invadentem, omnium vestigia lambentem, omnium genua detinentem.'

<sup>3</sup> *Cypr. ep.* 55. 6 'ut nec in totum spes communicationis et pacis lapsis denegaretur . . . nec tamen rursus censura evangelica solveretur, ut ad communicationem temere prosilirent, sed traheretur diu paenitentia.'

<sup>4</sup> Conc. Nicaen. can. 11 *τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀπροσμένους ποιήσουσιν οἱ πιστοί, καὶ ἑπτά ἔτη ὑποπεσοῦνται, δύο δὲ ἔτη χάρις προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν.* This system appears also in the last of the canons attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus (Migne, *P. G.* x 1048; cf. Harnack, *Gesch.* i p. 429 f.), and in the sixth canon of Ancyra.

<sup>5</sup> Achelis, *die Canones Hippolyti*, p. 46; the consecrator prays, 'Grant him also,

was also, according to the Hippolytean canons, to be said at the ordination of the Presbyter<sup>1</sup>, who was thus invested with authority to absolve, even if he did not exercise it in the Bishop's presence. The Bishop gave absolution by laying his hand on the head of the penitent, but the *clerus* joined in the act of imposition<sup>2</sup>, and in cases of necessity it might be ministered by a single Presbyter or by a Deacon if a Presbyter could not be found<sup>3</sup>.

H. B. SWETE.

O Lord, the episcopal office, and a merciful spirit to forgive sins.' Hauler, *Didascalias fragmenta*, p. 27 f. 'similiter episcopus [et] episcopi est] dimittere in remissione . . per te salvator dicit his qui peccaverunt, "Remittuntur tibi peccata tua";' ib. *canonum reliquias*, p. 105 'da . . . solvere etiam omnem colligationem secundum potestatem quam dedisti apostolis.' Similar forms occur in the *Constitutions* (ii 11 f., 41, viii 8), and in the *Testamentum Domini* (Rahmani, p. 31).

<sup>1</sup> Achelis, p. 61; cf. Hauler, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. *ep.* 15. 1, 16. 2, 17. 2, 18. 1, 19. 2; cf. Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 420.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. *ep.* 18. 1.

## PSALM CX.

IN dealing with a difficult Psalm, like the present, the historical method is the only fair and profitable method of study. We must put out of our mind for a while all preconceived ideas. We must read it as though we read it now for the first time. We must try to find out what it meant to the men to whom it was first spoken—how it was to them a Divine message. But, when we have done this, we must remember that no Word of God exhausts its meaning upon one age: we are therefore not merely justified in asking, but we are obliged to ask, What were the thoughts and traditions which have gathered round this Psalm in later times and have so transmitted God's message to the ages? For I suppose we shall most of us admit that the same Spirit which moved holy men to *write* has also, in every age, moved holy men to *read* in that writing that portion of an infinite truth which was intended for their age. In other words, tradition must itself be reckoned as a factor in Inspiration.

And now let us become merely critics to determine

*The Meaning of the Psalm and the Date of its Composition.*

*The Title* in itself proves nothing: since (a) no title forms part of the text, and (b) many Psalms are, by their titles, ascribed to David which could not possibly have been written by him.

Again, it is recognized by scholars that the Psalms as we have them now grew out of three collections, made at widely different times, the third and last collection (Ps. xc-cl) being placed by Kautzsch as late as B. C. 141.

Of course it may be argued that a late collection of hymns may contain some of great antiquity, but if this collection was made 800 years after David's death we must, at least, admit that the evidence of his authorship, which rests only upon the title, is slight indeed.



Let us now turn to the Psalm itself and endeavour to determine, from internal evidence, the age to which it belongs.

## Ps. CX.

[Part I. *The Coming One is a King.*]

1. Thus saith YHVH to 'my lord'<sup>1</sup> :—

'SIT THOU AT MY RIGHT HAND

TILL I MAKE THY FOES A FOOTSTOOL FOR THY FEET.'

The  
Divine  
Word.

2. The rod of thy strength shall YHVH send forth out of Zion.  
Rule thou in the midst of thy foes.

The  
Psalmist  
meditates  
on its  
fulfilment  
(cf. *vv.*  
5-7).

3. Thy people offer<sup>2</sup> themselves willingly in the day of thy  
mustering-host.

In the beauty<sup>3</sup> of holiness, from the womb of dawn, thou  
hast the dew of thy youth<sup>4</sup>.

[Part II. *The Coming One is a Priest.*]

4. YHVH hath sworn—and He does not repent—

'THOU ART A PRIEST FOR EVER,

AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK.'

The  
Divine  
Word.

5. Adonai<sup>5</sup>, at Thy right hand, hath smitten kings, in the day  
of his wrath :

The  
Psalmist  
meditates  
on its  
fulfilment  
(cf. *vv.*  
2, 3).

6. He judges among the heathen, it [i.e. the battle-field] is  
filled with dead ;

He hath smitten the head, over a wide land.

7. He will drink of the brook in the way, therefore he will  
lift up his head.

## NOTES.

v. 3. The two readings, 'in the *beauties* of holiness,' 'in the *mountains* of holiness,' have about equal weight. If we adopt the former we have an expression which nowhere else occurs, and which, judging from the analogy of 1 Chron. xvi 20 ; Ps. xxix 2, xcvi 9, would rather denote *holy sanctuaries* than *holy garments* : whereas if (with Midrash Rabbah, Sym. Jer., &c.) we adopt the latter we have an expression which at least in the *singular* ('holy mountain') is very common, and which occurs in the *plural* in Ps. lxxxvii 1. Zion is called God's *holy mountain* because it is an earthly counterpart of the *holy mountain* of Heaven (Ezek. xxviii 14). The mountains, also, are more naturally coupled with the thought of

<sup>1</sup> Adonai.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jud. v 2.

<sup>3</sup> Or *mountains*, Sym. Jer.

<sup>4</sup> Only here and Eccl. xi 9 f.

<sup>5</sup> *my lord*, as v. 1.

'dew' and of the 'dawn': thus we read of 'the dawn spread upon the mountains' (Joel ii 2), 'the dew of Hermon' (Ps. cxxxiii 3; cf. 2 Sam. i 21).

'The dew of thy youth.' Many modern commentators interpret 'thy youth' as 'thy young men,' i. e. 'thy youthful soldiery.' But the only other passages in which this word 'youth' occurs are in Eccles. xi 9, 10, where it is once translated 'youth' and once (perhaps better) 'childhood.' It is, then, evident that 'the dew of thy youth' implies a birth that is ever fresh, a constant renewal of youth (cf. Isa. xxvi 19). Just as the Morning-star is called 'the son of the dawn' (Isa. xiv 12) because it seems each morning to be born anew, so, too, of the Hero of our Psalm, 'His going forth is prepared as the dawn' (Hos. vi 3); but though 'His goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting' (Mic. v 2), yet his youth is ever new.

This interpretation will also throw some light upon the last line of the Psalm, which holds the same relation to Part II that the present line does to Part I.

v. 5. 'Adonai, at Thy right hand,' &c. *Adonai* is pointed here as if it were the name of God, and is usually translated 'The Lord.' But it seems to me that the structure of the Psalm requires us to take it, as in v. 1, of the Messiah. And this for the following reasons:—

(a) In vv. 2, 3 the meditation is not upon the action of God, but upon the action of Messiah: we should therefore naturally expect that in the corresponding verses of Part II the action would also be that of the Messiah.

(b) In Part I Messiah is seated at God's right hand; it would therefore be strange, in Part II, to picture God at the right hand of the Messiah.

(c) Lastly, 'He will drink,' &c. (v. 7), must refer to Messiah. Why then should not 'He judges,' &c., 'He hath smitten,' &c., also refer to Messiah?

v. 7. 'He will drink of the brook in the way . . .' This difficult line is supposed by many commentators to be a fragment; but, if we look at the structure of the Psalm, we see that it corresponds exactly with the last line of Part I. There *Adonai*, like a rising sun, on the 'holy mountains,' had a renewal of unending birth: here, like a setting sun, going down into the waters, he comes forth again with new vigour, rejoicing as a giant to run his course.

But the poet is still thinking of Gen. xiv or of the legend upon which that chapter was formed: just as Abraham pursued the four kings, so in a straight course (cf. Jer. xxxi 9), guided by God, Messiah pursues the powers of evil. The natural picture is, of course, of a warrior stooping to drink and then continuing the pursuit. But the word 'drink' suggests a deeper meaning; to 'drink the waters of *Sihor*' implies

to be conformed to the customs of Egypt; to 'drink the waters of the River (i. e. *Euphrates*)' is to adopt the manners of Babylon (Jer. ii 18): therefore to *drink of the brook in the God-guided Way* suggests obedience to the God-guided life.

*On the Structure of the Psalm.*

We first observe that the Psalm falls into two natural parts, each commencing with a Divine Word, or Oracle. This Divine Word comes forth from YHVH and refers to a Being who is called *Adonî*, 'my lord,' in Part I, and *Adonai*, 'the lord,' in Part II<sup>1</sup>.

In Part I (*vv.* 1-3) the Divine Word is, 'SIT THOU AT MY RIGHT HAND TILL I MAKE THY FOES A FOOTSTOOL FOR THY FEET.' i. e. *Adonî* is, by a Divine oath, constituted a King. The poet then (*vv.* 2, 3) sees, as it were in vision, the nature of that Kingship—and it is unlike any other.

(a) He rules (*v.* 2) not with the strength of earth but with the strength of God.

(b) His subjects (*v.* 3) are rather priests than soldiers. Like Arthur's knights, the holiness of their King has made them willing volunteers to share his battles.

We feel at once that it is no common king that is here described, but that same Conqueror, with weapons not carnal, who has already been pictured in Ps. xlv.

In Part II (*vv.* 4-6) the Divine Word is,

'THOU ART A PRIEST FOR EVER  
AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK.'

i. e. This same holy King is also to combine the office of Priest. Clearly he could not have been of the race of Aaron, for, if so, there would have been no need for him to have been constituted Priest by a Divine oath. To make this still more clear we have the words, 'After the order of Melchisedek.' So then this Priest-King, even as he differs from other kings in the nature of his rule, differs also from other priests in the order of his priesthood. Next (*vv.* 5, 6) the poet sees in vision the nature of that priesthood—and it, too, is unlike any other. For, as in Part I the King had ruled as a Priest, so here we see (*vv.* 5, 6) a Priest conquering like a King.

<sup>1</sup> The difference between *Adonî* and *Adonai* depends only upon the vowel-points.



We are now in a position to inquire, Was there any period in which the Messianic hope centred on a combination of the Kingship with the Priesthood? Certainly there was. Ezekiel had seen the fall of both priesthood and kingship. 'Remove the mitre, take off the crown . . . until he come whose right it is' (Ezek. xxi 26 f.). Zechariah saw, in the coming Messiah, the union of the two. To him Zerubbabel represented the House of David, while Joshua, the high priest, with equal dignity, represented the growing power of the priesthood; but when he pictures the coming Messiah (*Tzemach*, 'the Branch') both Zerubbabel and Joshua are merely types, the Messiah has more than combined the offices and dignity of both. This he sets forth in an acted parable (Zech. vi 9 ff.):

'And the word of YHVH came unto me, saying, Take of them of the captivity, even of Heldai, of Tobijah, and of Jedaiah; and come thou the same day, and go into the house of Josiah the son of Zephaniah, whither they are come from Babylon; yea, take (of them) silver and gold, and make a noble crown (lit. *crowns*) and set it (or *them*) upon the head of Joshua the son of Jehozadak, the high priest; and speak unto him, saying, Thus saith YHVH of hosts, Behold, the man whose name is Tzemach (*the Branch* or *Outspring*) he shall spring up out of his place, and he shall build the Temple of YHVH; even he shall build the Temple of YHVH; and he shall bear the glory (i.e. as King), and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both' (i.e. the office of Messiah, both as priest and king, will be an office of Peace).

Now the name *Tzemach*, 'the Outspring,' is a most suggestive name for the Messiah, implying, as it does, not merely the *dayspring* [ἀνατολή, Jer. xxiii 5; xxxiii 15 (Theod. and Sym.); Zech. iii 8; vi 12], but also the effect of the dayspring upon creation by causing an 'outspring' from the ground [Isa. lxi 11]. The two thoughts are combined in Ps. lxxxv 12, 'Truth shall *spring* out of the earth; and Righteousness shall look down from heaven.'

Jeremiah, alluding to this Spring-tide of Righteousness, says, 'In those days and at that time I will *make to spring* to David an *Outspring* of righteousness . . . this is the name whereby it shall

be called, YHVH our Righteousness' (Jer. xxxiii 15). In another passage (xxiii 5) he gives this same name to *Tsemach* himself. In Zechariah, as we have seen, 'the man whose name is *Tsemach*' is the Messiah, who combines in his own person all the highest thoughts of Kingship and of Priesthood.

Now it is evident that *Tsemach* has derived his attributes from natural religion, from what we may call the yearly parable of the Spring-tide. In other words *Tsemach* is, in the sphere of Revelation, what *Tammuz* is in the nature-religion of Babylonia and Palestine. The favourite name of Tammuz was *Adonî*, i.e. 'My Lord' (Ezek. viii 14, Heb. and Vulg.; cf. Jer. xxii 18, *Ah me Adôn*).

The fact that God's parable of Nature has been perverted into nature-worship is no argument against a right interpretation of that parable. I suggest therefore that a Psalmist who lived in the Persian period expressed under the name of *Adonî* that same Messianic hope which Zechariah had expressed under the kindred name of *Tsemach*. If the Psalm be read with this thought in mind some of the most difficult passages (e.g. vv. 3, 7) will gain a new light.

There is no period in the history of O. T. Revelation at which the Messianic hope approached so nearly to a Divine Theophany as in the Persian period.

If now we turn to Jewish tradition there is no question but that, in early times, Ps. cx was interpreted of the Messiah, though after the rise of Christianity it was, by the Rabbinic writers, applied to Abraham.

The meaning of *Adonî* in the first verse has always been a difficulty; the Zohar (quoted by Neale) says, '*The higher degree (YHVH) spake unto the lower (Adonî), Sit thou on My right hand*' [Quoted as *Zohar Gen. fol. 15, col. 139*<sup>1</sup>], thus giving a semi-divine meaning to *Adonî*.

The Yalkut comments as follows:—

'In the time to come the Holy One, blessed be He, is going to make King Messiah sit at His right hand and Abraham at His left. And the face of Abraham grows pale and he says, 'My son's son sits at the right hand and I at the left! Then the Holy One, blessed be He, appeases him and says, Thy son's son is at My right hand and I am at thy right hand.'

<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to verify this reference.

In the New Testament Christ appeals to this first verse with a view to show that the dignity of the Messiah would be greater than that of David. This may be said to have been His chief object, and, if our interpretation be correct, such a meaning was justified both by the intention of the Psalmist and by the voice of later tradition. The question of authorship is of minor importance.

If the words of Christ (Mk. xii 36; Matt. xxii 44; Lk. xx 42) have been correctly reported, He claimed David himself as the author of the Psalm. This is, no doubt, a difficulty. But it is by difficulties, honestly faced, that God leads men to new truth. Most men now admit that there were things of which Christ was ignorant. (Mk. xiii 32; Lk. ii 40 ff. &c.)

But some will say, Limitation of knowledge is one thing, but mistake as to a matter of fact is quite another. If Christ could be mistaken in a matter of fact how can we look to Him as a sure Guide?

May not this difficulty be met by considering the nature of Inspiration? Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and the more holy they were the more completely they reflected and transmitted the message of God. If it were possible to have conceived of one who should have been absolutely 'pure, undefiled, separate from sinners,' the Divine message through that man would have been unique so far as it concerned *life and conduct*: but there is no reason to suppose that it would have extended to facts of science or of history or of criticism.

In Heb. i 1 f. the message of God through Christ is compared, and at the same time contrasted, with that through the prophets: *compared*, as though it were the same in kind; *contrasted*, as being different in degree.

This being so, the absolute and unique authority of Christ, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, is in no way affected even if it should prove that He was mistaken as to the authorship of a Psalm; but we positively assert that the inner meaning of the Psalm, as indicating the advent of a Priest-King of more than human power, was known and interpreted by Christ.

E. G. KING.



## THE GREEK MONASTERIES IN SOUTH ITALY. I.

THE EVENTS WHICH PREPARED THE WAY FOR THE FOUNDATION OF GREEK MONASTERIES IN SOUTH ITALY.

AT the end of the sixth century South Italy was almost entirely Latin. The constant tide of Greek influence which has always ebbed and flowed on its coasts was then at its lowest point. Only at Reggio, and at some of the other sea-coast towns, were there any colonies of Greeks. The *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* gives us no evidence of any Greek life, and Procopius, in his *History of the Gothic War*, states that there are no Greeks on the Western coast<sup>1</sup>.

But this was the low-water mark of Greek life in the South of Italy, and from the beginning of the seventh century events prepared the way for a fresh invasion of Greeks, which began in the eighth century, gathered strength and flourished in the ninth and tenth, languished in the eleventh, experienced a short but brilliant renaissance under the Normans in the twelfth, and then rapidly decayed in spite of an attempt to resuscitate it in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This Greek life in South Italy in the Middle Ages is an important factor in the evolution of Italy, and I propose to collect the chief facts which go to make up the history of one side of it—its monasteries. The materials for reconstructing this chapter of history are not good, and there are many lacunae, but enough remains to enable us to see the general lines on which the Greek monastic life developed, and to trace the growth and decay of at least the chief homes of the Basilian monks of the district.

<sup>1</sup> Αὕτη μὲν ἔστιν ἡ μεγάλη Ἑλλάς καλουμένη τὰ πρότερα· ἐν Βρεττιοῖς γὰρ οἱ Λοκροὶ τέ εἰσιν οἱ Ἐπιζεφύριοι καὶ Κροτωνιάται καὶ Θούριοι, τοῦ δὲ κόλπου ἐκτὸς πρῶτοι μὲν Ἑλληρῆς εἰσι, κ.τ.λ., *Bell. Goth.*, i 15.

The important feature of the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century is the expulsion, at least in part, of the Latin population, thanks to the invasions of the Lombards which began about the year 589. The account of these invasions has been written by Paul the Deacon in his books *De gestis Langobardorum*. The picture he gives is of a fierce and ruthless invasion sweeping Italy from the Alps to Reggio, and he relates a story of Atharis standing by the straits of Messina and claiming them as the boundary of Lombard land. That, however, would appear to have been an empty boast. It is even doubtful whether the Lombards reached Reggio at all, and certainly they could never have claimed an 'effective occupation' of the *terris* of the Sila and the Aspromonte, while on the eastern coast the emperor seems to have retained Bari, Brindisi, Gallipoli, and a few other towns until the middle of the seventh century.

But the Lombards never relaxed their pressure; the terror of their fame was as effectual in driving out the inhabitants as the fury of their actual onslaughts, and monks and clergy fled for refuge to Sicily, abandoning, it would seem, all thought of returning. They were established after a short time in the monastery of S. Theodore at Messina, as is shown by the following letter<sup>1</sup> of Gregory to Peter the sub-deacon, who was his legate<sup>2</sup> in Sicily.

GREGORIUS PETRO SUBDEACONO.

'Venerabilis Paulinus episcopus Tauri (i. Taurinac) civitatis provinciae Brutiorum, nobis asseruit monachos suos occisum dispersos barbarica, eosque nunc per totam vagari Siciliam, et eos quippe sine rectore nec animarum curam gerere, nec disciplinae sui habitus indulgere. Qua de re praecipimus eosdem monachos te omni cura et sollicitudine perquisitos ad unum reducere, et cum memorato episcopo rectoreque suo in monasterio sancti Theodori in Messasensi civitate posito collocari, et hi qui nunc ibi sunt, quos egere rectore comperimus, et illi, quos de congregatione eius inventos redaxeris, in unum positi eo duce, omnipotenti Domino deservire. Quam rem venerabili Felici eiusdem civitatis episcopo nos significasse cognoscit, et

<sup>1</sup> Greg. opp. lib. 1, ep. 41 (Migne, P. L. 77, p. 494).

<sup>2</sup> Greg. opp. lib. 1, ep. 1 (Migne, P. L. 77, p. 440).



praeter suam notitiam in dioecesi sibi commissa ordinatum quippiam contristetur.<sup>1</sup>

It is easy to see from this letter that the whole of the South of Italy must have been an unsafe and unpleasant country for peaceable folk to inhabit, and that the original Latin population must have constantly diminished.

Nor did matters improve: the invaders pushed on and in 663 succeeded in making good their possession of all the eparchy of Calabria, with the exception of Gallipoli and Naples, and the name of Calabria began to be transferred to the eparchy of Bruttium, which was merged into what was sometimes called the Duchy, sometimes the Theme, of Calabria. No one has ever suggested that during this troublous time there were any Greek monasteries or even any settled Greek life of any kind in South Italy. The rule of the Emperor did not in itself at all imply Greek life; his subjects in Calabria were Latin at this time, not Greek, so far as there was any settled population at all. The wars of the previous century had driven out the old inhabitants, and nothing had been put in their place, for the Lombards were learning that success in battle does not always mean victory in war, and that they had merely desolated what they had tried to subdue.

So far Sicily had been a harbour of refuge for the fugitives, but in the middle of the seventh century it was closed to them. The Saracens appeared on the coasts of the island and Constans II sent a large army to combat them. To the inhabitants this was but a double invasion; and if there was any difference between the conduct of the Greeks and the Arabs it was not in favour of the Greeks. 'Ingressus Sicilia,' says the *Liber Pontificalis*<sup>1</sup>, speaking of Constans, 'per indictionem VII et habitavit in civitate Syracusana et tales afflictiones posuit populo seu habitatoribus vel possessoribus provinciarum Calabriae, Siciliae, Africae, vel Sardiniae per diagrafa seu capita atque nauticatione per annos plurimos, quales a seculo numquam fuerunt, ut etiam uxores a maritos vel filios a parentes separarent. Et alia multa inaudita perpepsi sunt, ut alicui spes vitae non

<sup>1</sup> *Liber Pontific.* (ed. Duchesne), i p. 344.



remaneret, sed et vasa sacrata vel cymilia sanctorum Dei ecclesiarum abstollentes nihil demiserunt.'

At the same time Greeks began to obtain high preferment, civil as well as ecclesiastical, in South Italy, and the church of Sicily and Calabria became truly part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The centre of government by the Greek army was Syracuse, but Calabria was also under its rule and influence, though subordinate to Sicily, and so it happened that when in the eighth century Leo the Isaurian claimed the church of Calabria for Constantinople, the only person who objected was the Pope. This was the turn of the tide. The army of Constantine began to drive out the old population, and to supplant it by Greeks.

Another factor in the situation was the unrest and panic of all the Levantine nations, who throughout the seventh century arrived in Italy and Sicily in great crowds of fugitives. The Persians of Chosroes and afterwards the succession of Arab invasions cast up, as it were, on the Italian coasts wave after wave of terrified Orientals. From Antioch, Syria, Alexandria, Egypt, they came for refuge; some of them to Rome, some to Naples, some to South Italy and Sicily, and the strange heresies and customs which they brought caused the Romans no little discomfort, for the rules of hospitality made it necessary to provide such of them as were monks with monasteries and churches, and the situation which was produced required careful handling. Pope Donus, however, was equal to the occasion. 'Repperit,' says the *Liber Pontificalis*<sup>1</sup>, 'in urbe Roma, in monasterio qui appellatur Boetiana, Nestorianitas monachos Syros, quos per diversa monasteria divisit, in quo praedicto monasterio monachos Romanos instituit.' The wise Pope knew that it is often easy to dissipate an opposition that it is impossible to destroy. But it would have been impossible for him to do anything of the kind in Sicily or even in South Italy, where, although the Church had not yet been claimed by the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Papal authority can hardly have been more than nominal. In Sicily therefore Greek life and Greek monasteries must have flourished before the end of the seventh century. So it came about that when the Emperor wrote to Pope Agatho<sup>2</sup> in 678 for representatives to be sent to the Council—ἐκ δὲ τῶν

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* i p. 348.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* i p. 355.

σάρων Βυζαντιῶν μοναστηρίων ἐξ ἑκάστου μοναστηρίου ἀββάδας τέσσαρας—the Pope sent among others Theophanes from Baias in Sicily. I think therefore that it is probable that we do right to distinguish at least two cases in considering the fate of the great rush of Greeks and Orientals of this period.

1. *Those who went to Rome or other truly Latin centres.* The numbers of this class were largely swelled by the fugitives from the iconoclast movement (v. p. 350) and they were given monasteries and churches by the Popes, but care was taken to arrange that their individuality should be merged in that of the ordinary Latin monk. The apparent number of Basilian monasteries of this period in Rome is delusive. They were Basilian and Greek in externals, and in the language of their services, but the Greek spirit was crushed out, or educated away, and they cannot be taken as separate from the other monasteries in any essential feature.

2. *Those who went to Sicily.* These found themselves in familiar surroundings among men of their own faith and language, and they were an important factor in the Hellenization of the country.

These two cases may be regarded as clear. The case of South Italy as distinguished from Sicily on the one hand and the Latin territory on the other is less clear. Probably the truth is that it was very nearly deserted. So far as it had any population it was perhaps by this time Greek, but I cannot find any evidence for a vigorous ecclesiastical life. Calabria in the seventh and eighth centuries seems to be in a position entirely subordinate and inferior to Sicily. It produced no saint; I cannot find that it possessed any monasteries. In the wild ravines of the Aspromonte there may have been a few hermits, but their abodes were solitary and their lives are unrecorded. This is not to be wondered at. Calabria at that time must have been a most undesirable country. Ruined by the constant warfare of centuries, always exposed to the attacks of the Lombards, it can have attracted no one to live in it, so long as it was possible and safe to remain in Sicily.

But there is one other movement which has been adduced (notably by François Lenormant in his *La Grande Grèce*) as a chief cause of the Hellenization of South Italy and Sicily.



This is the iconoclast movement. It is suggested that the monks and others who were driven out by the iconoclast emperors took refuge in Italy and Sicily, and so started the Hellenizing process.

There is no doubt that the monks came over to Italy; but I do not think that the fact is of first-rate importance for two reasons.

1. The Hellenization of South Italy and Sicily was neither partial, nor temporary. It was complete, it lasted for a long time, and it can only adequately be explained by a process of depopulation and repopulation such as has been described. It could not be accounted for by any immigration of monks alone who are, as Mgr. Batiffol reminds us, '*gens aeterna in qua nemo nascitur.*'

2. So far as the evidence goes, it would seem that the monks, at least in large and important bodies, went to Rome and Naples in preference to Sicily or Calabria. Hence the numerous foundations of monasteries for Greek monks which were made by the Popes of this period. At first sight it seems strange that monks should go to a land inhabited by foreigners, rather than to one in which at least the language was familiar to them. But it is not hard to understand that the chief object of the monks was to escape the domination of the emperors, and find freedom to venerate images without persecution. This object they could attain far more easily in a country subject to the Pope than in Calabria or Sicily, which were within the Byzantine empire, even though the Emperor's control was not always effective. The case of those Greeks who fled from the iconoclast persecution must therefore be distinguished from those who fled from Arabs or other foreign invaders. The latter, as suggested above, had every inducement to go to Sicily, where they would be among their own countrymen. The former had every inducement to keep outside the limits of an empire which persecuted them.

I therefore think that the iconoclast movement did not do much towards Hellenizing South Italy or Sicily, that its effect in this direction has been much exaggerated, and that the Hellenization of the country is to be traced (1) to the expedition of Constant II and the occupation by Greek soldiers and settlers to which it gave rise, and (2) to the immigration of Greeks, lay and monastic alike, who fled from the troubles which were depopulating the Levant generally.



The state of things sketched above continued in South Italy and Sicily until the ninth century. At that time there comes a sudden change. The vigorous and important Greek life in Sicily is almost entirely destroyed and passes to the mainland. The lives of the saints begin to be filled by Calabrians, and monasteries seem almost to spring out of the ground.

This sudden change was due to the fresh and successful vigour of the Saracens in Sicily. In the course of about seventy years they completely overran the island. Palermo was taken in 831, Messina did not fall until 878, but only Taormina, helped by the extraordinary strength of its position, lasted until the tenth century. It fell in 902. At the same time the Saracens attacked the East coast of Italy, and Bari, Brindisi, and Tarentum by the middle of the ninth century formed the realm of the Sultan of Bari. The result is obvious. The Greek population of Sicily and Calabria was driven together into the almost inaccessible districts of the Aspromonte and the Sila. Geographically speaking these two mountains have only just escaped being separated from the mainland and from each other by narrow straits, similar to the strait of Messina, and in the ninth century the Greeks who took refuge in them were for a time more isolated by the flood of invaders than they would have been by the waves of the Ionian sea. But it was not for long. Though Sicily was not recovered, under Basil I the Saracens on the mainland began to be pushed back, the east coast was recovered and formed into the Theme of Langobardia, which remained separate from Calabria until the end of the tenth century, when the two were united and placed under the control of the Catapanus of Italy and Calabria, a district including that which was afterwards called the Basilicata.

In the ninth century therefore, when Sicily practically disappeared from the Byzantine empire, Calabria, more especially its mountain strongholds, assumes a fresh importance.

#### THE AUTHORITIES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE BASILIAN MONASTERIES OF SOUTH ITALY.

When the Greek life of Sicily was driven into Calabria in the way just described we begin to find evidence of the rise of Basilian monasteries in South Italy.

We have no good evidence for the existence of any Basilian monasteries in this district earlier than this date—the middle of the ninth century—but from that time we have an adequate amount of material, not indeed for writing the history of the foundation of every Basilian monastery, but for illustrating sufficiently the manner in which they were founded. This material is to be found in the lives<sup>1</sup> of the Saints of the period. It may perhaps be possible some day to supplement and illustrate it by a study of manuscripts and charters in the Vatican and at Messina, and possibly at La Cava and Monte Cassino, but at present nothing of importance of this kind is known to exist.

The saints of this period and locality, whose lives have been adequately preserved, are Elias Junior, Elias Spelaeotes, Lucas of Demena, Vitalis, and Nilus of Rossano, while there is a short and inadequate life of Fantinus. These cover the period of the rise of the Greek monasteries, from the end of the ninth to the beginning of the eleventh century, and there is also extant the life of Philaretus of Aulinae, who lived in the middle of the eleventh century, which gives a picture of the Greek monasteries just before the Norman period. The authorities for these lives are as follows.

(1) The life of *Elias Junior*. This is found in a Greek MS at Messina, which was once in the library of S. Salvator. According to the Bollandists it is cod. 41. But I think that the numbers at Messina have been altered since their time. It is published in Latin in Gaetani's *Vit. SS. Sic.* tom. 2, pp. 63 ff., and in the Bollandists' *Acta SS. Aug.* iii p. 479 ff. It was written by a monk who had known Elias, as he shows by reminding his readers that they had seen Elias. 'Quotquot adestis cives, quotquot indigenae, quotquot vestris oculis hominem vidistis, quotquot eius famam auribus accepistis, oro vos atque obtestor, ita verba mea exaudiatis, ut nemo ex vobis sit, qui ea in dubium vocare audeat aut nolit illis fidem habere, iam enim vos, qui illam cognovistis, certiores reddimini; qui vero ignoratis sanctissimi viri insignem virtutem, admirabimini<sup>2</sup>.'

This also implies, and the suggestion is supported by his

<sup>1</sup> Chiefly in the *Acta Sanctorum*, by the Bollandists, which I shall refer to as the *A. SS.* by the numbers of the volumes in each month.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS. Aug.* iii p. 489 z.

eulogy at the end of the life, that the writer was a monk in one of Elias's foundations, probably Aulinae, since he refers to the possession of the Saint's body, and there is no doubt that Elias was buried there.

(2) The life of *Elias Spelacotes*. This is found in a Greek MS at Messina (? cod. 42), formerly of S. Salvator's, and is published together with an old Latin translation by the Bollandists, in the *Acta SS.* Sept. iii p. 843 ff. According to the Latin translator the name of the author is Quiriacus, but this name does not appear in the Greek text. It is, however, certain that he was a contemporary authority, as he says in his preface, οὐδὲ λόγοις πλαστοῖς ἐγκωμιάζειν τολμώντος ἐγκωμίων ἀνθρωπίνων ἐνδέει ὑπὲρ ἐκείνα τυγχάνοντα. ἀλλ' ὅσα παρὰ τῆς ἀψευδοῦς αὐτοῦ γλώττης δι' αἰνιγμάτων μυστικῶς ἀκήκοα, καὶ ὅσα παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἀσκησάντων ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν ἔμαθον, καὶ ἅπερ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐωράκαμεν καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἀποστολικῶς ἐψηλάφησαν, ταῦτα γράφειν, ὡς οἶμαι, ἀκουστά τε καὶ κατὰδηλα τοῖς θέλουσι ποιεῖν καὶ ἀκλίνδυνον<sup>1</sup>.

I do not see anything in the life to show in what monastery it was written, but obviously the writer must have once been a monk at Melicuccà, Elias's monastery.

(3) The life of *Lucas of Demena*.

This was written in Greek by a contemporary scribe, but it is only published in Latin by Gaetani and by the Bollandists in *Acta SS.* Oct. vi p. 332 ff. from an anonymous Latin version of an inferior character. The Greek was known to Sanctorius and may be extant at Messina, which is very rich in hagiographical MSS, of which the catalogue is unpublished.

That the writer was a contemporary of Lucas who joined him at S. Julian's and went with him to Armentum is shown by a sudden change at this point in the narrative from the third to the first person, and continues, 'Timentes igitur eo in nos cum imperio venturos<sup>2</sup>, in munitum castrum fugere cogitavimus. Sed cum inter saeculares homines versari nobis turpe videretur, statuit magister noster in privatum locum naturaque munitum contendere<sup>3</sup>.'

(4) *The Life of Vitalis*. This was found in a Latin MS of the year 1565 at Armentum, and transcribed for the Bollandists

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 848 r.

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to Otto's invasion in 970.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* Oct. vi p. 340 a.



by Lucas Muscatus of Armentum. It is published by them in the *Acta SS. Mart.* ii p. 26. It is also published by Gaetani in the second volume of his *Lives of the Sicilian Saints* from two MSS at Armentum, but, say the Bollandists, 'quod arbitraretur stylum rudem esse, eam sua phrasi perpoluit; at nobis primi auctoris stylus minus displicebat, quem proinde retinuimus.'

But these Latin MSS only represent an early translation from a Greek original which the Bollandists describe 'auctore fere coaevo,' though, as they never saw it, and there is no clear internal evidence, they can hardly be trusted on this point. The date of this Latin version is given at the end of the Life. 'Facta est autem haec de Graeco in Latinum translatio anno Dominicae incarnationis millesimo centesimo nonagesimo quarto, mense Julii XII Indictionis.' It is interesting to notice that even by this time Greek was dying out in the Basilicata. The writer takes credit for translating the Life into Latin, and so rescuing it 'ex opaca Graecorum silva.'

(5) *The Life of Nilus*. This is the best known of all the lives of Calabrian saints. It is published by the Bollandists in the *Acta SS. Sept.* vii p. 279 ff., and in Migne, *P. G.* 120, p. 9 ff. It was written in very good Greek by a writer whose identity is doubtful. A note attached to cod. Vat. 6151 says, 'hanc vitam B. Bartholomaeus scripsit.' Bartholomew was the third abbot<sup>1</sup> of Grotta Ferrata, Nilus's last foundation, and it is very probable that he wrote the Life, but the evidence is hardly sufficient.

MSS of the Greek are to be found at Grotta Ferrata in cod. B. β. 2, in cod. Vat. 1205, in cod. Paris. suppl. 106, and also, I believe, at Messina. The vivid and detailed character of the writing suggests that it was written by a contemporary, and this view is confirmed by the use of the first person in the account of Nilus's funeral, 'Ὅτε δὲ ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτῶν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ τῆς ψαλμωδίας ἀκηκόασιν, ἐξῆλθον καὶ ὑπήντησαν ἡμῶν ἅπαντες . . . πάντες ὄμον ἐθρηνοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.<sup>2</sup>', which at least shows that the writer formed part of the funeral procession.

(6) *The Life of Fantinus*. This is published by the Bollandists

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Codices Cryptenses*, by Dom A. Rocchi, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 165 B.

in the *Acta SS.* Aug. vi p. 621 ff. It is an extract from a Milan MS with which other MSS have been collated, but they give neither the date nor the number. It is quite a short notice, and has no signs of having been written by a contemporary of the Saint.

It has no great value, but it clearly refers to the Fantinus who was a friend of Nilus, and left him about the year 950, to go to Greece. It is possible that a closer examination of menologies and lives of saints at Messina would reveal the existence of a longer and earlier life. This would probably be valuable, as it might throw light on the foundation of the monasteries on Mount Mercury.

(7) *The Life of Philaretus.* This life was written by a monk named Nilus, who had lived with Philaretus in the monastery of Elias Junior at Aulinae. That he was a contemporary of Philaretus is shown by his constant use of the first person; e.g. in describing Philaretus's return to the monastery, he says, 'Quid vero pro his attulit cum ad nos venit singularis virtutis homo?' It is published in Latin by the Bollandists in the *Acta SS.* Apr. i p. 605 ff.; but it was written originally in Greek. The Bollandists say that the Greek MS is at Messina, and that the Latin which they print is taken from the translation made by Augustinus Floritus, S. J. They would have published the Greek, but were unable to obtain a copy.

Philaretus died in 1070, and his Life must have been written towards the end of the eleventh century. Less interesting than the Lives of Elias or Nilus, it is a valuable monument of the monastic life of South Italy just before the Norman period.

Taken together these lives form a considerable mass of evidence as to the period of the foundation of the Greek monasteries of South Italy. They are, with the exception of the Life of Fantinus, almost contemporary documents. They represent the opinions and statements of perfectly sincere witnesses, superstitious, no doubt, and exceedingly apt to see miracles in every act of their heroes, but quite free from the suspicion that they are writing history for party purposes. Their story is worth exactly as much as is the evidence of any uneducated, superstitious, but frank and sincere witness, who is trying to tell the story of a friend's life.



In the main it is entirely trustworthy, but allowance has to be made for the credulous and superstitious imagination of the witness. If, however, historians never had to deal with greater obstacles than these, they would probably find their task considerably easier than it is.

I cannot refrain from expressing the hope that some of these lives will be properly edited and published from the Greek MSS, most of which may be found at Messina. For merely historical purposes the editions and translations given by the Bollandists are perhaps sufficient, but the Greek would be of the greatest value for the study of the development of the language in South Italy. The Bollandists say that they do not print the Greek, because it is so bad, and so full of mistakes in spellings that they cannot correct it, and cannot even always understand it. In other words, the Greek MSS of these lives are full of dialectical forms and phonetic spellings, which will probably render them a mine of information to the student of the later developments of the Greek language.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF MONASTIC LIFE.

It is possible in these histories to trace a steady development of monastic life. There is a constant tendency to go further and further towards the north, there is a constant tendency to draw closer and closer the bonds which united the monks to each other, and there is a constant tendency to a greater cultivation of literary studies. I propose now to treat only of the first two of these tendencies, reserving for another section the consideration of the third.

##### *The Tendency to move Northwards.*

The monasteries did not spread evenly or at once over the whole of Calabria and the Basilicata. There was a steady tendency to go north, in which each successive move can be explained by a reference to the course of events in the struggle between the Greeks and the Saracens, and so far as one can judge from the few scattered remarks which bear on the subject, at each step further north the monks were carrying their costume and life into districts where they were almost unknown.



The first monastery that is mentioned in the *Lives* is that at Salinae, founded by Elias Junior<sup>1</sup>, at almost the most southerly point in Calabria, close to Cape del Armi. Elias came to it from Sicily, whence he had fled from the Saracens, who captured his native town Enna (Castro Giovanni) in 837. He had wandered about for a long time, visiting, according to his biographer, most of the important places in the Levant, and had been guided to Salinae by a dream<sup>2</sup>. This was between 880 and 888. The date is fixed as between these limits, by the following considerations. Elias was at Palermo at the time when the Saracens and Greeks were preparing<sup>3</sup> for the campaign between Hasan ibn Abbas and Nasar (whom the writer of the Life calls Basil) in 879-80. Therefore Elias did not go to Salinae before 880. Again, he left Salinae and went<sup>4</sup> to Patras because of a fierce attack made by the Saracens on Reggio. This must be the attack which was made in 888, and therefore his arrival at Salinae was before that date.

After his flight to Patras, Elias returned<sup>5</sup> to Salinae, but not for long. The danger of attacks from the Saracens was too great, and he continued the movement northwards, which he had begun when he left Sicily, by going to Aulinae<sup>6</sup>, on a mountain in the north-west of the Aspromonte, close to Seminara.

It is noteworthy that whereas Aulinae enjoys a considerable period of moderate prosperity, Salinae seems to disappear soon after the death of its founder.

Elias Spelaeotes, the next saint in chronological order, does not himself continue the northward movement further than Elias Junior had taken it, but he curiously duplicates the experience of his namesake. Like him he first lived near Reggio at Armo<sup>7</sup>, close to S. Agatha (though I do not think that Armo can be counted as a monastery), for some time before 888, when he also left the neighbourhood of Reggio<sup>8</sup> and, perhaps in the company of Elias Junior, went to Patras. He returned to Armo<sup>9</sup> in 896, and in 903-4 went for a short time to Salinae<sup>10</sup> and lived with Daniel, the companion of Elias Junior, after the death of the

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 495 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 494 E.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 498 B.

<sup>4</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 854 F f.

<sup>5</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 860 F.

<sup>6</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 493 A.

<sup>7</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 498 A.

<sup>8</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 498 B.

<sup>9</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 856 E.

<sup>10</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 862 E.

latter. Then he too joined in the movement towards the north and west to Melicuccà<sup>1</sup>, not far from Aulinae and Seminara.

In this way the lives of the two earliest saints show the development of the monastic settlements from the extreme south of Calabria, the southern slopes of the Aspromonte, to a district about fifty miles (measuring by road) on the northern side of the same mountainous country.

At this point the movement north was arrested for about forty-five years, and a flourishing collection of monasteries grew up in the Seminara district, of which we know the monastery of Elias at Melicuccà and the monasteries of John, Zacharias, Fantinus, and Nilus on Mount Mercury. But in the middle of the tenth century the movement suddenly began again, and spread with greatly increased rapidity. Elias Spe-lacotes<sup>2</sup>, it is true, did not leave his own district, though he was in obvious danger. He was an old man, and unwilling to move. Probably some of his followers remained with him and found protection in the poverty which rendered them unobtrusive, and in the inaccessible nature of their home, which made them a difficult object of attack. But on every side there were signs of movement. Fantinus<sup>3</sup> left Mount Mercury and went to Thes-salonica, Lucas<sup>4</sup> went to the Basilicata, Nilus<sup>5</sup> returned to his old home, Rossano, a city which had always boasted of its invincible resistance to the Saracens, while Vitalis, who had gone to the north in his youth, stopped<sup>6</sup> on his way southwards and never went back further than the Basilicata. This movement must be dated in each case between 950 and 958—it is not easy to fix the precise time of the migration of each saint, nor is it matter of very great importance. The most probable dates are 950-2 and 957-8. In each of these years there was a special outbreak of war, the earlier being Hasan's invasion, and the later the disturbance which began when Constantine Porphyrogenetus sent Argiros to Calabria and was resisted by Amar, Hasan's brother.

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 863 c.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 875 f.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. vi p. 623 b and *P. G.* 120, p. 57 b.

<sup>4</sup> *A. SS.* Oct. vi p. 338 a.

<sup>5</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 73 a.

<sup>6</sup> *A. SS.* Mar. ii p. \*27 A. The Bollandists' notes interpret San Sevarina here as the Episcopal town in Calabria. This is probably wrong, as Cassano is mentioned in the context, and there is a San Severino in the neighbourhood.



When we reach the second half of the tenth century, the movement northwards is still the chief feature. It accounts for the rise of the Greek monasteries in the district of the Sila, and in the Basilicata, as well as of the isolated convent at Grotta Ferrata, near Rome, and it extends over a far wider field than that which was covered by the monks of the previous half-century. At least one reason for this fact is that the leaders worked more independently and at greater distances from each other. They seem to have preferred to have separate 'spheres of influence,' although Lucas and Vitalis met on at least one occasion<sup>1</sup>, and it is inconceivable that Nilus and Lucas were quite unknown to each other, as they had lived so near each other on Mount Mercury, in the cave of S. Michael, and at Melicuccà respectively.

The district which comes nearest to the Aspromonte is the Sila, separated from it by the valleys of the Ippolito and the Corace. For some cause which I cannot explain this was never quite so popular with the Greek monks<sup>2</sup> as the mountainous districts to the north and south of it. The chief centre of the monasteries in this neighbourhood is Rossano, and the man who founded the first of them is Nilus. His chief foundation is that of S. Adrian's, on the high ground near the district of S. Demetrius; but he also reorganized and practically refounded a nunnery which had been established a short time previously by Eupraxias<sup>3</sup>, an Imperial official.

Nilus stayed at Rossano or its neighbourhood until the time of Kasem in 976, when he went on further north, across the valley of the Crati, and past the Basilicata, to Capua<sup>4</sup> and Monte Cassino<sup>5</sup>, but before looking at his work in this locality, it will be well to notice that of Lucas and Vitalis, who took the Basilian monasteries into the Basilicata while Nilus was doing the same for the Sila.

Lucas had been a pupil of Elias Spelacotes at Melicuccà<sup>6</sup>, and probably left him at the same time that Fantinus went to Thessalonica and that Nilus went to S. Adrian's at Rossano, i. e. about 950. Frightened, as had been Nilus and Fantinus, at the

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Mar. ii p. \*28 D.

<sup>2</sup> It was in the thirteenth century the head quarters of the Latin order of Florus.

<sup>3</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 85 B.

<sup>4</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 124 C.

<sup>5</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 124 D.

<sup>6</sup> *A. SS.* Oct. vi p. 337 F.



etates of the Lucania, he went towards the north, but, without stopping at the most mountainous district, the *Sila*, as *Nino del.* he went on until he reached the mountains of the Basilica, and stopped at *Veio*<sup>1</sup>. Here he stayed seven years, and then, apparently from a desire for privacy, he crossed to a desert monastery, *S. Juliano's*<sup>2</sup>, near the *Agri*, "quod," says the writer of his *Life*, "refugit amplexus." Here he stayed for about ten years, and then, alarmed at the invasion of Otto I in 970, he moved to a safer spot in the same district<sup>3</sup>: "statuit," says the author of the *Life*, "magister noster in僻remote locum naturaque munus considerare," etc. Here he built the monastery of *Armentosa*, and here he died either in 984 or 993. (It is difficult to say which date is right, as the *Life*<sup>4</sup> says that he died '1mo Oct. a mundo condito 5493, ab incarn. Domini 993.') *Law* was the great founder of monasteries in the Basilicata, and, besides those mentioned above, tradition assigned to him the foundation of several other monasteries, e.g. a monastery at *Bombicino* called *S. Circo*, and the great monastery of *S. Anastasio* or *S. Elias* at *Carbo*. I much doubt whether he founded the latter, but *S. Elias* is in any case so distinctly a monastery of the Norman period that I shall leave the discussion of its foundation until later.

So far the lives of the Saints of South Italy have all proceeded in much the same manner—they have all started from the south and gone north; but the remaining *Life* gives a slightly different picture. *Vitalis*, a Sicilian by birth, went first of all to *Rome*<sup>5</sup>, and then made his way southwards to *S. Severina*<sup>6</sup> (no doubt the one in the Basilicata, not the one in Calabria) and to *Casano*<sup>7</sup>. This seems to be a different tendency, but I do not think that it is really difficult to explain. *Vitalis's* intention was to return home. His *Life* is more carefully and obscurely

<sup>1</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 128 n.

<sup>2</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 129 n.

<sup>3</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 130 n.

<sup>4</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 131 n.

<sup>5</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 128 n.

<sup>6</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 129 n.

<sup>7</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 130 n.

<sup>8</sup> *L. J.* SS: tom. III. p. 131 n. The *Life* at this point inserts a rather long list of names of Sicily. I have thought this an insertion, and *Vitalis's* career in an other class parallel to the others. It would consist of a month spent in Sicily; a visit to *Trapani*; a return to *Veio*; and then a steady progress to the north.

<sup>9</sup> *Vitalis* admitted the view that the story is an invention, because it seemed to be a possible and true possible story, and was which was slightly different to the previous ones of the development of the monastic system.

written than the others, and it is almost impossible to make out exactly when Vitalis reached Cassano, or whether it was not really only a stage on a journey home after a visit to Rome. In any case, as soon as Vitalis reaches Cassano he seems to be drawn into the same gradual movement northwards which marks the lives of his contemporaries. From Cassano he goes to Roseto<sup>1</sup>, and from that he strikes inland and towards higher ground, and he settles for a time at S. Angelo near Mount Rapora<sup>2</sup>. He then goes to S. Julian's<sup>3</sup>, and finally lives for a time in a cave near Armentum<sup>4</sup>, where he sees Lucas.

After a time he founds a monastery<sup>5</sup> near his cave on the site of an old church or shrine of SS. Adrian and Natalia. But he does not stop there, and presently moves seventy or eighty miles further north<sup>6</sup> to Rapolla, going through the *partes Turrinensium* (? Tursi), and here, in 994<sup>7</sup>, he dies.

This is almost the northern limit of the Basilian monasteries which can be traced to the Hellenizing movement in South Italy. The next generation, as represented by Elias III, Vitalis's nephew, or by Philaretus, did not wander; they were content with their position. It only remains to notice the concluding years of the life of Nilus, who, at the time of Lucas's death, was pushing still further north, and founding as it were little islands of Greek monks in the middle of the Latin population.

Nilus left Rossano about the year 976 because of Kasem's invasion, or rather because of his fear that it would be renewed, soon after the time that Lucas founded his monastery at Armentum, and, passing by the Basilicata, perhaps because of its disturbed condition (Kasem's second attack was in progress), went northwards until he reached Monte Cassino<sup>8</sup>, where the Latin monks welcomed him and gave him the dependent monastery of Vallelucio<sup>9</sup>. But when the Abbot of Monte Cassino died circumstances were changed, and he moved<sup>10</sup> to the neighbourhood of Gaeta, where he founded the monastery of Serperi. Finally, because in the first instance of his friendship

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*27 c.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*27 d.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*29 e.

<sup>4</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*32 c note.

<sup>5</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 125 b.

<sup>6</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*27 d.

<sup>7</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*28 a.

<sup>8</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. \*31 c.

<sup>9</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 124 d.

<sup>10</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 145 f.

for the Anti-Pope<sup>1</sup>, himself a Greek, he went on to Rome to the convent of S. Anastasius<sup>2</sup>, and afterwards to Tusculum to the monastery of S. Agatha<sup>3</sup>, which had been hospitably given to the Greek fugitives and still contained a few Greek monks. While he was there a nobleman named Gregory<sup>4</sup> gave him some ground at Grotta Ferrata between Tusculum and Marino, and here, just before the death of Nilus, was founded the monastery of S. Mary's, now a national monument of the kingdom of Italy, and almost the only Greek monastery which still remains in that kingdom.

From this account of the general progress of the Basilian monasteries between the end of the ninth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, it is clear that the monks gradually moved further and further north, and that each move is due to a fresh outbreak of war between the Saracens and Greeks, or some similar disturbance. The monks are first found near Reggio, but the Saracens come, and they move to the north of the Aspromonte. The Saracens return, and they go to the Sila. They are threatened by Otto's invasion, and they take refuge in the highlands of the Basilicata, or still further north. That is the outline of the way in which the monasteries spread north; but in each case it was only the more energetic monks who moved; the others probably scattered for a time, and returned to their home after the danger was past. In this way each attack of their enemies drove the Greeks further north, but did not leave the more southern monasteries entirely deserted. On the other hand, those monks who remained in the south were probably inferior to those who went north, and this is at least a partial explanation of the fact that none of the monasteries in the south seem to have flourished, and that those which play an important part in the Norman period are not the old foundations, but new ones founded by men who do not appear to have been willing to stay in the more ancient convents.

In concluding this survey it may be well to bring together the chief points which have persuaded me that the men whose lives I have used were the real founders of Greek Monasticism

<sup>1</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 149 A.

<sup>2</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 157 C.

<sup>3</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 149 D.

<sup>4</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 160 A.



in South Italy, and that they are not, as some Italian writers maintain, merely a part of a great system, which has left no other traces behind. No doubt there were a few other founders of monasteries, whose names and memory have perished, but these were so far the chief and important part of the movement that its history is adequately given in their lives.

The earliest evidence, that of Elias Junior, gives no support to the theory that the Greek Monasticism of South Italy dates from a period anterior to the end of the ninth century. There is no mention of his going to already existing monasteries. But it is only fair to admit that Elias Junior was so fond of solitude that he probably would have avoided monasteries even if they had abounded. His evidence, therefore, should not be pressed. More important is the testimony given in the life of Elias Spelaeotes. He was a native of Reggio, and at an early age wished to become a monk. But in order to accomplish his purpose he went to Sicily<sup>1</sup>. There is no note of surprise in his biography that he did this. It is apparently regarded as the obvious course. Does not this imply that there were no monasteries in the neighbourhood of Reggio? Again, when he returned to Calabria he did not go to a monastery, but settled at Armo<sup>2</sup> with Arsenius, who previously had lived alone. Later on in his life he did go to a monastery, but it is to Salinae<sup>3</sup>, which Elias Junior had founded, and which was then under the rule of Daniel.

The same thing is true of the later lives, they refer to the monasteries of the Aspromonte, the origin of which we know, but not to others.

Nilus, for instance, went to the monasteries of Mount Mercury. We know of three monasteries there, S. John, S. Zacharias, and S. Fantinus. The founders of these monasteries were still living when Nilus arrived, and one of them, Fantinus, was his closest friend.

In order to avoid the opposition of the law<sup>4</sup>, Nilus went to a monastery which we cannot identify certainly, but which Agresta<sup>5</sup> states to have been Aulinae, Elias Junior's foundation.

That there were no monasteries in the neighbourhood of Rossano

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 850 f.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 862 E.

<sup>3</sup> *Vita di San Basilio*, p. 365.

<sup>4</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 854 f.

<sup>5</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 24 B.

is distinctly stated by Nilus's biographer. In his youth, he says<sup>1</sup>, Nilus found no one to control his passionate nature; he knew no bishop, priest, abbot or monk, so rarely was the monastic dress seen in Rossano.

Lucas, again, and Vitalis consistently established monasteries; they never find them already established. Lucas, it is true, revived an old monastery, S. Julian's<sup>2</sup>, but it was deserted, and from the name was probably one which had been left by the Latins when they fled from the country.

The same thing is true of the life of Vitalis, though his evidence is less important as, like Elias Junior, he was for the most part a hermit.

Therefore I believe that, at least until more evidence has been produced, we ought tentatively to regard it as probable that the saints whose lives have come down to us were really the founders of Greek monasticism in South Italy, and that before their time there were no Greek monasteries in the district.

There probably were hermits; but the rise of monasteries does not begin before the end of the ninth century; and the leaders of the monks were Elias Junior, Elias Spelaeotes, Nilus of Rossano, Lucas of Demena, and Vitalis.

#### *The Development of Organization.*

The earliest Greek monks in South Italy seem to have been hermits. The founding of monasteries was, as it were, an accidental result which was thrust on them by the force of circumstances.

Elias Junior was a hermit for the greater part of his life, attended only by his faithful friend Daniel. There is, it is true, an extraordinary story<sup>3</sup> that before he went to Salinae he converted twelve Saracens, who were baptized and followed him; but they play no part in the subsequent story, and are almost certainly one of those mythical additions which grow up so quickly round the life of a saint. The chief reason why he left Salinae was no doubt the fear of the Saracens, but he was also influenced by the desire to lead a more secluded life than he had found possible at Salinae, 'ubi autem,' says the historian of his

<sup>1</sup> P. G. 120, p. 20 A.

<sup>2</sup> A. SS. Oct. vi p. 338 c.

<sup>3</sup> A. SS. Aug. iii p. 494 A.

Life, 'a multis interpellari se videt, inanem populi auram fugiens, in Mesobiani (?) montes se abstrudit, nimirum pacatiorem vitam exacturus<sup>1</sup>.' This shows both that he himself did not wish to encourage the growth of a large monastery, and that his cell at Salinae was beginning to be famous, and becoming a centre for those who wished to lead a 'religious' life. Apparently some of those who had been attracted to Salinae by the fame of Elias remained there after his removal, for we find that when Daniel was bringing the corpse of his master from Thessalonica to Aulinae for burial he turned aside to go to Salinae<sup>2</sup>, and bade the brethren there go to Tauriana and await his arrival, Tauriana being in the days before the building of Seminara the most convenient town near Aulinae.

Exactly the same thing happened at Aulinae: Elias had gone there in order to lead a secluded life, but he was soon joined by others, and if the story in his Life be correct, the community thus established became so famous that it was endowed by the Emperor Leo the Wise. 'Sed Leo,' says the Life of the saint, 'imperator religiosissimus, qua fuit vel post mortem in Patrem sanctum observantia, census et praedia eius monasterio liberalissime attribuit, ut omnium quae in Italia sunt monasterium clarissimum ac celeberrimum existeret<sup>3</sup>.'

The same development may be traced in the *Life of Elias Spelacotes*. This is perhaps the most valuable document that we possess for this stage of the monastic history, as it is fuller than the *Life of Elias Junior*, and earlier than that of Nilus or Lucas, in whose time the coenobite system was more widely spread. From it we may gather that the monks did not pass at once from hermit life to the true coenobite life. There is an intermediate stage, which may be called the period of the Lauras. That is to say, the true convent is led up to by a collection of hermits who live close together without altogether living in common. They join for purposes of prayer and religious exercises, but each man is his own master. This evolution from hermits' cells to monasteries is found throughout the East. To some extent all the stages are still preserved on Mount Athos, that curious survival from the Middle Ages, for there are there

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 498 b.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 507 c.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 507 a (should be b).



to this day hermits' cells, often placed in the most inaccessible corners of rocks that can only be reached by rope ladders; idiorhythmic monasteries, in which the monks live in their own rooms and only have their religious services in common<sup>1</sup>; and the true coenobite monasteries in which the monks feed in common and are ruled by an *ἡγούμενος* instead of by *ἐπίτροποι*. It is interesting to notice that the great monastery of Athanasius<sup>2</sup> still retains traces of the very loose bond which there was at one time between its members, both in its architecture, which in places clearly represents a collection of cells arranged in a little street, and in its usual name—the Laura. This survival of different stages of history on Mount Athos helps to explain the analogous history of the South Italian convents. It is clear that many of the brothers felt unhappy in anything like a coenobite life. So we find that when the fame of Elias Spelaeotes attracted many brethren to Melicuccà, Cosmas, who had been there before him, went away<sup>3</sup> to some more secluded region. No doubt his case was one among many, for the Aspromonte probably had many hermits at this time. The remarkable thing about Elias and the other saints, whose lives are recorded, was not that they were hermits, but that, being hermits, they attracted others to join them, and so became the founders first of Lauras and then of convents.

These three stages, Hermitage, Laura, Convent, are clearly marked in the life of Elias Spelaeotes. He begins his career as a hermit<sup>4</sup>, accompanied only by Arsenius, and chooses a desolate spot near Reggio for his home. After staying a short time in the monastery of Salinae<sup>5</sup>, he goes away to Melicuccà<sup>6</sup>; and leads a hermit's life there in a cave with Arsenius.

There is no description of his life here, but it may be assumed to have been the same as that which he led in his hermitage at

<sup>1</sup> It is, however, probably true that some of the monasteries which are now idiorhythmic were once coenobite, and have returned to the earlier form of organization.

<sup>2</sup> Athanasius the Athonite, whose *ὄνομα κοσμικόν* was Abraham, lived at the close of the tenth century, v. *A. SS.* Jul. ii p. 246 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.*, Sept. iii, p. 863 c.

<sup>4</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. pp. 853 F (on Mindino in this passage, see Minasi, *Lo Speleotà*, p. 166) and 854 F.

<sup>5</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 862 E.

<sup>6</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 863 c.

Patras, except, perhaps, that some of the severity described may have been due to the temptations which he had just endured at the hands<sup>1</sup> of a φλύαρον, μάλλον καὶ βέβηλον καὶ δύστροπον γύναιον. Here we are told he lived, ὑποπιέζων ἐπὶ πλείον ἐαυτὸν πείρη καὶ δίψει καὶ παννύχῳ ἀγρυπνίᾳ, ὥστε δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς καλλιγράφειν καὶ προσεύχεσθαι καὶ μετὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν τῶν ἐωθινῶν ὕμνων ἐν τῷ ἐδάφει ἐαυτὸν ἀνακλίνων τῷ ὕπνῳ ἐγκελεύεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς λέγων· Δεῦρο κάκε δοῦλε<sup>2</sup>, but his fame attracted many others, and although he was willing to leave Melicuccà and seek seclusion elsewhere with Cosmas, he was obviously destined to be a leader of men, and Cosmas refused to take him from his work. He and his own disciple, Vitalis, would go, but the vocation of Elias was clear<sup>3</sup>.

In this way Melicuccà passed from a hermitage to a Laura. It soon became a true κοινόβιον, as Cosmas foresaw. In cap. vi<sup>4</sup> we find that the monks no longer lived in small caves near one another, but all together in one large cave. Soon even this became too small for them, and they migrated to one which was still larger. At first it was unfit for habitation, even by monks, as it was quite dark, but a hole was knocked through in the side, and a monk named Cosmas built a salt-pit, and a mill for grinding corn. At the same time a church was built, and called τῶν κορυφαίων καὶ θείων ἀποστόλων<sup>5</sup>.

This was the beginning of a true monastery at Melicuccà, and probably the foundations of other monasteries were of the same kind.

For instance, when Nilus first went to S. Adrian's he seems

<sup>1</sup> A. SS. tom. cit. p. 857 v.

<sup>2</sup> A. SS. tom. cit. p. 858 v.

<sup>3</sup> The writer of the Life naturally throws this incident into a semi-miraculous form, but his meaning is obvious, ὁ μέντοι, he says, θεῖος Κοσμάς ὀχληθεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ σφόδρα μεταμεληθεὶς, φιλήσυχος ὢν, ἐβουλήθη τοῦ ἀπάραι τῶν ἐκείσε σὺν τῷ μαθητῇ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ αὐθις καταμόνας οἰκῆσαι. Ὅσοι ἐπιγνοῦς ὁ πανάγιστος πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἥλιος, προσέπεσε τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ, λέγων· Μὴ διαφευχθῶμεν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, πάτερ ὅσιε, ἀλλ' ὡς συνίθεμεν ἀλλήλους, διαμείνωμεν. Ἔσομαι γάρ σοι πειθήνιος ἐν πάσιν, καὶ δουλεύσω σοι ὡς πατέρι καθὼς τῷ μεγάλῳ Ἀρσενίῳ. Εἶζας οὖν ἐν τῇ κλήσει τοῦ μεγάλου Ἥλιου ὁ μοναχός, καὶ μικρὸν ἐφησυχάσας, θεωρεῖ παρὰ τοὺς ὕμους πᾶσαν τὴν περιγραφήν τοῦ μοναστηρίου σηλαίαις μικροῖς πλήθει τε καὶ μοναχῶν ἀινούντων καὶ ψαλλόντων τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τὸν ὄσιον Ἥλιον ὡσπερ περιφανῆ ἀστὴρα ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν· ταῦτα θεασάμενος καὶ καλῶς διακρίνας, ἔωθεν ἀναστάς, λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ αὐτοῦ· Ἀνάστα, ἀδελφέ· ἐγὼ μὲν ἐντεῦθεν· εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς κοινόβιον γενέσθαι τὸν τύπον τοῦτον, καὶ πολλοὺς σωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πατέρος ἡμῶν Ἥλιου, ὡς γὰρ πρότερον καὶ πρόφαιρον. Ἄσπασάμενός τε αὐτὸς ἀπῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν. Acta SS. tom. cit. pp. 863 f.

<sup>4</sup> A. SS. tom. cit. p. 863 f.

<sup>5</sup> A. SS. tom. cit. p. 865 v.

to have been alone, or accompanied only by Stephen, but he was soon joined by George of Rossano (the text might mean that George was with him on Mount Mercury, but I do not think that it does), and after a short time we have the following incident: *Αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνεξάλειπτα ἔχων ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τὰ τοῦ ἀγίου εὐαγγελίου ἐντάλματα, καὶ τὸ 'ὕμεις δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε βαββί, μηδὲ κληθῆτε καθηγηταί,' οὐδέποτε κατεδέξατο ἀκοῦσαι οἷον δῆποτε ὄνομα δόξης ὑπόληψιν ἔχον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸ φρόνημα πάντων κατώτερον ἔχων, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἀδελφῶν ἑαυτὸν ἐλογίζετο. Διὸ καὶ τῶν τέκνων τῆς ἐρήμου πληθυνομένων, καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πνευματικῶς γεννοαμένων καὶ εὐαγγελικῶς ποιμαινομένων, ἐτέρῳ τὸ τῆς ἡγουμενίας ὄνομα πάσαις τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνεχειρίζεν, ὡς εἰς ὑπῆρξε καὶ πρῶτος ὁ παρμακάριστος καὶ τρισόσιος Πρόκλος, ἀνὴρ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου παιδείσεως σφόδρα πεπειραμένος, βιβλίῳ τε τῶν ἐξωθεν καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων, ἐνδιαθέτων τε καὶ τῶν ὑστερον ἐκτεθέντων, κιβώτιον τὴν οἰκίαν καρδίας ἀποτελέσας<sup>1</sup>.*

This seems to show that Nilus himself, at least at this stage of his life, did not seek actively to found monasteries, but that his fame attracted men to him, and the force of circumstances compelled the establishment of a convent.

The same tendency may be seen, though not so clearly, in the other lives of this period, viz. those of Lucas and Vitalis; but it is perhaps unnecessary to pursue the point further. Enough has been said to show that the monasteries in South Italy were no exception to the rule which obtains in other early Basilian foundations. They were due to the fame of a hermit attracting men to come and live near his cave, and so forming first a Laura, and afterwards a convent.

A point which it would be interesting to settle is whether these early monasteries had any solid and valuable buildings. I do not think that there is any definite evidence to be obtained from the lives of the saints, but they leave the impression that architecture was not given much care by the monks. Possibly an examination of the ruins which remain in Calabria might throw some light on the subject, but it is more probable that whatever does remain is much later than the original foundations.

K. LAKE.

<sup>1</sup> P. G. 120, p. 77 B.

(To be continued.)



## 'REASON AND REVELATION'

DR. ILLINGWORTH'S *Reason and Revelation* is a book which no thoughtful person can read without feelings of admiration for its author: admiration both for the wide learning which here, as in his other works, has enabled him to illustrate his subject by quotations from the Fathers, the Schoolmen, the philosophers of the eighteenth century, the psychologists of our own day; and also for the extreme felicity of some of his phrases. Dr. Illingworth describes prayer as 'a unique school of sincerity'.<sup>1</sup> Such a phrase is in itself an argument. It is an answer to that common theory of prayer which led M. Zola to speak of those who pray as lingering in a realm of 'sweet illusion.'

It is obvious, however, that a theological book must be judged mainly by the general drift of its conclusions. There is (for reasons which will become clear presently) a certain difficulty in stating Dr. Illingworth's position concisely; but the general purpose of his book may be gathered from the following statement, which is framed almost entirely in his own words.

'Christianity,' Dr. Illingworth maintains, 'has always claimed to be rational'.<sup>2</sup> But we have been taught by Kant that the human mind is not, as Locke and Hume had supposed, a blank tablet passively receptive of impressions from without<sup>3</sup>; and it came to be recognized with increasing clearness during the nineteenth century that the whole of our nature co-operates in the acquisition of knowledge<sup>4</sup>. Therefore Christianity is not to be judged by mere reason<sup>5</sup>. It is not from every man that Christianity can accept criticism; for the most important elements in its evidence are moral and spiritual facts, and these can only be read aright by men of moral and spiritual insight—insight born of discipline and effort<sup>6</sup>. Reason is limited by our personal prepossessions<sup>7</sup>. We cannot approach Christian evidences—for

<sup>1</sup> *Reason and Revelation: An Essay in Christian Apology*, by J. R. Illingworth (Svo, London, 1902).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 171.

<sup>3</sup> p. vii.

<sup>4</sup> p. 26.

<sup>5</sup> p. viii.

<sup>6</sup> p. 245.

<sup>7</sup> p. 246.

<sup>8</sup> p. ix.

example, the Gospel history—without presuppositions of one kind or another; we must approach the Gospel history either as Christians or as non-Christians<sup>1</sup>. And these presuppositions result from old philosophical theories, rather than from new facts<sup>2</sup>. Hence it is in the region of philosophy that all attacks on Christianity move and must be met<sup>3</sup>. Yet we must not reduce Christianity to a philosophy, as the Gnostics did<sup>4</sup>. The Fathers never regard Christianity as a mere philosophy, but always as an historic revelation. The heresies were attempts to rationalize this revelation, and the patristic answer to them consisted in the reassertion of the historic fact. And this was the meaning of dogma, epitomized history<sup>5</sup>. Thus we must maintain the well-known distinction between Reason and Revelation; for the Christian Revelation states truths which Reason could never have reached<sup>6</sup>, and even when revealed cannot comprehend<sup>7</sup>. If we are asked on what evidence the Fathers believed this revelation, we must answer that besides the evidence of Miracles and Prophecy they recognized the self-evidence of the Incarnation from its sublimity and power. And this argument from the intrinsic excellence of Christianity is an appeal to the natural reason of man<sup>8</sup>. A modern Christian, besides the presuppositions of natural religion which lie at the root of Christian belief, has also as evidence the Christian character and the Christian Church as facts of present experience<sup>9</sup>. Thus Christianity is an appeal, not to our reason only, but to our entire personality<sup>10</sup>; and faith is reasonable since it is only a particular application of the universal law of human life, namely Trust, based on the particular conviction that God is Love. And this conviction, though taught dogmatically, rests as much on evidence and argument as any other theory of the universe. Moreover, a deeper analysis will show that this trust in God is really the presupposition of all other trust; e. g. of trust in the uniformity of nature, and of trust in our fellow man<sup>11</sup>. The great difficulty to the belief that God is love arises from the existence of sin in the world; but we cannot conceive finite free-will without the possibility of sin, or any worth in human nature without free-will<sup>12</sup>. Nor must the Christian view of future punishment be said to complicate the

<sup>1</sup> p. xi.    <sup>2</sup> p. xi.    <sup>3</sup> p. 245.    <sup>4</sup> p. xi.    <sup>5</sup> p. xii.    <sup>6</sup> p. 130.    <sup>7</sup> p. 122.  
<sup>8</sup> p. xiii.    <sup>9</sup> pp. xiii-xv.    <sup>10</sup> p. xv.    <sup>11</sup> pp. xvi and xvii.    <sup>12</sup> p. xvii.



original difficulty, since there is no one exclusively Christian doctrine on this subject<sup>1</sup>; and we must bear in mind that the very darkest possibilities which the New Testament can suggest are part and parcel of the same revelation which assures us that God is Love<sup>2</sup>.

It is hardly likely to be denied that the most important of the positions which Dr. Illingworth here defends is that which concerns the familiar distinction between the sphere of Reason and the sphere of Revelation—the distinction to which he refers in the title of his book. We must examine, then, with special attention his views on this subject.

The Christian revelation consists, he teaches, of a certain small group of doctrines, those of the Incarnation and the Trinity<sup>3</sup>, the divine origin of the Church<sup>4</sup>, the personality of God, the freedom of the will, the destiny of matter to become the manifestation of spirit<sup>5</sup>. These are to be distinguished, on the one hand, from the beliefs we may hold about subjects such as future punishment, with regard to which no clear revelation<sup>6</sup> has been made; and, on the other hand, from those beliefs which are presupposed by revelation<sup>7</sup> but are not a part of it; for example, that belief in God which belongs to natural religion, or again, the moral doctrines of the Sermon on the Mount, 'much of which was not original nor beyond the discovery of man's natural reason<sup>8</sup>.' The dogmas of the Christian Revelation, on the contrary, state truths which 'reason could not have reached<sup>9</sup>,' with which, moreover, it is 'incompetent to deal<sup>10</sup>'; truths which, 'if they were to be known at all, could be known by revelation only<sup>11</sup>.' Revelation does not attempt to show the rational necessity of its doctrines<sup>12</sup>, and these doctrines must not be criticized with the same freedom as philosophy allows itself in other fields<sup>13</sup>. They are 'fixed points' on which the Christian can no longer philosophize as if he were dealing with open questions<sup>14</sup>; they must be accepted with implicit obedience<sup>15</sup>, and must be allowed to prescribe the outlines within which philosophy is to move<sup>16</sup>.

It is clear that Dr. Illingworth's aim is to withdraw certain doctrines of the Christian faith from the arena of free philosophical

<sup>1</sup> p. xviii.      <sup>2</sup> p. 233.      <sup>3</sup> p. 143.      <sup>4</sup> pp. 183, 184.      <sup>5</sup> p. 117.  
<sup>6</sup> p. 232.      <sup>7</sup> p. 209.      <sup>8</sup> p. 183.      <sup>9</sup> p. 130.      <sup>10</sup> p. 129.      <sup>11</sup> p. 129.  
<sup>12</sup> p. 185.      <sup>13</sup> See p. 185.      <sup>14</sup> p. 117.      <sup>15</sup> p. 129.      <sup>16</sup> p. 241.



discussion, to put them into a class apart from the rest of our rational knowledge. We must ask, then, how far he succeeds in this attempt; how far the opposition between Reason and Revelation can, in the form in which he states it, be maintained. We may see cause perhaps for asking, as a subsidiary question, whether Dr. Illingworth himself maintains his theory consistently, whether indeed his own words may not again and again be quoted against it.

Now it would be foolish to enter upon this discussion without recognizing that, so far as its general outlines are concerned, Dr. Illingworth's theory not only has in its favour a great weight of authority, but also commends itself strongly to the sentiment of religious people. There are many to whom the suggestion that the Doctrine of the Trinity, for example, is a product of philosophic thinking appears to be an attempt to take away honour from God in order to confer it upon the mind of man. Would not such a view, it will be asked, reduce this doctrine to the level of a mere human speculation? Above all, will it not deprive it of the right to be spoken of as a mystery? As these questions represent a very common way of thinking, it will be worth while, before coming to close quarters with Dr. Illingworth's argument, to make a preliminary observation.

An unwillingness to treat Christian doctrines as falling within the scope of philosophy is very commonly bound up with the belief that philosophical conclusions are necessarily vague and insecure. Yet this is a belief which Dr. Illingworth (though he has sometimes, perhaps, fallen in some small measure under its influence<sup>1</sup>) must, if it were presented to him in so many words, strongly repudiate, since he recognizes that belief in God is itself a philosophical doctrine, and arrived at by philosophical reasoning. 'Theism,' he says, 'and all that it involves lies in the region of philosophy<sup>2</sup>.' 'Our reason demands a self-existent Being, to make relative and contingent existence possible<sup>3</sup>.' The same general opinion is held, as a matter of course, by all who make the usual division between natural and revealed religion. If then we should find ourselves led to maintain that, just as reason reflecting upon facts of experience, especially of spiritual experience, has brought men to belief in God, so further reflection

<sup>1</sup> See *Divine Immanence*, pp. 153, 154.

<sup>2</sup> *Reason and Revelation*, p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> p. 198.

and further spiritual experience leads us to be dissatisfied with that conception of a 'unipersonal God' at which reflection first arrives, and has thus led to a belief in a plurality of Persons within the Godhead, we need at any rate have no fear that this view can be regarded as treating the Doctrine of the Trinity with disrespect. If without irreverence we may regard Theism as a product of philosophy, so without irreverence we may regard Trinitarianism as a product of philosophy likewise. We must recognize of course that reason would never have arrived at this doctrine without the help of religious experience. If the Fathers of Christian theology had been unspiritual men, and, equally, if they had been unacquainted with the story of the life of Christ, they would not have arrived at the theological views which they express. But this admission is in no way inconsistent with the frank acknowledgement that their doctrines are the work of reason. If Newton had not known by experience the motions of the heavenly bodies, he could not have formulated the Theory of Gravitation, yet no one denies that that theory is the work of the human mind from beginning to end. That, while regarding the Christian Dogmas as products of thought, we may fully take into account all that is involved in the desire of religious men to speak of them as mysteries, will be seen presently. The feeling, moreover, that to bring these doctrines into the region of philosophy is to take away honour from God, must surely disappear after a moment's reflection. We can make no such delimitation of frontier as this feeling implies between the regions of divine and human operation, since human reason is itself the gift of God. It is possible, therefore, to call in question Dr. Illingworth's antithesis between Reason and Revelation without in any way depreciating the doctrines of the Christian faith.

How then does Dr. Illingworth develop his position? No one who has attempted to follow his argument can have failed to be struck with the somewhat singular use which he makes of the word 'fact.' The doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, he tells us, are statements of fact<sup>1</sup>; and this not in the popular sense in which a fact merely means anything that is true, but in the special sense in which we distinguish the 'simple facts of the

<sup>1</sup> p. 143.

case' from the 'views' we may take of them, the 'theories' which we may form to explain them<sup>1</sup>. A part of what Dr. Illingworth means is that the Fathers of the Church refused to give rationalistic explanations of the Christian mysteries—a subject to which we must return presently. Yet, even so, it is difficult to see how the expression 'the fact of the Trinity'<sup>2</sup> is consistent with what we find in other passages of the book. Dr. Illingworth admits that Theism belongs to philosophy<sup>3</sup>, and that Trinitarianism is an integral part of Theism—the 'natural climax to which Theism logically leads'<sup>4</sup>. Surely, then, on his own principles, the Doctrine of the Trinity must be part of our 'explanation of that ultimate meaning of the world which it is the constant object of philosophy to seek'<sup>5</sup>. Thus it seems strange that he should sometimes speak<sup>6</sup> as if this doctrine were no part of our explanation of the world at all, but simply a statement of one of the facts to be explained.

But the Trinity, he teaches, is not merely a 'fact' but an 'historic fact.' Dogma is 'epitomized or condensed history'; and it states facts 'whose character as facts rests on the authoritative statements of Jesus Christ'<sup>7</sup>. Thus Dr. Illingworth adopts the familiar comparison which likens religious faith to our acceptance of a plain historical fact—such as the fact of some one's birth or death—on the testimony of a credible witness. Commonly, however, as this comparison is made, is it not to a great extent misleading? There is at least one difference, not always noticed, between the two cases. I may, of course, accept on the evidence of a friend a fact whose occurrence I cannot prove, whose surroundings and manner of happening I am quite ignorant of. There may also be some element of 'mystery' in the case, some difficulty in reconciling this fact with other facts. But I am, at any rate, perfectly clear as to the *meaning* of my friend's assertion. With the dogmas of religion it is just the opposite. The difficulty lies not in our inability to prove them, not in anything which surrounds them or follows from them, but within the four walls of the doctrines themselves. If I say that I believe in a Triune God, the difficulty is to know what it is that I mean by my own statement. Dr. Moberly, in his extremely valuable book

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 72, 142.<sup>2</sup> p. 143.<sup>3</sup> p. 166.<sup>4</sup> p. 238.<sup>5</sup> p. 241.<sup>6</sup> See p. 128.<sup>7</sup> p. 132.<sup>8</sup> p. 129.



*Atonement and Personality*<sup>1</sup>, has pointed out that much popular Christian thought 'meaning to be orthodox is in fact Tri-theistic.' Now Tritheism in its simplest form makes a perfectly simple and intelligible statement. If a man tells me that he believes in Three Holy and Powerful Divine Beings, working with perfect harmony for their own collective glory and for the good of man, I have not the slightest difficulty in knowing what he means. But this doctrine bears hardly any resemblance at all to the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity, as we shall see at once if we ask whether these supposed Divine Beings are Divine in a strict sense—that is, not merely powerful but almighty. This question leads straight to the doctrine of 'three Almighty's,' condemned in the Athanasian Creed; a doctrine which will not bear a moment's examination, since each of these separate Divine Beings must, in order to be Almighty, have absolute control over the wills of the Others, leaving them not only not Almighty, but not even free. When however we try to correct, in ourselves or in others, this Tri-theistic way of thinking, it is then that we find where the real difficulty of the matter lies. What, we ask, is the true view which we wish to put in the place of this false view? In trying to reach it we not uncommonly find that we are merely alternating between Tritheism on the one hand and Unitarianism on the other.

There are some people, as we know, who tell us simply to 'accept' the doctrine without further inquiry. But we cannot even 'accept' a statement without knowing what it means. If we do, we are merely accepting words. And to accept words, without giving them any meaning in particular, is obviously a very different thing from orthodox belief. Yet no sooner do we try to arrive at any definite meaning than we find ourselves stumbling helplessly from one heresy to another, till we are almost tempted to give up the effort in despair and to sink back upon the unbeliever's conclusion that Christian Dogma has no meaning at all.

Against this purely unbelieving view it can, of course, always be pointed out that the Christian Fathers, who were quite as sincere thinkers as other people, defended their dogma with zeal, and that they would not have defended it if it had not meant

<sup>1</sup> p. 84.

something to their minds. This is an argument which, so far as it goes, any honest man acquainted with history will admit. But it is plainly insufficient. We need to convince the inquirer not merely that theology meant something to Athanasius long ago, but that it means something to us to-day.

Now, at this point at least, Dr. Illingworth affords us most valuable help. He tells us what 'the essence of the Christian Revelation' is; what 'we mean by it'<sup>1</sup>. 'Briefly, its essence is'—to quote that part of his statement which concerns more immediately the Doctrine of the Trinity—'that God is Love; and that this is possible, because there is a Trinity of Persons within the Godhead, between whom the reciprocity of love can exist, a divine society'<sup>2</sup>.

The more this statement is reflected upon, the more valuable will it be seen to be. Perhaps no better illustration of its meaning can be given than by a reference to Shelley's satirical paraphrase of the opening chapter of the Bible<sup>3</sup>:

'From an eternity of idleness  
I, God, awoke; in seven days' toil made earth  
From nothing.'

These words certainly call up a very unpleasant picture; and every one must feel that the Trinitarian has a position of advantage in being able to say: 'According to my view, the existence of God can never be described as an eternity of idleness, but must rather be thought of as that which Shelley would most have praised, an eternity of love.' Shelley's words therefore enable us in some measure to understand why the Doctrine of the Trinity was so zealously defended by the early Church. The religious instinct had led men to desire to believe in a God Whom they could thank for all things, to Whom they could ascribe all perfections. The arguments of natural religion seemed to justify the religious instinct in this desire. But Monotheism had, after all, made no very complete conquest of the human mind. Is not this partially explained if we reflect that behind the ordinary Monotheism there lies for the thinking man—even if he be only dimly conscious of it—the nightmare conception which Shelley's lines put into words? When Christianity, which was everywhere the champion of Monotheism against heathenism, spoke never-

<sup>1</sup> *Reason and Revelation*, p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> p. 183.

<sup>3</sup> *Queen Mab*, vii.



theless of the Father as loving the Son, and the Son the Father—so that loyalty and submission to the Divine Will, a state of mind than which nothing is more divine, can be ascribed to God Himself—is it surprising if men felt that this was the proper outcome of that ascription of all perfections to God which had been made by natural religion, and therefore vehemently rejected those heresies which, though intellectually clearer than orthodoxy, yet led men back to that loveless<sup>1</sup> view of God which Christianity had replaced by a brighter one?

But at this transition from Greek or Jewish Monotheism to the Doctrine of the Trinity, what exactly is it that has happened? Have we simply made a relapse into Tritheism, as Dr. Illingworth's phrase 'a divine society' might seem to suggest? The sentiment of Christendom denies that we have made any such relapse. But can we justify this sentiment, and show clearly wherein the difference between Trinitarianism and Tritheism consists?

The difference between the two may be shown readily enough by any one who—venturing upon a philosophical illustration—will compare the way in which Christian thought 'outgrows' Jewish Monotheism with the way in which, even in dealing with everyday human experience, the mind 'outgrows' the familiar conception of Space.

Space, we say, extends infinitely in all directions, so that nothing can possibly be outside it. But we cannot say that our thoughts and wishes are within it. They do not take up room, or move about inside our body. When Locke says that his soul travels in the coach from Oxford to London, we feel at once that there is something wrong. Athanasius remarks that we ought not to ask 'where' God is. It is the same with the soul. God and the soul are present in the world in somewhat the same sense in which the 'influence of Titian' may be present on the canvas of a modern artist. This influence would not take up the room which otherwise might have been occupied by pieces of paint. That is, it is not present spatially. If, then, my thoughts are neither within space nor outside it, then from a purely spatial point of view they must be regarded as non-existent. In other

<sup>1</sup> In this connexion the curious piece of polemic in Athanasius' *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos* (ed. Bened. tom. i p. 366) may not be without significance.



words, the spatial way of thinking, which is absolutely necessary for certain purposes of Science and daily life, breaks down when we come to admit the reality of human thoughts and wishes. It cannot, without contradicting itself, admit that certain things are real, of whose reality there is nevertheless no doubt.

Similarly—to take a less prosaic example—the conception of Cause breaks down when we apply it to God. One of our primary religious instincts urges us to give God thanks, and this implies that He is the Cause of what happens—that God's Will is the Cause, and the World the Effect. But if we are thus to separate God's Will and the World, so that God's Will is one thing and the World another, then we require some link—some third term—to join the two, just as our will is connected with its fulfilment by certain Laws of Nature. Causation implies the connexion of two things in accordance with a law. Religion, however, refuses to divide its gratitude between God on the one hand, and some Law which is distinct from God on the other: and therefore Religion comes in the end to treat God's Will and its fulfilment as inseparable, as no longer two, but one. Thus the conception of God as Cause has at length broken down under the stress of the very same feeling which originally evoked it: for when we no longer have two distinct terms, Cause and Effect, we no longer have what we mean by Causation.

And just as these conceptions, Space and Causation, break down as thought advances, so the common conception of a Person breaks down when we apply it to God. A person in the ordinary sense of the word, if he is to love, needs an object of love outside himself. 'Dependence is as fundamental a characteristic of personality as self-identity<sup>1</sup>.' God, however, is no longer what we mean by God—is no longer the perfect Being which we define Him to be—if He is dependent on something outside Himself: and therefore it is not ultimately satisfactory to think of God as a Person in the sense in which that word is commonly understood<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Reason and Revelation*, p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> It is a fashion with some theologians to say, not that the conceptions of Cause or Personality 'break down' when applied to God, but rather that it is only when applied to Him that these conceptions 'find their full meaning.' But is this way of speaking anything more than an attempt to introduce a new use of words! If we choose to use the word Causation where there are no two terms to be distinguished as Cause and Effect, we are no doubt at liberty to do so; but we certainly

The difference, then, between Tritheism and Trinitarianism is that Tritheism—in common with Unitarianism and ordinary popular Atheism—employs the common conception of a Person, while Trinitarianism is, in one aspect, simply a declaration of the inadequacy of this common conception to our theological needs. Just as, according to Athanasius, we must not speak of God as in Space at all—and therefore must not think of Him as either in motion or at rest—so we must not speak of God as, in the common sense of those words, either personal or impersonal. To the man who cannot emancipate himself from spatial conceptions—who asks therefore whether God is somewhere, or everywhere, or nowhere—we must undoubtedly answer that He is everywhere. For the purposes of the religious imagination the thought of the omnipresence of God is of permanent value<sup>1</sup>. Similarly to the man who asks—as for certain purposes we must all continue to ask—whether God is personal or impersonal, the answer must be that He is personal. But nevertheless, according to the Trinitarian, personality—in its common as distinct from its theological sense—is an inadequate conception, just as extension through Space is an inadequate conception, for the full truth about God. In other words, Tritheism deals in conceptions which are shallow and clear, Trinitarianism in conceptions which are mysterious and profound. And thus Dr. Illingworth's account of the 'meaning' and 'essence' of the Christian Dogma leads us to a view entirely congenial with the general religious sentiment—a view which represents it as teaching, on the positive side, that God is Love in the fullest and most human sense of that word; that is, that the Ultimate Reality is good, according to that final standard of goodness with which we believe ourselves to have in Christian morality at least a partial acquaintance; and, on the negative side, that the Trinity is a mystery; that is, that certain common conceptions which we use for the purposes of Science and daily life are inadequate when applied to God. Is it not run the risk of being misunderstood. Dr. Moberly (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 162) sees 'no reason for assuming that what is implicit in human personality must exhaust the meaning of personality in God.' But if, as he suggests, we are to use the word 'personality' to cover something which even a 'perfect analysis' of its usual meaning would not show to be involved in it, what are we doing but arbitrarily using the word in a new sense? How in this case can the old meaning throw any light upon the new? What connexion is there between them?

<sup>1</sup> See 2 Chron. vi 18. See also *Library of the Fathers*, vol. viii p. 18 and note.



just because it is the expression of the two truths that God is Love, and that God is mysterious, that the ordinary religious man most loves and values the doctrine of the Trinity?

It may of course be objected that, even as an abstract statement, Dr. Illingworth's account of this doctrine is insufficient, that many religious experiences and conceptions have converged to produce the Christian Dogma as we have it, and that in particular the inward experience of God's working in the human soul, and the resulting conception of God as Spirit, needed even in a bare outline a somewhat fuller mention than it receives in Dr. Illingworth's summary<sup>1</sup>, in which the Doctrine of the Spirit—as distinct from that of the plurality of the Divine Persons—appears as subordinate to the Doctrine of the Visible Church. This criticism, however, need not be discussed here. It is a criticism which implies that Dr. Illingworth's treatment of the subject, even if incomplete, proceeds on the right lines; and it would be ungracious to appear to grudge to Dr. Illingworth the full measure of praise which is due to a writer who has had the courage to tell us what the Christian Revelation means, in contrast with the many theologians who have seemed to think that the less significance and intelligibility it is supposed to possess the more venerable it will become.

Taking Dr. Illingworth's statement, however, just as it stands, can we regard it as consistent with his own theory of Revelation? His theory of Revelation may be expressed in the following propositions: (1) that Christian Dogma is history, not philosophy<sup>2</sup>; (2) that it rests on authority, not on reason<sup>3</sup>; (3) that we must not philosophize about it with the same freedom which philosophy claims in dealing with other subjects<sup>4</sup>. Surely these propositions are not really consistent with the view that the Doctrine of the Trinity *means* that God is Love and that perfect Love implies reciprocity<sup>5</sup>.

For, in the first place, the Doctrine of the Trinity, as thus explained, is at once a criticism and an expansion of the common conception of God. How can such a criticism of a fundamental conception of the mind belong to the domain of history? If Theism 'lies in the region of philosophy' as Dr. Illingworth

<sup>1</sup> p. 183.<sup>2</sup> p. 132.<sup>3</sup> p. 129.<sup>4</sup> p. 117.<sup>5</sup> See p. 183.



asserts<sup>1</sup>, must we not on this view say the same thing about the Doctrine of the Trinity? Will Dr. Illingworth then fall back upon some such statement as the following—'That God is Love, and that this is not possible unless the reciprocity of Love can exist within the Godhead, is not, strictly speaking, what the Christian Revelation *means*: it is rather what *follows* from it. Behind this obviously philosophical reflection concerning reciprocal relations—and beyond all such "subtilities of conception"<sup>2</sup>—there lies the simple historical fact of the existence of the Three Persons?' Have we not, however, already seen that the Doctrine of the Trinity states no simple historical fact at all? It is not couched in terms which history uses. If we say that Jesus Christ was miraculously born we are making a historical statement. If we say that this birth is to be regarded as an Incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity, we have passed beyond historical fact to theological interpretation. A 'Tri-personal consciousness'; 'Three Subsistences of One Substance'; 'Three Existences of One Essence'; 'Three Subsistences of One Subsistence'—these surely are not the categories of history<sup>3</sup>. Dr. Illingworth will hardly say that the Incarnation is an occurrence in the life of Three historical Persons. If the Doctrine of the Trinity uses the word Person in the sense in which that word is used by history, it is not distinguishable from Tritheism. Unless it draws our minds above the region of historical conceptions altogether—unless we see it in its philosophical context—we can give it no meaning except a heretical one<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> p. 166. <sup>2</sup> See p. 142. <sup>3</sup> Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, pp. 159, 175.

<sup>4</sup> Theologians are often disposed to make in this connexion two contradictory demands. They insist on the one hand that, not only provisionally, but finally and without qualification, God shall be regarded as a Person in the usual sense of that word; and, on the other hand, that God's nature shall be regarded as utterly inscrutable. How can God's Nature be utterly inscrutable if we have a conception under which it is not merely provisionally useful, but finally satisfactory, to bring it?

To say that certain common conceptions are inadequate to express the Nature of God is not Agnosticism—since we must have some positive knowledge of God before we can recognize this inadequacy—and is far more in accordance with the usual religious sentiment about mystery than is Dr. Illingworth's remark that 'to comprehend God would be synonymous with possessing universal knowledge' (p. 185). Mystery means something different from mere ignorance of facts. No one would think of saying that a man's life was a mystery merely because we did not know all that he had done.

Secondly, when Dr. Illingworth interprets the Doctrine of the Trinity as meaning that the Godhead is such as to admit within it the reciprocity of love, is he not, in thus telling us what the doctrine means, at the same time giving us a reason for holding it? If the 'conviction that God is Love rests as much on evidence and argument as any other theory of the universe<sup>1</sup>,' and if, moreover, Christian doctrine is 'the natural climax to which Theism logically leads<sup>2</sup>,' then our faith rests not upon authority but upon Reason. Let us freely admit that if the Doctrine of the Trinity had not been suggested to us by our teachers we should not have been able to construct it. Yet if, when once it is presented to us, we can see that it logically follows from belief in God, then it no more rests upon authority than the axioms of Euclid rest upon the authority of those who first taught them. Thus even if our Saviour—besides placing together in the Baptismal Formula three words of deep religious significance in a singularly impressive conjunction, a conjunction whose suggestiveness theology may still be very far from having exhausted—had explicitly declared the Doctrine of the Trinity as it is stated in the Creeds of the Church, it would still not have been true that this doctrine rested on His authority. His theological teaching would have been 'an appeal to the natural reason of man<sup>3</sup>' just as His moral teaching is.

'But,' Dr. Illingworth will say, 'the comparison with Euclid is altogether misleading. Euclid deals with an abstract subject-matter, whereas in deciding upon the truth of Christian doctrine we are dealing with a subject-matter which is complex and concrete<sup>4</sup>.' Dr. Illingworth's treatment of the distinction between abstract and concrete thinking is worthy of careful attention, but it does not support his theory of revelation. A judgement which concerns literature—a decision, for example, as to how much of *Henry VIII* is the work of Shakespeare—is a conspicuous example of 'concrete thinking.' In such a case it is necessary to take into account, so far as possible, the whole context of the problem, and impossible to exclude the influence of those presuppositions which depend on the greater or less acuteness of our literary taste. But no one says that literary judgements rest on revelation. Similarly, when we observe that good men and bad men judge differently of Christian evidences, ought we not to be

<sup>1</sup> pp. xvi, xvii.<sup>2</sup> p. 238.<sup>3</sup> See p. xiii.<sup>4</sup> See p. 70.



concerned to show that the presuppositions of the former are rational? We weaken our case if we suggest that the good men have some non-rational sources of conviction which 'limit' reason from without<sup>1</sup>.

The question, then, which we must ask is whether the Trinitarian Dogma is really the logical climax of Theism or not. If it is, then, like Theism itself, it rests upon reason. If it is not—if we can consistently hold in the fullest sense that God is Love without believing in a plurality of Persons within the Godhead—then the whole of Dr. Illingworth's justification of Trinitarian belief breaks down. So far as Dr. Illingworth teaches that the argument which leads from belief in God to belief in the Trinity is not conclusive, and therefore needs to be eked out by a reference to revelation, he is, in fact, playing into the hands of the Unitarians, who maintain that no one would ever accept the doctrine of the Trinity on its own merits, if he were not biassed in its favour by attachment to traditional teaching. Dr. Illingworth is surely a better defender of Christian belief when he says<sup>2</sup> that 'the essence of the Christian position was that the life and teaching of Jesus Christ had revealed to the intellect as well as to the heart what neither the heart nor the intellect could have discovered by themselves, but which, when once revealed, they *could recognize as self-evidently true*,' than when he says—in exactly opposite sense—that 'the Christian religion claims to be a revelation of truths about God and man which we can see to be eminently reasonable, but *cannot adequately test*.'<sup>3</sup> Must there not be something wrong with the position which can betray a writer of Dr. Illingworth's great powers into such a contradiction as this?

But, thirdly, is not the very conception of Dogma as a statement 'with which reason is incompetent to deal'—which reason must not freely criticize—intrinsically unsound? 'Of course,' says Dr. Illingworth, 'a revelation must be understood to begin with<sup>4</sup>'; and towards a better understanding of the Christian Dogma he gives us much help, as we have seen. But to understand it we must think about it; and if we are to think, we must think honestly. We must allow thought to follow its own laws: we must surrender ourselves to the logical consequences which are involved in the meaning of the terms we use. Dr. Illingworth

<sup>1</sup> See p. ix.    <sup>2</sup> p. 125.    <sup>3</sup> p. 239 (the italics are added here).    <sup>4</sup> p. 184.



does not sufficiently distinguish between thinking about given facts and thinking with a prescribed conclusion. We can hardly expect the world to have much respect for our thought if we give out that before beginning to think we have already decided upon the conclusion at which we are to arrive<sup>1</sup>. If a statement is presented for our belief, we must surely ask how far it is consistent with itself, and how far it agrees or disagrees with what we otherwise know: but to do this is to subject the statement to free criticism.

Moreover, as Dr. Illingworth himself recognizes, the Christian dogmas are not absolutely final and satisfactory. They are 'the most accurate or least inaccurate modes' of stating the truth<sup>2</sup>. Indeed it is obvious that statements which are not perfectly clear cannot be regarded as absolutely final. 'The Three Persons,' says Feuerbach, 'are not only *Unum*—the gods of Olympus are that—but *Unus* . . . God is a Personal Being consisting of Three Persons'<sup>3</sup>. We cannot be contented to leave the subject thus. If we are really convinced that belief in God is a rational necessity, if we are in earnest in saying that Trinitarianism is a real advance upon the doctrine of a God regarded as 'uni-personal,' then we cannot be willing to let the matter remain in confusion. If it has been worth while to advance so far, it is worth while to press on still further. It cannot but be right to hope that the Spirit of God will lead us into all the truth, not merely to a part of it<sup>4</sup>.

Such a hope is not really contrary to the views of the Christian Fathers. It is true, as Dr. Illingworth says, that they rejected the endeavours of the heretics to 'rationalize Christian doctrine'<sup>5</sup>. But the heresies were not so much 'attempts at explanation' as attempts to eliminate everything difficult, everything for which an explanation was required. The fault of the heretics was not that they tried to know too much, but that they tried to think of God under the conceptions of vulgar rationalism, to explain the doctrine of the Trinity by means of the very conceptions against which that doctrine is essentially a protest. When Athanasius teaches that there are certain questions which are not to be asked, and says of those who ask them that 'it is all

<sup>1</sup> See p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> *Essence of Christianity*, ch. xxiv—Miss Evans's translation.

<sup>4</sup> St. John xvi 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Reason and Revelation*, p. 121.

one as if they sought *where* God is<sup>1</sup>, the moral of this comparison is, not that it is wrong to wish for knowledge, but rather that we must not think of God under inadequate categories. It is 'irreligious' to ask where God is, not because God wishes His position in Space to be kept a secret, but because it shows 'ignorance of God' to think of Him as occupying Space at all. The example set by the Fathers, if rightly understood, is not in favour of those who would withdraw theological statements from philosophical criticism. And may we not say, in general, that Dr. Illingworth is far more in consonance with the best theological traditions, as well as with the most vigorous parts of his own work, when he tells us that Christianity is essentially on the side of free thought<sup>2</sup> than when he teaches that there are certain doctrines with which reason is incompetent to deal? For is it seriously possible to treat the growth of Christian Dogma, even if we give the very simplest account of it, as anything else than a philosophical movement? 'The Christian Dogma arose,' it may be said, 'simply because Jesus Christ—Whom His followers recognized as their Lord and their God, the highest object of homage and reverence which they could conceive—was known to address prayers to His Father, and spoke of receiving from His Father the promise of the Holy Ghost.' Yet, if the early Christians had been really unspeculative, this faith need never have taken shape as a theology; they need not have asked, as they did ask, what the relation was between this Supreme Object of their homage and the God of Rationalism and Natural Religion. The conception of God as the Highest Object of Reverence, and the conception of God as the Creator and Governor of the World, are, after all, two conceptions, not one; and the refusal to identify the Creator of the World with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ was not, as we know, unheard of in early times. If the Fathers, taking up a position similar to that of the Ritschlian school of modern days, had argued that no theory of His relation to the Creator of the World could make Jesus seem any more Divine than they already recognized Him to be, they might have condemned all the attempts at theological definition—those of Athanasius as well as those of the Arians—as heretical alike. It cannot be said that the temptation to a low estimate of these

<sup>1</sup> *Against the Arians*, ii 36, quoted by Dr. Illingworth, p. 127.

<sup>2</sup> p. 22.

definitions had never been felt. Dr. Illingworth quotes St. Hilary<sup>1</sup> as complaining that 'whereas it is by faith alone that we should worship the Father, and reverence the Son, and be filled with the Spirit<sup>2</sup>, we are now obliged to strain our weak human language in the utterance of things beyond its scope—forced into this evil procedure of our foes.' Yet the Fathers became philosophers even in spite of themselves; for when once—however reluctantly—they had consented to use these definitions, they cannot have been willing that they should be regarded as phrases conveying no intelligible meaning to the mind. And it is a mere truism to say that in dealing with intelligible conceptions reason is dealing with what falls entirely within its own province.

There are many matters of great interest in Dr. Illingworth's book besides those which have been dealt with here—notably, his very able treatment of the thesis that the various lines of Christian evidence form, 'not a chain of reasoning which would be no stronger than its weakest link,' but a 'cumulative argument'; and his somewhat strange assertion that for Christian theology the Freedom of the Will cannot be an open question.

His handling of these subjects is, however, of far less importance than his general theory of Revelation. The school of writers to which Dr. Illingworth belongs has produced work of very high theological and religious value. Anything which impairs the usefulness of writings such as theirs is a matter of concern to the Church. But is there not good reason for thinking that if they could bring themselves to abandon that partial distrust of philosophy of which Dr. Illingworth's theory of Revelation is a symptom, they would immeasurably strengthen their position as interpreters of the Christian Dogma?

CHARLES J. SHEPPEARE.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> The basis of fellowship of the New York State Conference of Religion is described in the following terms:—

- (1) The Fatherhood of God.
- (2) The Ethical Teachings of Jesus and the Prophets.
- (3) Emphasis on Social Righteousness.
- (4) The Spirit of God in the Minds of Men.

Thus the members of the Conference would be at one with St. Hilary in the desire to 'worship the Father, to reverence the Son, and to be filled with the Spirit.' If we recognize that the theology of the Church Councils is more definite than that of the New York Conference, we ought to recognize also that, on St. Hilary's own showing, this result is due in some degree to the heretics.



## DOCUMENTS

TEXTS ATTRIBUTED TO PETER OF  
ALEXANDRIA.

THE texts printed or described below are found in the remains of two MSS, to be here designated respectively A and B. To the former of these belonged the fragment ascribed to Peter, which Dr. Carl Schmidt recently published<sup>1</sup>. The following table shows those which relate to Peter among the ascertained remnants of the original volume of A, arranged according to their pagination, where that is preserved, or failing that, as internal evidence suggests:—

- a. Paris, MS copte 132<sup>1</sup>, fol. 27, (1st of 4th quire, =) *about* p. 50.
- β. " " 131<sup>1</sup>, fol. 1, pp. 67, 68.
- γ. " " 129<sup>14</sup>, fol. 131, pp. ?
- δ. Brit. Mus., Or. 3581 A (14), pp. 85, 86.
- ε. Paris, MS copte 130<sup>5</sup>, ff. 123, 124, pp. 89-92.
- ς. " " 129<sup>14</sup>, fol. 109, pp. ?
- ζ. Zoega, *Catal.*, no. cxxxviii, pp. 135-142.
- η. Paris, MS copte 130<sup>5</sup>, fol. 102, pp. 19, 20.

Of these A<sub>a</sub> does not indeed contain positive proof of its ascription to Peter, but its contents make this, in the circumstances, most probable. The position assigned to A<sub>γ</sub> is quite hypothetical. A<sub>ς</sub> is placed next to A<sub>ζ</sub> merely as being, like it, biographical. A<sub>ν</sub>, being the leaves edited by Dr. Schmidt and A<sub>β</sub>, A<sub>γ</sub> others which he intends to edit<sup>2</sup>, will not be further dealt with here. A<sub>η</sub> owes its position to the connexion with the next fragment.

Other work by the scribe of this volume has been preserved: I have seen considerable portions of a History or Miracles of the Virgin (Zoega cxix, cclviii, cclxxxiii) and of Pseudo-Prochorus (Paris 129<sup>17</sup>, 72-74, 76-79, *ibid.* 129<sup>18</sup>, 109, 110, Zoega cxxxiv), fragments of Gregory

<sup>1</sup> In *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F. v 4 (1901). It would be difficult to maintain the genuineness of these texts after Delehayé's criticisms (*Anal. Bolland.* xx 101), though certain of the passages which I here publish may indicate interpolated, rather than wholly apocryphal compositions.

<sup>2</sup> *V. loc. cit.* 46 as to A<sub>β</sub> (letter to the apostate Apollonius). Dr. Schmidt has also copied A<sub>γ</sub> (referring to the imprisoned bishops).





нмаат · маренпех перпроотш еппотте аτω егнашшпе паш  
 мпростатис аτω пархш аτω пхок · апок же ω неспит марен-  
 спотзазе епарачхωρεг пат епсоотш хесебенлоисе ерон пшат нш  
 ραρταπετροο мпараломос · мπεотоειш ереїѣ пенхоеис переїѣ  
 мпнотте пшуре псаѣаωѣ ѣсїω пнегалпостонос шажхоос жеотш  
 ппетеренесканзаалон нш еѣол ρитоотот · мпертренесканзаалон  
 шшпе еѣол ρитоотш ω неспит ммерит епсоотш паштωс хепносмос  
 отлаатне аτω [fol. b] [ϣ]нанар[ατ]е ное пот[ρα]сот · еис ρиште  
 [ω] неспит [α]инааке мпештортр ρшн еротш епетитопос · арире  
 ппетисετναζис χωρισ мптречхнаѣ · мприласматизе неоп снаѣ  
 ριχποτотсiαстирион потωт потροοѣ потωт еѣол хеаттамон  
 хеатμετстирион мпотсѣωлп еѣол шшпе ριχμπεотсiαстирион паш  
 ѣпатсаѣωти ероѣ · асшшпе же неотамити мпешот птаѣотешне  
 ереотамнише непископос сшотρ етраѣолики еτναζис ρμптопос  
 етеїре нреме мшшомлѣт енепископос · λοιπον итерепамнише  
 сшотρ етеκκλiсiα етепстнаѣе прѣте · ρμптрелсмот пнептан-  
 иласматизе ммоот сшр ехмпамнише атехриѣ шшпе етρεпешне  
 нренкеоєи ρїѣол итисфрагизе ммоот ρμпнотирион итκκλiс-  
 матизе ммоот · ρμптрешитоотш же мппереме непископос  
 екκλiсiαтизе мшсωма мпенхоєис їѣ неχѣѣ · еис отсми асшшпе  
 шарон есхω ммоос хеѣрниш пити ω ишшоос етмооше мпооде  
 несоот илосикон мпечѣѣ · паш же итеренсωтш ероот ашшш ·  
 ашпат ρωс отсршме есаѣерате птпе ммон ереотшшре шшш  
 епесωѣ ριχμпессѣош еѣсоотш ерон мпештннше снаѣ еѣхω ммоос  
 хеѣрниш пити тирти ω ишшоос етотсаѣ етмооше калωс · алла  
 мпреїре мпеїρωѣ ипоѣе итеїамше хипешнаѣ ммон<sup>1</sup> етети (*sic*  
*ex pl.*)

[fol. a] Beloved sons, be not severe (*σκληρός*) with these godless  
 ones, lest (*μήποτε*) they beat your . . . (*σύγγραφος pl.*), saying: 'Where  
 are your patrons<sup>2</sup> (*πάτρων pl.*)?' and we be delivered (*παροδιδόναι*) into  
 their hands and they humble our life down to (the level of) their own  
 depravity (*lit.* destruction). Be not reckless (*ἀγνώμων*); because if we  
 appear (*φαντάζεσθαι*) in the streets of the cities (*πλατεία, πόλις*), our  
 enemies will talk against us, saying: 'Whence (*πόθεν sic*) are they thus

<sup>1</sup> For *μμον* here cf. my *Ostraca*, no. 83, and the quotations there.

<sup>2</sup> I leave the explanation of these words to those familiar with the early  
 organization of the Christian community in Egypt. One might regard the former  
 word as = *συγγραφεύς*, here some responsible scribe or notary. 'Patron' might be  
 the patron of a *collegium*, or perhaps here = *advocatus*.



so proud and come not to worship the king's gods?<sup>1</sup> And thus a great disorder (*ἀταξία*) and disturbance shall befall the faithful (*πιστοί*) who walk in the fear (?)<sup>2</sup> of the Christian patriarchs (*πατριάρχης*). For (ὅτι) I know, brethren, and am aware (*νοεῖν*) that there is nothing good in this kingdom. Nevertheless (*πλήν*) be not stumbling-blocks unto the heathen (*Ἕλλην*)<sup>3</sup>, lest a conflict arise between us and them. Let us cast our care upon God and He will be for us a helper (*προσέτις*) and a beginning (*ἀρχή*) and an end<sup>4</sup>. But (*δέ*) as for us, O brethren, let us be diligent (*σπουδάσειν*) to give place (*παραχωρεῖν*) unto them, knowing that they do take occasion against us at all times before their unrighteous (*παράνομος*) king. In the time when Jesus our Lord, the Lamb of God, the Son of Sabaoth, did teach His apostles (*ἀπ.*), He used to say: 'Woe unto them by whom offences (*σκανδαλον*) come'<sup>5</sup>. Let not offences (*σκ.*) arise through us, O beloved brethren, who fully (*πάντως*) know that the world (*κόσμος*) is nought and [fol. *β*] that it shall pass (*παράγειν*) as a dream<sup>6</sup>. Behold, brethren, the pains of the disturbance are come nigh your τόποι. Hold your congregations (*σύνεξις*) without (*χωρίς*) neglectfulness<sup>7</sup>. Break (*κλασματίζειν*) not (bread) twice upon the same altar (*θυσιαστήριον*) on the same day<sup>8</sup>; for we have been told that a mystery (*μυστήριον*) and a revelation happened at the altar (*θυσ.*); and this I will relate to you<sup>9</sup>. It happened (+ *δέ*), on the fifteenth day of the past month, when a number of bishops (*ἐπ.*) were gathered for the general communion (*καθολικὴ σύνεξις*)<sup>10</sup> in the τόπος, making forty and three bishops (*ἐπ.*); then (*λοιπόν*), after that the multitude was gathered at the church (*ἐκκ.*) wherein we should meet together (*συνάγειν*), while the blessing<sup>11</sup> of the (breads) which we had broken (*κλασμ.*) was spreading among the multitude, it became needful (*χρεία*) that we should bring forth other breads and sign (*σφραγίζειν*) them in the cup<sup>11</sup> (*ποτήριον*) and

<sup>1</sup> Text perhaps corrupt.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. i 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 1 Pet. v 7; Apoc. i 8.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Matt. xviii 7.

<sup>5</sup> 'Dream' not quite certain. Cf. 1 John ii 17.

<sup>6</sup> The word translates *ἀνεμρός*, Eccli. xxii 1.

<sup>7</sup> This rule is found in a canon, attributed in the end of the twelfth century to Gregory Nyss. (v. Riedel, *KRQquellen* 102, also *ibid.* 61). Vansleb mentions the custom (*Histoire* 94). In the West it was apparently accepted by a sixth-century synod at Auxerre (Martène, *ed. nov.*, lib. i, c. 3, art. iii, § xxii; but cf. M.'s interpretation, art. vi, § xii).

<sup>8</sup> Or 'at this altar. I will relate it to you.'

<sup>9</sup> I find this expression in the Sa'idic version of Eustathius' *Encomium on St. Michael* (Berlin, MS or. 1611, fol. 1), where Boh. has simply *σύνεξις* (Budge, p. 125, 24); also in the Life of Pesynthius (*Inst. égypté*, Mém. ii 393), bishops being in both cases celebrants.

<sup>10</sup> The word corresponds to *εὐλογία*, e. g. *Mission franç.* iv 721. Cf. my *Ostraca*, no. 90, and Lagarde, *Aeg.* 259 *supra* = Tattam, p. 66.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Renaudot, *Lit. Or. Coll.* (ed. 1847), 240, 320.









nourish me (and) that received the succession (*διαδοχή*) of Mark—I too have been entrusted therewith<sup>1</sup>—did never wash in water since he became bishop (*ἐπίσκοπος*); for (*γάρ*) he was spotless; yet (*λίτ.* and) did he wash thrice in a single day. Wherefor did he wash? [p. 86] I will recount to you the cause (*αἰτία*) for which he washed. Now (*ἐπειδή*) he used to hold-fast by the verse (*λέξις*) which is written<sup>2</sup>, saying: 'Thou shalt wash thy body (*σῶμα*) in water and shalt be purified, if the shadow of the wicked (*ἀσεβής*) touch thee.' The chance befell on a day, as my father Theōna would go (*προελθεῖν*) to the market-place (*ἀγορά*), there came also a damnable (*κατὰδικος*) heretic (*αἱρετικός*), passing by (*παράγειν*), being a bishop (*ἐπ.*) of the heresy (*αἵρεσις*) of the Simonians<sup>3</sup> (*σιμωνιανός*), those who are in error (*πλάνους*) in their nature (*φύσις*). His shadow touched my father Theōna, (but) not his power. Forthwith he turned back and went not to the matter concerning which he had come. (And) he bade a dish (*λακίνη*) of water to be brought him and he bathed himself at one side of the bishop's-house (*ἐπισκοπεῖον*) (and) he . . . And after a little, he asked for (*αἰτεῖν*) water a second time and until three times and washed, saying this Psalm<sup>4</sup>: 'Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop from the blood of the wood and I shall be clean. Thou shalt wash me therewith and I shall be white beyond the snow (*χιών*).' But (*δέ*) when we knew him to have done against (*παρά*) his custom (*ἔθος*), not only (*οὐ μόνον*) once but (*ἀλλά*) up to three times, we were greatly amazed and (*δέ*) we desired to ask him concerning this matter. He said unto us: 'Wherefor do ye consider in your hearts concerning that I have done to-day, against (*παρά*) my custom (*ἔθος*)? For (*γάρ*) God is my witness that I will not be defiled by a stinking dog like this heretic (*αἵρ.*). For (*γάρ*) I was walking to-day, intending to go to the magistrate (*ἀρχων*) concerning some poor who had (*sic ex pl.*).

Cf. *Passio*, ed. Viteau, 75 ὁ ἀναθρήψας με πατήρ μου καὶ ἐπίσκ. Θ., and *ibid.* 79; also Migne, *PL*, 18, 460 (? Anastasius) 'pater meus qui me nutritiv sanctissimus Th. ep., cuius pontificalem cathedram regere suscepit.' So too the Bohairic, ed. Hyvernat, 274.

<sup>2</sup> Whence comes this quotation?

<sup>3</sup> These Gnostics are included in Maruta's list, ca. 400, though possibly only as a reminiscence (*v.* Harnack, *TU.*, N. F. iv 1, pp. 7, 13). As such they appear in Abū 'I Barakāt in the fourteenth century (Riedel, *KRQuellen* 17). To assume that Nestorians are here intended (*v.* Gibbon, ed. Bury, v 119) would credit our text with a too glaring anachronism.

<sup>4</sup> Ps. 19 (Greek), according to the Sa'idic version. But an interesting though late (ca. twelfth cent.) Greek-Sa'id. liturgical MS (Brit. Mus., Or. 5465) gives a number of Psalm verses, among them this, in a form showing whence the current Sa'idic was translated: *ραντοῖς (=ραντιῶν) με οσοπου (=ὕσώπω) ἀπο τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ξελου (=ξύλου) καθαρῶσθαισον με (=θήσομαι) πλενῖς (=πλυνεῖς) μου (=με) ἐφ' αὐτοῦ ἀπερ (=ὑπὲρ) χιονα λευκανθσονμαι (=θήσομαι)*. Comparison of this MS with the corresponding passages of Cod. U (Br. Mus. Pap. xxxvii) shows, as might indeed be expected, identity with its readings. Cf. Brightman in this *JOURNAL*, ii 175.

## Αε.

The earlier of the two biographical fragments narrates an encounter between Peter, when but a deacon, and Diogenes, a heathen philosopher. Each had desired an acquaintance with the other. When they meet, Diogenes exhibits his magical powers. Peter, to vindicate the superiority of Christianity, asks leave of the then aged archbishop [Theonas] to undertake the cure of the philosopher's only daughter, who suffers from a disease of the eyes (ερερενλετωμα ει εβολ ρηπεσθαλ). He is forthwith ordained presbyter and, at a second meeting, before the assembled multitude, while Diogenes expounds the doctrines of Pythagoras and Plato, Peter cites passages (χρησις ρλ.) from the scriptures. The girl, aged 13, is then introduced (sic εχθλ.).

I leave this passage and Αε, which treats of the martyrdom of the saint, to the investigations of Prof. Achelis, who has promised a monograph upon Peter.

## Αη.

I could not connect this dilapidated fragment with the name of Peter, until, when already going to press, I chanced upon Kabis's quotation<sup>1</sup> of a corresponding passage from Cod. Vatic. lxi (dated 962). Mai's description of this volume<sup>2</sup> showed it to contain in fact a homily by Peter and made it probable that our next fragment, Βα, belonged to the same work; and this was, by Prof. Guidi's ever ready help, proved to be the case.

The first phrases are addressed to a single individual: [p. 19] '... teach thee for reward. God forbid<sup>3</sup>. But I would thou shouldst find freedom (παρησία) in the day wherein is no respect of persons, and that I also may say before Christ, the true shepherd: "Lo, I and the children whom God hath given me<sup>4</sup>. Lo, . . . thou hast entrusted (?) . . ."' After a long *lacuna*: εητη ρη[ααα κ]σα μπλ . . . . . [ετ]μοττε ερ[ογ κεαλ]λων . . . . . δε ηε ρει . . . . . ηεφιοττε [η]οτωα λαατ αν [ρο]λωε ηεατο[ι . . . . . μηρερηρε [η]ηεφιοττε ε[τθε]ηαι ηερεπερω[αα] ηεηεφιοττε εβολ ηιατ [ηα] ηηζωον δε η[τιμη]ε ηαρε . . . . . [ε]ε εβολ [ [p. 20] μπ . . . . . ετχοσε . . . . . μπεη . . . . . εεηηαν [οτωη δε] εορηγ [ηατχι] ηοηηηηε . . . . . οηεφιοττε . . . . . η . . . . . ηη[τ] . . . . . ατω ηατ . . . . . ηερερηη . . . . . η ηεηχο . . . .

<sup>1</sup> *Aeg. Zeitschr.*, 1875, 84 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> *Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* v 156. But Zoega prints (p. 62) the title of the *παθήγησις*, showing that 'qui suffectus est S. Athanasio' (i. e. Peter II) is gratuitously inserted by Mai.

<sup>3</sup> The word translates *μή γένοιτο*.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. ii 13.







επεμα χεσπαστιριστα μμογ ριον απερκτις αμς ετρεψρε-  
 ξετε ραπσωτ τιρψ χεσπασαδωσνε · οτπε πψαχε πταςιντις ερμψ  
 ρμπερλιθε χεντερεπχοεις ταμιο παρμμ αρχοος ησαμ-[ρ. μπ]  
 -ταμλ χεαμοτ ρωοκ πτοτωστ μπρωθ ημσβιχ αρχοος χεπψα-  
 οτωστ απ χεαμπετο πμοσ εροι ησαβλλακ ερμψ αμμοσ χεεστωψ  
 ρω ετραψωπε πρισοε μμπαρταμωτρεοε εεμμε μμογ · πτερεψριε  
 πτεμακμια πριτη πσι πμοττε αμτρεοτα ημειχεροτθην σοκψ εβωλ  
 πταμτε πκωπε πκωρτ αμμοχψ ερμψ εκμμκμκμκμ απρεπκεαμμμψ  
 παρτελοε ημμμψ παρ πταμρραλ μμοοτ · πτεμμοτ αμμοτρεαρεπε  
 πσι πμοττε εκωλτ μμμμ κβωκ ερμψ ποτμοσ ποτμοεμψ οττε  
 ημκαρτελοε πτε πμοττε εμμτρετθωκ επεσιντ εκμμκμκμκμ · ψμψ  
 επαμροατις εστομψ εκμμοτ χεαμπερεψκομπεις οττε λομμοε παρμψα  
 ρμμψα μμπαρχαρτελοε μμχαμλ ψμμμω ερωτι μμπεπταμμοσ  
 πταμσαμωτψτ απα θεωμμα τατογ εροι εβωλ χεαμμοτμογ ρω (*sic ex pl.*).

'and he gave his hand and raised him up, saying, "Fear not, Daniel, thou man greatly beloved. The Lord hath sent me to thee to tell thee all things about which thou shalt ask. I am Michael, the captain (*ἀρχιστρατηγός*) of the host of the Lord!" Ye know that there is none greater than M. among the angels; if he is the captain, is it not then (*οὐκοῦν*) he who is the greatest of them all? But let us not bandy (= *σοφίζεω* in 2 Pet. i 16) words, in the manner of some who take account of the *Genesis* (*γένεσις*) which Enôtês composed, to set against the *Genesis* of Moses, when it says<sup>2</sup> that the Devil (*διάβολος*) was cast out of heaven because of the evil (*κακία*) which he had brought forth and that Michael was set (*καθιστάμαι*) in his place, that he might be associated with (*συνιστάμαι*) the just judge (*κρῆτής*), and might be the ambassador (*προσβεύειν*) for all creation; for he is good (*ἀγαθός*). What are the words which Siêtês in his madness wrote? That<sup>3</sup> after the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Daniel x 11 ff.

<sup>2</sup> I have found no traces of the legend of Satan's displacement by Michael beyond the allusion in *Assump. of Moses*, ed. Charles, p. 39, and in the 'Prayer of the Virgin,' ed. Basset, *Apocr. éthiop.* v, and *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* xix 217.

<sup>3</sup> This legend is met with in Byzantine and Syrian literature, and was incorporated in the Koran (v. Bonwetsch's 'Questions of Bartholomew,' *Götting. Nachr.*, 1897, 36 ff.). Apparent traces of it in earlier times are noted by W. Meyer in the Munich *Abhandlungen* xiv 3, 198. A rabbinic version is given by M. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge* 70. It is related as follows in another Coptic encomium on Michael, attributed to Chrysostom (Paris 131<sup>4</sup>, 43): 'The angels beheld the likeness and image of God in Adam and they fell down and worshipped him and gave him glory as the likeness of God. But Mastema, which is Sataniël, saw the honour that was given to Adam and he was greatly jealous. He stiffened his neck before the Lord and said unto the angels: "It befits not us to worship Adam, for he is virgin (*παρθενικός*) earth; but we are

Lord had created Adam, He said unto Sanatiël, "Come thou too and worship the work of my hands." And he said, "I will not worship; for there is none greater than I excepting thee," saying (besides?), "I too desire to be equal to (ἴσος) the (MS my) demiurge (δημιουργός) and like him." When God had found in him this wickedness (κακία), He caused one of the Cherubim to drag him from (?) the midst of the fiery stones<sup>1</sup> (and) He cast him down upon the earth and with him a multitude of angels besides whom he had deceived. Forthwith God commanded to close (κωλύειν) the place of ascent for a long time, between (them and) the other angels of God, that they should not be able to descend upon the earth. I see the listeners (ἀκροατής) wishing to ask me, saying, "Shall no scoffer (σκάπτειν) nor scoundrel (λοιμός) keep festival at the feast of the archangel Michael?" I will relate to you what my father Theóna, that nourished me, told me; for I too asked him' (*sic expl.*).

## Bβ.

An abstract of this text will suffice to show that it recounts an incident of the same type as that in Dr. Schmidt's published fragment. The passages in inverted commas are translations.

[p. 67] 'Let us honour the martyrs, that they may pray for us and that we may obtain heaven.' What follows regards ceasing from evil-doing and insists that repentance is ever open to all. There was a presbyter named John who, with a deacon Athanasius and a reader Apollo, did<sup>2</sup> the service (συνάγειν) in the τόπος of St. Mary. The presbyter was rich and had lost his wife; her domestic work (πικρωῆ κείνη) was done for him by a woman who came in and out of his house. 'But the devil filled his heart toward her and he sought a time of this sort (i.e. an opportunity for evil).' It happened one day that they were drinking wine together at midday and they carried out the iniquity (παρανομία) together (*sic expl.*).

W. E. CRUM.

angels (formed) of flames of fire and honourable, (made) from the elements (ἔλη πλ.) of fire, while he is earth from the earth." And he desired in his wickedness to lead astray (σκανδαλίξειν) the angels, going in and stiffening his neck before God. But Michael the archangel and all the orders (τάγμα πλ.) of heaven marvelled at the pride of the devil (διάβολος) and his vainglory (κενοδοξία) and they hardened their hearts against his tyranny (τύραννος), beseeching him daily that he would leave his pride and repent and become humble and remain in his honour. But he would not hear them, but he conceived trouble, &c.' (Ps. vii 15-17). On the name Mastēma v. Rönsch, *B. der Jubiläum* 107. Other occurrences in Coptic texts: *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, l. c.; *Mission franç.* iv 776; cf. Pereira, *Abba Samuel* 146. The legend of Sataniel had reached Severus of Ashmunain (v. Renaudot, *Litt. Or. Coll.*, ed. 1847, i 278).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ezek. xxviii 16 (LXX) and perhaps *Secrets of Enoch*, ed. Morfill and Charles, 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Lit.* 'was doing.' The meaning presumably is 'was in the habit of doing.'



## NOTES AND STUDIES

THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF EZEKIEL<sup>1</sup>.

IN the last number of the JOURNAL I drew attention to the difference in style and vocabulary between the first and the second half of the Greek Jeremiah. I attempted to show that the most probable explanation of this difference was the employment of two translators, the former of whom undertook the rendering of i-xxviii, while the latter translated xxix-li; the final chapter, it was suggested, might possibly be the work of yet a third hand. I found that there was a certain mixture of the two vocabularies in the middle of the book, immediately before and immediately after the point where the work of the first translator ended, and that this mixture was also apparent to some extent in the later chapters of the second portion. It was further shown that the hand of the second translator of Jeremiah reappeared in the book of Baruch<sup>2</sup>. With greater hesitation I hazarded the conjecture that this division of the Greek book into two parts might be traceable to an older division of the Hebrew Jeremiah into two books, and might afford an explanation of the different position assigned to certain chapters in the Greek and in the Massoretic texts. I pointed out that some critics, who had failed to notice the change in the style and vocabulary of the Greek version, had nevertheless, on other, though perhaps insufficient, grounds, been led to the conjecture that there were in pre-Christian times two distinct Hebrew collections of the prophecies of Jeremiah. Lastly, it

<sup>1</sup> I had intended to follow up my previous paper with some remarks on the affinity existing between the Greek versions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets, and the contrast which they present to the Greek Isaiah. But the discovery of the two hands in Ezekiel seemed to deserve separate treatment. A few notes on the Greek versions of the Prophets considered collectively are reserved for a later number of the JOURNAL.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Nestle has drawn my attention to the explanation which he has given of the statement in the Syro-hexaplar text that certain words in Baruch are 'not in the Hebrew,' namely that the Hebrew of Deuteronomy, not of Baruch, is intended (see his article SEPTUAGINT in Hastings, *B.D.* iv 450 note 2). I am not yet convinced that there was never a Hebrew original of the first half of Baruch: if, however, that view is correct, the second of the Jeremiah translators seems to have been the *author* of Baruch (part I).



was shown that the Codex Alexandrinus contained a slight indication that the close of the twenty-eighth chapter was at one time regarded as the conclusion of a book.

It was not until the proofs of my previous paper had been printed and revised that I discovered that the Greek version of Ezekiel presented certain features closely analogous to those which I had detected in the Greek Jeremiah. Although I was able to refer to this discovery in the final revise of my paper, and to some extent to modify what I had written, I must confess that some parts of that paper might have been otherwise worded, had the evidence as to Ezekiel been before me when it was first undertaken.

As I have already briefly stated in my former paper, the Greek of Ezekiel, as tested by style and vocabulary, falls into three parts: (1) i-xxvii, which I shall call Ezek. *a*, (2) xxviii-xxxix, here referred to as Ezek. *β*, (3) xl-xlvi, here termed Ezek. *γ*. Instead of the two main divisions which we found in Jeremiah, we here find a threefold division. But, as I hope to show, there are here, as in Jeremiah (excluding the appendix), two translators and two only. While the second portion of Ezekiel presents certain features peculiar to itself, in the third portion we find a recurrence of the *a* phrases, which are absent from the *β* portion. In other words, the hand which translated Ezek. *γ* is, in my opinion, identical with the hand which translated Ezek. *a*. The book appears, like Jeremiah, to have been divided, for purposes of translation, into two nearly equal parts, but, instead of the second hand continuing to the end, as was the case in Jeremiah, the first translator resumed the task when the difficult concluding section, containing the account of the vision of the Temple, was reached. Even here there is not wanting a slight parallel in Jeremiah, in that a certain mixture of the two vocabularies may be traced in chapters xxxix to li of that book.

Table III, which follows, shows the most noteworthy differences between Ezek. *a* and Ezek. *β*. The size of the page would hardly admit of the addition of another column devoted to the renderings in Ezek. *γ*. But such a column is the less needed, as most of the Hebrew words and phrases included in this table are, owing to the totally distinct subject-matter of Ezek. *γ*, entirely absent from that portion. It should be stated that none of the *β* renderings shown in this table occur in *γ*; where the Hebrew word occurs at all in the *γ* portion, it is the Greek version of *a*, not of *β*, that is employed. At the end of the table I have added lists of (1) other peculiarities of Ezek. *β*, (2) renderings common to Ezek. *a* and Ezek. *γ*, but absent from Ezek. *β*, (3) the few instances of noteworthy coincidence in the renderings of Ezek. *a* (mostly in xxvi-xxvii) and Ezek. *β*. An asterisk indicates that the word or phrase to which it is affixed is not found in the LXX except in the passages cited. The



4. 'Tubal and Meshech' ἡ σύμπασα καὶ τὰ παρα- Μόσοχ καὶ Θεοβελ xxxii 26, τείνοντα xxvii 13 xxxviii 2 (Μέσοχ BQ), Cf. Na. i 5 ἡ σύμπασα לְכָל־ xxxix 1 (Μέσοχ B, Θεοβέρ A)

PREPOSITIONS, CONJUNCTIONS, &c.

5. סביבֹּחַ and [κύκλω, κυκλόθεν occur in περικύκλω 10 times from cognate Ez. α β γ] xxviii 23 to xxxix 17. Only else in Prophets in Is. iv 5

6. יעַן (יעַן אֲשֶׁר) [ἀνθ' ὧν α β γ] \*ὑπερκύκλω xxxii 23 A ἀντὶ τοῦ c. inf. 5 times from xxix 9 to xxxvi 6

7. לְכֵן (עַל כֵּן) [διὰ τοῦτο in α β γ] ἀντὶ τούτου xxviii 7, xxxiv 9. The use of ἀντὶ for 'because' ('because of')—apart from its use in the phrase ἀνθ' ὧν—is confined in the Prophets to Ez. β

In α and γ διὰ with accusative is only used in the phrase διὰ τοῦτο

In β διὰ with accusative, apart from its use in διὰ τοῦτο, occurs 14 times (xxviii 17-xxxix 25) as the rendering of כ, ב, ל, לָךְ, &c. These examples include 3 instances of διὰ τὸ (μή) c. inf.

8. אִלּוּ אִם (in oaths and as-severations) εἰ μὴ xvii 16, 19, xx 33 A (ἢ μὴν Q om. B) εἰ μὴν 5 times from xxxiii 27 to xxxviii 19. (See Deissmann, *Bible Studies* 205 = *Neue Bibelstudien* 33.) The phrase does not occur again in the Prophetical books except as a v. l. in Is. xlv 23 and Ez. v 11 (see opp.)

9. כ 'when' usually ἐν τῷ c. inf. ἡμέρα ἃν xxxii 9, xxxiii 33, (xxxv 11 = 7שכח). ἡμέρα does not occur elsewhere in Ez., and it is absent from Jer. and Min. Prophets



## MISCELLANEOUS.

10. **ד'בנא** οἱ ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι xii 14 οἱ περί (τινα) xxxviii 6 *bis*,  
'bands' παράταξις xvii 21 οἱ μετά (τινος) xxxviii 22  
9, xxxix 4
11. **פּרַשׁ, פּרַשׁ** ἀφανίζειν iv 17, xx 26, οἱ μετὰ (τινος) xxxviii 22  
and cognates xxv 3 ἐρημοῦν xxix 12, xxx 7 *bis*,  
xxxii 15, xxxiii 28, 29,  
[Also xxx 7 (B ἡρη-  
μωμ.), xxx 14 A (B  
ἀπωλῶ), xxxvi 4 (τοῖς  
ἐξηρημ. καὶ ἡφανισμ.),  
and in ββ<sup>1</sup> xxxvi 34  
*bis*, 35 *bis*, 36] xxxv 3, 7  
ἐρημος 10 times (xxix-  
xxxv)  
ἐρημία xxxv 9
- חַרְבַּ, חַרְבַּ** ἀφανισμός 9 or 10 times ἀπόλεια xxix 9, 10, 12,  
(iv-xxiii) [xxix 12 A] xxxii 15  
ἐξερημοῦν vi 6, xii 20, xix  
7 [xxxvi 4 B] ἐρημοῦν [xxxvi 2, 19 and]  
7 times (xxix-xxxviii)  
ἐρημία xxxv 4
12. **בּוּ (בּוּה)** διαρπαγή xxiii 46, xxv 7 σκύλον xxix 19, xxxviii  
12 f.
- בּוּ** διαρπάζειν vii 21 (δια-  
φθείρειν A) σκυλεύειν [xxxvi 12] xxix  
19, xxxviii 12 f., xxxix  
10
- Cf. the renderings of לָשׁ by σκύλον, προνομή, προνομεῖν.  
13. **חַרְבַּ pi. ni.** διασπείρειν (v-xxii) 5 λιμῶν xxix 12, xxx 23, 26,  
times. This verb in xxxvi 19 [xxxvi 4 = al.]  
β usu. = γρβ  
διασκορπίζειν (v vi). In  
α β γ = γρβ
14. **קָבַץ** εἰσδέχεσθαι xi 17, xx 34, συνάγειν [xvi 37 A, 37<sup>b</sup>]  
41, xxii 19, 20 *bis* xxviii 25, xxix 13, xxxiv  
ἐπισυνάγειν xvi 37<sup>a</sup> B 13, xxxvii 21, xxxviii 8,  
(συνάγειν AQ) xxxix 17, 27  
ββ<sup>2</sup> ἀθροίζειν xxxvi 24
15. **טוּב** καλός xvii 8, xx 25 (προσ-  
τάγματα οὐ κ.), xxiv 4 ἀγαθός xxxiv 14 *bis*, xxxvi  
[xxxiv 18] 31 (τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα ὑμῶν  
τὰ μὴ ἀγ.)
16. **לָבַד** κλήμα xvii 6, 7, 23, xix κλάδος xxxi 7, 9, 12 (and  
11 (and elsewhere for elsewhere for other  
other Heb. words) Heb. words)

<sup>1</sup> I use ββ to denote the section xxxvi 24-38, on which see below.<sup>2</sup> See below.



slight deviations occur occasionally in Ez.  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . In the case of the dependent genitive pronoun it should be noted that the transposed order is only found intermittently, the position of the pronoun after its governing noun being quite common even in Ez.  $\beta$ . Later scribes may however have replaced the more usual order in some of these passages; this is generally done in the MSS A and Q in the passages quoted above.

The following are some of the *words and usages common to the  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  portions, but absent from the  $\beta$  portion*<sup>1</sup>.

\*τὸ αἶθριον (ix, x)<sup>2</sup> (xl, xlvii)<sup>3</sup>, ἀπέναντι (i-xxvi, xl, xliii), ἀφηγούμενος (xi-xxii, xlv ff.), \*δουλοῦσθαι (xxi 14, xliii 2), ἐγγίσειν (vii-xxiii, xl-xlv: usu. = כָּרַב), εἰσπορεύεσθαι (viii-xxvi, xlii-xlvi: = בָּוֵא), ἐκδύειν, ἐξάγειν, ἐχόμενος -ου -α (i-xi, xlii-xlviii), ἡγούμενος (α<sup>3</sup> γ<sup>3</sup>), κατὰ c. gen. (α<sup>3</sup> γ<sup>3</sup>), κατέσται (i, iii, xi, xl-xlvii), \*κόλασις = לַשְׁכָּרָה (xiv, xviii, xlv), κόμη (α<sup>3</sup> γ<sup>3</sup>: not else in Prophets), κορυφή = שֹׁאֵר (α<sup>3</sup> γ<sup>3</sup>), τὰ νόμιμα (v-xx, xliii-xlv), ὅτι τράπον (x-xxv, xl-xlviii), ὄρασις, ὅστις (α<sup>3</sup> γ<sup>3</sup>: also once in  $\beta$  εἰς ὅτου = טַע), ὄψις, τὸ παράπαν c. neg. (α<sup>3</sup> γ<sup>3</sup>: no Heb. equivalent), παραπικρύνειν, παρῆξ, *the historic present in the phrase πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου* (ii-xi, xliii-xlv), πρῶτον = פְּרִת (viii-xi, xliii-xlvii), πύλη = טַע (viii-xxvi, xl-xlviii), σκεῦος = כֵּל (ix-xxvii, xl: σπλον in xxxii 27), συντελεῖν usu. = כָּלַל pi. (iv-xxiii, xlii f.: συντελεῖα usu. = כָּלַל is confined to Ez.  $\alpha$ , xi-xxii), τάσσειν = שׁוּשׁ or שׁוּשׁ (iv-xxiv, xl-xlv), τοίχος = קִיר (iv-xxiii, xl-xliii), τρισσός = שְׁלֹשׁ (xxiii, xlii: only twice elsewhere in LXX) and τρισσῶς (xvi, xli: only 4 times else in LXX), ὑπέρ and ὑπέρῶν, ὑποκάτωθεν (ὑποκάτω in  $\alpha$   $\beta$   $\gamma$ ), ὑπόστασις.

There are also numerous instances, which need not be enumerated, of words found only in the  $\alpha$  portion; their absence from the  $\gamma$  portion is due in most cases to the non-occurrence of the Hebrew phrase in the concluding chapters, where the subject-matter is quite distinct from that of the rest of the book.

So far I think I may claim to have established that the first twenty-seven and the last nine chapters have been rendered into Greek by a single hand, and that a second hand appears in the twelve chapters xxviii-xxxix. The list last given includes some quite rare words, the use of the historic present in one and the same phrase in the middle of past tenses<sup>2</sup>, beside some not uncommon prepositions and other words which are absent from the middle portion of the book. The reappearance of the first style at the close of the book makes untenable, I think, the hypothesis that the translator laid down his pen for a time and then on resuming his work adopted a completely different style.

<sup>1</sup> Several of the Hebrew phrases, it is true, are absent from the  $\beta$  portion. But this list is merely intended to prove the identity of translators  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ .

<sup>2</sup> The only other instances of the historic present in this book which I have noted are viii 16 (προσκυνῶσιν) and lxvii 8 (παίνεται).



There is only one noteworthy instance of an apparent difference between the portions which I have called  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . This difference is found in the rendering of the Divine name 'the Lord God' (יהוה אלהים). This title is characteristic of Ezekiel, in which book it is found in the M. T. no less than 228 times. It appears, however, that in a very large number of these cases the Hebrew which the translators had before them contained only the single word יהוה<sup>1</sup>. The following table will show the LXX renderings according to the A and B texts in the three parts of the book.

	Ez. $\alpha$	Ez. $\beta$	Ez. $\gamma$
<i>B text.</i>			
	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ <i>passim</i>	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$
	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ about 15	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ 35 times or	
	times or upwards	upwards	
	(beginning at xii 10)		
	[(?) $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\delta$ $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ $\overline{\iota\mu\omega\nu}$ xx	[ $\overline{\alpha\delta\omega\nu\alpha\iota}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ in the	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ ( $\delta$ ) $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ about 16
	5, xxi 24, 26]	Pentecostal lesson	times (the article in-
		xxxvi 32, 33, 37]	serted in xliii, xlv,
			omitted in xlv ff.)
<i>A text.</i>			
	$\overline{\alpha\delta\omega\nu\alpha\iota}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ 61 times	$\overline{\alpha\delta\omega\nu\alpha\iota}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ 22 times	$\overline{\alpha\delta\omega\nu\alpha\iota}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ only xlvii
	(Hexaplaric). Also	with the same vari-	16 $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\delta$ $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ (usually)
	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$	ations as in $\alpha$	
	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\delta$ $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$		
	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\delta$ $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ (doublet)		
	(?) $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\delta$ $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$		

The B text is certainly the nearest to the original, and the result of the table is to show that  $\beta$  rendered the double name by  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$   $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ ,  $\gamma$  by  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$  ( $\delta$ )  $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ , while  $\alpha$ , in so far as his Hebrew contained the double name at all, agreed rather with  $\beta$  than with  $\gamma$  in his rendering of it. The difference in this respect between the earlier and the later portions of the book has, however, been noted already by Cornill, and he has argued that  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$  ( $\delta$ )  $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$  in the last part is the rendering not of יהוה אלהים, but of יהוה אלֹהִים, and that Ezekiel by the use of the latter phrase at the end of his book intended to bring his account of the new Jerusalem into connexion with the story of Paradise in the early chapters of Genesis, of which that combination of names is a distinctive feature (*op. cit.* p. 174). If Cornill is right, there is no difference of rendering between  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . In any case there are a few instances in Ezek.  $\alpha$  (B text) and several in the A text of the rendering  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$   $\delta$   $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ , and the phrase is one in which other parts of the

<sup>1</sup> See on this phrase Cornill, *Das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel* (1886), pp. 172 ff. In  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  together he reckons that Codex B has  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$   $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$  58 times only as compared with 201 instances of the double name in the M. T.

LXX show a strange diversity of rendering. Thus in Amos we find  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ ,  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma} \overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ ,  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma} \delta \overline{\theta\varsigma}$ ,  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma} \overline{\kappa\varsigma} \delta \overline{\theta\varsigma}$  intermixed in an inextricable fashion. There is certainly no reason here sufficient to overthrow the other numerous reasons which have been put forward to prove that Ezek.  $\alpha$  and Ezek.  $\gamma$  are the work of one and the same hand.

In concluding these somewhat tedious but necessary lists, I must add yet a further list of the few instances where a peculiar word or phrase is common to the  $\alpha$  and the  $\beta$  portions. (There are no noteworthy instances of coincidence between the  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  portions.) The cases of coincidence between the  $\beta$  portion and the chapters in the  $\alpha$  portion earlier than the twenty-sixth which seem to deserve notice only amount to four or five. These are \**ἄρμονία* (xxiii 42, a sort of transliteration of  $\overline{\eta\sigma\eta}$ , 'a multitude,' and xxxvii 7, a paraphrastic rendering of  $\overline{\delta\alpha\gamma}$ , 'a bone'): *ἐκάτερος* ? = *ἕκαστος* (i 11 f. and xxxvii 7: N.B. these two  $\alpha$  words occur in immediate proximity in  $\beta$ ): \**ἐκκεῖσὺν μάχαιραν*, *ἐκκ. βρομφαίαν* (v 2, 12, xii 14, xxviii 7, xxx 11): \**πέλη* (xxiii 24, xxvii 10, xxxviii 4 f., xxxix 9): *στηρίξειν τὸ πρόσωπον* ( $\alpha^{\beta}$ : but in xxxv 2 *ἐπιστρέφειν τὸ πρόσω.*). These few instances may be accounted for without difficulty. More numerous are the instances of coincidence between the last two chapters of the  $\alpha$  portion (xxvi, xxvii) and the  $\beta$  portion. We have already noted an instance of this in the position of the genitive pronoun, and others will be found above in Table III. Here may be added *ἀνθ' οὗ* xxvi 2 B, xxviii 2 B (the usual phrase is *ἀνθ' ὅν*, which AQ read here also): *ἐμισχύειν* xxvii 9 +  $\beta^{\beta}$ : *κατακαλύπτειν* xxvi 10, 19, xxxii 7, xxxviii 9: \**στυγνίζειν* =  $\overline{\delta\delta\psi}$  xxvii 35, xxviii 19 AQ (B *στενάζειν*), xxxii 10: *συναγωγὴ* =  $\overline{\lambda\eta\eta}$  (rendered *ἄγλος* in xvi, xvii, xxiii) xxvi, xxvii, xxxii-xxxviii: \**χρηστὸς* (*λίθος*) =  $\overline{\eta\psi}$  xxvii 22 B (*ἐκλεκτός* A), xxviii 13. Were it not for the more striking examples given in Table III, notably exx. 1 and 3 (the name of Tyre), indicating that the division comes at the end of chapter xxvii, it might be thought that we should rather place it at the end of chapter xxv. The true explanation of this mixture of the two vocabularies in xxvi and xxvii (to which a close parallel is to be traced in the central chapters of Jeremiah) appears rather to be something like this. The second translator, before beginning his own work, read over the last portion of the work of his predecessor, starting not unnaturally at the opening of the denunciation upon Tyre, the translation of which had been left for him to complete. While reading over these pages, he introduced some corrections of his own; in particular, he was something of a stylist with a nice ear for order of words, and objected to the too frequent conclusion of a clause with a genitive pronoun. In these cases he improved the rhythm of the sentence by a slight transposition.

It must not be supposed that either of the translators is entirely consistent in his renderings. Exact consistency, such as was aimed at



by the revisers of our English Authorised Version of the N. T., must not be expected. I have already noted and suggested an explanation of some inconsistencies in the closing chapters of Ezek. *a*. A similar diversity of rendering may possibly be detected in its opening chapters, as also in the opening chapters of Jer. *a*. At any rate it is only in the opening of Ezek. *a* that we meet with *ἐὰν ἄρα* (= **אם**: ii 5, 7, iii 11 *his*), *ἀριστερός* (i 10, iv 4, but also in xxxix 3: *εὐώνυμος* in xvi 46, xxi 16), *βαδίζω* (= **הלך**: i 9, iii 4, 11: elsewhere *πορεύεσθαι* in *a* and *β*, including i and iii).

In Ez. *β* there is one section where the Greek markedly stands out from that of its immediate context. It is the passage containing God's promise to give His people a new heart in place of their stony heart (xxxvi 24-38). I shall refer to this section as *ββ*. The following are the distinctive features which I have noted in it.

xxxvi 24 *ἀθροίσω* = **קבץ** pi. The Greek word occurs here only in Ezek. For the renderings of the Hebrew word in *a* and *β* see Table III, 14. The Hebrew is rendered by *ἀθροίζω* in Theodotion and Symmachus in Ezek. xx 34, and in other books of the LXX in *α' σ' θ'*.

*Ιδ.* *γαίῶν* = **ארצות**. *Γαῖα* here only in Ezekiel: the plur. of **ארץ** is elsewhere rendered by *χῶραι*. But *α' σ' θ'* have *ἐν ταῖς γαῖαις* in Ezek. xxix 12.

32 *ἀδωναὶ Κύριος* B<sup>ab</sup> **מס** (*κύριος Κύριος* B\*, *κύριος ὁ θεός* A), 33 and 37 *ἀδωναὶ Κύριος* B (*κύριος ὁ θεός* and *κύριος Κύριος ὁ θεός* A) = **אדני יהוה**. Throughout Ezek. *a* and *β* the constant rendering of the Hebrew phrase in Cod. B is, as we have seen, *κύριος Κύριος*. Here only does this MS introduce the Hexaplaric rendering. *Ἀδωναὶ Κύριος* is the rendering of *α' σ' θ'* in Ezek. vii 5, xviii 23: in ii 4 *θ'* has *ἀδωναὶ* ΠΠΠ.

34 *ἀνθ' ὧν ὄτι* = **תחת אשר**. The ordinary Greek phrase in Ezekiel for 'because' is the simple *ἀνθ' ὧν*: the compound phrase only occurs again in the LXX in Deut. xxviii 62 and twice each in 2 and 4 Kingdoms, where it is perhaps a Hexaplaric intrusion. It is used by Theodotion, e. g. in Jer. xxxvi 19, 25.

34 *παροδείματος* B (*διοδείματος* A) = **עבר**. *Παροδείμειν* is not used again in the translated books of the LXX: but it renders **עבר** in *σ'* e. g. in Ezek. xxxiii 28. *Διοδείμειν* (not attested in *α' σ' θ'*) is similarly used in the LXX in Ezek. v 14, xiv 15 and elsewhere: *πάραδος* (= *παροδίτης*) occurs in Ezek. xvi 15, 25.

35 *κῆπος τρυφῆς* = **עדן**. *Κῆπος* does not occur again in Ezek., which uses *παράδεισος* instead (xxviii 13, xxxi 8 *his*, 9). *Κῆπος* is, however, the rendering of *θ'* in Ezek. xxviii 13 and of *α' θ'* in xxxi 8.

38 *γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγώ* (A *ἐγώ εἰμι*) *Κύριος*. The omission of *εἰμι* in cod. B is contrary to the regular practice of Ezek. *β* (Table III, 2). Contrast,



just before the section ββ, xxxvi 23, and, just after it, xxxvii 6, 13 (in 14 there should be no stop after the first Κύριος).

In this section then, in the text of the Vatican MS, we appear to have a clear case of the influence of some other version, resembling that of Theodotion. It had occurred to me that the appearance of this fragment of another version in the middle of the LXX might be due to *lectionary usage*, and it is satisfactory to discover some confirmation for this conjecture. In a Lectionary in the British Museum of about the eleventh century (Add. 11841 = Gregory Lect. Apost. 79) I find on fol. 47<sup>vo</sup> the passage Ezek. xxxvi 24-28 given as the third of three lessons for evensong on the day of Pentecost. The two lessons which precede it are taken from Numb. xi 16-29 and Joel ii 23-32<sup>1</sup>. The Ezekiel passage opens with the introductory formula Τάδε λέγει Κύριος, which takes the place of the first και in verse 24. Otherwise the text agrees with that of Codex Vaticanus save for slight differences, viz. γερεῶν for γαιῶν in verse 24 (so H, and P. 26 and 36), καθαρόν ἕδωρ for ἕδ. καθ. in 25, ἐν omitted in 26. Only the first five out of the fifteen verses make up the lesson: but doubtless the practice varied, and the following ten verses were sometimes read. Indeed it appears that the whole passage with eight more verses at the beginning (Ezek. xxxvi 16-38) was read at a very early time as a lesson in the Jewish synagogue<sup>2</sup>. The reading of a prophetic lesson or Haphtara is considered by critics to have been begun in the time of the Maccabees: at the end of every three verses a translation in the language of the country was given. Is it too bold to conjecture that a very early version of this section, resembling that of Theodotion<sup>3</sup>, and used for lectionary purposes in the Jewish synagogue, was incorporated by the translators? An alternative, but (to my mind) a less satisfactory suggestion, is that the version of Theodotion, or one resembling it, was used in the lessons of the *Christian Church*, and that in some unexplained way the lesson for Pentecost has in this passage supplanted the older version of the translators. The conjecture here made may possibly throw light on other cases of mixture of texts in the LXX.

<sup>1</sup> In our Prayer-book Ez. xxxvi 25-end is an alternative lesson for the evening of Whit-Sunday. The passages from Numbers and Joel are read on the Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun-week.

<sup>2</sup> See the art. 'Haftara' in Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, ii p. 337. The lesson is given as the one read 'am Sabbat-Para' (which seems to be the second sabbath before the Passover). The use of three lessons from the O. T., and none from the N. T., on the evening of Pentecost, as attested in the British Museum Lectionary, appears to have come down from a time when the Old Testament was the only source from which lessons were drawn.

<sup>3</sup> We know that for some books of the O. T. such a version existed in pre-Christian times.

We must return from this unique section to the consideration of the main divisions of the Greek book, which, as we have seen, falls into three parts. There is the break at the end of xxvii and the break at the end of xxxix. The second of these breaks coincides with a distinct change in subject-matter. There is an interval of over twelve years between the date given in xl 1 and the last date previously mentioned (xxxiii 21). The description of the Temple must at all times have been regarded as a distinct section, and may have at one time formed a separate book<sup>1</sup>.

The case as regards the other dividing-line is different. The two chapters which close Ezek. *a*, and the one which opens Ezek. *β*, all three being concerned with Tyre, would seem to be inseparable parts of a single whole. There is no break in the subject-matter<sup>2</sup>. We are not, however, without manuscript evidence for this point being regarded, for whatever reason, as one where a fresh departure is made. The Codex Marchalianus contains two early chapter-numberings in this book. According to one of these arrangements (found also in Cod. Vaticanus) the book is divided into fifty-six parts, according to the other into twenty-five *τόμοι*. The end of our chapter xxvii coincides with the close of a section in both these arrangements. According to one system Ezek. *a* contains thirty-three sections or chapters, according to the other thirteen. Moreover, in this MS the last words of chapter xxvii are followed by two slanting lines, apparently indicating a pause. It will be noted that, with the division into twenty-five *τόμοι*, a break at the end of the thirteenth represents the nearest possible division of the book into two parts containing an equal number of *τόμοι*.

It appears, then, that the break at the end of Ezekiel xxvii represents a division of the book into two nearly equal parts, made without strict regard to subject-matter. If we turn back again to Jeremiah, we are struck by the fact that there too the break comes nearly at the halfway point. If we take the pages of the Cambridge manual edition of the LXX and those of the R. V. (minion 8vo, 1885) as a test, we get the following result:

<sup>1</sup> Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, art. 'Ezekiel' (i 818): 'This remarkable prophecy [xxxviii f.], representing the utmost limit of E[zekiel]'s prophetic vision, has the appearance of being intended as a conclusion to the book. This fact, taken in connexion with the long period of silence which follows, and a certain change of view manifested in xl ff., strongly suggests that the first edition of the prophecies really ended here, the remaining section having been added afterwards as an appendix.'

<sup>2</sup> One small section, however (xxix 17-21), dated 'in the seven and twentieth year,' and recognizing error in a previous prediction (xxvi 12), is clearly later than the rest. The dates given in Ezekiel are i 1 (the thirtieth year), i 2 (fifth year of Jehoiachin's captivity), viii 1 (sixth year), xx 1 (seventh), xxiv 1 (ninth), xxvi 1 (eleventh), xxix 1 (tenth, LXX twelfth), xxix 17 (twenty-seventh), xxxi 1 (eleventh), xxxii 1 and 17 (twelfth), xxxiii 21 (twelfth 'of our captivity'), xl 1 (twenty-fifth 'of our captivity').



}	Jer. $\alpha$	= 66 pp. Camb. LXX = 23½ pp. R.V.
	Jer. $\beta + \gamma$	= 60 " " = 21½ " "
}	Es. $\alpha$	= 58 " " = 21½ " "
	Es. $\beta + \gamma$	= 53 " " = 19½ " "

The coincidence can hardly be accidental. It suggests that the translators of these two books were guided by the same principle in the apportionment of their work: and if that is the case, it is further suggested that the translations were parts of a common undertaking, and were made at the same time. In the case of Ezekiel, as we find that one and the same hand has translated the beginning and the end of the book, while a second hand intervenes in the middle, it becomes practically certain that these two Ezekiel translators were contemporaries. And the same is probably true of Jeremiah. The parallel between the two cases leads me now to abandon the suggestion, previously made, that there may have been an interval of time between the translations of Jer.  $\alpha$  and Jer.  $\beta$ .

We arrive at the result, then, that with a view to expediting the translation of these two prophetic books, each book was divided into two parts, and two translators were set on to the work simultaneously. Whether the translators already found a break in the middle of their Hebrew texts, in other words, whether the Hebrew books were transcribed on two separate rolls<sup>1</sup>, must remain doubtful. I have given some reasons for believing that such was the case in Jeremiah. The translator who undertook the earlier part of each book appears to have been the recognized leader and the more competent of the two. In Jeremiah we have seen that the second worker was lacking in skill and knowledge<sup>2</sup>. Towards the end of his work we may perhaps trace indications of a revision by the first hand. In Ezekiel, although the second hand is not so markedly inferior to the first, it is to be noticed that the first translator took to himself the hardest portions of the book, namely the chariot-vision in the first chapter, and the final section which I have called  $\gamma$ . These portions were, as Jerome tells us, considered so obscure that a Jew was not allowed to read them until he had reached his thirtieth year<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Some interesting remarks as to the influence of the length of the roll on the division of Biblical books are to be found in Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen und zur bibl. Litt.* (Strassburg, 1902).

<sup>2</sup> Witness his employment of Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew, where he was ignorant of the meaning of the latter.  $\alpha\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon$ ,  $\sigma\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon$  represent  $\text{הָיָה}$  (xxx 33, xxxii 16);  $\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\delta\alpha\varsigma$  =  $\text{קָרַח הָרֶשֶׁת}$  (xxx 31, 36);  $\tau\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\alpha\iota\alpha$  =  $\text{הַמְצִיאוֹת}$  ('guides-posts,' xxxviii 31);  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  =  $\text{הָיָה אֲדֹנָי}$  (xli 5, rightly rendered  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\upsilon\iota$   $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\upsilon\epsilon$  in xxii 18).

<sup>3</sup> Ep. lili ad Paulinum, 'Tertius [the third of the greater prophets] principia et finem tantis habet obscuritatibus involuta ut apud Hebraeos istae partes cum exordio Geneseos ante annos triginta non legantur.' The same statement is repeated in the short preface to his Commentary on Ezekiel.



It appears, after all, so far at least as these two books are concerned, that there is some truth in the statement of Epiphanius<sup>1</sup> that *the translators worked in pairs*. The greater part of the story told by that Father<sup>2</sup> of the translation and the cells is wildly extravagant and improbable. But his statements with regard to the pairs of translators deserve quotation. They were, he says, shut up two and two in thirty-six cells (*ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἕξ οἰκίσκοις, ζυγὴ ζυγὴ κατὰ οἰκίσκον*): the cells were double (*διπλοῦς τε αὐτοὺς ποιήσας δύο δύο ἐνέκλεισεν*): each pair had two servants to cook for them, and shorthand writers, and so on. Then comes the noteworthy statement that *to every pair was assigned one book*: *ἐκάστη δὲ ζυγῆ βίβλος μία ἐπεδίδοτο, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἡ βίβλος τῆς τοῦ κόσμου Γενέσεως μιᾷ ζυγῆ, ἡ Ἔξοδος τῶν νόων Ἰσραὴλ τῇ ἄλλῃ ζυγῆ, τὸ Λευτικὸν τῇ ἄλλῃ καὶ καθ' ἕξ ἄλλῃ βίβλος τῇ ἄλλῃ*. He goes on to say that each Hebrew book was circulated in turn to every pair (*κατὰ περίοδον ἐκάστη ζυγῆ ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐπιδιδόμεναι*), so that thirty-six independent renderings of the whole Bible were produced, which were found to agree in the minutest details! In spite of the fabulous accretions which are attached to it, it certainly looks as if in the statement that 'to each pair was assigned one book' we have a tradition, with an element of truth in it, which survived into the fourth century. How far the statement may be applicable to other books of the Greek Bible is a question which awaits further investigation.

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

### ON SOME EARLY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *GREGORIANUM*.

THE notes on which the following paper is based were taken during the first half of the year 1895, a considerable portion of which was devoted to a minute examination of the mass-books of an earlier date than the tenth century in the Vatican Library, the Bibliothéque Nationale, and at Cambrai. The object was personal: viz., if possible to satisfy my mind in regard to a certain number of questions on the answers to which must depend the history of public worship and sacred rites in Western Europe from the sixth century to the tenth. As, for instance, these: (1) is it possible to recognize with certainty the *Gregorianum* in the actual state in which it was sent by Pope Hadrian to Charles, and to define with exactness its contents? (2) If so, what

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Redpath recalled the story to my mind.

<sup>2</sup> In *De mens. et pond.* 3 ff. A fragment only of the story is quoted by Wendland in his edition of Aristeas, p. 139.

MSS present that text in its most authentic tradition and purest form? (3) What is to be thought of such books as e.g. the *Gregorianus* of Ménard; can they be said to represent in any degree better the mass-book, and practice, of Rome about the year 800, than did (say) the missals of Auxerre or Beauvais, Sens or Paris in 1760? (4) The exact nature and text of *Greg.* thus determined, in what sort of relation does it stand to *Gelas.*; and, in particular, were these two books ever in use at the same time in Rome, or did the one displace the other, as, say, the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI displaced the First? (5) In what degree can the use of *Greg.* be traced in the extant MSS of both types of *Gelas.* viz. the earlier type represented by the Vatican MS, or the later type which I have called 'the eighth century recension'; or traced even in 'Gallican' and 'Mozarabic' books? (6) Finally, by what steps, in exact detail, did the book consisting of the *Gregorianus* and the Carolingian Supplement come to take the form presented by the type of missal common in the eleventh and twelfth centuries?<sup>1</sup>

The interest attaching to these investigations is not merely liturgical. Much more than this is in question, and much that to many persons

<sup>1</sup> I may be allowed to say in explanation that my regretted friend Dom S. Bäumer and I had planned a history of the mass in the West in which we hoped to trace definitively at least the main lines of its development from the fifth century to the thirteenth when, with the establishment of the Uses, the interest of the subject (except on its rubrical side) so greatly lessens. An article in the *Zeitschrift f. Kath. Theologie* (1892) on the Stowe Missal, and one in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* (1893) on the external history of the *Gelasianum*, were the first of a series of papers in which we designed, as a prelude, to bring successively into prominence, and, if possible, under discussion, some points of liturgical history which, it seemed, had remained unnecessarily obscure. The premature death of Dom Bäumer (1894) put an end to a project which it was beyond my unaided powers to attempt to execute, but not to my curiosity in regard to those portions of the work which would, I think, have fallen in the main to my share. I must mention the name of another friend, a man of the highest promise, who has passed away so young—Adalbert Ebner, Domvicar at Eichstätt. In reply to a communication which reached him 'am Feste des hl. Gregor,' and gave particulars as to the Vat. MS Reg. 337 which he had been unable to see, he wrote me from his bed of suffering a letter 'in festo S. Benedicti 1895' briefly indicating his ideas for § iii of the 'Untersuchungen' of his *Iter Italicum* (p. 373 seqq.) dealing with the classification of the MSS, and his difficulties. He was not sufficiently recovered to write again until May 7, by which date I had made progress with my work in Paris. For every reason I felt thereafter that I could do no better than communicate to him such knowledge as I had gained. An endeavour at that time to give an account of the MSS of *Greg.* in the only periodical likely to be open to such technicalities was vain; on my return to England other interests absorbed attention, and as Ebner's book was published next year, I was only too ready to let the matter sleep, so far as I was concerned, and I desired to leave the work to be completed by those who had easier access to the MSS, and could better command attention, than I; a prospect which Ebner's death has greatly clouded.



may appear more interesting. They involve the elucidation of one of the most instructive and least known chapters of Merovingian history which will, perhaps better than any other single line of inquiry, exhibit the gradual process of preparation for the Carolingian revival with its Roman aspirations of every kind and preference for Roman models; and will show that this was no sudden outburst, but the result of a movement that with slow but sure steps had been maturing for nearly two centuries. But the proof of all this for the assurance and the purposes of the historian can be given only after much detailed technical work on the part of the liturgist. The aim of the present note is to make some slight contribution to this object by an attempt to answer the first question raised above, so far as the MSS investigated by me, in combination with the descriptions of others by Delisle and Ebner, will allow.

The MSS that I have examined for the purpose fall into two classes:

I. Those which contain the *Gregorianum*<sup>1</sup> only, without the Carolingian Supplement: viz. the Cambrai MS 164 (old numbering, 159) written for the Church of Cambrai in the episcopate of bishop Hildoard, 790-816 (see Delisle, note 2 of the last page of *Mémoire sur d'anc. Sacr.*); and the Paris B. N. lat. 2292 (Delisle, *op. cit.* No. xxiii), presented by bishop John of Arezzo to the abbey of Nonantola, near Modena, about the seventh decade of the ninth century. These MSS will be designated *Ca.* and *Non.* respectively.

II. Those which contain *Greg.* and the Carolingian Supplement. These MSS contain also much additional matter, generally by other and later hands. Such additions are of primary importance for the history and development of the missal from the ninth to the eleventh century, for they lay bare the economy of later mediæval liturgy, in Missal, Ritual, Pontifical. The MSS to be reviewed are: Vat. Regin. 337 (*Reg.*); Vat. Ottobon. 313, from Paris, Delisle No. xxxv (*Ott.*); Paris B. N. lat. 12050, the missal of the priest Rodradus, Delisle No. xxii (*Rodr.*); Paris B. N. lat. 2812, from Arles, Delisle, No. xxxvi (*Arel.*); Paris B. N. lat. 9429, from Beauvais, Delisle No. lii (*Beuv.*). All these MSS are assigned to the ninth century except *Beuv.* which is stated to be of the tenth<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In using the terms *Gregorianum* and *Gelasianum* I do not wish to beg questions. While believing that both do represent substantially what is the truth, I would gladly use any conventional designations that might be agreed on. See the last two pages of the article on *Gelas.* in the *Hist. Jahrb.*; which, indeed, are only a German translation of an English original.

<sup>2</sup> The following MSS described or mentioned by Delisle, and Ebner *Iter Italicum*, not examined by me, may (and some certainly do) contain *Greg.* as found in the MSS mentioned in the text: I. Autun, Seminary Library, MS 19 bis, Delisle, No. xvi.



As *Ca.* is practically unknown, and *Rodr.* presents features of special interest, some observations on these two books are necessary before proceeding further. *Ca.* is at once distinguished from every Carolingian Sacramentary that I have seen, or found described (except the later Cambrai MS 162-163, old numbering 158, also saec. ix), by the shape of the volume, tall and narrow, nearly three times as high as broad (295 x 103 millim.). The original MS consists of ff. 35<sup>b</sup>-203; ff. 2-35<sup>a</sup> and 204-245 comprise supplementary matter added by various hands in the ninth century. Though of mean appearance compared with its congeners, this MS was intended, so far as the ideas of the Cambrai School<sup>1</sup> could go in that direction, as a 'Prachtexemplar.' In the

1. Rheims, Town Libr., MS 320-272 (213 [E 320], I believe, of the present catalogue), Delisle, No. xxi. 3. Le Mans, Town Libr., MS 77, Delisle, No. xxxi. 4. Florence, Laurentian Libr., MS Aedil. 121, Delisle, No. xlix; Ebner, pp. 29-30, 385. 5. Verona, Chapter Libr., MS xci, Delisle, No. xxvi; Ebner, pp. 290-291. 6. Verona, Chapter Libr., MS lxxxvi, Delisle, No. xxv; Ebner, pp. 286-288. 7. Mainz, Seminary Libr., Ebner, p. 388. 8. Cologne, Cathedral Libr., MS 137, Delisle, No. xxxix; Ebner, p. 383. 9. Donaueschingen, MS 191, Delisle, No. xli. In company with Dom Bäumer I saw this MS some eleven or twelve years ago, but cannot remember its arrangement; I doubt if it can be of so early a date (c. 830) as he is disposed to assign to it. There is a possibility that 10. Monza, MS in the Treasury, Ebner,

p. 105; 11. Chapter Libr.  $\frac{C. 19}{100}$ , Ebner, p. 107; and 12. one of the Essen MSS at Düsseldorf (Delisle, No. xl; see Bäumer in *Hist. Jahrb.* 1893, p. 258), may belong to this class; as would also 13. the Senlis Sacramentary, Paris Bibl. de Ste Geneviève, MS Latin BB. 20, Delisle, No. xxxi, but for the displacement of the ordinations (evidently a gallicanized set) which are placed between Mur. ii, col. 240, and the prefaces.

<sup>1</sup> The days were long since past when (as Traube says, *Perrona Scottorum in Sitzungsber. d. kgl. bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Classe*, 1900, p. 493) Péronne, S. Riquier, Corbie, those three monasteries on the Somme, were literary centres animated by a common Irish spirit. When the Cambrai MS 164 was being written, Corbie under Adalhard, and S. Riquier through Angilbert, looked to Rome, not to Ireland, for their culture, and the representation of Irish influences in those quarters had passed to Cambrai. Thus the most ancient extant MS of the 'Hibernensis,' still at Cambrai, was written there during the episcopate of Hildoard's predecessor Alberic († 790?); a MS now at St. Petersburg (Q. ii 5), for the most part also excerpts from the Canons, contains a set of twenty verses (printed *M. G. Post. Latin.* i 411-412) which the Irishman Dungal addresses to Hildoard, in which he describes himself as 'exiguus et famulus . . . tuum.' It is not improbable that the long letter from Dungal (first printed by Jaffé from a Harl. MS, and since by Dümmler in *M. G. Epp.*) to a bishop not named, from whom he received an annual allowance, was addressed to Hildoard. Another St. Petersburg MS (F. i 7, saec. viii) contains an 'Egloga' from St. Gregory's *Moralia* of Lathcen filius Baith († the Irish prince, s. vii), see *Neues Archiv*, v 246. Did this also come from Cambrai? I may be considered as giving way unduly to imagination if, remembering the literary jealousies, friendships, and coteries in the days of Charles and Lewis, I suggest that, whilst the Carolingian Supplement is naturally found at S. Riquier, its absence is as natural at Cambrai (the solitary 'Scottic' MS at S. Riquier early

centre of ff. 35<sup>b</sup>, 36 and 37 over a space 220 x 72 millim. surrounded by red lines, the vellum is purple; f. 35<sup>b</sup> offers the title in gold and white characters, disposed in fourteen lines as follows, the words or parts of words printed in italics being in gold: ' | *In nomi*ne dñi hic sa|cramentorū<sup>1</sup> | de circulo | *anni* | *exposito* | a scō Gregorio | Papa Roma|no editū | *ex authen*lico libro | Bibliothecae | cubiculi s|criptum.' The rest of f. 35<sup>b</sup> and ff. 36, 37 are occupied with the Canon (to 'miserere nobis' inclusive Mur. ii 60). On f. 203<sup>a</sup> at the end of the 'Oratio ad ordinandum pontificem' (Mur. ii 271-272)<sup>2</sup> after five lines blank is the following colophon (already printed by Delisle) on alternate lines, in red, by the usual rubricist of the MS, traced in a character that grows larger and more emphatic as he proceeds: Hildoardus | praesul. anno | xxii. sui onus | episcopatum | hunc libellum | sacramentorum | fieri promul|gavit. The date commonly assigned as that of Hildoard's accession to the see of Cambrai is 790; if this be correct the MS would date from 811 or 812; it cannot be later than 817, when Halitgar was already bishop. Hildoard's last known act was to obtain from Lewis the Pious a confirmation of the possessions of his church dated April 15, 816; his death is, again, commonly assigned to July 4 of that year. In any case the MS of

in the ninth century, Traube, p. 529, was probably a relic of the old *fonds*). The comparatively poor and mean form and style of the two sacramentaries at Cambrai suggested at once when I saw them the usual character of the more ordinary Irish codices. The initials, neat, and of good effect from their mere lines, will doubtless tell their tale to the expert; although I noticed in MS 164 but one initial of the common Irish type with dots, fol. 175<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It is impossible here to discuss the question what was the precise text of the title of the book sent from Rome. But the evidence of *Ca.* on this point is not to be lightly dismissed. The '*liber sacramentorum*' of most MSS is not improbably a correction suggested by the niceness of the later Carolingian scholars, who would scout a '*Hic*' or '*Incipit Sacramentorum*.' The noun on which this genitive depends is commonly suppressed in the earliest liturgical documents: '*ordine quo in Sacramentorum continetur*,' Ordo Rom. i, § 32, cf. § 39; '*sicut in Sacramentorum commemoratur*,' Angoulême Sacramentary B. N. lat. 816 (hereafter called '*Ang.*'), f. 47<sup>a</sup>, cf. Muratori, ii 401; S. Amand ordo in Duchesne *Origines*, 2<sup>e</sup> ed. p. 459, 3<sup>e</sup> p. 476. The '*Incipit Sacramentorium*' of *Non.* (see Delisle, No. xxiii) is probably only a scribe's correction of the MS before him (the '*i*' is inserted, small, in the lower member of the '*R*'); '*Sacramentorium*' is a form I do not remember to have seen in s. ix documents. Cf. '*Explicit Sacramentorum a S. Greg. pp. Rom. acditum*' in the Modena Sacramentary (Ebner, p. 96); this evidently goes back on the *Hucusque* preface only, and has no independent value as testimony. Note also how the colophon of *Ca.*, like the *Hucusque*, calls *Greg.* a '*libellus*' not a '*liber*.'

<sup>2</sup> The prayer *Praesta* (= *Gelas.* iii 93, first coll.) appears in Mur. ii 272 only through a mistake; it is written in *Reg.* by a later hand to fill up the last five lines of the page. It does not appear in any other MS I have seen; but *Ard.*, as well as *Ca.*, leaves a space of five blank lines here. *Praesta* seems to be found after the '*Orat. ad ord. pont.*' in the Modena MS (Ebner, p. 96). It is no part of *Gvg.*



*Greg.* which he caused to be written<sup>1</sup> is the earliest copy yet known. It seems hardly open to doubt that this 'libellus sacramentorum' is the only Frankish example still in existence (the case of *Nan.* is different as will be explained later) of the missal used by those persons (and the writer of the *Hucusque* preface tells us there were such) who thought the Carolingian Supplement 'superfluous' and 'not necessary,' did not need it and did not have it, but were content to 'use only' the 'opusculum' of the 'blessed Pope Gregory.' The interesting question arises whether Hildoard's MS derives directly or indirectly from the identical *Gregorianum* sent into France by Hadrian before it received its Frankish supplement. I have been able to find nothing whatever in the MS proper to supply an answer one way or the other, or to take it (for textual and critical purposes) out of the category of MSS which derive from a date subsequent to the addition of the Supplement, and I believe we must be content not to know<sup>2</sup>. So far as its text is concerned, it abounds in solecisms and grammatical errors<sup>3</sup>; of these, however, the 'anno xxii sui onus episcopatum' is one somewhat too extravagant to be taken as a fair specimen. Instances of the scribe's carelessness, too, are not uncommon<sup>4</sup>. Still, when all deductions are made, this MS, as I hope may appear later, will be found of primary value as a witness to the genuine text of *Greg.* as it was sent into France by Hadrian.

*Rodr.* is in some respects the most interesting and instructive of the early Gregorian Sacramentaries. It is not the production of an

<sup>1</sup> The pompous 'feri promulgavit' doubtless has no further meaning; cf. the 'Albericus... feri rogavit' of the colophon of the Cambrai MS of the 'Hibernensis.'

<sup>2</sup> It may be of interest to state that though divided into two volumes the Cambrai MSS 162, 163 form a single Sacramentary; vol. i contains the matter of *Greg.* in Mur. ii 1-138 with a body of masses of common of saints at the end; vol. ii presents a fusion of the rest of *Greg.* and of the Supplement in an order I have not noticed elsewhere. The general character of this Sacramentary is perhaps sufficiently indicated by the fact that it has twelve lessons on Holy Saturday (cf. the eighth-century recension of *Gelas.* in Wilson, *Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 334-335). These volumes present doubtless the next stage of the development of *Greg.* in the Church of Cambrai.

<sup>3</sup> Commonly 'orationē' for 'oratio'; 'incipiunt orationes cotidianas'; 'uigilia adsumptio S. Mar.'; but these things are much more common in Carolingian texts than appears from our smooth prints. The study of the Sacramentaries from this point of view would probably repay the philologist. For the 'ad complendum' of the other MSS of *Greg.*, *Ca.* regularly uses the form 'ad completam'; but once, f. 70<sup>a</sup>, 'ad cōplū.'

<sup>4</sup> For instance: 'et oblationem' for 'et oratio'; omission of 'Iohannis Thome Iacobi' from the canon; of 'Per Christum Dom. nostrum' before 'Per quem hæc omnia' at close of canon; of 'nostris' after 'debitoribus' in the Lord's Prayer; of 'spiritum sapientiæ et intellectus' in the prayer 'ad inf. consignand.' (Mur. c. 65); 'post velandum altare' (for 'velatum').



official scribe; nor is it written for some solemn church; nor does it represent the needs (or fancied needs) of a young Levite, brought up from childhood in the routine of a cathedral school, when about to receive the order of priesthood and use the missal for the first time himself. Rodradus was a man of mature years, seemingly of easy means; whether a layman or a cleric long in orders who hesitated to take upon himself priestly responsibility, is not certain; but certain it is that he was a man whose scruples could be overcome only through the exercise of extreme pressure on the part of his bishop: 'victus Hilmeradi antistitis (of Amiens) iussionibus, et vincetus episcopalis auctoritatis excommunicationibus,' as he himself says. In Rodradus's missal *Greg.* (ff. 19<sup>b</sup>-102<sup>a</sup>) with the Supplement and its preface (ff. 102<sup>a</sup>-201<sup>a</sup>) are kept separate and intact; there follows (ff. 201<sup>b</sup>-248<sup>b</sup>) a body of additional matter which shows how prayers and formularies endeared to the Frankish clergy by long habit ('cui animo sedent') came back in the ninth century with ever increasing volume into public use; and what a devout person like Rodradus who accepted the burden of the sacred ministry only with fear and trembling—'trepidus suscepi' are his words—thought in the year 853 'necessary' (so far as his mass-book was concerned) for its performance<sup>1</sup>.

In comparing the MSS to be reviewed, it will be convenient to consider first the portion of *Greg.* in Muratori ii 7-138, 240-272; and only afterwards the forms of ordination and their position in the MSS. *Reg.* as being printed in Mur. affords the simplest and easiest means of comparison<sup>2</sup>.

I. In *Off.* the prayers are the same, and in the same order, as in *Reg.*, except that:

(a) it adds to the mass of Passion Sunday a 'super populum' *Da nobis quaesumus Dne perseverantem* (Mur. col. 47, note o); this is the

<sup>1</sup> Ff. 201<sup>b</sup>-248<sup>b</sup> comprise roughly: ordinations, ff. 201-204; votive masses (Trinity, Wisdom, &c.), ff. 205-207; masses for vigil and day of the new feast of All Saints, a common of evangelists, ff. 208-209; masses for various occasions like those at the end of Book iii of *Gelas.*, ff. 210-216; masses for dead, ff. 217-219; proper masses of Saints, largely from *Gelas.*, ff. 220-228; common of Saints, ff. 228-233; masses, again, for special occasions and of a personal cast, ff. 234-242; a collection of 'apologiae sacerdotis,' ff. 243-245; finally, a long 'Ordo ad visitandum et inungendum infirmum,' ff. 246-248. At fol. 222<sup>a</sup> is a mass of Invention of Holy Cross, with a long preface, which affords a good example of the way in which the barbarism of Merovingian liturgical composition was corrected in Rodradus's more cultured days; the original text of this preface is to be found in the Angoulême Sacr. Paris B. N. lat. 816, f. 69<sup>a</sup> (Rodradus, or the corrector whom he copied, has changed 'cuius ligni mysteriis saluari credimus omnes' of the Ang. text into 'c. l. mysterio saluari nos credimus').

<sup>2</sup> It is well to state that in *Reg.* Muratori's col. 241 immediately follows his col. 138.

'super populum' of the following Tuesday in *Reg.* and also in *Ott.* itself.

(b) it adds on Palm Sunday a 'Benedictio in Palmis' *Deus cuius Filius pro salute* (c. 51, note 2); I cannot trace this further back.

(c) it adds a 'super populum' *Purifica q. Dne* to the mass of Palm Sunday (c. 52, note b); this is the 'ad populum' at this day in *Gelas.* (c. 546), and in the eighth-century revision of *Gelas.* (Wilson, p. 332, Ang. f. 32<sup>a</sup>).

(d) it adds to the 'orationes pro peste' (better, according to the MSS, 'or. de mortalitate') a prayer entitled 'super oblata' *Subveniat nobis* (c. 269, note k); this is the 'secret' of the mass 'tempore quod absit mortalitatis' in *Gelas.* (c. 712), and eighth-cent. *Gelas.* MS R. (Wilson, p. 369, and Gerbert, p. 305, there referred to), Ang. f. 165<sup>a</sup>, and Paris B. N. lat. 2,296, f. 42<sup>b</sup>.

II. In *Ca.* the prayers are the same, and in the same order, as in *Reg.*, except that on the Epiphany the seventh 'alia oratio' *Illumina* and the 'super oblata' *Ecclesiae tuae* (cc. 18, 16) exchange places in *Ca.*

Moreover, according to my notes, *Ca.* does not contain the prayer *Salutaris tui* of the mass of the Monday of the first week of Lent (c. 31), and the prayers of the mass of Thursday of that week are *Devotionem, Suscipe q. Dne* (see Pamelius, ii 221), *Sacrificia q. Dne, Tuorum nos* instead of *Devotionem, Sacrificia q. Dne, Tuorum nos, Da quaesumus* (cc. 32-33). But I think it is most probable that the MS itself is in these two latter cases like *Reg.*, and that I have here blundered<sup>1</sup>.

III. In *Rodr.* the prayers are the same, and in the same order, as in *Reg.*, except that:

(a) Fifth week of Lent, Saturday, for 'super obl.' *Cunctis nos* (c. 51), *Rodr.* f. 47<sup>b</sup> has *Praesta q. o. D. ut ieiun.*; this latter in *Gelas.* (c. 531) is the 'secret' of Wednesday, but of Saturday in saec. viii *Gelas.* R. and S. in Wilson, p. 332; Ang. f. 31<sup>b</sup>; Godelgaudus, in U. Chevalier *Bibl. Liturg.* vii p. 323.

(b) Assumption, for 'sup. obl.' *Subveniat* (c. 114) *Rodr.* f. 75<sup>b</sup> has *Intercessio q. Dne b. Mariae*; and *Subveniat* follows as 'alia.' *Intercessio* (which in *Gelas.* is the 'secr.' of masses of St. Fabian, and St. Rufus, cc. 638, 664), adapted, is made the 'secr.' of Assumption in s. viii *Gelas.* (R. and S. in Wilson, p. 353; Ang. f. 87<sup>a</sup>; Godelg. p. 340; B. N. lat.

<sup>1</sup> In investigating *Ca.*, I was only able to use Pamelius; when rendered back to *Reg.* the notes thus taken of the contents of the MS, apart from the inversion of the two Epiphany prayers (where a mistake could not creep in), exactly reproduce *Reg.* except in these two cases, in the first of which I may easily have noted that the MS has 'prayers 1, 2, 5' of Pamelius instead of '1, 2, 4, 5,' and in the second '1, 2, 3, 4' instead of '1, 3, 4, 5.' In this latter case the incipits show how a mistake may easily have arisen.



2296, f. 22<sup>b</sup> breaks off imperfect in the mass of the Assumption, but begins with the collect *Concede* as R., S., Ang., and Godelg.; *Concede* is the Ambros. 'super sind.' for Assumption.)

(c) SS. Cornelius and Cypr., for 'super obl.' *Adesto* (c. 119) *Rodr.* f. 77<sup>b</sup> has *Plebis tuae Domine munera, Adesto* being made an 'alia' collect. This is the arrangement in Ang. f. 92<sup>b</sup>, and apparently in S.

(d) The mass of Exalt. of H. Cross found in *Reg.*, *Ott.*, &c., has caused trouble in more than one MS. It is enough to read the first line of the 'super obl.' *Iesu Christi Dni n. corpore saginati* to see that the prayer is an 'ad complendum.' The present Roman missal has overcome the difficulty by reading in accordance with good sense but counter to all ancient authority 'saginandi.' *Rodr.* has adopted more radical measures, but also done better, by making *J. C. D. n. c. s.* a first 'ad compl.' and that in *Reg.*, &c., a second. For 'super obl.' *Rodr.* has adopted the 'secre.' *Devotas* of the mass of Exalt. of H. Cr. in *Gelas.* (c. 667) and s. viii *Gelas.* (R., S., in Wilson, p. 356, Ang. f. 92<sup>a</sup>)<sup>1</sup>.

(e) At f. 101<sup>b</sup> *Rodr.* inserts between the 'oratio ad ordinand. pont.' (cc. 271-272) and the *Hucusque* preface to the Supplement, with the rubric 'v non. mai. Inuentio s. crucis' the mass for that feast in *Gelas.* cc. 645-646 which is also simply adopted in s. viii *Gelas.*<sup>2</sup>

(f) Finally, in the 'Orationes pro peccatis' the prayer *Praesta* at the head of col. 250 of Mur. is placed in *Rodr.* after *Exaudi*, the third prayer of that col.

The case seems clear: not merely is *Reg.* in all these items supported by *Ca.*, *Ott.*, &c., but the changes in *Rodr.* evidently show themselves to be so many instances of the discarded *Gelas.* (and, as appears from (a) above, the eighth-century recension, not the earlier form) asserting itself even in a text which professes formally to be a copy of *Greg.*

IV. In *Belv.*<sup>3</sup> the prayers are the same, and in the same order, as in *Reg.*, except that:

(a) it omits the special preface *Qui ut de hoste* (c. 9) for the mass 'ad sanctam Anastasiam' on Christmas Day.

(b) it omits the fifth and sixth 'aliae orationes' of that feast, *O. s. D. qui hunc diem, D. qui hum. subst.* (c. 11).

V. *Arel.*—I did not examine this MS prayer by prayer, but only noted the order of contents according to the rubrics; this order is that of *Reg.*

<sup>1</sup> The s. viii *Gelas.* (Wilson, p. 356) probably gives a clue to the solution of the difficulties; but this is a matter that cannot be dealt with now.

<sup>2</sup> In *Rodr.* this same mass for the feast of the Inv. of H. Cr. (the absence of which from *Greg.* seems to have been keenly felt in the Gallic lands) is repeated later with a special preface (see *supra*, p. 417, n. 1).

<sup>3</sup> Two leaves are missing between ff. 77 and 78 (from *tribus benignis*, Mur. c. 246, to *populi tui ne plus*, c. 250).



VI. *Non.*<sup>1</sup> shows the following differences from *Reg.*:—

(a) for the mass 'in Oct. Dom.' and 'or. in alia dominica' (cc. 15-16) are substituted 'Dominica prima post natale Domini,' 'Dom. 2<sup>a</sup> p. n. D.' (cf. Supplement in Mur. cc. 158-159); and after the Epiphany, separately intercalated among the feasts of Saints, are Dom. 1 to 6 'post Theophan.' (*ibid.* cc. 159-161). The compiler of the Supplement (which is not contained in *Non.*) derives these six masses from s. viii *Gelas.* which, for its part, largely uses in them *Greg.* material. The subject of the Sunday masses of *Non.* will be again adverted to when the North Italian group of *Greg.* MSS is considered later.

(b) The masses of St. Agatha and St. Valentine are omitted.

(c) Between Nativ. B. V. and SS. Prot. et Hyacinth. (c. 118) a mass 'S. Gorgonii mart.' is inserted (so too in s. viii *Gelas.* MS S., Wilson, p. 355, and Ang. ff. 91-92; Gorgonius is a *Gelas. leas.*, col. 667).

(d) The order of the masses of Sept. 14, SS. Cornel. and Cypr. and Exalt. S. Cr. in *Greg.*, is inverted in *Non.*, and precedence is given to Exalt. S. Cr. as in saec. viii *Gelas.* MS S., Wilson, p. 356, and Ang. f. 92<sup>b</sup>. In MS R, the mass of SS. Corn. and Cypr. is suppressed, and Exalt. S. Cr. is alone honoured on this day.

(e) On Sept. 16 the mass of St. Euphemia is given under the combined title 'Nat. S. Euphem. uirg. Lucie et Geminiani,' and the mass of SS. L. and G. in *Greg.* is omitted in *Non.* I know of no other instance of this arrangement.

(f) The September Ember days and the 'die dom. vacat.' mass (cc. 122-124) are omitted (see below, p. 424, note 3).

(g) Before SS. Cosm. and Damian (c. 124) are added masses of the vigil and feast of St. Matthew, and of St. Maurice and Companions; after St. Mark Pope (c. 126), a mass of St. Denis; between St. Calistus and St. Caesarius (c. 126), masses of St. Luke, and of the vigil and feast of SS. Simon and Jude, and of vigil and feast of All Saints.—Of these, the masses of All Saints date from the ninth century; that of St. Denis may (just possibly) be of some interest in reference to the origin of the MS<sup>2</sup>; the text of those of SS. Matthew, Simon and Jude, and Luke, is the same as in MSS R., S., and Ang. of s. viii *Gelas.* I know of a mass of St. Maurice only in Ang. f. 94<sup>a</sup>, but the prayers are different (St. Maurice is also in the Missale Gothicum, in the Ambrosian, and in the Padua MS, Ebner, p. 127).

(h) Several masses throughout the volume have special prefaces.

<sup>1</sup> A leaf is missing between ff. 34 and 35 (from 'ad compl.' of 'fer. vi,' Mur. c. 38 to c. 40, line 7, *ab imminentibus*).

<sup>2</sup> A space of two lines left for the rubricist was never filled in; and the first line of the collect is in red.

(1) Finally, the 'oratio ad ordinand. pont.' (Mur. cc. 271-272) is incorporated among the forms of ordination.

Thus, though the prayers and order of *Greg.* as found in *Ca.*, *Reg.*, *Ott.*, *Rodr.*, *Belv.* (and *Arel.* as limited above) are still preserved in *Non.*, this MS shows a further stage in the process of incorporating Gallican-Gelasian matter into *Greg.*

In regard to the forms of ordination of *Greg.* and the place assigned to them, the following is the evidence of the MSS examined.

In *Ca.*, *Reg.*, *Ott.*, *Rodr.*, they are those given in Mur. ii cc. 357-361, and they are placed between the Canon (cc. 1-6) and the masses (c. 7 seqq.).

This was also the order in *Belv.* when that MS first left the hands of the copyist; but changes were immediately made which obscure though they do not obliterate the original features. The MS in its present mutilated state begins with the words 'ab eterna damnatione' of the Canon (c. 3), which is continued almost to the end of f. 2, where after *Agnus Dei*, &c. (as Mur. c. 6), in the same line is the rubric 'Benedictio episcoporum,' and there follow on the rest of this page and on ff. 4 and 8 the forms of ordination, Mur. ii 357-361, in their proper sequence, and with their text intact. On ff. 3, 5, 6 and 7 are inserted by, as I think, the same scribe and rubricist, forms for minor orders as follows: ff. 3 and 5 = Mur. ii c. 405 (*Ostarius cum ordinatur* to end of c. 408), and then 'Capitulum S. Gregorii' *Sicut qui invitus to ac manutergium* (Ménard, p. 234; Migne P. L. 68. 219-220); f. 6<sup>a-b</sup> 'Ad subdiac. ordinand.' *Exhibeatur in conspectu to consequatur* (Ménard, pp. 234-235, c. 2; Migne, c. 220); there immediately follows, in the last two lines of f. 6<sup>b</sup>, the title '*In nomine Domini. Incipit*,' &c., continued on f. 7<sup>a</sup>, as in Mur. c. 1 to *dignum et iustum est*. These inserted non-*Greg.* ordinations go back of course to the Gallican set in *Gelas.* i 95, cf. 96. It would appear, therefore, that the scribe first copied *Greg.* as he found it before him in the order now found in *Ca.*, *Reg.*, &c.

*Arel.* The original MS now begins f. 9<sup>a</sup> with the words 'ab omni perturbatione securi' of the Canon (Mur. c. 6) and the masses follow. If the original MS when perfect contained the ordinations they must have been placed before the Canon. The forms for minor orders, practically the same as those in *Belv.*, are found ff. 5<sup>a</sup>-8 in a hand hardly later (it would seem) than that of the original scribe.

*Non.* begins with the Canon, which is followed by the forms of ordination, all in the original hand, and thus disposed: the 'Bened. episc.' and 'Or. ad ordinand. presb.' as Mur. ii cc. 357-360, but the 'Or. ad ord. pont.' which is the last item in the other MSS (cc. 271-272)

is in *Nov.* inserted before the 'super obl.' c. 358, with, however, omission of that part of the explanatory rubric 'Or. ad . . . incipit est' which would have made the insertion intelligible. After these, and under the title 'Incipit ordo de sacris ordinibus benedicendis' (cf. *Mur.* c. 405), come forms for orders up to subdeacon inclusive similar to those in *Beko.* and *Arel.* Then, with the title 'ad ordinandum diaconem,' the remaining *Greg.* form (*Mur.* cc. 360-361). *Nov.* in this particular of the ordinations again shows an advance on the other MSS.

The testimony of the MSS enumerated p. 413, n. 2 *supra*, on the points hitherto considered, so far as it can be ascertained from the descriptions of Delisle and Ebner, appears to be as follows:—

(a) In regard to the place of the *Greg.* forms of ordination, they are placed between the Canon and the body of masses in Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7; the masses immediately follow the Canon in 2, 10, 11 (and 13); 5 is imperfect; as to 8, 9, 12 information is wanting<sup>1</sup>.

(b) As regards the remainder of *Greg.* (*Mur.* ii cc. 7 to 138+241 to 272) the descriptions in Delisle of 1, 2, 3 (and, except the ordinations, of 13 also) raise a strong presumption that they offer the same book as *Reg.* No. 4 shows, according to Ebner (pp. 29, 30), the same 'arrangement and contents' as *Reg.*, except that 'numerous prefaces have been embodied in the text.' If I rightly understand Ebner (p. 290), No. 5, imperfect, affords the same text as *Reg.* in *Mur.* cc. 116 to 138+241 to 272, except that the mass of Exalt. S. Crucis and St. Nicomedes (*Mur.* cc. 119-120) are wanting (or is it only that a leaf is missing?). His description of No. 6 is of course defective, yet, taking all the circumstances into consideration, it seems little doubtful that this MS is, like No. 5, a copy of *Greg.* of the type of MS *Reg.* No. 7 shows 'exactly the same disposition of its contents' as *Reg.* (Ebner, p. 388). As to Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 further information is required before any definite statement can be made.

The question arises whether the book thus limited is complete, or whether any other items not now found in *Reg.* were contained in the original MS of the *Gregorianum* that was sent from Rome to Charles by the hands of 'John the monk and abbot.' If the witness of the MSS is to be taken as decisive in such a question, the only items, so far as I can see, on behalf of which a claim can be raised that calls for any consideration, are contained in a group of *Greg.* MSS which I may call the North Italian group.

The question raised by this group of MSS is—did *Greg.* as sent by Hadrian comprise, besides the matter of *Reg.*, a body of Sunday masses

<sup>1</sup> In MS Bodl. Auct. D. i 20 (Delisle, No. xxxviii), though the MS seems not to agree with *Reg.*, the ordinations (bishop, priest, deacon, only) come between the Canon and the masses.



(after Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost) corresponding to Nos. vii-xlii in Muratori's print of the Carolingian Supplement (coll. 158-176)? Their absence from *Rodr.* seemed to Ménard to be so 'incredible' and 'absurd' a feature as to be a main consideration in leading him to choose for his print his 'Codex S. Eligii' (B. N. lat. 12,051, Delisle, No. li), with the result of involving the whole subject of the early Roman Liturgy in confusion and darkness, and making it for subsequent inquirers a region 'ubi sempiternus horror inhabitat.' The mere fact that the compiler of the Carolingian Supplement thought proper to include in it the body of Sunday masses Nos. vii-xlii raises of itself a strong presumption that such masses were not contained in the *Gregorianum* as sent into France. But there is still room for the supposition that this was only an omission; and it might be urged that the 'North Italian group' of *Greg.* MSS, so far as their contents are yet known, countenances this supposition. The Verona MSS 91 and 86 may be taken as typical: immediately after the end of *Greg.* comes a section headed 'Incipiunt orationes ad missam diebus dominicorum' containing<sup>1</sup> masses for Sundays after Epiphany (4?), (? oct. of) Easter (4?, 5), (? oct. of) Pentecost (5?), oct. of Apostles Peter and Paul (5), Lawrence (5), Michaelmas (8)<sup>2</sup>.

The Gospel capitulars of the eighth and ninth centuries show a two-fold arrangement distinguished by the mode of counting Sundays after Pentecost: one class reckons simply Sundays 1 to 24 (or 25, 26) after Pentecost; the other, Sundays after Pentecost, Peter and Paul, Lawrence, Michaelmas ('post S. Angeli'; some capitulars reckon 'post Cypriani' instead of 'post Angeli'). Of the two modes the latter bears on the face of it evidence of Roman origin or connexion, even if there were not actual evidence that the origin of the other is not Roman but Frankish. Not merely is this the system adopted in the eighth-century recension of *Gelas.* (MSS R., S., Ang., Paris MS lat. 2,296), but

<sup>1</sup> I am obliged here to combine the information in Ebner, pp. 287, 290.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Monza, MS  $\frac{F. 1}{101}$ , saec. ix-x: post oct. Pasch. 1-4; post Pentec. 1-6; post nat. Apost. 1-6; post Laur. 1-5 (?); post Angeli, 1-8 (Ebner, p. 108). Padua Bibl. capit. MS D. 47: post Epiph. 1-4; post oct. Pasch. 1-4; post Pentec. ebd. 2-5; post nat. Apost. 1; post oct. Apost. 1-5; post nat. Laur. 1-4; post S. Angeli, 1-9 (*ibid.* pp. 123-127). In this MS the Sundays are intercalated among the feasts of Saints as in *Greg.* and saec. viii *Gelas.* It appears to be the most interesting of all the MSS catalogued by Ebner; though (speaking with the reserve imposed on one who has not seen the MS) I cannot but think that Ebner's assignment of it to the class of the 'gregorianisirtes Gelasianum' (= s. viii *Gelas.*) is due to a misunderstanding. It seems to be *Greg.* But he is probably right (p. 380) in viewing it as a member (the earliest and, I would add, a most revolutionary member) of the 'North Italian group.' The Roman topographical notes are hardly a sign of the purity of the text.

is in *Nov.* inserted before the 'super obl.' c. 358, with, however, omission of that part of the explanatory rubric 'Or. ad . . . imitram est' which would have made the insertion intelligible. After these, and under the title 'Incipit ordo de sumis ordinibus benedicensis' (cf. *Mur.* c. 40), come forms for orders up to subdeacon inclusive similar to those in *Sub. and Abal.* Then, with the title 'ad ordinandum diaconem,' the remaining *Greg. form* (*Mur.* cc. 360-361). Now in this particular of the rubrication again shows an advance on the other MSS.

The testimony of the MSS enumerated p. 413, n. 2 *infra*, on the points hitherto considered, so far as it can be ascertained from the descriptions of Delisle and Ebner, appears to be as follows:—

(1) As regards the place of the *Greg. forms* of ordination, they are placed between the Canon and the body of masses in Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7; the masses immediately follow the Canon in 2, 10, 11 (and 12; 5 is imperfect; as to 8, 9, 12 information is wanting).

(2) As regards the remainder of *Greg.* (*Mur.* ii cc. 7 to 138+141 to 272) the descriptions in Delisle of 1, 2, 3 (and, except the ordinations of 23 also) raise a strong presumption that they offer the same book as *Reg.* No. 4 shows, according to Ebner (pp. 29, 30), the same 'arrangement and contents' as *Reg.*, except that 'numerous prefaces have been embodied in the text.' If I rightly understand Ebner (p. 290, No. 5, imperfect, affords the same text as *Reg.* in *Mur.* cc. 128 to 138+141 to 272, except that the mass of Exalt. S. Crucis and St. Nemesios (*Mur.* cc. 119-120) are wanting (or is it only that a leaf is missing?). His description of No. 6 is of course defective, yet, taking all the circumstances into consideration, it seems little doubtful that this MS is, like No. 5, a copy of *Greg.* of the type of MS *Reg.* No. 7 shows 'exactly the same disposition of its contents' as *Reg.* (Ebner, p. 380). As to Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 further information is required before any definite statement can be made.

The question arises whether the book thus limited to whether any other items not now found in *Reg.* original MS of the *Gregorianism* that was sent by the hands of 'John' k and abbo MSS is to be taken as such a ch a. so far as I can see, on for any consideration, as I may call the North Ita.

The question raised by Hadrian comprise, besides

<sup>1</sup> In MS *Forl.* Auct. D. 19 agree with *Reg.*, the ordination Canon and the masses.



Amalar, a curious and inquiring person, leaves us no doubt on the subject. In compiling his antiphonar for the Office, he found in some MSS a body of what he calls 'antiphons taken from the *codices* gospels.' No one who carefully examines and follows Amalar's treatise will, I think, fail to come to the conclusion that Tommasi (*Opp.* v 297 seq. and his note A) rightly identifies these with the antiphons for Sundays 1-24 after Pentecost in his St. Gall MS ('Hartker,' just published in facsimile). 'As to these antiphons,' writes Amalar, 'I asked the masters (= cantors) of the Roman Church whether they sang them. "Certainly not," they replied. But our masters (in France) avouch that they received them from the first masters who taught the Roman chant within the Frankish dominions. God alone knows who are the deceivers here, who the deceived; and whether the Romans never sang them, or have simply let them fall out of use through their own negligence and indifference; in any case we sing them, not only on account of their wording (for their words are truly salutary), but also on account of the high repute of our cantors, who, in the art and practice of Church song, proudly point to their own pre-eminence'<sup>1</sup>.

The Modena MS *Bibl. capit. ii 7*, 'saec ix to x,' shows (Ebner, pp. 94-96) a *Gregorianum* considerably more interpolated than *Non.*, and considerably altered. At the end is a body of Sunday masses; those after Pentecost are numbered 1-24, thus betraying the influence of the Carolingian Supplement. But in the four MSS mentioned above, these Sundays bear a distinctly Roman label. Should the text of their masses, on examination, prove to be different from that of the corresponding masses in the Supplement<sup>2</sup>, a case is made out for considering them really part of *Greg.* as used in Rome in Hadrian's time, and therefore *Reg.* and its congeners as, so far, incomplete. If not, they will be welcome evidence of the channels through which, and probably the form in which, the Supplement found its way south, and by-and-by to Rome. Until the necessary information is forthcoming the question must be left open<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> 'Qui glorianur magisterio se uti cantilenae exercitationis,' Amalar. *de ord. Antiph.* cap. 68. If the Roman deacon John badly lost his temper over this matter of Church song (Bäumer, *Gesch. d. Breviers*, pp. 233-235), there was much to excuse him.

<sup>2</sup> The whole series of the Suppl. derives directly, not from the older type of *Gelas.*, but from the saec. viii recension.

<sup>3</sup> We are now in a position to understand the economy of *Non.*, which it may be well to explain here. The original MS ends f. 101<sup>a</sup>. A later scribe (saec. xi, I think), without the loss of a line, continues the MS with the title 'Incipiant misse in diebus dominicis a pentecosten usque ad aduentum Domini'; then follows (in more than one hand seemingly) the series *Dom.* 1-24, incorporating the September Ember day masses omitted by the original scribe of the MS (see p. 420 *supra*). The masses for Sundays after Easter do not appear in the MS. The



But whatever the answer on the point of detail thus reserved, it is, I think, already clear that, taking into account the whole body of 'Gregorian' MSS of the ninth and tenth centuries, one class of them, and one only, preserves the *Gregorianum*, the actual book, sent by Hadrian to Charles, viz. that represented in print by *Reg.*—when, of course, that print is restored to the order of the manuscript itself, viz. Mur. ii, coll. 1 to 6 + 357 to 361 + 7 to 138 + 241 to 272<sup>1</sup>. I would add, moreover, that from this book alone<sup>2</sup> can the rites and formularies, and the authentic text of the prayers, in use in the Roman Church at the close of the eighth century be ascertained; and all other texts such as those printed by Pamelius, Rocca, Ménard, or presented in the whole body of known MSS of the ninth and tenth centuries, can claim to represent the use of the Roman Church only in so far as they coincide with the MSS of the class represented in print by *Reg.*<sup>3</sup> At the same

omission of the *Greg.* Ember masses of September makes it probable that, varying the practice observed for the Sundays after Christmas and Epiphany, which are intercalated among the Saints' days, the person for whom the book was written reserved the Sundays after Easter and Pentecost (including the September Ember masses) for a special series at the end of *Greg.* as now found in the Verona MSS 91 and 86. Whether this series was ever actually written, and the MS has since been mutilated, must remain uncertain. Delisle, from the handwriting, considers the MS to be of French origin; if this be so it would acquire, from the liturgical point of view, an additional interest, inasmuch as it so far departs from both the true and corrupt types of *Greg.* then current in France, that it must have been written under particular instructions to suit the practice of the region for which it was intended. I say nothing on the subject of the 'orationes cottidianae Gregorii papae,' printed by Ebner, pp. 318-21, from the Padua MS, as it seems sufficiently clear that the model and original of this section is to be sought in the saec. viii *Gelas.*

<sup>1</sup> It is to be remembered that the *Liturgia Romana vetus* must have been to a large extent a printer's speculation; and that Muratori never saw the MSS *Reg.* and *Ott.*, but only copies sent him by his friend Giuseppe Bianchini the Oratorian; nor does it even appear that he corrected the proof-sheets of *Greg.* with these copies; the only part of the work that is certainly his is the preface. The undertaking was looked at askance by some at least of those who had access to the MSS, and could have afforded effectual help; see Vezzosi's remarks on the *Lit. Rom. vet.*, and on Muratori, and his work, in *Thomasii Opp.* vi, xlii-xliii. It is a pity that Vezzosi, who, as he says, often examined *Reg.*, and corrects Muratori's number ('non 335 sed 337'), did not, even if he must needs indulge in injurious remarks and insinuations, also point out the great mistake in the print which has misled those who have used 'Muratori' from that day to this. I may add that there appears to be no ground for supposing that *Reg.* is a MS written anywhere else than in France.

<sup>2</sup> Of course the *Ordo Romanus* must be the main source for merely rubrical directions.

<sup>3</sup> The words in the text are purposely made, both for inclusion and exclusion, as definite as I can make them. I know that they go beyond what is warranted by anything adduced in this 'Note,' and recognize what the statement made implies for the history and chronology of a number of sacred rites. But I believe they

time it is to be observed that one valuable and useful instrument of criticism still exists, which, in points of detail, enables us to get behind all the extant MSS of *Greg.* This is the 'eighth-century recension' of *Gelas.*, the important rôle of which in the evolution of Western liturgy has not as yet been duly appreciated. This work, more than anything else, not merely facilitated Charles's measures in regard to the mass-book, but rendered them inevitable.

EDMUND BISHOP.

## CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF LATIN MSS. III.

### THE LYONS-PETERSBURG MS OF COUNCILS<sup>1</sup>.

THE first of the papers published under this heading in the *JOURNAL* (*J. T. S.* i. 435-441), was mainly devoted to the proof of the fact that the manuscript now classified as F II 3 in the library at St. Petersburg was identical with the two MSS 563, 564 of the Jesuit College of Clermont, and further that it originally formed part of the same MS as Clermont 569, now Berlin lat. 83—the combined MS being that described by Sirmond in 1629 as the property of the Chapter of Lyons. The Petersburg MS has, through the singular generosity of the authorities of the Imperial Library, been deposited for some time in the Bodleian, and further notes based on personal inspection may therefore not be out of place in view of the great interest, both historical and palaeographical, which attaches to it.

1. The MS—that is to say, the Petersburg part of the original MS—is unfortunately in a terribly damaged condition; at some period before

express the conclusion to which, as precise information increases, liturgists will come; and it is at any rate important that such a thesis should be brought, if necessary, to the test of a detailed and formal discussion on the basis of the fullest knowledge of the evidence, if, that is to say, the study of Western liturgy of the seventh to the tenth century is to emerge from its present stage of impressionism. And I am the more insistent on this point when I read (to adduce but one instance) what a writer so careful as Friedrich Wiegand, whose vision is so clear, and who sees so much, says of the *Gregorianum* (*Die Stellung des apostolischen Symbols, &c.* i. 291-3, 296-7); in saying this I quite bear in mind what is said pp. 422-4 *supra*, as to the Sunday masses, Nos. vii-xlii, of the Supplement.

<sup>1</sup> I must record my grateful thanks to my colleague, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, for his help in making notes for me on this MS at a time when I was too ill to work myself.



the year 1764, when the catalogue of Clermont MSS was drawn up, it suffered from fire, with the result that in the first part of the MS nearly half the writing, and throughout the greater part of it several lines, have disappeared from the top of the page. For the last few leaves the damage reduces itself to the loss of a single line. The early leaves of the Berlin portion of the MS appear to have suffered similarly, so that the damage took place when the MS was still undivided. The breadth of the MS is  $9\frac{1}{2}$  inches, of the writing (which is in a single column) about 7 inches: the height of the MS when intact would appear to have been about  $13\frac{1}{4}$  inches, and of the writing something over 10 inches. There were originally twenty lines to a page. The ink of the early leaves has faded a good deal, though it hardly ever ceases to be legible: but from about fol. 63 onwards it is in admirable preservation.

The MS consists, with the exceptions to be mentioned, entirely of quaternions, signed with numbers on the last page of the gathering. The first gathering consists now of seven leaves only, the first leaf having been lost: it contained probably on the *recto* the title of the MS, on the *verso* the beginning of the preface of Dionysius Exiguus to the second edition of his collection of Canons, as the present fol. 1 *a* commences with fragments of the word 'digesta,' some ten lines from the beginning in Maassen's text, *Geschichte der Quellen*, &c., pp. 960-962. The gathering must have fallen to pieces before the present binding, since it is now wrongly arranged: the leaf now numbered 3 ought to follow, instead of preceding, leaves 4 and 5. The signature to this gathering has been completely cut away on fol. 7 *b*: of those to the second gathering on fol. 15 *b*, and to the fourth on fol. 31 *b*, just sufficient traces still remain: the rest are legible enough. All the gatherings are quaternions until the twentieth, which consists of two leaves only, foll. 152, 153—the last half of fol. 153 *b* being blank, though no corresponding break occurs in the subject-matter. Further the two signatures 19 and 20 are repeated: fol. 151 *b* is signed q. xviii; fol. 153 *b* q. xx; fol. 161 *b* q. xviii; fol. 169 *b* q. xx; fol. 177 *b* q. xxi; fol. 185 *b* (the last of the Petersburg MS) q. xxii. These various irregularities have a common explanation: the copying of the manuscript was entrusted to two scribes, who are easily distinguished, since one of them wrote in uncial, the other in semi-uncial: the uncial scribe wrote the first two gatherings foll. 1-15 (and also, for some reason or another, fol. 63 *b*), the semi-uncial scribe the succeeding gatherings down to fol. 153. It would seem that his part was calculated to finish at the end of the eighteenth quaternion, fol. 143 *b*; but, on account, as one may suppose, of the unusual space which semi-uncial writing covers (the uncial scribe gets about five more letters in a line), he required nearly ten more pages to copy his share of the presumably uncial exemplar, and so occupied



a nineteenth quaternion and nearly, but not quite, two leaves over it. Meanwhile the uncial scribe had been doing his part—the exemplar was therefore either, like many ancient MSS, never bound at all, or had been unbound for the present purpose—and his sheets had been already signed before it was found that his semi-uncial colleague would outstep the number of sheets allotted to him.

For the greater part of their work these two scribes write sharply distinguishable hands: the *a*, *r* and *s* are regularly of majuscule form in the one, of minuscule form in the other. But oddly enough each attempts on one occasion to imitate the characteristics of the other: on fol. 71 *a* the semi-uncial scribe tries to write in uncial, on fol. 162 *b* the uncial scribe tries to write in semi-uncial. A third hand appears to write a few lines at the bottom of fol. 175 *b* and at the top of fol. 176 *a*; and more strangely still his writing is uncial on fol. 175 *b*, semi-uncial on fol. 176 *a*. Possibly a fourth hand writes a few lines at the bottom of fol. 177 *a*. It would be interesting to know which, if any, of these hands continues to write in the Berlin portion of the MS: but I have never seen it, and it is not quite easy to draw a definite conclusion from Rose's description in the Berlin catalogue. Anyhow we seem in the composition of this huge MS—the Petersburg portion contains 185 leaves, the Berlin 119, of thick vellum—to be introduced into a scriptorium where more than one tendency, palaeographically speaking, is at work. In the uncial scribe we have an old uncial hand of the rather degraded and uninteresting but genuine and not yet imitative form in which it was still used at the end of the seventh century. In the semi-uncial scribe we have a contemporary using a totally different and far more life-like hand, the free and bold semi-uncial which was in use already at the beginning of the sixth century, and which anticipates in character and outline the later minuscule hand, while it has hardly yet in the Petersburg MS begun the process of contraction in size, and especially in breadth, which distinguishes the later from the earlier writing. On the other hand, in the fragmentary scribe of fol. 175 *b* we seem to have clear traces of the imitative uncial writing with its fine or rather finikin strokes, such as one associates with the transition from the seventh to the eighth century.

But impressions of date from handwriting alone are apt to be delusive, and only the most highly trained palaeographers have a right to offer a decided opinion on such matters: and even they, in the relative paucity of early MSS, would perhaps prefer to call in the aid of a further test. At any rate one whose knowledge is purely empirical will naturally fall back on the evidence of the abbreviations employed. The sacred names—*deus*, *dominus*, *iesus*, *christus* (*christianus*), *spiritus*—are consistently abbreviated by contraction in the ordinary forms. *Sanctus*

sanctitas), episcopus, presbyter, diaconus, are found both in full and in abbreviation: but whereas the abbreviations used for sanctus, presbyter and diaconus are regular or common, the abbreviations for episcopus are sufficiently abnormal to be instructive. Abbreviations by suspension are rare: but I have noticed eps for nominative plural (fol. 170 b); epis for accusative singular; episo<sup>1</sup>, with name agreeing, for accusative (fol. 169 a); eps, with name agreeing, for genitive (fol. 174 a); epsi for ablative: just as  $\bar{d}$  = dixit,  $\bar{leg}$  = legatus,  $\bar{proū}$  = prouinciae, occur in the Carthaginian Council. Abbreviations by contraction, on the other hand, are common: epsci epsco epscis are found occasionally, epis rarely; epsm epsi epso epsis very frequently, and indeed on the whole more often than the later normal forms epm epi epo epis. On fol. 170 b occurs the *vox nihili*  $\bar{epsōix}$ , which would appear to be the nearest the (uncial) scribe could get to a copy of epsōz = epsorum, i.e. episcoporum.  $\bar{qnm}$  I have noticed once for quoniam (fol. 161 a),  $\bar{p}$  occurs twice at least for per (foll. 3 b, 11 b): a superposed sign, something like s, is used for p not only at the end of a line, e.g. sacrificauerunt fol. 21 a, quorundam fol. 144 a, but twice in the middle of a line in cases of suas, fol. 163 b suas, fol. 164 b suam. The signs  $\bar{b}$ ; for bus,  $\bar{q}$ ,  $\bar{q}$ ; for que, are of course found commonly: the stroke for m at the end of a word occurs regularly at the end of a line (rather to the right of, than over, the final letter), not commonly elsewhere; and in the same way ligatures are allowed, and even letters or syllables are superposed, at or close to the end of a line, for economy of space. Noster is habitually written in full: but I have noticed both  $\bar{n}$  (dominus noster, fol. 57 b), and  $\bar{nōi}$  (domini dei nostri, fol. 172 a); while the third scribe, in his fragment at the top of fol. 176 a, is alone in using the later abbreviation nri = nostri. Practically no other abbreviations are found.

These indications, taken together, point to a date within the limits of the seventh century. The practice of the semi-uncial scribe hardly goes beyond the use of A. D. 600: the uncial scribe betrays indications of an approaching change: the third hand, both in his imitative writing and in his use of nri = nostri, seems to take us below the middle of the century. Probably the half-century A. D. 650-700 best suits the converging lines of evidence.

The exemplar of our MS would appear to have been one where (1) s and f might be confused, for on fol. 113 a, praes- was written praef-, though corrected by the first hand: (2) m and ni might be confused, for on fol. 120 b crescentiani is written crescentiam: (3) c and e might be confused, for on fol. 170 a co is written for eo, and on fol. 170 b causac for causae.

The rubbed condition of some of the outside leaves of the gatherings

<sup>1</sup> Probably copied from episc of the exemplar.

suggests that the MS was originally left unbound: but at some time in the eighth or ninth century the leaves were trimmed for binding, care being taken that all ends of lines or *marginalia* likely to be lost in the process should be first copied further into the page. If only one scribe was employed on this task, he used more than one handwriting: for the words lost or likely to be lost from the text of the first pages—after fol. 12 the original scribes had been more careful not to encroach on to the margin—are re-copied in uncial of a late type, while the *marginalia*, which consist almost exclusively of titles of the councils, are copied in by a Merovingian hand<sup>1</sup>. Everything was thus saved except on fol. 132 *b*, where a long passage (twenty-seven lines in Migne) in the Carthaginian council of June 401 is omitted in the text—without any break, so that the omission must have been due to the loss or passing over of a leaf or two leaves in the archetype—and supplied in another hand (of about 700 A. D.) in the margin: in this case the precautions taken elsewhere were omitted, and about eight letters have been lost from each line of the marginal supplement.

There are, speaking generally, no post-Caroline corrections in the MS. It is one great advantage possessed by ancient manuscripts of councils, that, as they passed out of date by the introduction of later systematic collections, they were safe for the most part from the disastrous industry of mediaeval scholars.

2. The contents of the Petersburg MS are as follows:—

fol.	1 <i>a</i>			Preface of Dionysius Exiguus to his second edition
	2 <i>a</i>			Capitula of the Canons of the Apostles
	5 <i>b</i>		”	” Nicaea (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	3 <i>a</i>	III	”	” Ancyra
	6 <i>b</i>		”	” Neocaesarea (whole title lost)
	”	V	”	” Gangra
	7 <i>b</i>	VI	”	” Antioch
	9 <i>a</i>		”	” Laodicea (whole title lost)
	11 <i>a</i>	VIII	”	” Constantinople
	11 <i>b</i>	VIII	”	” Chalcedon
	13 <i>a</i>		”	” Sardica (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	14 <i>a</i>		”	” Carthage (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	16 <i>a</i>	XII	”	” <i>diuersorum conciliorum Africae prouinciae</i>

<sup>1</sup> If the MS was, as is probable, in Lyons, it is perhaps hardly likely that Caroline minuscule and not Merovingian writing would have been employed after 800 A. D.



20 <i>b</i>	[XIII] <sup>1</sup>	Capitula of the Canons of Ancyra <sup>2</sup>
22 <i>a</i>	XIII	Arles
22 <i>b</i>	xv	Sinodus Valentina (no capitula, name only)
"	xvi	Sinodus Foroiculensis " "
"	xvii	Sinodus Regensis " "
"	xviii	Capitula of the Canons of Orange
23 <i>b</i>	xviii	Vaison
24 <i>a</i>	xx	Arles <sup>3</sup>
25 <i>b</i>	xxi	Agde
28 <i>a</i>	"	Orleans (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
29 <i>b</i>	xxiii	Epaon
32 <i>a</i>	xxiiii	Arles 'secunda' <sup>4</sup>
33 <i>b</i>	"	Vaison II (whole title lost)
"	I Text of the Canons of the Apostles	
43 <i>a</i>	"	Nicaea (number at the head of the Canons lost)
50 <i>a</i>	III	Ancyra
56 <i>a</i>	IIII	Neocaesarea
58 <i>b</i>	"	Gangra (number at the head of the Canons lost)
61 <i>a</i>	VI	Antioch
69 <i>b</i>	VII	Laodicea
77 <i>b</i>	VIII	Constantinople
80 <i>a</i>	VIIII	Chalcedon
92 <i>b</i>	X	Sardica
102 <i>a</i>	XI	Carthage
119 <i>b</i>	"	'diuersa concilia uniuersae prouinciae Africae'
178 <i>b</i>	XIII	Ancyra
185 <i>a</i>	XIIII	Arles

With regard to the first fourteen of these items the correspondence

<sup>1</sup> The MS has at the end of the titles of the 'diuersa concilia Africanae prouinciae' **EXPLICIT CAPITULA XIII**. The number XIII obviously belongs to the heading of the next series of capitula: but the fact that it is thus misunderstood and misplaced suggests that our MS was copied from an exemplar which contained so far exactly the same contents, including, that is, the second version of the canons of Ancyra.

<sup>2</sup> The title is 'Ancyram et Caesaream,' but the capitula here, and the text on fol. 178*b*, give only Ancyra. 'Ancyra and Caesarea' is a form drawn from the title prefixed to the canons in the Isidorian version.

<sup>3</sup> The capitula of this council are only a selection: they are numbered i-viii, xiii-xxv, vi-x, i(?)-vi (= xlvi-lvi of the editions).

<sup>4</sup> The capitula which follow this title are, however, those of the second council of Orange, A. D. 529.

between capitula and text in the Petersburg MS is complete. But this part of the MS breaks off after fol. 185 *b* in the canon there numbered viii, but in Bruns xvi, of the first council of Arles: and from this point onwards the Berlin MS takes its place. From Rose's catalogue it will be seen that that MS begins with the final words of the same canon, '... nionem consequantur | ut nullus epis alium epism inculcet,' and after Arles has the following councils:—

fol. 1 *a*; xv Statuta synodi apud ecclesiam Valen(t)nam [Valence, A. D. 374].

fol. 2 *a*; xvi Clero et plebi ecclesiae Foroiuliensi [Letter of Valence to Fréjus].

fol. 3 *b*; xvii Sinodus habita in ciuitate Regensi [Riez, A. D. 439].

fol. 6 *a*; xviii Constitutiones sanctae synodi habitae in territorio Arausico [Orange I, A. D. 441].

fol. 11 *a*; Constitutiones sanctae synodus habitae in ciuitate Vasensi [Vaison I, A. D. 442].

fol. 12 *b*; xx Synodus habita in ciuitate Arelat. [Arles II, A. D. 452].

fol. 16 *a*; XXI Synodus habita in ciuitate Agatensi [Agde, A. D. 506].

fol. 25 *b*; Cum auctore deo in Aurilianensi urbe . . . [Orleans I, A. D. 511].

fol. 30 *b*; xxiii Synodus Epaunensis [Epaon, A. D. 517].

fol. 37 *b*; xxiiii Constitutio sanctorum episcoporum quae in ciuitate Arelatensi . . . [Arles IV, A. D. 524].

fol. 39 *b*; xxv Constitutio habita Carpentoratae [Carpentras, A. D. 527].

fol. 40 *b*; Capitula sancti Augustini.

fol. 44 *a*; xxvi Constitutio episcoporum in ciuitate Arausica [Orange II, A. D. 529].

The correspondence, it will be seen, between the list of capitula of these Gallic councils in the Petersburg MS and their text in the Berlin MS is complete down to no. xxiii. But the capitula give Orange II under the heading xxiv Arles II and substitute Vaison for Carpentras as no. xxv: the text in the Berlin MS goes on without break to De synodo Arverna [Auvergne, A. D. 535], Synodus Aurelianensis secunda [Orleans III, A. D. 538], Canones Aurilianenses tertii [Orleans V, A. D. 549]. At this point (fol. 80 *a*) the words EXPLICIT FELICETER AMEN may indicate the end of one stage in the collection: but the original hand still continues with other councils, no longer however in strict chronological order—Arles III, A. D. 455; Vaison II, A. D. 529; Arles V, A. D. 554, ending on fol. 87 *b* with the ejaculation DS ADIVVA ME. The remaining leaves are by another hand and contain more miscellaneous matter, including only one council, that of Macon in A. D. 581<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gillert's list of the councils whose capitula are contained in the Petersburg

The original MS, that is, the Petersburg MS with the first eighty-seven leaves of the Berlin MS, consisted therefore of the following elements :

(i) The complete collection of Greek and African councils according to the second edition of Dionysius Exiguus, with the preface properly belonging to it. About this Dionysiana the following points are to be remarked. It is a century earlier than any other complete MS of Dionysius known to us: its history is definitely connected with the papal chancery by the subscription (whether originally belonging to our MS or to its ancestor) appended to the last of the Dionysian documents, the letter *Optaremus* of the African council to Celestine, *EXPLICIUNT CANONES ECCLESIASTICI EX SCRINIO ECCLESIAE ROMANE TRANSLATI AMEN*, fol. 178 b: it was written a century before Pope Hadrian sent his enlarged Dionysiana to Charles the Great, and yet it already contains several (though not all) of the marks which distinguish the Hadriana from the original Dionysius, such as the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, the Chalcedonian definition, and some at least of the names of the bishops present at the different councils.

(ii) The council of Ancyra, this time in the original form of the Isidorian version, printed from the two MSS of Freising and Würzburg by Maassen, pp. 929-933.

(iii) A series of Gallic councils in strict chronological order, beginning with the first council of Arles in A. D. 314, and going down either to the second council of Vaison—the last of which the capitula are given at the head of the MS—or to the second council of Orange—the last which is numbered in the text of the MS—but in either case to the year 529 A. D.

The facts that the list of capitula at the beginning of the MS ends here, and that the continuous numeration of pieces (i-xxvi) comes to a close at about the same place in the text, tend to suggest that the nucleus of our MS is a collection of Greek, African, and Gallic councils, of which the two former elements represented Roman, while the other represented local, church law, made after the year 529 (the date of the councils of Orange II and Vaison II), but perhaps not long after, since other councils followed quickly which might naturally have been included in any posterior collection. If this is so, the development of the Dionysiana must have begun at a very early period after its publication, since that does not precede by more than ten or twenty years the hypothetical date I have suggested for the nucleus of our MS.

MS (*Neues Archiv* v 616) is correct, except that he omits Epaon and Vaison II—in the latter instance the title is lost in the MS, and the mistake was excusable. The list in the Benedictine catalogue of the Clermont MSS, A. D. 1764, omits Valence, Fréjus, Riez, Orange—exactly the councils where there is no rubricated title, and which therefore a careless cataloguer would naturally overlook.



To this original nucleus the first addition would be that of a series of mainly Frankish councils, following the councils already incorporated in strict chronological order from 535 to 549 A. D., and brought to a close by the EXPLICIT FELICETER of Berlin fol. 80 a : the second addition consists of councils from Provence, which this time form not simply a continuation but a correction to the series, since the first of them goes back again to the year 455. But as the last belongs to A. D. 554, there is no reason for doubting that the whole of our Petersburg and Berlin MS down to this point represents a collection made, or rather completed, soon after the middle of the sixth century, a century before the MS itself was written.

That our Petersburg-Berlin MS was written at Lyons there seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt. It was from Lyons that Sirmond first drew it to light : and the indications of a collection whose later additions are councils of Auvergne and Orleans on the one side, of Arles and Vaison on the other, combine excellently for the great city which lies midway between the Loire and the Mediterranean. That it was not our present MS, but only the ultimate exemplar of a portion of it, which was written at Rome, is clear—apart from palaeographical reasons—from the stages which we have seen reason to postulate in the accumulation of Gallic material, before the original Roman-Gallic collection swelled to the dimensions of our present MS.

C. H. TURNER.

## TWO NOTES ON ISAIAH xli 5-7<sup>1</sup>.

### I.

I AM much attracted towards Dr. Barnes's view ; and certainly think that he has shewn that the meaning *solder* for  $\text{בַּקָּרֶבֶת}$  rests upon a slight foundation ; one would gladly have the same meaning for it in all its occurrences. There are, however, difficulties (which I will state briefly) which make me hesitate about accepting the view as a whole. (1) Is it clear that  $\text{מְצַרֵּת}$  is a *metal-founder* in general ? The whole root (including  $\text{מְצַרֵּת}$  Prov. xvii 3 = xxvii 21 'the fining-pot for *silver*') is so used of the *noble metals*<sup>2</sup> (and the figurative senses of *smelt*, *smelt away*, or *refine*<sup>3</sup>, and *test*<sup>4</sup>, seem also to presuppose this), that, though our data are of course limited, it seems to me doubtful whether it would have been used of other metals. This is my chief ground for hesitation. Less serious ones are : (2) In a description of general war-

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.* vol. iv p. 266.

<sup>2</sup> See Jer. vi 29, Zech. xiii 9, Ps. xii 7 [A.V. 6], lxxvi 10; and the *ptcp.* (R.V. usually *goldsmith*), Jud. xvii 4 ('founder,' but the metal worked with is silver), Neh. iii 8, 32, Isa. xl 19<sup>a</sup>, xli 7, xlvi 6, Jer. x 9, 14 = li 17, Prov. xxv 4 ('finer').

<sup>3</sup> As Isa. i 25, xlvi 10, Jer. ix 7 (A.V. 6), Zech. xiii 9, Mal. iii 2, 3.

<sup>4</sup> As Jud. vii 4, Ps. xvii 3, xxvi 2.

like equipment, is the construction of the *armour* likely to have been the particular specially selected to be made prominent and dwelt upon? (3) Does the proposed view give due weight to the general resemblance of Jer. x 4<sup>b</sup>?

S. R. DRIVER.

## II.

Dr. BARNES'S proposed interpretation of Isa. xli 6, 7 is attractive. But if it be an allusion to the repair or manufacture of armour, it is most obscurely expressed. What precisely is meant by רבקים in 1 Kings xxii 34 is quite uncertain: but 'joints,' 'fastenings' seems to be the sense, not 'armour-plates.' At any rate the word seems more likely to be used here of the work 'soldering' or 'riveting,' 'joining parts together,' than as a specific word for armour or any part of it.

To judge from the contexts in which לא ימוט occurs, surely it is not a natural phrase to apply to the loosening of the armour-plate fastened on the leathern shirt.

It still seems to me most natural to interpret the verses by the help of xl 19, 20. The expressions agree so closely, and the writer expects his readers to remember them.

But further. Is not the earliest comment on the passage to be found in Jer. x 3 ff.? The passage is a compilation of reminiscences of Isa. xl-xliv; cp. עין מיער כרתו with Isa. xliv 14 (xl 20); מעצור, Isa. xliv. 12. The phrase במספרות ובמקבות יהקים (v. 4) combines xli 7 with xliv 12; finally the stronger יפיק (totter) is substituted for ימוט. It seems to me almost certain that the writer of Jer. x had these passages in his mind and interpreted xli 7 of idols. Wisdom xiii 15, 16 (quoted by Gesen.) may be a further reminiscence, but I lay no stress on it.

Now as to the connexion. No doubt the reference to the idol factory is abrupt; but the author expects us to remember what he has said a few lines above. His mind is full of the contrast between Jehovah and idols. I should agree very much with the analysis given of the passage; only in their alarm the nations do something much more ridiculous than mend their armour: they mend their gods. v. 5 does not read at all like a patch stuck in. ימוט קרבו ויאתי corresponds to נישו of v. 1; very probably with LXX (ἐσθῆσι) we should read יהיר for יד in v. 2, to which יחרדו in v. 5 corresponds.

I wish one could give רבק the sense which LXX seems to do: 'a thing stuck together:' a contemptuous term for an idol: 'the joinery:' so that the suffix in ויהקרו would refer to it.

I agree that xli 6, 7 does not fit in well with xl 19, 20: I think the writer of the note is inclined to exaggerate the difficulty of retaining the passage where it stands with the old interpretation.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.









To sum up:—for the point after  $\text{L}\omega\omega$ , i. e. for Westcott and Hort's *text*, and the punctuation demanded by the rules of Syriac syntax, we have codd. 8\* 10 17\* 20, and perhaps also 14\*; for the point after  $\text{J}\omega\omega\text{? } \varphi\text{-}\omega\omega$ , i. e. for Westcott and Hort's *margin* and the text printed by Mr. Gwilliam, we have codd. 1 7 23, and the later punctuators of 4 8 14 and 21.

There can be no doubt that the later tendency was to put the stop where Mr. Gwilliam has put it. It is implied in the Arabic *Diatessaron*, a translation made in the eleventh century; indeed, it would probably be difficult to get Syriac evidence for the stop after  $\text{L}\omega\omega$  later than the seventh century. But the earliest witnesses tell another tale. Both the MSS assigned by Wright to the fifth century (codd. 14 and 17) had the stop by the first hand, and they are doubtless right in having it. I cannot but consider it a matter of regret that the Oxford *Tetraevangelium* should have retained in this important verse a conventional punctuation that mangles the grammar and obscures the thought.

F. C. BURKITT.

#### NOTE ON ACTS xii 25.

IN a paper entitled 'A point in Pauline Chronology' Mr. G. A. Simcox has directed the attention of readers of this JOURNAL (vol. ii 586-590) to the difficult reading *ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν*. But his remedy, namely to omit the whole verse as an interpolation, is surely more desperate than the disease. Three alternatives at least seem preferable. (1) We may assume that the verse originally contained no reference to Jerusalem at all; or (2) we may connect *εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ* with *πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν*, giving it a more emphatic meaning than is usually suggested by those who favour this construction; or finally (3) we may be able to justify 'from Jerusalem' as after all the original reading.

(1) Most will admit that the textual phenomena are *prima facie* against the reading 'from Jerusalem,' either in its 'Western' form (*ἀπὸ*) or in its Alexandrine and Syrian form (*ἐξ*). It is discredited not only as a *lectio facilior* divided against itself, but also by the fact that it is not the common usage of Acts to specify the place *whence* return is made, wherever it is indicated by the context<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, even the place *whither* is twice omitted after *ὑποστρέφω*, in Acts viii 28, xx 3. In the former of these we have *ἦν δὲ ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ*, where the destination is only to be inferred from a statement that the man was a eunuch of the queen of the Ethiopians. In

<sup>1</sup> Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ ἔρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἑλαιῶνος is the one case in which the place whence is named at all.



the latter we read that Paul ἐγένετο γνάμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας, where ὑποστρέφειν may be rendered 'to retrace his steps.' Accordingly one can fairly say that our author's use of this verb is sometimes rather allusive in its reference. Hence also it is just possible that both forms of the reference to Jerusalem are glosses, εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ being due to the copyist's habit<sup>1</sup> of writing εἰς after ὑποστρέφειν.

(2) But it is hard to believe that such a gloss was added independently in so many distinct lines of transmission, the original reading failing to survive in any MS, Father, or Version. It seems better to take even the difficult εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (supported by  $\aleph$ BHLP, *minusc. aliq.*; Syr.-Harcl. *mg.*; Chrys. *codd.*) as original, and try to find out how our author could write it. Now if we are to justify the reading, instead of smoothing it to τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες διακονίαν, as Westcott and Hort suggest, we must discover some reason for the emphatic position of εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. If εἰς . . . διακονίαν meant no more than τὴν εἰς . . . διακονίαν, it would probably be indefensible as Greek. But need it? The root of the difficulty seems to lie in the common misreading of the facts implied in xi 29 f., into which a special reference to Jerusalem is wont to be imported. But if we take the passage as it stands, namely as stating that relief was prepared for 'the brethren in Judaea' and that it was sent 'to the elders' (i. e. in Judaea), we shall begin to see a fresh point in xii 25, which adds the information that its bearers 'fulfilled the ministration up to Jerusalem.' That is, they reached the mother-church itself with relief, and did not merely minister to the needs of more rural centres, where the famine would be felt most acutely.

(3) But having reached a point of view which invests the reference to Jerusalem (at all) with a fullness of meaning lacking on ordinary theories of the passage, we may ask whether 'from Jerusalem' may not after all be original. For it is only on the assumption that the relief was intended for and indeed sent to Jerusalem, rather than Judaea, that 'from Jerusalem' can be called *lectio facilior*. If on the contrary it be a pregnant and allusive touch, suggesting that the delegates ended up their relief journey through Judaea at Jerusalem—a circumstance which explains their returning with John Mark in their company—all this may have been missed by some scribe, who then substituted εἰς (possibly with Gal. ii 1 ff. in mind). We are so apt to forget that there is no explicit mention, in the whole context, of any visit to Jerusalem; and when it is assumed among us, this is largely in connexion with a special and restricted exegesis of the reference to 'the elders' in xi 30. If the idea of 'from Jerusalem' be thus justified, it is immaterial whether

<sup>1</sup> Only this requires the further assumption that his attention was nodding; else he would have written εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν, as read by E, the Peshitta, the Thebaic and Ethiopic, and some minuscules.



ἀπό or ἐξ be original. But the former is perhaps preferable, both on Lucan usage and on MSS evidence (including the Latin), especially if Tischendorf is right in thinking that B\* began to write ἀπό.

If such a view be correct, it has some bearing on the other matter to which Mr. Simcox refers, that of Paul's visits to Jerusalem. For it makes it less likely that Paul would represent a relief journey to Judaea generally, in the light of a visit to Jerusalem on purpose to interview the apostles. Nor does the preceding narrative itself in Acts xii 17, 'and he (Peter) departed and went to another place,' at all encourage the notion that Paul saw him in Jerusalem on this same relief journey. If, then, we are to distinguish the visit of Gal. ii 1-10 from that of Acts xv, as I cannot but think that we must, it seems more likely than ever that the enigmatic visit was a private one *ad hoc*, unrecorded in Acts (as having no immediate public issue) and prior even to Peter's imprisonment by Herod Agrippa I.

VERNON BARTLET.

#### TERTULLIAN'S USE OF SUBSTANTIA, NATURA, AND PERSONA.

IN a notice in the JOURNAL (vol. iii p. 291) of my inquiry into the meaning of Homoousios in the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed (*Texts and Studies* vii 1), Dr. Strong took exception to what I had written in regard to Tertullian's usage of the words *substantia*, *natura*, and *persona*, and to my acceptance of the tradition that ὁμοούσιος was condemned at the Council of Antioch in 269.

As I am repeating the same statements in a *Short history of the development of Christian Doctrine to the Council of Chalcedon*, which is now in the press, it seems desirable to ask for a little space in the JOURNAL in which to consider the passages to which Dr. Strong refers; lest I should seem to ignore the criticism of one who has made a special study of the matter. My short history is intended as an introduction to the subject for students beginning their work, and therefore does not afford a suitable opportunity for such a discussion.

That Tertullian's use of the words is 'philosophical' as well as 'juristic' I do not think any one would be inclined to deny. I stated clearly my own opinion that it was. Perhaps I should have said that he passed from the philosophical to the juristic, rather than from the juristic to the philosophical, sense of the terms. But I think Tertullian was a jurist first, and a philosopher second: so I do not conceive that I wronged him much, or really misrepresented the dominant bias of his thought.

With regard to the two passages to which appeal is made by Dr. Strong,

I think that his criticism misses the true force of Tertullian's argument, and that, if they are taken as a test, it will be found that Tertullian's usage is clear and consistent, as I stated it.

(1) In the passage *de Anima* 9, he is definitely distinguishing 'substances' from their characteristics or attributes. He has argued that the soul must be *corpus*. Every *corpus* has, as one of its properties, 'colour.' The 'colour' of the soul must be aerial and bright (*aërius* and *lucidus*). But this does not mean that the 'substance' of the soul is 'air' or 'light.' And he takes two examples of precious stones—the 'ceraunia' and the beryl—to illustrate the point. No one would say that the *substantia* of the 'ceraunia' is fire (*substantia ignita*), just because it gleams with a reddish glow of colour: nor that the *materia* of beryls is water (*aquosa materia*), because there are waves of pure lustre in them (*quod fluctuant colato nitore*). For there are any number of things that are associated together in colour, and dissociated from one another in *natura* (*Quanta enim et alia color sociat, natura dissociat?*).

The resemblance of these last words to the expression in ch. 32 'duritia communicat, substantia discordat' is merely superficial, and the apparent interchange of *natura* and *substantia* is illusory. It is not the case that in ch. 9 *natura* is used as *substantia* is used in ch. 32. There is no dispute as to the meaning of *substantia* in either place. And the context shows that *natura* here is used in the same general sense as in ch. 32, though here it is found in its widest and most inclusive usage—of the sum total of the attributes or properties of a thing, and is contrasted with a particular attribute or property which is comprised in it.

The soul is a *substantia* with certain properties, some of which it shares with other *substantiae*. One of its properties is to be 'aerial,' but its substance is not air. And then comes the illustration. There is fire, and water, and precious stone. Each is itself a *substantia*; each has its own *natura*. Viewed absolutely in its fullness, the *natura* of each of the three distinguishes it from the others. But one precious stone has some of the characteristics of fire, and another precious stone has some of the characteristics of water. Substances, so far as they share in the same characteristics, are associated together by this similarity of nature, relatively, so far as it goes; but at the same time the difference of nature, absolutely, as a whole, dissociates them. They are alike in one attribute, but in the sum total of attributes they are not alike.

The argument is only intelligible if the distinction between *substantia* and *natura* is kept clear, and if the contrast between the relative likeness and the absolute unlikeness of the things which are compared is recognized.

(2) In the passage *adv. Praxean* ch. 7, the confusion between *substantia* and *persona*, of which Dr. Strong speaks, is not Tertullian's.



Tertullian is quite clear. He is discussing the Scriptural and theological use of the term *sermo*, and is only concerned to maintain that it is no mere appellation or personification that is meant by it; it is nothing airy and meaningless and unsubstantial; but, on the contrary, it is a real existence, a *substantia*. 'This *substantia* of the Word,' he says, 'whatever it is, I say is a person (*persona*), and I claim for him the name of Son.' That is to say, the Word, to which reference is made in Scripture, is a real existence: one and the same with the person of Jesus Christ the Son of God. If there were no *substantia*, there could be no *persona*. The use of terms is strict, and in keeping with Tertullian's use elsewhere.

With regard to the other question which Dr. Strong raises, my argument does not depend on the accuracy of the tradition that the word *ὑποούσιος* was condemned at Antioch. (All that I am concerned to maintain is that it was generally distrusted in the East, while its Latin equivalent was as generally approved and used in the West. That this was so does not require argument.) But the matter is of antiquarian interest, at all events. What Dr. Strong says about the evidence is of course true. The statement that the Council of Antioch recommended that the word be withdrawn from use comes to us from Arian sources. It would not be likely to come from Nicenes. But the Nicenes accepted the Arian statement, and only argued that it did not matter. The term was rejected by the former Council in one sense, and used by the later Council and themselves in another sense. Now these references do not amount to positive proof that the term was considered at the Council of Antioch and—for whatever reason—condemned. But, if it were not so, how could the belief that it was so ever have originated? Not even Arian ingenuity and daring would have been capable of such an invention, in the absence of justification for it; and there is *prima facie* probability that Paul of Samosata did use the term in a sense inconsistent with the Catholic interpretation of the Person of Christ. Against this evidence there can only be set the fact that the extant Acts of the Council contain no reference to the matter. It is easy to see why the reference should have been omitted.

Finally, though the purpose of this note is fulfilled, I may perhaps be allowed to say that I much regret the slip of the pen which led me to cite a passage from the *de Mundo* as one from the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle. But so far as concerns my statement of the history of *ὑπόστασις*, if Aristotle did not use the term as I said he did, so much the better for my argument. The fact that the exposure by Dr. Strong of what he styles 'a somewhat serious inaccuracy' strengthens my argument is to me at least a satisfaction.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.



THREE PASSAGES IN SS. IGNATIUS AND  
POLYCARP.

THE following passages seem to contain unnoticed echoes of the thought or expression of New Testament writings.

(a) S. Polycarp to the Philippian, c. vi *ζηλωται περι τὸ καλόν*. Cf. Gal. iv 17, 18 *ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς . . . καλὸν δὲ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε*.

(b) S. Ignatius to the Magnesians, c. x *Μὴ οὖν ἀναισθητῶμεν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Rom. ii 4 *ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ . . . καταφρονεῖς*. For what follows in S. Ignatius cf. Rom. ii 5-9.

(c) S. Ignatius to the Magnesians, c. xiii *ἵνα πάντα ὅσα ποιεῖτε κατευοδῶθῆτε σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι*. Cf. 3 S. John 2 *περὶ πάντων εἴχομαι σε εὐδοῦσθαι καὶ ὑγαίνειν, καθὼς εὐδοῦταί σου ἡ ψυχὴ*. [But the passage which seems clearly to have suggested the phrase of S. Ignatius is Ps. i 3 *πάντα ὅσα ἐν ποτῇ κατευοδῶθήσεται*, to which Lightfoot refers. EDD.]

T. NICKLIN.

## REVIEWS

## ADDRESSES ON THE ACTS.

*Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles.* By EDWARD WHITE BENSON, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. (Macmillan & Co.) 1901.

THIS weighty volume of addresses was delivered in Lambeth Palace during Lent between the years 1887 and 1892 to an audience of ladies, which increased in numbers each year till they numbered nearly one hundred. They were not written out in full, and have been preserved partly from the notes of some of those ladies present without which 'some of these lectures could never have been reconstructed,' and partly, in the later addresses, from the report of a shorthand writer. They are edited by Miss Benson, who makes clear the conditions under which the volume has been produced, and an introduction by Adeline, Duchess of Bedford, who was present throughout the eleven years in which the Archbishop gave these and other addresses, emphasizes some of the dominant notes in the Archbishop's teaching.

The circumstances referred to, and the purpose for which the addresses were intended must be borne in mind in any review of the book. They were not intended 'to be the channel for mere critical discussion or the medium for settling points of controversy,' but to bring out 'the real principles which we may gather out of the history of the Acts.' Not that critical questions are ignored, for the Archbishop was too scholarly to do that, but when he does refer to them it is often with a sort of half-apology for doing so, nor are they mentioned unless it is necessary. Thus for purposes of edification—the main object of the addresses—it matters little what the exact meaning of the terms 'Italian band' and 'Augustan band' are, and so all that is said about the latter is that 'it has its name from Augustus.' Again, in the references made to John the Baptist, the allusions to him in St. Matthew's and St. John's Gospels are combined without any indication of the difficulties of combining the two accounts.

Nor must it be forgotten that the lectures were not written, and therefore the volume has been recovered from notes, and these never had the Archbishop's revision. In that case some doubtful statements

might have been struck out and some too definite expressions modified. Some of these are dealt with in the notes, appended by the editor<sup>1</sup>. But it is not likely that the statement that the Ἀσπαρχαί were 'some of the principal people of the world' would have been allowed to stand, nor are the details as to the temple on pp. 532-3 quite correct, for there is no evidence that there were only four notices as to Gentiles entering the Jewish part of the Temple, and these were affixed not to the outside of the court of the women only but to the low screen which ran round the whole Jewish enclosure. They would be necessary wherever there were gates. One would have wished also to know what authority there is for the statement that 'there were always three legions quartered at Caesarea.' It seems an impossibly large number to have been there together, and without some special and temporary reason. Why again is St. Paul said to have left Jerusalem for Caesarea on his way to Rome 'on May 26,' and what reason is there to suppose that on the way to Antipatris on that occasion they would go 'sometimes by the sea'? The cases mentioned involve questions of fact, and there are others which may involve differences of opinion and are more subjective. Such is the paragraph in which Felix's question from what province St. Paul came is discussed, nor can we accept the explanation given of the words *there are proconsuls* in xix 38, or the implied explanation that 'the rest' in v 13 means 'all who were likely to rush into the Church for the sake of such help as would come from the temporary community of goods.' There can be little doubt that the words mean the official classes as distinguished from 'the people' mentioned in the next verse.

But all the points which have been mentioned are relatively unimportant, and do not lessen the value of the addresses for those who heard them, or for those who may read them in the published volume. One could only wish that much more were being done on the same lines not only by those holding high office in the Church for those holding high position in society as many hearers of these addresses did, but also in every parish for every class. We want, it is true, critical and scholarly commentaries on the Bible, and criticism and reverence are not incompatible, but we also want such volumes as this to bring out and bring home the permanent value of the Bible, and its practical bearing on the problems and interests of to-day. Few books are more suited for this purpose than the *Acts of the Apostles* as expounded in the volume before us, or in the somewhat similar volume on the same book addressed by

<sup>1</sup> Some small points have escaped correction. Thus on p. 237 the Jewish fast days were *Monday* and *Thursday*; p. 442 St. Paul's *trial* at Corinth should be probably St. Paul's *stay*; p. 486 *Festus* who heard him from time to time should be *Felix*. There are mistakes in Greek or accents, e.g. pp. 407 (εὐσχημώτης), 416 note, 596, 638 note.



Dean Vaughan to his congregation at Doncaster. The principal object of the Archbishop was 'to give a living picture of the time of the Apostles, and the parallelism of problems of the Church at that time with those of the Church to-day,' and if this led to the 'delineation of pictures necessarily problematical' 'in a more substantive manner than criticism should allow,' and if again 'this produced a modernity of expression which is often a little startling' the gain in clearness and interest is greater than the loss caused by any such deviations from exactness—and they are few—as those to which allusion has been made.

It is impossible to do more than refer to the many apt illustrations, particularly suitable to the audience, by which the Archbishop often emphasized his points, and carried on the interest of his readers. Here a fact from nature, or from literature, here an allusion to a well-known painting or to some incident in history, here a saying or an anecdote! Nor is it possible to indicate the practical lessons for ordinary life drawn from the narrative on almost every page. In one place he finds opportunity to emphasize the duties of mothers to their children, at another the position and responsibility of country houses, at another the contrast between the religion of society-people in the country and the religion of the same class in London. Here the fashionable interest in religion is discussed, in connexion with Felix and Drusilla, and elsewhere the subject of Demetrius and the disturbance at Ephesus suggest as a subject commercial religion, which 'may be as strong in an aristocracy, in royalty, or in a Christian Clergy as in Demetrius and his craftsmen.' The book is a large and expensive one, but it is one which need not be read continuously, and may be opened for edification at almost every page. We can endorse the closing words of the preface and express the belief that many may very profitably turn to these utterances of Archbishop Benson 'who in our own times seek to reconcile the Divine and human elements in life, to mark the action of one upon the other, and above all to know of a surety that the Lord is among us in these and all the days even unto the end of the world.'

LL. J. M. BEBB.

### THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES.

*Die Oracula Sibyllina* bearbeitet im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, von Dr. Joh. Geffcken, Leipzig, 1902.

THREE great editions of the text of the Sibylline Oracles have now appeared: first that of Alexandre, 1841-1856, the second that of Rzach,

1891, and the third that of Dr. Geffcken, the most recent editor. It is true that most students of the Sibyllines have also used the text of Friedlieb (published in 1852), but this scholar cannot be classed in the same rank with the editors just mentioned. His textual contributions save in the matter of fresh collations were meagre and disappointing, and particularly so as they were subsequent to those of his great predecessor Alexandre.

The task of preparing this edition was first placed in the hands of Dr. L. Mendelssohn by the Royal Prussian Academy. In the course of some years Mendelssohn accumulated a vast amount of material for this work, but was unhappily cut off before his labours had reached a final stage. The task then devolved on Dr. Geffcken, and to him we owe the present excellent edition.

Geffcken's superiority to Rzach lies in his more critical method. The former recognized the necessity of thoroughly familiarizing himself with the various forms of literature allied to the Sibyllines and the historical background they presuppose. Rzach on the other hand is too often ignorant of this, and is too ready to emend his text on the authority of Homer and other ancient writers, whose relations with the text were remote even when actual. This can be best shown by an instance emphasized by Geffcken. Thus in viii 194 the MSS read *μη ποτ' ἐγὼ ζῶην, δε (ἢ) ἰαρά βασιλεύσει*. Alexandre retains the *ἢ ἰαρά* and explains it as 'ipsa Roma deliciis affluens': Rzach thinks *θηλυτέρα* possible, and cites the proposals of two anonymous scholars *ἢ Ἰραλή* and *ἢ ἄργή*. But the true text is recovered from the passage quoted by Geffcken from 'The last Vision of Daniel' in Vassiliev's *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, i 46 *καὶ ἐν τῷ μὴ εἶναι ἄνδρα χρήσιμον βασιλεύσει γυνὴ μίαν ἐν τῷ ἐπιτάλῳ φ*. Thus for *ἰαρά* we must read *μίαν*.

Another weakness in Rzach's edition arises from his use of uncritical texts of the Sibylline fragments preserved in Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus, Justin and others. This mistake has not been committed by Geffcken, though he is not indeed quite free from reproach. Thus on pp. 35, 50 he quotes Dillmann's Latin Version of the Ascension of Isaiah, where the corrupt 'Berial' is given for 'Beliar'—a corruption that is peculiar to *some* of the Ethiopic MSS, but against the Greek and Latin Versions, where these exist, as in iii 11, 13, and the universal Jewish and Christian tradition. Throughout, also, he uses Ceriani's Latin translation of the Apocalypse of Baruch, although this has been superseded by two recent translations in German and English. Does Dr. Geffcken regard Ceriani's modern Latin Version as a genuine ancient one? His use of it certainly gives that impression.

But whilst we draw attention to the undoubted superiority of Geffcken's text in certain respects, we must likewise emphasize the fact that but for

Rzach's collations, Geffcken's text would have been less excellent. Thus, whereas Rzach collated the MSS MQVHAPF at least once, and in some instances twice, for his edition, and further had RL collated for him by Kleiber, Dr. Geffcken has not done any first hand work of this kind. By means of Mendelssohn's fresh collations of HP and Violet's partial collations of ST (the latter MS discovered in Toledo by Violet) he has, it is true, made some contribution to a more exact knowledge of the MSS evidence. But it is a matter of regret that the editor did not recollate at all events the three chief MSS MQV. That the labour involved in such a task would have been fully compensated most palaeographers would readily concede. It takes many collations to ensure accuracy. Indeed the case of R—a MS of only third-rate importance—might have impressed on Dr. Geffcken the advisability of recollating some of the most important MSS. Thus he writes that Mendelssohn held that a new collation of R was necessary, although it had already been collated by Opsopoeus, Alexandre, Gildemeister and Kleiber.

Geffcken accepts the traditional division of the MSS into three classes, and agrees with Rzach as to the order of the MSS in each class in respect of worth with a single exception. Whereas Rzach assigns to A the third place in the second class, Geffcken places it in the first.

This edition, which has had the great advantage of revision by Professor Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, closes with a most valuable index of subjects, for which, as well as for the whole work, scholars will be duly grateful to Dr. Geffcken.

R. H. CHARLES.



## CHRONICLE

### OLD TESTAMENT.

(1) IN vol. iv of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* Dr. K. Budde writes on 'Hebrew Poetry.' On the general question of 'metre' he decides that 'the vastly preponderating probability appears to belong to the theory of Ley, who counts the "rises" without taking account of the "falls." . . . An exact measurement of a verse by syllables could hardly have been carried out with such a method of writing' [as the Hebrews employed before the invention of the vowel-points]. Wolf Baudissin writes a very full article on 'Priests and Levites.' 'Prophecy and Prophets' is by the late Dr. A. B. Davidson; it is one of the very best articles in the whole Dictionary. One quotation may be given here. 'Moral threats or promises could be made only to a subject considered moral. The predictions of the prophets against foreign nations, though often having the form of threats against their capital city or their land, are really not directed against these material things, but against what might be called the national personality, the moral subject which the nation was, with its spirit and influence in the world of the prophet's day.' The article 'Psalms' is by Prof. W. T. Davison, and 'Righteousness' (in the O. T.) by Dr. J. Skinner. Dr. Nestle's 'Septuagint' and 'Sirach' are full of detailed information, the latter being especially valuable for its clear presentation of facts. 'Song of Songs' is by Mr. J. A. Selbie. The 'Syriac Versions' are treated by Dr. Nestle. 'Tabernacle' is by Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy, and 'Temple' (an illustrated article of twenty-one pages) by Dr. T. W. Davies. Dr. H. L. Strack writes well but somewhat briefly on the 'Text of the Old Testament.' The article 'Vulgate' by Mr. H. J. White deals fully and satisfactorily with the Old Testament no less than with the New. 'Weights and Measures' are discussed by Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy, who contributed a very able article on 'Money' to vol. iii of the Dictionary. Dr. F. G. Kenyon is interesting on 'Writing,' and Dr. J. H. Moulton's article on 'Zoroastrianism' is a very stimulating piece of work.

(2) Vols. x, xi, and xii of Hauck's *Realencyclopädie*, though marked by the same lack of a sense of proportion as the earlier volumes, contain some useful Old Testament articles. It is difficult to see why Charles

Kingsley should have ten pages while the prophet Malachi has only four, or why six pages should be devoted to Merle d'Aubigné, only half a page less than the space given to the Books of Kings. Good geographical articles, KAPHTHOR, LIBANON, and ROTES MEER, are contributed by H. Guthe. KARÄER, which includes a full bibliography of six pages, is by V. Ryssel. A. Jeremias contributes several Assyriological articles, KACHEMISH, MERODACH, MEDIEN. W. Baudissin treats of KEMOSCH and MALZEICHEN AM KÖRPER. KIMCHI and MASORA are by H. L. Strack. Von Orelli writes on KLAGELIEDER, KÖNIGTUM IN ISRAEL, LEVI (LEVITEN), and MESSIAS. The article BÜCHER DER KÖNIGE is by Volck. I. Benzinger contributes several important archaeological articles, KLEIDER, KRANKHEITEN, KRIEGSWESEN, MASSE UND GEWICHTE, LOS BEI DEN HEBRÄERN. Frants Buhl writes on LAUBHÜTTENFEST and on MESAINSCRIFT. The article on MERODACH-BALADAN is by the late R. Krätzschmar.

(3) Volume iii of *Encyclopaedia Biblica* contains some noteworthy work on the Old Testament. Of the articles, not a few, written by the senior editor, it is perhaps enough to say that theories regarding Jerahmeel and Mizzur fill so large a place in them that students who cannot accept these theories can find but little pleasure or profit in the articles. This statement applies to the lengthy treatment of the PSALMS as well as to Dr. Cheyne's shorter contributions. Dr. G. F. Moore writes on LEVITICUS and NUMBERS, and in addition an interesting article on the PHILISTINES. PALESTINE is divided among four contributors, A. Socin (physical features), H. H. W. Pearson of Kew (flora), A. E. Shipley (fauna), W. Max Müller (history). PHOENICIA is fully treated as to its religion and history by Eduard Meyer of Halle; a good map is added for illustration. NINEVEH and other Assyriological articles are by C. H. W. Johns, and POMEGRANATES and several botanical articles by N. McLean. C. C. Torrey of Yale writes on i-iv MACCABEES, and J. L. Myres on POTTERY (with many illustrations). Dr. Driver's article on MESHIA contains a facsimile, a transliteration, and a translation of the Moabite Stone. A treatise on NAMES is divided between Th. Nöldeke, G. Buchanan Gray, Dr. Cheyne, and E. Kautsch. With such contributors *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. iii, cannot fail to contain a great mass of valuable work.

(4) The *Jewish Encyclopedia* does not profess to deal fully with Biblical subjects, but vol. iii (issued late in 1902) contains four articles which deserve notice here. BIBLE CANON is by Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell University. BIBLE EDITIONS, an article illustrated with several facsimiles of early editions, e. g. the Psalms (with Kimchi's Commentary) of 1477 and the Bologna Pentateuch of 1482, is by R. Gottheil of Columbia University. BIBLE EXEGESIS, a very good sketch of Jewish



exegesis, is contributed by W. Bacher of Buda-Pesth; an appendix on Modern and non-Jewish interpretation is added by J. F. McCurdy. The article BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS includes a facsimile with superlinear punctuation from the St. Petersburg Codex, and contains notices of the famous named codices which are mentioned from time to time in Rabbinic literature. R. Gottheil writes the article on BIBLE TRANSLATIONS, illustrated by a page from Cod. B of the LXX. It is interesting to learn that the English Authorized and Revised Versions are more popular with Jewish readers than the English translations made by their co-religionists.

(5) In the *Journal* for July, 1902, the appearance of a first instalment of the third edition of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* was noticed. The second instalment (II Hälfte, 1 Lieferung) edited by Dr. H. Zimmern falls into two parts, the first dealing with Babylonian gods and demons, the second with Babylonian myths. The first part treats of the world of gods in the 'systematised form' which it received in the course of history in Babylon itself, the very ancient local worships out of which it sprang having but slight connexion with the theological ideas and representations of the Old Testament. The author gives first the Babylonian views regarding each divinity, and then seeks to establish from the Old and New Testaments a number of parallels. These last often fail to convince, for they are of too general a character to establish the theory of Babylonian influence, yet, used with caution, they promise to throw some much needed light on difficult passages in the Prophets and the Psalms. Thus when Dr. Zimmern illustrates the phrase 'the kingdom of heaven' from the existence of a 'God of heaven,' Anu, among the supreme divine Triad of the Babylonians, one doubts whether there can be any real connexion, but on the other hand when after remarking 'Speziell scheint Anu am Nordhimmel lokalisiert gedacht worden zu sein' he proceeds to compare Isa. xiv 13; Ps. xlviii 3 [2, E. V.], he seems to be giving us a hopeful suggestion. Marduk (Maruduk) or Merodach is somewhat perversely paralleled with our Lord, though both Birth and Death have to be excluded from the ascertained features of the parallel. With regard to the former event Dr. Zimmern's opening words are: 'Es sei ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen, dass ein ähnlicher Mythos über die Geburt Marduk's aus der babylonischen Litteratur bis jetzt noch nicht bekannt ist.' Accordingly he goes on to point out that Babylonian-Assyrian kings were sometimes called children of the Mother-goddess. With regard to Death Dr. Zimmern writes, 'Jedensfalls wird aber auch von Marduk, als Sonnengott, zu gelten haben, dass er im Winter stirbt und in die Unterwelt hinabsinkt.' As a whole the parallel between Marduk and our Lord is very weakly supported. The second part of



Dr. Zimmern's work deals with the Myths of Creation, of the Combat with Tiamat, of Oannes, of the Flood, and of Gilgamesh.

In the third instalment (Schluss-Lieferung) an account is given of the new material furnished by L. W. King in his *Seven Tablets of Creation*. These 'seven' tablets, be it remarked, do not correspond severally with the seven days of Creation; tablets I-III deal with the rising of the older gods against the younger, the inhabitants of heaven; tablet IV with the victory of Marduk and the making of the firmament; V with the formation of the Heavenly Bodies; VI with the making of man, while tablet VII contains the Hymn of the gods addressed to Marduk as Creator. The concluding portion of the work is taken up with the worship of the Babylonians and Assyrians, their conceptions regarding the Universe, and finally with a brief account of the relation between the Babylonian-Assyrian and Hebrew languages.

Indices and a Map conclude a work which, though not so trustworthy a guide as Dr. Schrader's own second edition, cannot be spared by students of the Old Testament.

(6) Prof. Sayce's Gifford Lectures on the *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia* are interesting, as we should expect. He begins his account of Babylonian religion by calling upon us to distinguish between the Semitic and non-Semitic elements embodied in it, and (as a preliminary) between the Semitic and non-Semitic elements in our sources of information. He next passes to the two great primitive sanctuaries, Eridu, once on the Persian Gulf, with its god Ea, whose home was in the deep, and Nippur or Niffer the inland city whose god was El-lil, 'the lord of the ghost-world,' the husband of the Lilith of the mediaeval Jews.

(7) *Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Ueberlieferung bei den vor-exilischen Propheten* is a book of 176 pages by O. Procksch, dedicated to Frants Buhl. The first part is divided into three chapters, the first of which deals with the attitude of Amos and Hosea towards the Decline and Fall of the Northern Kingdom, and the second with Isaiah and his times; while the third is entitled the Century of Deuteronomy, and treats of (a) the Deuteronomic literature, *i.e.* Deuteronomy itself, Micah vi 1-18, and 1 Samuel i-iii, vii, viii, xii, xv *al.*, (b) Jeremiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, (c) Ezekiel. Dr. Procksch points out that the centralisation of worship at Jerusalem caused by the Deuteronomic reformation brought about a revival of national feeling which gradually exalted the theory of the inviolability of Zion into a dogma, against which Jeremiah had strenuously to contend. The second part of the book deals with the references of the Prophets to the early history including the accounts given in the book of Genesis. Dr. Procksch believes that the references in Hosea are to E's form of the narrative. The five references

to the catastrophe of Sodom (in Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah) are collected and discussed. The Paradise story as it appears in Ezekiel is dealt with at length. In Ezek. xxviii 16 Dr. Procksch (page 162) wishes to adopt the reading of the LXX, *καὶ ἤγαγέν σε τὸ χεῖρόν σου ἐκ μέσου λίθων περὶ ὕψους*, but his reproduction of the supposed original Hebrew contains two serious slips. The book is worthy of careful study.

(8) *Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes* by Dr. Julius Boehmer is a brochure which explains its contents very fittingly in its title. According to the author we have in the Old Testament only the 'substructure' of the doctrine of the kingdom of God. Dr. Boehmer prepares the way for his investigation by a statistical analysis of the use of the root *מלך* and its derivatives as they are applied to historical kings, to Messiah, to God Himself, and to false gods. He applies similar treatment to the roots *משל*, *רעה*, *שפט* and to the word *נָגַד*. The author next takes a historical review of the kingdom in Israel, and then sums up the 'Züge des Königsbildes im Bilde Jahwes.' The last and most important part of the book is headed 'Der Melech Jahwe Gegenstand des alttestamentlichen Evangeliums,' and starts naturally from Deutero-Isaiah.

(9) Herr Paul Kahle who contributed an interesting article on a newly discovered supralinear system of pointing to the *ZATW*, 1901, pp. 273-317, has now brought out a pamphlet entitled *Der masorelische Text nach der Ueberlieferung der babylonischen Juden*. The subject of this interesting little book is the Berlin MS or. qu. 680, which consists now of ninety-four leaves out of 210 which once contained the whole Hagiographa. The MS was perhaps found in Yemen, and at first sight the punctuation seems to agree with that of MSS believed to have come from that district. But an older punctuation is to be sometimes detected, these older signs standing not with the consonants they belong to, but over the intervals between consonants. No conjunctive accents occur. Herr Kahle appends some lengthy extracts from the Psalms, Song of Songs, and Lamentations, written with the newly discovered punctuation.

(10) Dr. August Heider's *Die aethiopische Bibelübersetzung* (1. Heft) is the beginning of an important contribution to the discussion of the very difficult problem of the date, origin, and value of the version in question. Lagarde assigned the Aethiopic to the fourteenth century, and placed a very low value upon it. Recent investigation, however, does not seem to confirm such views. Heider, whose researches start with the prophet Jeremiah, agrees with Cornill (*Ezechiel*, 36-8) in finding an ancient recension of this version in the Berlin MS ('B'), but he divides Cornill's 'later recension' into two—the 'common' revised with the help of the Syro-Hexaplar, and the 'academic' revised



with the help of Hebrew MSS. The ancient Aethiopic was derived from MSS of the Septuagint, not of the Egyptian (Hesychian) type, as some have thought, but of the Syrian (Lucianic) recension. In proof of this, Heider points out that the Old Aethiopic has (like the Lucianic) the same 'Textbestand' as the Hebrew. The condition of Jer. xxv 13 ff. (the point at which the great variation between Hebrew and Greek begins) is very interesting in the Berlin MS:—'Zuerst der ganze Vers 13 LXX, dann oben am Rande in derselben Schrift, wie B sonst geschrieben ist, Vers 14 LXX, dann folgt im Texte Vers 15 LXX, dann im Texte weiter Vers 14, 15, 16 Hebr. und so fort. . . . Vers 14 LXX und  $\frac{3}{4}$  des Verses 15 LXX sind mit roter Tinte geschrieben.' The Hefte concludes with a detailed collation of the Aethiopic with select authorities for the LXX text of Jer. i-iii.

(11) In the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* for January Mr. Stanley A. Cook, of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, has edited with a facsimile and notes a 'Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus.' It consists of a single leaf, which seems originally to have measured 5 in.  $\times$  2 $\frac{7}{8}$  in. There are no points and no *soph pasuq*, but there are spaces between words, and the final letters are regularly used. The handwriting has a superficial resemblance to the ordinary 'Rabbinic' character, but with important differences. The *Ziv* resembles the *Ziv* of Syriac Estrangela. Mr. Cook concludes that 'the palaeography safely allows us to ascribe [the fragment] to the second century of this era.' Whether, in face of the scantiness of the evidence from handwriting, we venture to agree with the Editor as to the century to which the fragment belongs or not, we must confess that the Text now published raises questions of unparalleled interest for the Old Testament. The contents of the fragment embrace the Ten Commandments (Exod. xx 2-17), followed by the *Shema* (Deut. vi 4, 5). Two lines introducing the *Shema* intervene between the two passages, but these lines do not agree with any part of Deut. vi 1-3. The text of the Commandments is noteworthy. In five points of some importance it agrees with the LXX and disagrees with the Massoretic text. In two of these instances the fuller text of Deuteronomy is supported for Exodus by the LXX and the new Fragment. The order of Commandments VI, VII, and VIII varies from the Massoretic text, but the variation does not agree with the LXX. In the Tenth Commandment the new authority agrees with the LXX in mentioning the 'wife' before the 'house.' It is earnestly to be hoped that some light may shortly be thrown on the *nature* of this most interesting document.

(12) *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, by J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A., with an Appendix by George Harford, M.A., is a second edition of the first volume of the Hexateuch issued by the same editors in 1900.



A good many references are added in this edition to the latest literature of the subject, together with a General Index and an Index of important Scripture passages. The whole work is a marvellous piece of minute investigation—witness for instance the attempted separation of J and E in the Book of the Covenant, pages 210–15.

[(13) The importance of the Code of Hammurabi is marked by the prompt appearance in *Der alte Orient* of a useful rendering into German, by Dr. H. Winckler, of the text from Father V. Scheil's edition, with a few explanatory notes. The title *Die Gesetze Hammurabis, Königs von Babylon um 2250 v. Chr. : das älteste Gesetzbuch der Welt*, is perhaps too emphatic, apart from the doubtful use of the word *Buch*, so long as the age of the so-called 'Sumerian Laws' remains to be settled. But when the author says (p. 7) that the inscription is the most important document which has come to us from the region of Babylonian culture, he is not far wrong. It is when he adds that this *Corpus juris* is the oldest document of this sort known up to the present in the development of mankind that he over-states his case. The qualifying words 'so completely' are necessary before 'known.' But he certainly is right in saying that it is one of the most important documents in the history of mankind.

Dr. Winckler's cheap and handy translation will be welcomed by a wide circle of readers as an introduction to a study of the Code. He does not stay to elaborate comparisons with the Mosaic Code, but points out several noteworthy coincidences in forms of expression. The fundamental questions of direct influence are hardly yet ripe for discussion. A more thorough study of the Code than Dr. Winckler's is a necessary preliminary. It is all very well to catch at chance similarities of thought or phrase, but we cannot forget that similar circumstances have probably always suggested to men similar expedients. We must analyse the principles which underlie the judicial awards before we can assert any dependence of one Code upon another. Hammurabi was not the first to 'establish righteousness' in Babylonia; sixty years or so before, the same is said of Sumu-lâ-ilu. Mere retaliation is a principle that does not require any acquaintance with a foreign code to originate. But we may be thankful for every hint as to the direction in which to watch.

C. H. W. J.]

(14) Mr. C. H. W. Johns, Lecturer in Assyriology at Queens' College, Cambridge, whose *Assyrian Deeds and Documents* (vols. ii and iii) were briefly noticed in the JOURNAL for April, 1902, has issued an English translation of the Laws of Hammurabi under the title of *The oldest Code of Laws in the World* (Messrs. T. and T. Clark). Mr. Johns wisely contents himself at this early stage with a literal translation, and though a few of the laws thus presented are hard reading, it is well, in the

interest of accuracy, to preserve as closely as possible the stiff legal phraseology. The book will be very interesting to the readers of Mr. Johns' article in the JOURNAL for January, 1903.

(15) *Critica Biblica* (A. and C. Black), Part I, is a collection of emendations of the text of Isaiah and Jeremiah, based chiefly upon Dr. Cheyne's Jerahmeel-Muzri theory. The changes suggested are far-reaching, and will for the most part commend themselves only to those readers who have already accepted the theory.

(16) Dr. Davidson's posthumous *Biblical and Literary Essays* (Hodder and Stoughton) are, like all that came from his pen, well worthy of reading. Five are reprinted from the *Expositor* and eight are new. Among the subjects are the prophets Amos and Hosea and Psalms ii, lxxii, and cx. The volume concludes with an Essay on the Uses of the Old Testament for edification.

(17) Lieferung 1 and 2 of the German translation of Morris Jastrow's *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung) have now appeared. The translation may be taken as a new edition of the work, for it is described as 'vom Verfasser vollständig durchgesehene und durch Um- und Uebersarbeitung auf den neuesten Stand der Forschung gebrachte deutsche Uebersetzung.' Chapter i deals with the sources, Chap. ii on 'Land und Volk,' Chap. iv on 'The Babylonian Gods before the time of Hammurabi,' Chap. vi on 'The Pantheon of Gudea,' Chap. viii (as yet unfinished) on 'The Pantheon at the time of Hammurabi.' The 144 pages now published form about one-fifth of the whole work.

(18) Dr. Hugo Winckler prints a lecture entitled *Die babylonische Kultur* (J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung) which deals in an interesting fashion with such matters as the astronomy of the Babylonians and their measures of time. A good many of the parallels with other folklore suggested in this lecture do not convince, but Dr. Winckler is always interesting.

(19) Dr. Alfred Jeremias writes a pamphlet ('Im Kampfe um Babel und Bibel,' J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung) against those who complain that 'Der Panbabylonismus legt seine starke Faust auf das alte Testament.' Delitzsch and Winckler seem to have startled some Old Testament scholars in Germany, notably Budde and König.

(20) The second volume of Dr. E. G. King's *Psalms in three Collections* contains Psalms xlii-lxxxix, the most characteristic of which are, as the Editor remarks, the Asaph and Korah Psalms. Dr. King has an interesting Introduction dealing with the characteristics of the Asaph and of the Korah Psalms. With regard to the former he holds that 'the Sons of Asaph were a guild of Prophets of uncertain tribe, but probably belonging to the House of Joseph: that the functions of this guild were those



connected with the *Asiph* feast in the Seventh Month; and I claim to have shown that all the characteristics of the Asaph Psalms are accounted for in the thoughts which gather round the Sabbath Month.' The Commentary is vigorous, independent, and marked by a power of deep insight into the meaning of the Text. Dr. King is well acquainted with the results of recent Old Testament criticism, and always writes with his eyes wide open; but his notes single out the spiritual features of a Psalm, and never raise unnecessarily the mere dust of criticism. The treatment of Psalm li is excellent; Dr. King treats it as the Confession of the Jewish Church, and shows how well some of the more difficult expressions in the Psalm fall in with his view. Particularly good are the notes on ver. 4 ('that thou mayest be justified'), 5 ('shapen in iniquity'), 7 ('purge me'), 11 ('cast me not away'), and 14 ('blood-guiltiness'). Very interesting also is the treatment of that difficult Psalm, the sixty-eighth. Dr. King is quite open-minded, and receives suggestions both from modern textual critics and from modern writers on comparative religion, but he never allows himself to be dragged down by the modern spirit which so often ignores the spiritual element in the Psalms. The Commentary will not help novices to pass examinations, but it will stimulate religious teachers, and help to open their eyes to the stores of spiritual truth to be found in the Old Testament.

(21) Dr. Karl Budde, who brought out a literary and historical introduction to the books of Judges and Samuel in 1890, has now published a commentary on Samuel (*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A. T.*, Lieferung 18). With regard to David's lament (2 Sam. i 17-27), he says that though it cannot be *proved* to be David's, yet there are no serious grounds for questioning his authorship, and the reference to the Book of Jashar establishes its antiquity. He gives us faithfully all Klostermann's emendations, in which that knight-errant scholar confounds most of the poetry of the lament into prose.

(22) The Books of Samuel have found yet another Commentator in Dr. W. Nowack (*Handkommentar zum A. T.*, I Abt., 4 Band). The work is very full, but it may be doubted whether it adds much to our knowledge. The Introduction contains a polemic against Dr. Löhr's conservative principles of Textual Criticism. Nowack estimates the LXX at a higher value than Löhr, e.g. in 1 Sam. xvi 5 he prefers *καὶ εὐφράνθητε μετ' ἐμοῦ σήμερον* (LXX) to the 'and come with me to the sacrifice' of the M. T., and in xxv 22 *ταῦτε ποιήσαι ὁ θεὸς τῷ Δαυεὶδ* (LXX) to the 'so do God to the enemies of David' of the M. T. Perhaps Dr. Nowack fails in these instances to discern between text and interpretation. The treatment of David's Lament seems to exaggerate the textual difficulties of that passage.

(23) In the same series Dr. Kittel (now Professor at Leipzig) has



brought out an edition of Chronicles. The treatment is commendably brief, especially in the Second Book. The *Shihor* of 1 Chr. xiii is explained as 'der östlichste Arm des Nildeltas,' and the notion that *Mizraim* here means anything else than 'Egypt' is rejected. Kittel's historical judgements are reserved and careful.

(24) Dr. G. Diettrich (now of the Heilandskirche, Berlin) published in 1901 an interesting anonymous Jacobite Introduction to the Psalter in the Syriac text with a German translation. He now continues his Syriac Old Testament studies with a monograph on the Nestorian *Isô'dâdh's* place in the History of Old Testament Exegesis. The text of *Isô'dâdh's* Commentary on Hosea, Joel, Jonah, Zechariah ix-xiv, and Psalms xvi, xxii, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxii, and xlv (in this order) is given with a German translation and a few critical notes in illustration of the theme. The Introduction is both interesting and important, dealing as it does with such subjects as the arrangement of the O. T. according to the Nestorian Canon, the authorities quoted by *Isô'dâdh*, the dependence of *bar Hebraeus* on *Isô'dâdh*, and the text underlying the Commentary. The book is very important for all students of the Old Testament Peshitta.

Among recent contributions to Old Testament study contained in periodicals the following may be mentioned:—

(a) ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ALTTESTAMENTLICHE WISSENSCHAFT.

1902. II (pages 193-201). Dr. G. Diettrich gives 'Die Massora der östlichen und westlichen Syrer in ihren Angaben zum Buche Ruth nach fünf Handschriften.' The text of a Nestorian Massoretic MS (Mus. Brit. Add. 12138) is edited with various readings from the other four (Jacobite) MSS and from the text of the London Polyglott.

(Pages 202-28) Dr. A. Büchler discusses Theophrastus' depreciatory account of Jewish sacrifice.

(Pages 238-63) Herr A. Zillessen examines the LXX text of Isa. xl-lxvi.

(Pages 285-304) Herr E. Liebmann continues his textual work on Isa. xxiv-xxvii.

1903. I (pages 1-48). Herr A. Bender discusses 'Das Lied Exodus 15.' He thinks that the application of derivatives of the root *חָנַן* to describe the working of Jehovah points to exilic or post-exilic times. His final conclusion is:—'Das Lied ist nach jeder Hinsicht ein Psalm. Schon allein diese Thatsache verweist es in die nachexilische Zeit, und zwar als ganzes. Denn der Rekurs auf Exod. 15. 20 f. reicht u. E. nicht aus, einen Mosaischen "Kern" zu retten.'

(Pages 49-86) Herr A. Zillessen presents in a number of carefully compiled tables the variations in the rendering of tenses between the LXX (B) and other Greek recensions or versions of Isa. xl-lxvi. The

result is interesting and demands consideration; the author reserves his conclusions.

(Pages 531-171) Dr. Stade has an interesting article entitled, 'Streiflichter auf die Entstehung der jetzigen Gestalt der alttestamentlichen Prophetenschriften.' He protests against drawing a sharp distinction between 'Writing Prophets' and the earlier non-literary seers.

(b) THEOLOGISCHE LITERATURZEITUNG.

May 10, 1902. Duhm, *Jeremia erklärt*; review by Giesebrecht.

May 24. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms*; review by G. Beer.

June 7. Baudissin, *Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*; review by R. Smend.

Aug. 30. *Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1901); review by R. Smend.

Sept. 13. Schwally, *Semitische Kriegsallertümer* (Erstes Heft: *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*); review by P. Volz. Also an interesting notice by E. Schürer of three papers on Circumcision among the Egyptians and in the Old Testament contributed to the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* by Ulr. Wilcken, P. Wendland, and H. Gunkel.

Oct. 25. Giesebrecht, *Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens*; review by A. Bertholet.

Nov. 22. R. Kittel, *Ueber die Notwendigkeit und Möglichkeit einer neuen Ausgabe der hebräischen Bibel*; a lengthy review by G. Beer, who concludes: 'An der allgemeinen Durchführbarkeit des wohlwogenen Planes K's wird also nicht zu zweifeln sein.'

Jan. 17, 1903. E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das alte Testament* (3<sup>te</sup> Aufl.); review by P. Volz.

Jan. 31. W. O. E. Oesterley, *Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos* (Cambridge, 1902); review by Max Löhr.

Also reviews by R. Smend of Herkenne's Latin text of Ecclesiasticus, and of Norbert Peter's edition of the Hebrew text, and of his discussion of the Sahidic-Coptic version.

Feb. 28. C. H. W. Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents copied, collated, arranged, abstracted, annotated, and indexed* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1898-1901); review by Bruno Meissner.

(c) CRITICAL REVIEW.

May, 1902. A review of Dr. Kirkpatrick's *Book of Psalms* by Professor W. H. Bennett.

September. A survey of recent work in Egyptology and Assyriology by Professor Sayce, including a notice of recent excavation in Palestine.

November. A review of Duhm's *Jeremia erklärt* by Professor T. Walker of Belfast.



## DOGMATICA.

A. G. MORTIMER, D.D. *The Eucharistic Sacrifice: an Historical and theological investigation of the Sacrificial Conception of the Holy Eucharist in the Christian Church.* (Longmans, 1901. 10s.6d.) Dr. Mortimer argues against a view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (which he calls the 'modern' view) which connects it with our Lord's mediatorial work in heaven. He selects for attack *imprimis* a pamphlet by Mr. Brightman, entitled *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*<sup>1</sup>. Dr. Mortimer's objections to the modern view resolve themselves into three: (1) it has little or no traditional authority; (2) and this for the good reason that it conflicts with the Christian faith on two points—viz. (a) it assumes that our Lord's heavenly work is sacrificial, (b) it implies the imperfection of the Sacrifice of the Cross. As to the first objection, each of Dr. Mortimer's quotations from the Fathers and later Doctors would need to be tested and considered in detail. We venture to think he is too rigorous in excluding ideas approaching the 'modern' view from some of the passages quoted. Still they seem to prove that this view was at the most only 'sub-consciously' held. But Dr. Mortimer himself supplies evidence which makes us demur as to his opinion of the significance of this fact. He says (p. 178) 'until the controversies of the sixteenth century . . . no serious attempt was made by the theologians of the Church to investigate the *nature* of the [Eucharistic] sacrifice itself.' If that be the case, it would not be a fatal objection to the 'modern' view that it is not represented in the teaching of the Ancient Church, provided that it could be shown to be in harmony with scriptural doctrine. It is on this latter point that the brunt of the argument must fall. That there is a relation between the Eucharist and the heavenly intercession of the ascended Lord, Dr. Mortimer is willing to allow. As regards the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, however, he says this relation is only 'accidental': in both there is the same Priest and the same Victim. 'But in the Eucharist there is a sacrificial action . . . whereas in our Lord's heavenly offering no such sacrificial action is found.' This really constitutes the essence of the objection. What is to be said of this position? The very word 'offering,' which Dr. Mortimer himself uses in this connexion, seems to throw a doubt at once on what he says. But let us take the question before the bar of scriptural teaching. What is the meaning of the exact parallel drawn in Heb. ix between the high priest's entry into the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement and our Lord's entry into Heaven, 'to appear before the face of God for us' (v. 24)? Dr. Mortimer's answer is that the high priest's work in the holy of holies was not to offer sacrifice but to 'appear before God,' and that he did this by means of the blood of

<sup>1</sup> We understand that this pamphlet was printed for private circulation only.



a sacrifice which had already been offered. It is on this last point that we venture to think that Dr. Mortimer treads on very doubtful ground. The sacrifice, he says, was completed when the high priest entered the holy of holies. What, then, had been the use made of the blood which, as in all sin-offerings, constituted the central act of the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement? It had been sprinkled on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, says Dr. Mortimer (p. 462). But a reference to Lev. xvi shows us that this sprinkling of the blood upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering took place *after* the sprinkling upon the mercy seat. The bullock is presented and killed (Lev. xvi 11), and its blood is sprinkled in the holy of holies upon the mercy seat (v. 14). The same ceremonial then takes place with the goat selected for the sin-offering of the people (v. 15). In v. 17 allusion is made to the object of the entry into the holy place (i. e. holy of holies). It was 'to make atonement,' and the atonement is described as *completed* when the high priest leaves the holy of holies. And it is not until after this that we meet with the first mention of the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar of burnt-offering (vv. 18, 19); the purpose of which, we read, is to 'cover' for the altar itself. In other words, Dr. Mortimer, in order to make good his contention, asks us to rearrange the verses in Lev. xvi in the following order: 11, 18, 19, 12-15 (18, 19 again), 16, 17—an excellent illustration of the *Tendenz-Kritik*! But this is not all. The same theory is applied to all the different kinds of sin-offering. In all sin-offerings he regards the sprinkling of the blood as a kind of appendix to the sacrifice, 'an application of the blood of the sacrifice which had been offered' (p. 127). The only sense in which we can understand him is that a sacrificial use of the blood had been made already in the form of a 'pouring' as in the burnt-offering, and that the sprinkling of the blood upon the horns of the altar was additional to this (sacrificial) 'pouring.' But we can find no authority for this. Lev. iv 5-7, 16-18, 25, 30, 34 in describing the different kinds of sin-offering says nothing of any such 'pouring' of the blood upon the altar, and plainly regards the 'sprinkling' in the sin-offering as a substitute (not an addition) for the 'pouring' in the burnt-offering. The inference from this is very far-reaching. For it follows that the sprinkling of the blood in the sin-offering was not only an integral part of the sacrifice itself (instead of an appendix, as Dr. Mortimer considers it), but was also the consummating act of the sacrificial ceremonial. And, in a regular gradation, the blood was 'sprinkled' in a more sacred place according to the degree of expiation needed (Lev. iv), until the climax is reached on the Day of Atonement with the sprinkling upon the *Kapporeth*, above which rested the visible presence of Jehovah. And it is this act which the Epistle to the Hebrews makes to be the type of our Lord's heavenly intercession.

In both cases the intention seems to be the presenting to God of a pure life to 'cover' for sin—by the high priest of the old covenant a symbolical and ineffective, by the High Priest of the new covenant a real and effective presenting. It seems to us then very difficult to deny that the Epistle to the Hebrews regards the intercession of the heavenly High Priest as belonging to the sacrifice. His 'appearing for us,' taken in conjunction with His Death, is sacrificial. He pleads by 'appearing,' by the presentation of a pure life surrendered unto death: as the priest under the old covenant pleaded in the sin-offering by the presentation of a pure life representing (might not the regulations of the choice of victim and the laying on of hands warrant us in saying 'identified with?') the sacrificer's own life. This position is not open to the charge of explaining the New Testament by means of the Old. It is based upon the way in which the Epistle to the Hebrews (written by one who was a Jew, or at least thoroughly conversant with the Jewish religion) sees (especially in chap. ix) in the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement the symbolical prefiguring of the greater Atoning Sacrifice. If this is so, the greater part of Dr. Mortimer's argument falls to the ground. It rests upon a serious misunderstanding of the Old Testament sacrificial system. There are also other indications of a weakness in his handling of this part of the subject: e. g. the confusion (p. 51) of ceremonial acts belonging to different kinds of sacrifices, and the twice-repeated (doubtful) statement that the high priest on the day of atonement wore the breast-plate (pp. 128, 462; cf. Lev. xvi 4).

We have only space to speak very briefly of Dr. Mortimer's third difficulty, viz. that to regard the mediatorial work of the heavenly intercessor as sacrificial, and to connect with this intercession the Eucharistic sacrifice is to deny the completeness of the offering upon the Cross. Does not this again rest upon a confusion? Does it not blur the distinction between the oblation of the self-offered victim through death upon the cross, and the oblation in heaven of the life so surrendered? The former is the offering in its relation to the offerer, 'the one oblation of Himself once offered,' of which the slaying of the victim by the sacrificer under the old covenant was the type, with the essential difference, however, that our Lord's death in itself had an intrinsic value as the perfection of self-oblation: the latter is the offering in relation to the Priest, the type of which under the old covenant was the 'sprinkling' of the blood, the priest's act. The former was one act, consummated and completed upon the cross, never to be repeated; the latter is also one, but perpetual, beginning, it is true, with a definite act at a definite time—our Lord's entrance into heaven and His first presentation of Himself (to which allusion is made in Heb. vii 27, 28), but continued for ever in His 'appearing' for us before the Father. Either belongs of necessity



to the perfect sacrifice: either is sacrificial: neither can be separated from the other or made to constitute the whole sacrifice (in the strict sense of the word): yet either is in itself a perfect and complete offering (or sacrifice in this looser sense of the word), the one as the offerer's act of offering, the other as the priest's act of offering<sup>1</sup>. The completeness of the offering upon Calvary, so far from being denied, is absolutely essential to the sacrificial character of the heavenly offerings. And, if so, the sacrifice of the Eucharist may be related to the heavenly intercession without denying the completeness of the offering made upon the cross.

BERDMORE COMPTON. *Sacrifice* (Second edition. J. Parker & Co., 1901. 2s. 6d.). This book starts with an explanation and interpretation of the Old Testament sacrifices, and passes on from them to the consideration of the ideal of sacrifice as fulfilled by our Lord. We do not quite feel confident that it has escaped the danger of such a plan—viz. an over-estimate of the older sacrifices, with a tendency to make them the norm of the definition of sacrifice. Mr. Compton's very excellence—which we welcome as a much-needed qualification in one who writes on such a subject—his sympathy with the Jewish sacrificial system and insight into its sublime spirituality, makes the danger all the greater in his case. And we do not find in his book that which should serve to keep him safe, viz. the recognition of the truth and meaning of progress in Revelation. The details of the Old Testament sacrificial system are on the whole well treated. Here and there the interpretation seems imaginary rather than guided by such evidence as is available: e.g. the meaning of 'salt' (p. 34), 'honey' (p. 35), 'leaven' (p. 49), and the explanation on p. 105. On one point, however, and that a very important point—the interpretation of 'blood' and of the use made of the blood—we should demur strongly to Mr. Compton's reading of the facts. What is the evidence for the far-reaching statement that the 'blood' was regarded as offensive to God, defiling? The issues of this statement go beyond the Old Testament (see p. 77). In the consideration of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist there is a tendency at least in one chapter to confine it wholly to our offering of ourselves (p. 143). Exception might be justly taken also to a certain narrowness which shows itself in the general treatment of Inspiration, and in the refusal to take heathen sacrifices into consideration. The curtness with which the critical study of the Old Testament and the science of comparative religion are dismissed shows a want of patient consideration which will incur the charge of obscurantism.

ADOLF HARNACK. *Sokrates und die alte Kirche*. (J. Ricker, Giessen 1901. Pf. 50.) The above is the address delivered by Prof. Harnack

<sup>1</sup> For the substance of this paragraph I have to thank Father Puller of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley.



as Rector of the Berlin University at the opening of the academical year 1901. Dr. Harnack took for his subject the estimate which the Fathers of the first three centuries formed of Socrates the philosopher. He begins by referring to the alliance—a *concordia discors*, he calls it—between Christianity and Greek philosophy in the second century A.D. Socrates was the most revered name of the latter on its ethical and religious side. It was to Socrates—the Socrates depicted by Plato—that the Fathers turned as the best exponent of 'non-Christian' goodness, when they wanted to make a comparison, favourable or unfavourable, between it and the Christian ideal of life. The reader is shown by a series of apt quotations, particularly from Justin Martyr, the high estimate formed by the Greek Fathers of Socrates as the best of the Philosophers, one of those who were 'Christians before Christ' because they 'lived with the Logos' (so Prof. Harnack translates *ὁ μετὰ λόγον βίωσας* of Justin, Ap. i 46. This translation undoubtedly expresses Justin's thought as it appears in the context; but, as a translation, is it not too definitely personal?). One cannot but remark that the most favourable estimate of Socrates never really ventures to compare him with Christ. Origen draws a parallel between Socrates and Christ, but this is only as regards the method and substance of their teaching. The Apologists often liken the persecution of the *Christians* to the trial and death of Socrates. None, however—at least Prof. Harnack tells us of none—venture to compare Socrates and Christ in their death, although the comparison might seem to invite observation. 'The Christians stand in the same relation to Christ as Socrates to his God. From the Greek writers Prof. Harnack passes on to the Western Theologians, whose judgement of Socrates is, as we should expect, generally unfavourable and often unfair. It is hinted that this difference of judgement between East and West is due to different conceptions of the extent and effects of Original Sin (p. 15).

Though only for the most part engaged in a more detailed illustration of a well-known truth, the different attitudes of the early Christian Fathers to the Greek philosophy, Prof. Harnack's freshness and vigour makes this little *brochure* full of interest. He closes with an earnest appeal to study history, and a warning against the superficial study which contents itself with a knowledge of beliefs and opinions, but never aims at getting into contact with the personality and life history of their authors who 'lived them.'

ADOLF HARNACK. *Die Aufgabe der theologischen Facultäten und die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte.* (J. Ricker, Giessen, 1901.) This is another Rectoral Address, delivered by Prof. Harnack, on August 3, 1901. Its subject is the discussion of a proposal—whether definitely formulated or only in the air, we are not told—to enlarge the boundaries of the

Theological Faculty (at Berlin) so as to make it a 'Faculty for the History of Religion in general,' instead of confining it as under present conditions to the study of Christianity. The Prussian Government did not propose to take any steps towards altering present arrangements; and Prof. Harnack speaks in support of their decision. Discussing the *pros* and *cons* of the question, he admits that in the abstract there are weighty arguments in favour of the extension; thus (1) a general conception of religion can only be reached from the study of all religions: (2) the historical method—the only one by which religion can be studied—does not allow us to limit inquiry arbitrarily to one religion: (3) the needs of the Church in the foreign mission field demand the study of Comparative Religion. Over against these arguments he places his own objections to the proposed extension. He starts from a practical difficulty. The study of a religion requires a close acquaintance with the language, the thought, the political and social conditions and institutions of its adherents. How can it be demanded of a Theological Faculty to embrace so wide a field in regard to all religions? It would be impossible, and therefore the Berlin Faculty is content to find itself confined to the study of one religion. And, things being so, there are overwhelming reasons why this one religion should be Christianity. (1) To the Christian religion belongs the Bible, *the* religious book beyond all others at all times. 'What are Homer, the Vedas, the Koran, by the side of the Bible?' All departments of Theology group themselves round the Bible as their common centre. (2) Christianity is the most representative of all religions. Its development before and after Christ has brought it into contact with all successive ages since the beginning of history, and its extension has confronted it with every type of national character. In the relation of spiritual to secular government, of religion to other sciences, its history has embodied the widest range of experience. And amidst the variety of its manifestations there is scarcely any form of spiritual phenomena which is unrepresented. Christianity then by itself offers an incomparable field for the study of Comparative Religions. (3) It is a living religion. An organism can only be studied as a living thing: religion can only be studied by the sincere believer in a living religion. (4) Christianity is not merely one of many religions. It is *the* religion: Jesus Christ is *the* Master; His Gospel alone answers the spiritual needs of mankind as unfolded in history. Jesus Christ, as the disciples knew Him, Teacher, Lord, Saviour, the centre of the Bible, must be the centre of all Theology also. (5) Lastly the Theological Faculty has [at Berlin] by its statutes a special task imposed upon it, viz. the equipment of young men for the ministry of the Church. In conclusion Prof. Harnack appeals to the philologist, and especially to the student of oriental



languages, to include the study of religions in the range of his researches, and to put the results of his work at the service of the Christian Theologian. Prof. Harnack's address, by its subject and by the enthusiasm and conviction with which he deals with it, should arouse the greatest interest amongst all who are engaged as students or teachers of Theology.

JOHANNES WEISS, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes in der Theologie*. (Giessen, 1901. M. 3.) This book has grown out of an address delivered by (the younger) Prof. Weiss (of Marburg) at the Theological Conference at Giessen on June 14, 1900. In its present form it extends to a closely printed book of 155 pages, intended as a sequel to the author's previous work, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1900). The book begins with a history of the idea of the kingdom of God, starting from our Lord's teaching. We take it, however, that this part of the work is merely introductory to the second and main division, which consists of an exposition, criticism, and supplementing of Ritschl's conception of the kingdom of God. The first part does not profess to treat its subject exhaustively. The teaching of Jesus is given in a few summary headings: for a fuller account of it and its relation to contemporary Judaism the reader is referred to the other work mentioned above. From the succeeding history of the idea Prof. Weiss selects the most important epochs. In the account of the early Christian thought in the New Testament and the sub-apostolic ages, attention is drawn to the primitive importance and subsequent decline of Chiliasmic ideas. St. Augustine, the last opponent of Chiliasm, marks the next stage in the history. Prof. Weiss avoids the double error with which Prof. Robertson (*Regnum Dei*, p. 173) charges many modern writers on the subject, viz. of saying without qualification that 'St. Augustine identified the visible Church with the kingdom of God, and that he was the first to identify the two.' 'The sphere of the *Regnum Christi* (St. Augustine prefers this expression to *Regnum Dei* to denote the kingdom as present) within the Church is expressly narrowed (i. e. by St. Augustine) to include only the *Sancti*' (Weiss, p. 23). 'St. Augustine is quite unconscious that he is the first to assert the identity of the Church and the kingdom of God. . . . Whence did he derive this parallelism of the Church and the kingdom of God? From the parable in St. Matthew of the scribe learned in the kingdom of God, and the explanation of the parable of the Tares and the Wheat' (ib. p. 22). Prof. Weiss passes from St. Augustine to the mediaeval misconception of his teaching, which saw in the Papacy the realization on earth of the kingdom of God. The course of thought is then followed in succession through the Reformers (Melancthon, Luther, Calvin), the Pietists, the leading representatives of the *Aufklärung* (Hobbes, Leibnitz, Semler, Herder, Lessing, and Kant), to Schleiermacher, and finally Theremin, with



whose teaching Ritschl immediately connected his own. The rest of the book, under the form of an examination of Ritschl's conception, presents us with Prof. Weiss's own contribution to the subject. A development is traced in Ritschl's thought from his earlier, mainly 'ethical,' conception of the kingdom as the sphere of human activity in the practice of virtue—a view condemned as untrue to the proportion of our Lord's teaching—to his later and truer conception, the 'religious' conception, which approaches the idea of the kingdom from the side of God as its Founder, Gracegiver, and King. Prof. Weiss discovers in Ritschl a third idea also—the kingship of those who belong to the kingdom (cp. 'cui servire regnare est'), and criticizes him for not making more use of it than he does. The place of the idea of the kingdom in Ritschl's system is next examined with the result that it is found to be at the centre of the Ritschlian Teleology. It was the purpose of God in creation to call this kingdom into being; the kingdom is the final goal towards which all things are moving. But there is in Ritschl's system beside his Teleology another circle of ideas represented by his Soteriology, the centre of which is the Atonement. Ritschl himself saw the difficulty of bringing these two into relation with one another, and compared the Christian religion to an ellipse with these two fundamental thoughts, the kingdom of heaven and the Atonement, as its foci. To Prof. Weiss this difficulty amounts to an impossibility. 'It is impossible to bring together into one complete system these two groups of ideas, the doctrine of the Atonement, and the teleological world-conception dominated by the idea of the kingdom of God' (p. 125). According to him, Ritschl's ellipse really falls into two distinct circles, each of which has for its centre a point of view from which the whole Christian religion may be regarded. [Does it not take us some way towards the solution of this difficulty if we regard (*a*) the two centres as united in One Person, who is both Creator and Redeemer, (*b*) His work as starting with man's restoration to the unfallen state in which he was originally created (Soteriology), but leading on beyond that to the ultimate realization of the Divine plan for man in creation (Teleology)?] Prof. Weiss goes on to consider the practical value for the present day of the idea of the kingdom of heaven, as Ritschl conceived it, on its two sides, the 'ethical' and the 'religious.' The 'ethical' side of Ritschl's conception is supplemented by adding to it a truth which Ritschl perceived to hold good in the 'kingdom of sin,' viz. the working of a principle of conservation of energy by which the power of the good grows deeper and more permanent. The kingdom of God must include the thought of an 'organization' of the good, in which good acts produce or deepen in the individual the habit of goodness, whose influence in turn acts in a similar way upon the community, and promotes the

creation and strengthening of good laws and good institutions. So Prof. Weiss defines the kingdom of God on its ethical side as that 'organization of the good in which the will of God is not merely displayed in isolated dazzling acts of goodness, but obtains a lasting dominion, spreads more widely, and sinks more deeply from generation to generation.' On its 'religious' or teleological side Ritschl's conception is criticized as being too narrow in its identification of the kingdom of God with the 'kingdom of Christ,' founded by Christ and confined to the sphere of the Christian Church. Prof. Weiss regards the whole of human history as the field of the kingdom of God. The times before Christ he would not describe (with Ritschl) as the 'preparation' for the kingdom, but as 'stages in its development'; the Christian Church as the highest—though not the highest conceivable—stage. The complete realization of the kingdom is not for this world. To mankind upon earth the ideal is an ideal, unattainable, yet held up before us for our guidance and stimulus. Prof. Weiss leaves the two, the kingdom actual and the kingdom ideal, as an antinomy of thought: on the one hand, the kingdom as a present fact, slowly developing, God its King immanent in the world; on the other hand, the kingdom as future, perfect, God transcendent above time and space. To us an antinomy: but to God who sees *sub specie aeternitatis* a harmony. The latter part of Prof. Weiss's book, and especially all that he has to say on the teleological side of Ritschl's conception ('the idea of the kingdom as the principle of a religious view of history'), is wonderfully stimulating in its breadth of view, vigour of presentation and hopefulness. But there are two considerations which it might be expected would have received more notice. The first and graver question is this: What may be said of the ultimate end of that 'kingdom of sin'? What of the possibility of final disobedience in beings endowed with free-will? The second question is the relation of the Church to the kingdom. The Pauline conception of the Church, and her union with her Lord, the relation of that conception to the Church historically considered as a corporate organization with a continuity of life from its foundation to the present moment, and onwards into the future: does the Ritschlian conception of the kingdom of God give just weight to these considerations?

ALBERT TEMPLE SWING. *The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl: with Ritschl's 'Instruction in the Christian Religion,' translated by ALICE MEAD SWING.* (Longmans, 1901. 5s. net.) Prof. Swing has given us a very useful piece of work. Himself an ardent admirer of Ritschl, he writes with the purpose of interpreting the Ritschlian theology, and at the same time of vindicating it against attacks based upon misrepresentation. Particularly as regards the charge of 'subjectivism' he demands a rehearing and an acquittal of Ritschl, and gives us the evidence for his



case by lengthy quotations from Ritschl's own words. Two questions suggest themselves in this connexion which it would need a student of Ritschl to answer. Are the passages quoted the most representative that could be found? How far was Ritschl consistent with himself? If the answer to these questions proves satisfactory, Prof. Swing makes out a strong case upon the evidence which he produces. Dealing with the theory of knowledge which underlies the whole Ritschlian theology, he shows that so far from the denying the reality of things in themselves, it takes their actual existence as proved by the fact of the sensations which they excite in us (p. 79). 'Our *ego* is not of itself the cause of the impressions, perceptions, &c.' And in the application of this theory to religion Ritschl is shown testifying to the 'objective' reality of God, the soul, the good, love, &c. behind the phenomena (the historical Christ and the Christian experience), through which alone we know of Him and them. In view of this position it is perhaps a little unfortunate that Prof. Swing should use the word 'agnosticism' (p. 28) in connexion with Ritschl's teaching. It suggests a false impression of Ritschl's attitude towards Revelation. The vindication of Ritschl against the accusation that he discredits the historical validity of the Gospel narratives, is also, as far as we can judge, successful. Ritschl accepted the Resurrection and the miraculous element generally in our Lord's life in the sense in which they have generally been regarded in the Christian Church. On the Virgin Birth Prof. Swing quotes only one passage, from which we gather that Ritschl would not have regarded it so favourably. Prof. Swing would have added still further to the usefulness of his book if he could have found room for a chapter comparing Ritschl's teaching with that of the Catholic Church, especially on such points as the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Grace, the Church, and the Sacraments. He does this to some extent with regard to original sin. But on other points also we hear much of Ritschl's taking us from Dogma back to Biblical Theology. What does the change amount to in the sum total of its results? And, if we may add one word of criticism, Prof. Swing is hardly fair in his own estimate of 'dogmatic' theology. He does not seem to remember how much 'dogmatic' theology was forced upon the Church by the necessity of opposing false teachers. And he overlooks two further facts. *First*, that the foundation upon which the 'dogmatic' theology professes to rest, and apart from which it claims no authority, is a relationship towards the Bible exactly the same as that on which Ritschl's theology is based; the differences between the two arising from differences of interpretation. *Secondly*, that in her interpretation of the Bible, and in particular of the New Testament, the Church had the help and the authority of a continuous living tradition which we can trace back to the personal followers



of the apostles, and for which its representatives in the sub-apostolic age confidently claim the authority of the apostles themselves. The part played by Greek philosophy in the formation of the Christian dogmas is taken by Prof. Swing (and by Ritschl?) to be greater than the evidence goes to show. The translation of the 'Instruction' by Mrs. (or Miss?) Swing is well done. The English is quite readable, and (except in a few passages) the idiomatic complications of the German are simplified without any loss of meaning. May an English audience venture to protest against the expression 'back of' (= behind) of which Prof. Swing is very fond?

W. H. DAUBNEY, B.D. *The use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church.* (C. J. Clay & Sons, 1900, 3s.) Mr. Daubney complains of the widespread tendency to depreciate the Apocrypha and writes with the purpose of showing that this is contrary to the general feeling of the Church from the earliest times, and inconsistent with the position given to the Apocrypha in the formularies of the English Church. His contention is abundantly justified by the mass of evidence which he has here accumulated. The marshalling of arguments and quotations under the various headings is sometimes a little wanting in system; in cap. ix indeed it degenerates into a mere *farrago* of odds and ends. The evidence is defective, moreover, on two points which seriously affect the subject. What was the position of the Apocrypha in the judgement of the Jews before the Christian era? How far did the first Christians—especially the Jewish Christians—adopt the Jewish estimate? And lastly from the evidence as given by Mr. Daubney there arises another important question. The New Testament, it is proved, shows a considerable acquaintance with the Apocrypha: but it contains no direct quotation from Apocryphal books. What are we to make of this absence of quotation taken in connexion with the pre-Christian Jewish view of the Apocrypha? Is it enough to answer that there is the same absence of quotation from some of the books included in the Old Testament Canon? What again is to be said of the great contrast in this respect between the New Testament and the writings of the Fathers, practically all of whom quote very freely from the Apocrypha, generally assigning to it a considerable measure of authority, even where they do not cite it as 'Scripture'? Perhaps the consideration of these facts would not materially alter Mr. Daubney's conclusions: but we should like to have heard what he has to say about them. For the rest, he deserves our gratitude for the industry and care which has given us a very timely and useful book.

F. R. TENNANT, M.A., B.Sc. *The Origin and Propagation of Sin.* Hulsean Lectures, 1901-2. (Cambridge University Press, 1902, 3s. 6d. net.) Mr. Tennant, following other lines than those of the doctrine of

the Fall, suggests an alternative explanation of those facts in human life which are covered by the term 'Original Sin.' His survey of the facts differs, indeed, in the most important particular from the view of human nature taken by those who believe in Original Sin. We give in his own words the conclusion to which he comes. 'What if he [man] were flesh before spirit: lawless, impulse-governed organism, fulfilling as such the nature necessarily his and therefore the life God willed for him in his earliest age, until his moral consciousness was awakened to start him, heavily weighted with the inherited load, not, indeed, of abnormal and corrupted nature, but of non-moral and necessary animal instinct and self-assertive tendency, on that race-long struggle of flesh with spirit and spirit with flesh which for us alas! becomes but another name for the life of sin' (p. 11). We believe this sentence fairly states Mr. Tennant's view of the origin of sin. He deals first with the difficulties attaching to the conception of Original Sin in its Theological (Lect. i) and in its freer Philosophical form (Lect. ii, which discusses also and dismisses certain alternative theories which have been advocated in the course of Philosophical speculation). Lect. iii ('The Problem of the Origin and Propagation of Sin: its treatment in Empirical Science and Evolutionary Theory') contains the positive statement and defence of the author's position; Lect. iv the Theodicy to which his solution of the problem leads us. In their book-form the lectures are to be supplemented by a larger work on 'The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin' which is announced to be published shortly.

Mr. Tennant voices thoughts which have been floating in the air for some time. The conclusions which he reaches from his application of the idea of Evolution to the problem of the Origin of Sin will undoubtedly arouse considerable opposition. As far as I can judge the following are the points in which his position is open to criticism. On the destructive side Mr. Tennant inclines to overestimate (as a general rule; p. 22 is an exception) the degree of 'guilt' attached by theologians to Original Sin. He assumes the influence of St. Augustine in this particular point to be greater than it really was. He does not notice that in the Anglican Articles (Art. ix) it is the 'fault and corruption' of the nature which is said to deserve 'God's wrath and damnation'; nothing is said of the person to whom this corrupted nature belongs. Again, the conception of 'original righteousness' demanded by the doctrine of Original Sin is not quite so definite as Mr. Tennant makes it. A more serious misunderstanding of the doctrine seems to underlie his criticism that the 'theory of original sin places such seductive impulses as arise spontaneously from within us, apart from all acquiescence in them, under the ethical category of sin' (p. 23). The distinction here laid down corresponds to the difference between



temptation and sin. It is not the distinction between original and actual sin, since both of these are concerned with the will, original sin with the will in its natural attitude towards temptation, and actual sin with the will in action. Again, the assertion that the doctrine of original sin is unscientific does not seem warranted on the strength of the evidence as Mr. Tennant presents it. Natural Science, we are told, stops just short of giving a verdict on the question whether acquired physical modifications are transmissible. On the further question of the relation between parent and offspring as regards their moral natures, it is silent altogether. How then is the doctrine of Original Sin unscientific? Lastly, the final criticism to be made on this part of the subject is that the doctrine is supposed to rest for its Biblical evidence solely on the direct statements of Gen. iii and Rom. v.

Turning now to the constructive side of Mr. Tennant's work, we can only indicate briefly certain points which should not pass unchallenged.

(1) In giving the Evolutionary Theory of the Empirical origin of sin, the inquiry is empirical up a certain point only, beyond which it plunges suddenly into speculation. The 'moral consciousness' and the 'will' are traced back scientifically in the race and in the individual to the point where they cease to be perceptible by us. So far, good; but then it is assumed that before this point they did not exist. 'The faculties . . . of will and moral sense are made not born.' But, if our perception only reveals to us their working as far back as a certain point, does it therefore follow that before that time they were non-existent?

(2) Where Mr. Tennant is still faithful to his empirical method, his psychology and analysis of sin are not always satisfying. 'Morality' in the sense of a code of morals, and 'morality' in the sense of an attitude of the will towards the moral code, are two different meanings of the word, both of which must be taken into account in our conception of sin. Yet the conclusion that 'the first sin (i. e. of our first parents) . . . would rather be the least significant of all' (p. 91), is drawn from an argument (pp. 88-91) which seems to ignore the second meaning of 'morality.' Is it not the attitude of the will towards the acknowledged moral code which determines the degree of guilt in the sin, independently of the question how much that code contains? May not the sin of the savage against *his* code be very sinful? Further, in regard to this last point the final link is missing in the chain of evidence. Granted that the propensities which constitute the *fomes peccati* come to us from our animal ancestry and are in themselves non-moral, the last step in the evidence should tell us what attitude the will itself at its first appearance is seen to adopt towards these propensities. Is it neutral? Does it incline towards that 'higher law' which is just beginning to dawn upon the consciousness? Or is it found from the



first in sympathy and alliance with the impulses which it ought to curb? This goes really to the root of the whole matter: and to most thinkers<sup>1</sup> not only the theologians, but also the philosophers, the phenomena have seemed to point to the last of these alternatives. It is this aspect of the question, the fundamental aspect, which Mr. Tennant really evades. He assumes without proof that the will from the first has been neutral as towards the lower impulses. But this, if true, leads on to a still more serious consideration. In spite of Mr. Tennant's earnest and repeatedly expressed endeavours, there is reason to fear that he minimises the sinfulness of *actual sin*. Too much is said of sin merely on its negative side as the failure of the will to reduce into order the impulses of the lower nature: too little is said about the sinfulness of the will which runs out to meet the impulses half-way. The feelings of shame and guiltiness are hardly alluded to; we look in vain for an explanation of them or of their origin. Conscience is almost exclusively considered as the faculty which points to a duty, hardly ever as that which sits in judgement on the past and condemns. For the rest we thank Mr. Tennant sincerely for the temper in which he addresses himself to his subject, and the spirit in which he deals with those who disagree with him. Controversy in his hands is truthseeking and full of charity.

*Confession and Absolution. Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace, December 30, 1901—January 1, 1902.* Edited by Henry Wace, D.D., Chairman of the Conference. (Longmans, 1902, 3s. net.) As the results of this Conference were widely examined and discussed at the time when the Report appeared, they do not call for more than a brief notice now. The subject was divided into four headings—(1) the Scriptural basis, especially Matt. xviii 18 and John xx 22, 23; (2) the history of the Practice; (3) the mind of the English Church as declared in the Anglican formularies; (4) the treatment of Penitents and the training of the Minister. As regards the Scriptural question, all the members of the Conference were agreed that auricular confession was not incompatible with the terms of our Lord's commission to the Church, but they differed as to whether the Absolution was instrumental or only declaratory. On the practical question all were agreed that the Church of England permitted the use of such confession *under certain circumstances*, but differed as to what the circumstances were, and with what limitations exactly the confession was allowed. Lord Halifax believed that sacramental confession was demanded by the Church as necessary in every case of mortal sin. Others (e.g. Dr. Moberly, Mr. Coles) urged the advisability of habitual confession: others, again, strongly deprecated this, and held that the cases

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Tennant himself on p. 15 writes as if he agreed with them. 'Experience shows that *all* are tainted with moral evil, as if with an inborn disease.'

in which it was advisable were abnormal and rare. This part of the discussion was in many ways the least satisfactory. The members of the Conference often seem to be arguing at cross-purposes. At one moment the argument turns upon the interpretation of the mind of the Church on the question when private confession might be allowable or desirable; a few minutes later the discussion has drifted to the private opinions which the speakers have formed on the ground of individual experience. It is a very significant and welcome fact that there was so general an agreement on the great doctrinal aspects of the question. The disagreement practically centered round the words 'under certain circumstances'—that is, on a question of practical expediency rather than of doctrine. Disagreements of this sort are apt to raise much dust, but their real importance cannot be put on the same level with doctrinal differences. In view of this it might be thought that Dr. Wace was unduly pessimistic in his summing up of the Conference. It was true, as he said, that 'agreement had been reached on some important points, but divergence remained on others.' But might not a word have been added as to the relative importance of these points? It would have given a much more hopeful view of the issue of the Conference.

J. M. SCHULHOF, M.A. *The Law of Forgiveness as presented in the New Testament: A Study in Biblical Theology.* (Cambridge, Hefter and Sons, 1901.) Mr. Schulhof's book is welcome amidst the heat and bitterness of controversy as the work of a scholar, impartial, reverent, and closely accurate. In this last respect indeed it does not quite escape the defects of its qualities. The inquiry is too much, perhaps, an inquiry into the use and meaning of words, especially the words for 'forgiveness,' and too little an inquiry after the things which the words signify. We wish Mr. Schulhof would sometimes take a broader sweep of the field presented by the New Testament, and not confine himself too exclusively to the verbal questions. But the work which he has done will be of the greatest help to others whose defects are just those which this book should correct and supplement.

S. C. TICKELL. *Christian Heresies.* (Elliot Stock, 1902. 1s. 6d.) This little book has the somewhat alarming title 'Christian Heresies classified as simplifications of Christian Dogmas by conversion of Plurality into Unity or of Unity into Plurality.' It contains a table of the chief heresies of the first six centuries, followed by explanatory notes. It might be found useful, if taken in conjunction with a larger book on the same subject. But it is very doubtful even so whether the beginner (for whom it is meant) would be able to make much of it. There are several mistakes in the chronology, and the accents of the Greek words are often at fault. The heresies are correctly, although in some cases (notably that of Paul of Samosata) insufficiently described.

S. C. GAYFORD.



*RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO  
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*

(1) ENGLISH.

*Church Quarterly Review*, January 1903 (Vol. iv, No. 110: Spottiswoode & Co.). Portrait of the late Archbishop of Canterbury (*Frontispiece*)—The Three Churches in Ireland—The Church and the Clergy after the Restoration—Confession and Absolution—The Holy Eucharist: an Historical Inquiry, Part VI—The Life and Times of Giraldus Cambrensis, Churchman and Historian—'Contentio Veritatis'—The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles—The Study of Greek—The St. Margaret's Lectures—The Birmingham Bishopric—In Memoriam (The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of St. Albans, the Dean of Winchester)—Short Notices.

*The Hibbert Journal*, January 1903 (Vol. i, No. 2: Williams and Norgate). O. LODGE The Reconciliation between Science and Faith—H. JONES The Present Attitude of Reflective Thought towards Religion—J. WATSON James Martineau: a Saint of Theism—J. DRUMMOND 'Righteousness of God' in St. Paul's Theology (*concluded*)—L. CAMPBELL Aspects of the Moral Ideal: Old and New—W. B. SMITH Did Paul write Romans?—C. G. MONTEFIORE Jewish Scholarship and Christian Silence—Discussions—Reviews—Recent Theological Periodicals.

*The Expositor*, January 1903 (Sixth Series, No. 37: Hodder & Stoughton). G. ADAM SMITH Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem: I, A General View of the City—J. WEDGWOOD James Martineau, and the Heterodoxy of the Past—S. R. DRIVER Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah iv 3-vi 30—R. H. CHARLES The Rise and Development in Israel of the Belief in a Future Life—G. W. STEWART Wendt on the Fourth Gospel, I.

February 1903 (Sixth Series, No. 38). H. B. SWETE The Teaching of Christ—G. A. CHADWICK A Modern Séance—J. H. MOULTON Notes from the Papyri, II—G. ADAM SMITH Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem: II, The Name *Jerusalem* and other Names—G. W. STEWART Wendt on the Fourth Gospel, II—S. R. DRIVER Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah vii 1-ix 22.



March 1903 (Sixth Series, No. 39). J. WEDGWOOD Frederick Maurice and the Broad Church—H. R. MACKINTOSH The Objective Aspect of the Lord's Supper—N. J. D. WHITE The Virgin-Birth—G. ADAM SMITH Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem: III, The Waters of Jerusalem—S. R. DRIVER Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah ix 23-xiii—W. H. BENNETT Some recent Old Testament Literature.

*Jewish Quarterly Review*, January 1903 (Vol. xv, No. 58: Macmillan & Co.). H. HIRSCHFELD The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge (*with facsimiles*)—R. J. H. GOTTHEIL The Jews and the Spanish Inquisition (1622-1721), III—C. DE BETHENCOURT The Jews in Portugal from 1773 to 1902—A. LUCAS and H. FRANK J. L. Gordon *Simchas Torah (translated from the Yiddish)*—M. SELIGSOHN The Hebrew-Persian MSS. of the British Museum—M. STEINSCHNEIDER Allgemeine Einleitung in die jüdische Literatur des Mittelalters—W. BACHER Eine angebliche Ergänzung zu Jahjâ Şâlih's Tiklâl—Critical Notice: L. D. BARNETT Nolan and Hirsch's 'Roger Bacon's *Greek and Hebrew Grammars*.'

## (2) AMERICAN.

*The American Journal of Theology*, January 1903 (Vol. vii, No. 1: Chicago University Press). H. A. REDPATH The Present Position of the Study of the Septuagint—H. S. NASH The Social Ideal and the Dogma of Creation—G. W. KNOX The Orthodox Philosophy of the Chinese—F. C. CONYBEARE The Survival of Animal Sacrifices inside the Christian Church—Critical Notes: S. F. MACLENNAN and G. W. KNOX Principal Fairbairn's *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*: (a) from the Philosophical Standpoint: (b) from the Theological Standpoint—Recent Theological Literature.

*The Princeton Theological Review*, January 1903 (Vol. i, No. 1: Philadelphia, MacCalla & Co.). M. C. WILLIAMS Edward Irving—H. OSGOOD Dashing the Little Ones against the Rock—J. ORR Prof. Swing on Ritschl and his Critics—S. T. LOWRIE An Exegesis of 2 Cor. v 1-5—W. S. WATSON The Authenticity and Genuineness of the Book of Esther—W. IRVIN Success in the Ministry—B. B. WARFIELD Modern Theories of the Atonement—W. T. WHITLEY A Study in Textual Criticism (Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*)—T. W. HUNT The Epic Verse of Milton: *Paradise Lost*—B. L. HOBSON Fairbairn's *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*—Recent Theological Literature.

## (3) FRENCH AND BELGIAN.

*Revue Biblique*, January 1903 (Vol. xii, No. 1: Paris, V. Lecoffre, for the School of the Convent of St. Stephen at Jerusalem). Sanctissimi

Domini nostri Leonis divina providentia Papae XIII Litterae apostolicae quibus consilium instituitur studiis Sacrae Scripturae provehendis—P. BATIFFOL L'Église naissante. Le Canon du Nouveau Testament—M. J. LAGRANGE Le code de Hammourabi—TH. CALMES Les symboles de l'Apocalypse—Mélanges : TH. MACRIDY-BEV Le temple d'Echmoun à Sidon, fouilles exécutées par le Musée impérial ottoman (*suite*)—CLERMONT-GANNEAU Monuments palmyréniens : P. BATIFFOL Les *Tractatus Origenis*, à propos d'un livre nouveau : A. JAUSSEN Coutumes arabes—Chronique : A. JAUSSEN Voyage du Sinaï : R. SAVIGNAC Ou'airah ; Fouilles anglaises—Recensions—Bulletin.

*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, January–February 1903 (Vol. viii, No. 1 : Paris, 74, Boulevard Saint-Germain). J. TURMEL Le dogme du péché originel après saint Augustin dans l'Église latine : III, Essence du péché originel (*suite*) : La théorie de saint Anselme et la théorie de Catharin—P. RICHARD La légation Aldobrandini et le traité de Lyon (septembre 1600—mars 1601) : II, La diplomatie pontificale, ses agents au temps de Clément VIII—E. GRISELLE Épisodes de la campagne antiquétiste (1696–1699), d'après la correspondance de Bossuet, de son frère et de son neveu ; L'aventure de l'abbé Bossuet à Rome : II, Les démarches à la cour et les témoignages amis—H. M. HEMMER Chronique d'histoire ecclésiastique—J. DALBRET Littérature religieuse moderne.

March–April 1903 (Vol. viii, No. 2). A. LOISY Le discours sur la montagne ; (1) Mise en scène du discours ; (2) Les béatitudes ; (3) Le sel. La lumière—P. RICHARD La légation Aldobrandini et le traité de Lyon (septembre 1600—mars 1601) : III, La diplomatie pontificale, ses agents au temps de Clément VIII—C. CALLEWAERT Le rescrit d'Hadrien à Minicius Fundanus—Chronique biblique : A. LOISY (1) Ouvrages généraux (Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. iv : Cheyne *Encyclopaedia Biblica* : Houtin *La question biblique* : Gardner *Historical View of the New Testament*) ; (2) Assyriologie ; (3) Métrique biblique : édition et critique textuelle ; (4) Littérature et exégèse de l'Ancien Testament—J. DALBRET Littérature religieuse moderne.

*Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 1902 (Vol. vii, No. 4 : Paris, A. Picard). F. TOURNEBIZE Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie (*suite*)—L. PETIT Vie et Office de saint Michel Maléinos, suivis d'un traité ascétique de Basile Maléinos (*Texte grec*)—F. NAU and L. CLUGNET Vies et récits d'anachorètes (iv<sup>e</sup>–vii<sup>e</sup> siècles) : (1) Analyse du ms. grec de Paris, 1596 : (2) Textes grecs inédits extraits du même ms.—A. P. La rebaptisation des Latins chez les Grecs—L. CLUGNET Vie de sainte Marine : VII, Texte français—Mélanges : H. LAMMENS Les

formules épigraphiques: CHRISTUS HIC EST et ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΝΘΑΔΕ ΚΑΤΟΙΚΗΝ—Bibliographie.

*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, January 1903 (Vol. iv, No. 1: Louvain, 40, Rue de Namur). F. X. FUNK L'Agape—F. BETHUNE Les écoles historiques de Saint-Denis et Saint-Germain-des-Prés dans leurs rapports avec la composition des *Grandes Chroniques de France*—Mélanges: A. CAUCHIE Le Gallicanisme en Sorbonne d'après la correspondance de Bargellini, nonce de France (1668-1671) (*suite*)—Comptes-rendus—Chronique—Bibliographie.

*Revue Bénédictine*, January 1903 (Vol. xx, No. 1: Abbaye de Maredsous). L. J[ANSSENS] Dédicace—L. JANSSENS Maître Thomas Bouquillon—U. BERLIÈRE Les évêques auxiliaires de Cambrai aux xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles—J. CHAPMAN Les interpolations dans le traité de S. Cyprien sur l'unité de l'Église (*fin*)—R. PROOST La simplicité des substances spirituelles à l'origine de la philosophie chrétienne—G. MORIN Pages inédites d'Arnobé le Jeune: la fin des *Expositiunculæ* sur l'Évangile de S. Luc—U. BALTUS L'Eucharistie, centre du culte catholique—Analyses et Comptes-rendus.

*Analecta Bollandiana*, January 1903 (Vol. xxii, No. 1: Brussels, 14, Rue des Ursulines). H. DELEHAYE S. Melaniae Iunioris Acta graeca—FR. VAN ORTROY Martyrum monachorum Carthusianorum in Anglia Passio minor, auctore Mauritio Chauncy: Appendix, Supplique de Chauncy au pape Grégoire XIII—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques—[U. CHEVALIER Supplementum ad Repertorium Hymnologicum (*Plaude, potentissima parens . . . Quem paro uersu celebrare*).]

#### (4) GERMAN.

*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1903 (Vol. lxxxv, No. 2: Tübingen, H. Lauppe). VAN BEBBER Der Teich Bethesda und der Teich Siloe—FUNK Ein Fragment zu den *Apostolischen Konstitutionen*—P. VETTER Die litterarkritische Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Gottesnamen (*continued*)—SÄGMÜLLER Die Ernennung des Nachfolgers durch die Päpste Ende des fünften und Anfangs des sechsten Jahrhunderts (*concluded*)—H. KOCH Der Büsserplatz im Abendland—Reviews—Analecta.

*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, January 1903 (Vol. xiii, No. 1: Tübingen and Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr). A. HEGLER (the late) Kirchengeschichte oder christliche Religionsgeschichte? Akademische Antrittsrede—FR. TRAUB Kirchliche und unkirchliche Theologie—J. GOTTSCHICK Die Entstehung der Losung der Unkirchlichkeit der Theologie.



March 1903 (Vol. xiii, No. 2). J. KAPTAN Zur Dogmatik—K. EGER Wie ist über die gegenwärtige Konfirmationspraxis und über die neuesten Vorschläge zu ihrer Reform zu urteilen?

*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums*, February 1903 (Vol. iv, No. 1: Giessen, J. Ricker). H. USENER Geburt und Kindheit Christi—P. CORSEN Die Urgestalt der Paulusakten—E. SCHWARTZ Zu Eusebius' Kirchengeschichte: (1) Das Martyrium Jakobus des Gerechten: (2) Zur Abgarlegende—E. PREUSCHEN Bibelcitate bei Origenes—P. O. SCHJÖTT Eine religionsphilosophische Stelle bei Paulus (Röm. i 18-20)—E. C. BUTLER An Hippolytus Fragment and a word on the *Tractatus Origenis*—Miscellanea: E. PREUSCHEN (1) Encyclopaedia Biblica: (2) Zur Salbung Jesu in Bethanien.

*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, January 1903 (Vol. xlvi, No. 1: Leipzig, O. R. Reiland). A. HILGENFELD Der mysteriöse Marcus und der reactionäre Jacobus—J. ALBANI Die Bildersprache der Pastoralbriefe—J. DRÄSEKE Zum *Syntagma* des Hippolytos—O. CLAUSEN Die Theologie des Theophilus von Antiochien—B. WEISS Die Perikope von der Ehebrecherin—J. DRÄSEKE J. Dräseke, *Johannes Scotus Erigena und dessen Gewährsmänner in seinem Werke 'De divisione naturae libri v.'*

*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, December 1902 (Vol. xxiii, No. 4: Gotha, F. A. Perthes). R. ASMÜS Julians Brief über Pegasius—K. MÜLLER Zur Geschichte des Bussbrüderordens—M. BROSC Machiavelli, Cäsar Borgia und Alexander VI—G. REICHEL Die Entstehung einer Zinzendorf feindlichen Partei in Halle und Wernigerode—*Analecta*: G. SOMMERFELDT Zu Matthäus de Cracovias kanzelrednerischen Schriften: E. FISCHER Zu den Wittenberger Unruhen (1521-1522): E. LEMPP Die Anfänge des Klarissenordens: EB. NESTLE Ein paar Kleinigkeiten zu Köhlers *Dokumenten zum Ablassstreit von 1517*—Index.

*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, January 1903 (Vol. xiv, No. 1: Erlangen and Leipzig, A. Deichert). K. v. BURGER Kirchliche Tagesfragen—RISCHE Das öffentliche Wortzeugnis von Laien—D. SCHMIDT Zur Prinzipienfrage—COUARD Altchristliche Sagen über das Leben der Apostel, I.

February 1903 (Vol. xiv, No. 2). J. HAUSSLEITER Die Universität Wittenberg vor dem Eintritt Luthers—F. LUNGGREEN Die Fama über die Bruderschaft des Rosenkreuzes—W. LOTZ Der Bund vom Sinai, V—COUARD Altchristliche Sagen über das Leben der Apostel, II.

*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1903 (No. 2: Gotha, F. A. Perthes). J. LEY (the late) Die metrische Beschaffenheit des zweiten

Teils des Jesaja, Kap. 40-66—D. RYSSSEL Die Erzählung von Aphikia, dem Weibe Jesus Sirachs—H. ZIMMERMANN Evangelium des Lukas, Kap. 1 und 2 : Ein Versuch der Vermittlung zwischen Hilgenfeld und Harnack—P. DÜRSELEN 'Die Taufe für die Toten' 1 Kor. 15, 29—J. A. KNAAKE Die Schrift des Rabanus Maurus *De institutione clericorum* nach ihrer Bedeutung für die Homiletik und Rabanus Maurus als Prediger—Notes : J. A. BEWER Die Leviratehe im Buch Ruth : BOEHMER Sarbeth Sabanael : W. RIEDEL Bemerkungen zu den Kanones des Hippolytus—Reviews : J. W. ROTHSTEIN J. Köberle *Natur und Geist nach der Auffassung des Alten Testaments* : M. REISCHLE W. Dilger *Die Erlösung des Menschen nach Hinduismus und Christentum*—Miscellanea.

*Theologischer Jahresbericht, 1901-1902* (Vol. xxi, Part 3 : Berlin, C. A. Schwetschke). A. MEYER and R. KNOPF Das Neue Testament : (1) Allgemeines : (2) Text und Kanon : (3) Hermeneutik : (4) Evangelienfrage : (5) Einzelevangelien : (6) Leben Jesu : (7) Apostelgeschichte und apostolisches Zeitalter : (8) Paulinische Briefe : (9) Katholische Briefe und Apokalypse : (10) Biblische Theologie.

1901-1902 (Vol. xxi, Part 4). Kirchengeschichte : E. PREUSCHEN Kirchengeschichte bis zum Nicänum einschliesslich der Literaturgeschichte dieses Zeitraumes—A. BRUCKNER Kirchengeschichte vom Nicänum bis zum Anfang des Mittelalters mit Einschluss der byzantinisch-orientalischen Literatur—O. CLEMEN Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters—W. KOEHLER Kirchengeschichte vom Beginn der Reformation bis 1648—J. WERNER Kirchengeschichte von 1648 bis 1789—O. KOHLSCHMIDT Kirchengeschichte der Neuzeit von 1789 bis zur Gegenwart, mit Einschluss des Interconfessionellen.

1901-1902 (Vol. xxi, Part 5). Systematische Theologie : A. NEUMANN Encyklopädie mit Einschluss der prinzipiellen Theologie—A. NEUMANN and M. SCHEIBE Religionsphilosophie mit Einschluss der Apologetik—A. TITUS Dogmatik—Th. ELSENHANS Ethik.

*Bibliographie der theologischen Literatur für das Jahr 1901* (Sonder-Abdruck aus dem 21. Bande des *Theologischen Jahresberichtes* : Berlin, C. A. Schwetschke). Part I, (1) Oriental Languages, &c. ; (2) Old Testament ; (3) New Testament : Parts II, III Church History.

*The Journal*  
*of*  
*Theological Studies*

JULY, 1903

ROBERT CAMPBELL MOBERLY.

NOT long ago there appeared in one of the quarterlies<sup>1</sup> an article on 'Religion in Oxford,' which attracted a rather unusual amount of attention. It was a curious mixture of very genuine interest in religion with the methods and something of the piquancy of the New Journalism<sup>2</sup>. The tendency of the article was wholesome, because the writer had a really excellent ideal before his mind of what he would like to see; but he was rather exacting, and there was some want of proportion in his judgements of what he actually saw. His summary verdict was that 'there are no great influences in Oxford as there were in the days of J. H. Newman, or of T. H. Green.'

The writer even went so far as to use the word 'appalling.' 'What is the aspect of the University of Oxford now as a place of religion? The question is appalling, and no one could give it a satisfactory answer.' Perhaps some of us were not so much alarmed as we ought to be. We are accustomed to make some allowance for the style of the New Journalism, of which these highly coloured expressions are characteristic, and in which superlatives regularly stand where soberer old-fashioned pens would use the positive.

In regard to that particular startling expression, all I would

<sup>1</sup> *The Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> In criticizing this, as I shall probably have to do, I do not wish it to be supposed that I am entirely hostile. I am well aware that the New Journalism has its merits. Conspicuous among these are its unfailing vivacity and its complete frankness; and there is no lack of these qualities in the article to which I am referring.



say is this. There is no place in the universe where the question as to the aspect of religion might not (in the same sense) be described as 'appalling.' If that is the right word to use of Oxford, what of London? What of this country at large? What of the whole (so-called) Christian world?

If I were to ask myself the same question, I do not think that I should give it quite the same answer. The period of Newman no doubt stands by itself, and about that I will not speak. But the period of T. H. Green I can remember—in its beginnings at least, if not exactly in its zenith—and I should not be prepared to admit that religious influences in Oxford are any less strong now than they were then. Perhaps a question might be raised over the epithet 'great.' And it might be true to say that religious influences now are more diffused, and that they run through a greater number of channels; but in their sum total I believe that they have increased and not diminished. If the writer had undertaken to describe as a contemporary the Oxford of T. H. Green, I believe that he would have found quite as much to discount as he does at present. And, on the other hand, if he were to add up each several item of his own survey—and the list, long as it is, does not exhaust the whole—I suspect that the sum of the forces making for good in different ways would be far from inconsiderable, and well able to bear comparison with all but the very brightest times of Oxford history.

The writer so limits and defines the issue that he is almost bound to give an unsatisfactory answer. Instead of looking at the work going on in the Theological Faculty, and in Oxford generally, according to the Pauline metaphor, as a great building on which many hands are engaged and to which they bring such gifts as God has given them—their gold, or their silver, or their wood, or their straw—he will have nothing less than gold. And even the gold (to change the metaphor a little) must not be in the ingot, it must be minted as current coin. The writer has in his mind throughout one particular class, and a section even of that class (it is the cleverer undergraduate of whom he is thinking). There are certain peremptory questions which he wants to have answered for the benefit of this class, and in the way most acceptable to it. Short of this, nothing seems to interest him or to come really into his calculations.

The result is a picture that is stimulating—I gladly allow—but by no means equally just.

Of course much may be forgiven where the general aim is so good. But the moral I should draw would be somewhat different from that drawn by the writer. The moral I should draw would be that he has himself shown so clear an insight into the wants of his special clients as to be a real call to him to do his own virile part to supply them. I can quite believe that he is already doing so; and that is perhaps an item that has not been reckoned in his account. But let him do the same work for a wider public. Let him set down in black and white, in his own way, the answers that he would give to his own questions. That would be a positive contribution to the best interests of the University, and would not incur—as I am afraid that the article does to some extent incur—the charge of censoriousness.

#### I.

And yet, when all is said, there is truth in the critic's main position—that the meeting-ground of Philosophy and Theology is tactically the key to the battlefield, and therefore the most important to have adequately occupied. And there was also truth in his particular statement that our leading representative on that meeting-ground was Dr. Moberly.

Perhaps, for the critic's special purpose and to satisfy the rather narrow conditions that he lays down, it might be right to substitute, or to consider the substitution of, Mr. J. R. Illingworth. For that special purpose and under those narrow conditions, I should have thought that it would not be easy to find a more ideal writer. We should be told at once that Mr. Illingworth is not in residence, and that he is only an occasional visitor. I should perhaps add that, much as this fact is to be regretted, it is I believe due to no fault on the part of any one, but mainly to considerations of health.

But, putting aside Mr. Illingworth, and for a like reason Canon Scott Holland and the Bishop of Worcester, I should still submit that the University which numbered among its teachers on the one hand Dr. Moberly and on the other hand Dr. Fairbairn, was



not so poor and barren, even in the field of philosophical theology, as our critic would have us believe.

It is characteristic of the article that both these names are summarily ruled out of court; Dr. Fairbairn's because he speaks chiefly to Nonconformists, Dr. Moberly's because he spoke specially to theologians. On the principles of the article it would seem that only the spoken word, and the word directly spoken, could be held to count really at all. A mediated influence, and an influence too fresh to be as yet fully mediated, would not be considered. One only wonders what from this point of view would have been said of the influence of T. H. Green during his lifetime.

When I was in Oxford that influence certainly could not be called 'wide.' And, greatly as I admired Green personally, I cannot from my own point of view forget that his conception of the Origins of Christianity was just the Tübingen theory, pure and simple. He read into the theory his own moral  $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ , which was the really moving thing about him. And no doubt he did more than any one man to stem the tide of materialism that was invading Oxford. But I cannot easily imagine that even he could give the direct intelligible convincing replies that the reviewer desiderates for his questions.

However, for the present I am concerned only with Dr. Moberly, and from this point onwards I shall speak only of him.

The writer in the *Church Quarterly* fully acknowledged his claim to be a philosophical theologian; he spoke of his book *Atonement and Personality* as 'justly praised'; he laid stress on the fact that he was the 'outstanding person' in the Faculty of Theology. But then he went on to qualify this favourable judgement by speaking of him as in a restrictive sense, the 'theologians' theologian,' and (again in the manner of the New Journalism, and with all its exaggeration of language) to enlarge on his remoteness 'from modern men trained in other sciences.'

The phrase was ill-chosen, because Dr. Moberly's was essentially a modern mind; he knew well what 'modern men' were thinking about; and indeed it was a distinctive feature in *Atonement and Personality* that it took such full account of these thoughts and met them fairly on the ground of principle. The



very last thing that could be said of the book was that it was 'not modern.'

What the writer meant, however, had reference not so much to the substance as to the form. It was really little more than a way of saying that the book was theology and not (popular or commonsense) philosophy. This we may admit. The book *was* theology; and more, it was theology 'in the grand style'—theology in the style (e.g.) of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. I do not know how far the *Ecclesiastical Polity* and its author appealed to the non-theological undergraduates of his day. I should hardly imagine that they appealed irresistibly to them. But it is really in the succession of divines like Hooker and Butler that Dr. Moberly stands. They have not been so very plentiful in the Church of England that we can afford to think lightly of them. And for my own part I cannot regard the defective appreciation (so far as it existed) of a certain class of undergraduates as a very fatal condemnation. This does not mean that I think they should be ignored, or that I should not welcome and admire an influence that really told upon them.

This, however, raises a question that I should like to consider rather more at length—viz. what it was that made Dr. Moberly so great, and by the side of this what it also was that put some limitations on his effective usefulness.

Dr. Moberly was great, first and foremost, through his remarkable grasp of principle, and his remarkable power of following out a principle in its finest and subtlest application. His mind, as I have said elsewhere, was, in its characteristic habit, not inductive but deductive.

It was not his way to approach truth by amassing great stores of knowledge. He was not a great reader. German was a sealed book to him, and he did not make any great study of French. What he did read in any language he knew; because he not only had the scholar's accuracy, but his mind played critically round what he read—critically in the sense not so much of literary criticism (though he had clear views as to what he liked and what he disliked in literature) as of the criticism that is logical and philosophical. No one could be keener in detecting a flaw in an argument: no one could penetrate more surely to the presuppositions on which an argument rested. At

the same time he was an excellently trained scholar in Greek and Latin. For any subject that needed to be worked up in the originals he was always perfectly competent; and he would undertake the trouble where it was necessary. But the accumulation of detailed facts had no attraction for him in itself. His absorbing interest was in the general truths that underlay particular facts, the fundamentals of opinion. I shall have occasion to illustrate this presently, and therefore need not speak further about it now.

I see that Canon Scott Holland, in a singularly beautiful notice contributed to the *Guardian* of June 17, speaks in one place of a certain 'indolence.' It may have been so; Canon Scott Holland's knowledge goes back much further than mine. In later years perhaps there was at times a physical languor due to ill-health. But I suspect that what might have the look of 'indolence' may have been only the born thinker's habit of ruminating, where another man would be reading or doing. It was in this way that Dr. Moberly got at his principles. They seemed to come to him by a penetrating intuition. Until the intuition came he was helpless; no piling up of material gave him the clue that he wanted. But when once the clue had revealed itself, everything was plain to him; a sleuth-hound could not follow the track with surer instinct.

There is therefore a marked breadth about all Dr. Moberly's later and greater writings. (I specify these because I do not know some of the earlier tracts. I have in mind more particularly *Ministerial Priesthood* and *Atonement and Personality*.) In these works there is a constant reference of detail to principle, and especially a constant dragging out to light of latent principle that might have escaped observation. There is also conveyed throughout the sense of thoroughness and mastery. The element of tentativeness is unusually small. One has always the feeling that the matter in hand has not only been thought of but *thought out*. The construction is complete and without gaps. Right or wrong, it all coheres together.

These are the characteristics of great work. And there was a breadth of style corresponding to the breadth of treatment. From the first page to the last the books were upon the same high level. A chord is, as it were, struck at the outset, of which



the harmonious echoes go on sounding until the end. There is no straining or effort about it, but one feels that the books were planned upon a large scale, and carried out on a large scale. Possibly the amplitude of style at times amounts to redundancy; but in any case the amplitude is natural. Some writers think, not in clauses or in sentences, but in paragraphs. And this writer was one of them. The paragraphs have their own mode of evolution. They begin with a few short pointed sentences, which become more elaborate and intricate as they proceed; but the intricacy never becomes confusion. There is a stately rhythm in the whole, which sometimes has its unexpected turns but is never ragged or slovenly.

A conception and a style like this always imply moral qualities. And it was so here. There is the glow of a deep conviction, the tension of elevated purpose, the unflinching refinement of a mind 'touched to fine issues.'

All these qualities are great, and constitute the 'grand style.' But it was not quite greatness of the popular sort, to be at once and everywhere recognized. Dr. Moberly, it is true, was not one of those

On whom, from level stand,  
The low world lays its hand,  
Finds straightway to its mind, can value in a trice.

The impression of this is reflected—and exaggerated—in the criticism from which I have started. We ask ourselves why it was so. And some attempt should be made towards an answer. As I am upon this question I will take it in its widest bearings, and will consider not merely the books but all that tended to limit the influence of the man.

Some of the notices speak of him as having 'matured late.' I can understand what is meant, but I am not quite sure that the phrase is the right one. The fundamental qualities of mind were, of course, there all the time. And it is not exactly as though they were crude at one stage and ripe at another. There is no essential difference between the *Essay in Lux Mundi* and *Atonement and Personality*, or the volume of Sermons, *Christ our Life*<sup>1</sup>; but the latest books are more individually characteristic:

<sup>1</sup> There is one sermon in this volume dated as far back as 1892, but most of them are considerably later.



they are like the work of a painter or poet, who does not acquire his own special 'manner' just at first.

Where, as I have said, there was so much that was not only thought of, but thought out, it must needs be that there were the signs of advance. And it is probably true that in later years there was more confidence of utterance.

Canon Scott Holland has skilfully indicated the combination of tenacity and humility in this 'gentlest and humblest of men.' It is quite true that he was intensely humble in his self-estimate and in his estimate of the desire of the world to hear him. But this was very far from making him 'a reed shaken by the wind.' When once he had satisfied himself that a certain position was true no power on earth could shake him from it. I do not believe that criticism of which he could take the measure (and there was little criticism indeed of which he could not take the measure), made the slightest impression upon him.

What I have just said relates to the question of mental growth, it does not really affect the question of extent of influence.

There was an idea abroad that both in speech and writing Dr. Moberly was involved and obscure. 'Involved,' yes, perhaps, though not in the worse sense of the word; but 'obscure,' no.

I have said a word as to the intricacy of the sentences in the latter part of a paragraph, as it reached its climax. But this intricacy had in it nothing irregular; the grammatical structure was always perfect.

And in like manner as to the thought: it might be subtle, but it was never confused. There was never anything in it left to chance. The writer always knew exactly what he meant to say, and he said it with the nicest precision.

There were, however, some things that, especially to the English mind, were apt to be rather disconcerting, and to throw it off the track. The innate delicacy of Dr. Moberly's mind, his sensitive reluctance to wound, made him rather given to circumlocutions. He would prefer two negatives to a positive. And his natural precision of thought would often impel him to introduce parenthetical qualifications of his main statements.

Then he had a quite un-English fondness for abstract terms, which he would coin with the greatest freedom. This gave his writing and speech at times a rather strange appearance.

And there was a deeper significance in it than this. The mind was always moving in the region of fundamental propositions; and this is just the region in which the English mind as a rule rarely moves; so that there was a certain lack of sympathy and mutual understanding between the writer and his public.

Moreover the effect of this was heightened by the fact that our friend's habitual vocabulary was peculiarly his own. Although he was a philosopher, he did not repeat the shibboleths of any philosophical school. He is said to have regretted in later years that he had not received, when young, a more thorough training in the technicalities of philosophy. It is not very easy to realize what difference this would have made. There can be no doubt that he had all the essentials of a philosopher. And yet, as I have said, his writings were really theology and not philosophy; and they fitly continue the line of the great theologians. They belong, however, distinctly to theological *science*. Their function was to explore or enrich, not to popularize; and for this reason they did not satisfy the requirements of the *Church Quarterly* reviewer. It by no means follows that those requirements were really the higher. Advances in science are the ultimately and permanently important thing. The work of popularizing may well fall to other hands.

The same sort of deductions ought perhaps to be made from the effect of the oral teaching as from that of the written. The delivery in preaching, speaking, and lecturing was attractive to the few, but did not attract the many. The secret of this was happily seized in the *Oxford Magazine*: 'Over all lay the marks of severe and continuous self-discipline, *carried even to the exquisite.*' Far back, in early days, the attention to shades and gradations in vocal utterance had been so close that it had become a second nature. The average Englishman slurs his speech and is careless of articulation; there is no people that is so afraid of being 'righteous overmuch' in externals, and the average man is apt to draw the line of 'overmuch' where a scrupulous conscience cannot draw it. There was, however, not a grain of vanity or ostentation in this fastidiousness of Dr. Moberly's. Those are the last faults of which any one would accuse him. It was all part and parcel of his innermost self—just the care and finish and accuracy that were habitual to him, taking effect in speech.



These same qualities came out in another way, which was really, though it would be less noticed, precisely parallel. I do not think that I have ever known such punctuation as that in Dr. Moberly's writings. It is punctuation on the heavy scale, I should suppose on the heaviest possible; but it is gradated with the utmost nicety, and with him it seemed to be inevitable. I cannot imagine him hesitating between a comma and a semi-colon, as the rest of us might hesitate. It was a consistent and coherent system carried out with consummate exactitude.

This wholeness, completeness, closely knit logical unity was characteristic of the man. It came out in the smallest acts as well as in the greatest. It came out in things where the mass of mankind would never think of looking for character at all. It was a rare, a choice spirit, not to be judged by common rules, and therefore not quite appreciated by those who did not know him well enough to possess the key by which to judge him. In this work-a-day world such a spirit is apt not to get its due. For a long time Moberly had not his due. But his hour was come, and was still more coming, just when his work on earth was closed.

## II.

The story of the life is soon told, especially with the light that has been thrown upon it in the two admirable notices in the *Guardian* and in the *Church Times*. The writer of this was a late comer into the circle of friends, and is dependent for the earlier period on information derived from others.

Canon Scott Holland has given us a vivid little vignette of the parents: the brilliant father and the mother who transmitted to the son his personal beauty and the 'old-world delicacy' that hung about him.

The father, Dr. George Moberly, left a very considerable mark on his century, first as head master of Winchester from 1835 to 1866, and then as Bishop of Salisbury from 1869 till his death in 1885. The head master of Winchester was one of the chief allies and supporters of Dr. Arnold in carrying through the reform of our public schools, and he was granted a longer span of time in which to develop his ideas. He was also one of the most efficient and scholarly bishops in the latter half of the century.



The earlier years of Robert Moberly's career seem to have been rather a chequered and qualified success. It is strange that our most philosophical theologian, though he gained a first class in Moderations, only took a second in the philosophical school *par excellence*. We are told (by the *Guardian*) that philosophy was not very well taught at New College about that time. It is more interesting to note that young Moberly won the Newdigate with a poem on 'Marie Antoinette.' He really had all a poet's command of rich and elevated diction; and his power of description was very marked (e.g.) in the recently published volume of sermons.

A single example may serve to show at once the nature of this poetic gift, and the way in which it entered into his preaching. It is from the opening paragraphs of a sermon that I well remember, preached on the evening of Good Friday, 1897, from the text, 'When the even was come' (St. Matt. xxvii. 57):—

'What a contrast is here! After wild excitement, after fierce uproar, after hate and cruelty, after depths inscrutable of sorrow and pain: there is now—stillness.

'Stillness? Silence? Many of the most wonderful moments of human experience are moments of silence<sup>1</sup>. But think what a contrast there may be between silence and silence! There is the lurid suspense, breathless, unnatural, before the crash of the storm, before the thrill of the earthquake, or, there is the calm, fair stillness, when the storm is over, and the dim stars peep out, and the cool air faintly stirs. There is the stillness of prayer, in its rare intensity, when earth joins with heaven: and there is the stealthiness of guilt, in the moment before consummation of appalling sin<sup>2</sup>.'

I may mention, in passing, that it was characteristic of Moberly to begin his sermons in this striking, arresting way.

To resume the narrative. From New College he passed over to Christ Church with a Senior Studentship in 1867. He was Tutor of Christ Church from 1869 to 1876; Principal of St. Stephen's House, 1876 to 1877; and Head of the Theological College, Salisbury, on the nomination of his father, 1878 to 1880. But in these varied offices he had not yet found his feet; diffi-

<sup>1</sup> We may compare with this Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* xix 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Christ our Life*, p. 81.

dence, and a retiring disposition, and the complete absence of self-assertion, seem to have prevented him from taking hold.

A real step in advance came with his marriage in 1880 to a daughter of his father's predecessor in the see of Salisbury, Bishop Walter Kerr Hamilton. In the same year the newly wedded pair went to the College living of Great Budworth in Cheshire. Here they lived together the life so typical of the best of the English clergy, equally welcomed and beloved in the homes of gentle and of simple. The memory of the twelve years thus spent never died out, and the course of the last illness was followed by the old parishioners with touching solicitude. And yet it may perhaps be gathered that the people for the most part understood their vicar with the heart rather than the head. His goodness was recognized by all, though a select few went further.

It was while he was at Great Budworth that an event happened which stands out in Moberly's life as fraught with the greatest significance. I refer to his association with the volume entitled *Lux Mundi*, which was published in 1889. To this volume Moberly contributed an essay on 'The Incarnation as the Basis of Dogma.' The volume had grown out of the meeting for successive years in a sort of vacation party of a little group of Oxford friends. The group gradually widened, though Moberly belonged to it from the first. Common ideas led in the end to common action. There was a greater unity in the essays collected in *Lux Mundi* than in the previous volume of *Essays and Reviews* (1860), or in the later *Contentio Veritatis* (1902). It had the force of a manifesto to an unusual degree; it revealed the existence of a new and compact party (or rather type of opinion) in the Church of England.

In the seventies and earlier eighties, Oxford might be said to be divided between Liberals and Clericals in sharp antithesis. The Liberals were thoroughgoing, and in many cases pronouncedly negative. The Clericals in like manner were in great measure High Churchmen of strict observance. Of course there were other shades, but these two camps covered most of the ground, and between them there was more or less open war.

The writers in *Lux Mundi* were High Churchmen, brought up on the religious and moral ideals of Keble and Newman,



having for their motto, as one of them expresses it, 'He shall not strive nor cry.' But on the intellectual side they had open minds. They were all of them possessed of the best culture that Oxford could offer; and they could not help seeing that truth was sometimes on the side of their opponents. Candour compelled them to recognize this; and further reflection led them to think that the contending theories—the religious and the scientific, the Christian and the secular—were not so incompatible as they were represented. From this there arose a serious constructive effort to harmonize the old and the new—to retain the ancient pieties in a form that should be in full continuity with the past, but at the same time resolutely to face every well-grounded advance made by science in the present.

To most readers of the JOURNAL all this will be very familiar. But it ought to be placed upon record, if we are to appreciate properly the position of Robert Moberly. Not one of the contributors to *Lux Mundi* represented the fundamental principles of the book with more heartfelt conviction; not one strove to carry them out more fearlessly or more thoroughly. And the special field in which it fell to him to work was that of philosophy, especially moral philosophy and psychology.

Moberly served under three Bishops of Chester (Jacobson, Stubbs, and Jayne). The two last, more especially, were well aware of his merits and utilized his gifts in the diocese; and I believe I am right in saying that it was at the instance of Bishop Stubbs (who had been transferred to Oxford) that he was chosen to succeed Dr. Paget as Professor of Pastoral Theology in 1892. In this office he spent the remainder of his days.

It was not to be expected that Moberly's work as Professor would run quite on the same lines as that of his predecessors, Dr. Paget and Dr. King. All three were *winning* personalities; but whereas the other two were winning from the first and drew in their audiences by magnetic attraction, Moberly was one of those who need to be known before the full attraction can tell. In his new office, as at all times, he meekly accepted the comparatively limited appreciation that came to him, though there were never wanting a few who drank in to the full his influence and his teaching.

These few were steadily increasing in number. And still more



among the senior members of the University and among the class of tutors and lecturers Moberly was being 'discovered' and was becoming a power. The effect of his books was coming back to Oxford; and the prophet abroad was felt to be a prophet at home. In recent years it was understood that he was really the strongest figure in the Theological Faculty—not the most variously active or the most learned, but the deepest thinker, the most powerful mind, the mind round which others would rally on a great issue.

In 1900, on the death of Dr. Bright, Moberly was sent as representative of the Chapter to the Convocation of Canterbury. Here he at once began to make himself felt. At last he had found a sphere that was fully congenial to him; for by this time his books had begun to give him the reputation that he deserved. His brother clergy were prepared to listen to him; and this degree of encouragement at once called out his powers. He seemed to step into his place easily and naturally, and took an active part especially in the drawing up of the important report on the position of the laity. I do not doubt that if he had lived a great door was open to him on this side. His clear discernment of principle, his argumentative grasp and penetration, his tact in debate and his special power of unravelling confusions, and presiding over all his wise and considerate judgement, would have been of the utmost value in the exciting years that lie before us.

In all ways it seemed as if the harvest was at last about to be reaped, when the hour suddenly struck and the work ended. It was of a shallower ambition and with a dash of pagan mythological fancy that the poet wrote:—

But the fair guerdon when we hope to find,  
And think to burst out into sudden blaze,  
Comes the blind Fury with the abhorred shears  
And slits the thin-spun life.

It was not for any vulgar 'guerdon' that Moberly laboured. It was no 'sudden blaze' in Milton's sense that he coveted. The whole passage would need to be translated into Christian language before it could be applied to him. He did himself so translate the essence of it. 'I should like,' he said not very long before the end, 'to be thought of as one who wished to say, Thy Will be

done; but I shall try [to live] all I can.' He felt that there was more to do, and that he could do it. If the will to live could have sustained the failing strength, he would have been with us now. But it was a fatal disease from which he was suffering; and it was further advanced than his friends quite knew. The thread of life was too 'thin-spun,' and on June 8 it snapped:—the life, 'but not the praise.'

### III.

The real landmarks in the life of a scholar are his books. In Moberly's case the greatest work belonged to the last period of his career, the second half of the ten years of his professorship (1897-1902). The dividing line should really perhaps be placed at the publication of *Lux Mundi* in 1889.

From the period before this there is just a sheaf of tracts. The first to be given to the public was *An Account of the Question between the Bishop and the C.M.S. in the Diocese of Colombo* (1876). This was the fruit of a six months' journey to India and Ceylon. The controversy to which the pamphlet relates (involving Moberly's friend Bishop Copleston, now Metropolitan of India) is forgotten. But the intense impression which Moberly received and imparted to others on his return is well remembered by those who were intimate with him.

To the Budworth time belong two pamphlets on *Marriage with a Sister-in-law* (1884), and on *Church Courts* (1886); and a small volume, *Sorrow, Sin, and Beauty* (1889). In the same year with the last appeared the Essay in *Lux Mundi*.

I had not, I am afraid, paid proper attention to the Essay, and my own first recollection of contact with Moberly's mind dates from a pamphlet on *Disestablishment and Disendowment* (1894). Along with this may be mentioned *Undenominationalism*, a tract on the Education Question, published last year. These may be taken as specimens of the line which Moberly took on public questions. Any one who looks into these will appreciate at once the magnitude of the loss to us. With convictions stronger and deeper than those of most men, Moberly never writes as a partisan. He seems from the very first word to take up the question with which he deals into a region above the reach of party. One is tempted to ask whether it is even now too late for



our Nonconformist friends to take to heart the lesson of the trait last named, and so learn what it is that Churchmen are really contending for. To Moberly it seemed that their cause was based on the principles of true Liberalism, that their standing-ground is that of Nonconformity itself. It seems indeed a strange inversion of parts that Nonconformists, of all men, who have sacrificed so much for liberty of conscience, should seek to make it difficult and even impossible for others to have their own children taught in their own way. That the Church wants to teach its lessons *at the cost* of Nonconformists is a delusion that has some excuse in the intricacies of account-keeping, but is due only to these. She has really purchased her freedom for no light sum.

But I must not be tempted into a digression. The little book *Reason and Religion*, which came out in 1896, somehow did not quite appeal to me. The moment that showed me the full calibre of Moberly's mind was when I first read the Preface to *Ministerial Priesthood* (1897). And if I wished in short compass to convince any one else of that calibre, I would recommend him to read p. viii of the said Preface. The two books, *Ministerial Priesthood* and *Atonement and Personality* (1901), are the legacy left behind which will determine Moberly's place in the history of English Theology. It is mainly from these (and from personal intercourse) that I have drawn the sketch of his mind in the first section of this paper, and on these that I should rest the claim that I have made for him, that he stands in the line of Richard Hooker and of Bishop Butler.

Of the two books there would I suppose be a general agreement in placing *Atonement and Personality* first. Not that I would wish in any way to detract from the impressiveness of the earlier book. To me it seems very impressive indeed. But it had been more led up to by previous work; it was less on its author's own ground, and it gave less scope to his peculiar powers. In *Atonement and Personality* we felt ourselves in the hand of a master. Whether the book in the end establishes its positions or not, it must remain as a mighty effort of constructive thought.

With this book should be taken the volume of Sermons to which I have referred (*Christ our Life*, 1902), and the single important Sermon printed in this JOURNAL (January, 1903); with



*Ministerial Priesthood* (though with some anticipations of the later book) would naturally go the memorable contributions to the Conference on 'Priesthood and Sacrifice' (1900).

#### IV.

Unfortunately the time at my disposal for this article is too brief to allow of the calm review of Moberly's writings which I should have liked to make in order to draw out and trace in their connexions the leading ideas contained in them.

A large part of these leading ideas might be said to be common to the *Lux Mundi* school in general. On all the historical side of *Ministerial Priesthood* Dr. Gore had been beforehand with *The Church and the Ministry* (first edition, 1888; fourth edition, 1902). The broad principles from which the two writers started were the same; the most original features in Moberly's contribution would be, I suppose, the critical force and decision with which he brought to light the philosophical pre-suppositions of the argument and the stress which he laid on the pastoral side of the conception of the Priesthood. There was also an important appendix on the Roman controversy, which was at an acute stage just as the work appeared. And impressed upon the whole was the strong personality and lofty aim of the writer.

Beside the main idea and the main conclusions of *Ministerial Priesthood* there were many incidental positions that Moberly shared with his school, though he gave them specially clear and forcible expression. Such would be the assumptions underlying the argument as to the right relations of form and matter, and of body and spirit.

It was a common principle of the whole school to insist on the central significance for Christian thought of the Incarnation. This appears in the *Lux Mundi* essay, but also came in more incidentally in *Atonement and Personality*. On this side Moberly's writings touched both Dr. Gore's and Mr. Illingworth's (Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, 1891; Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*, 1902); he also coincides to some extent with the latter in his view of the relation of the Incarnation to belief.

Equally fundamental and equally common to the school is the

opposition to all forms of Individualism. Here we may see working together Mr. Illingworth (*Personality, Human and Divine*, 1894; *Divine Immanence*, 1898), Canon Scott Holland rather more sporadically, Mr. Wilfrid Richmond (*Personality as a Philosophical Principle*, 1900), and Dr. Strong (*God and the Individual*, 1903). But I think it will be agreed that Moberly's treatment of this subject in *Atonement and Personality* was on the largest scale, the most comprehensive and the most searching. Outside his more natural allies Moberly was greatly interested in, and valued highly, the convergence of thought in Mr. Inge's *Christian Mysticism* (1899) and the *Contentio* essay.

The book *Atonement and Personality* was remarkable for the way in which various strands of thought, both from within the school and from without, were drawn together and presented in a masterly unity. The specific treatment of 'Atonement,' though I think in general harmony with the tendencies of the school, was more peculiar to the writer. In this his affinities were rather with Dr. Macleod Campbell (*The Nature of the Atonement*, 2nd ed. 1867, 6th ed. 1886); he wrote in rather marked antithesis to Dr. Dale's well-known book on the same subject.

One of the most distinctive and important parts of the great work was that which touched upon the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Person of Christ in chapters IV, V, and VIII, and on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in chapters VIII and IX. To the best of my belief the portion relating to the Trinity is original thinking, with antecedents in the patristic writings, but so far as I know not in anything modern that Moberly would be likely to be concerned with. To all this part of the book I should be myself inclined to attach a very special value.

I have the impression that the treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit links on to teaching of the writer's father, Bishop Moberly. But this is an impression that I am not able at this moment to follow out and verify.

Neither should I venture to take upon myself, in this hasty way, to attempt to estimate the exact position in which the argument and conclusions of this great book stand now. It has received criticisms, friendly and unfriendly; but it has not as yet had any examination really commensurate with its importance.

I do not think that Moberly himself felt his position at all shaken. The sermon preached at St. Mary's, and printed in this JOURNAL at the beginning of the present year, was partly a reply to objections that had been brought, and partly a further development of the position. In both aspects it is deeply interesting and, I think it will be allowed, not less effective.

But indeed when once we realize how vast the scope of the book is, it must at once be seen that anything like a hasty appreciation of it must be impossible. It is nothing less than a system, and that almost in the sense in which (e.g.) Calvin's *Institutes* constitute a system. It is a reasoned view, in which part hangs together with part, of the whole Being and Nature of God. I really cannot think of any book on this subject in English that is so searching and so profound. And then it is also a reasoned view of the whole process of the redemption of man.

The nearest parallel that occurs to me in recent times is the work of Albrecht Ritschl in Germany. And it is a coincidence that Ritschl's greatest book should be very much upon the same subject of the Atonement (*Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, ed. 1 begun in 1870; ed. 3 1888-9). Ritschl has founded a school with very wide ramifications. Moberly's book perhaps rather gathers up a number of convergent lines of thought in a single powerful presentation. What will be the course of its history I cannot attempt to predict, but I have no doubt that English theology will be constantly going back to it and drawing from it for many years to come.

W. SANDAY.



## THE KING OF TYRE IN EZEKIEL XXVIII.

THE prophecy in Ezek. xxviii 1-19, respecting the king of Tyre, has long been considered one of the most obscure passages in the Old Testament. I do not here refer to the difficulties of detail, considerable as they are, but to the general tenor. The Old Testament contains many prophecies directed against Gentile princes, and Ezekiel himself has a series of prophecies directed against Pharaoh, but nowhere do we find anything at all resembling the language addressed to the king of Tyre. What reason can be assigned for this exceptional treatment? So far as I am aware, the question has never been answered; and if I venture to suggest an explanation of my own I wish to state clearly that it claims to be nothing more than a conjecture.

The section which we are considering is subdivided into two parts—the prophecy in the stricter sense of the word, addressed to the ‘prince of Tyre’ (נְיִיר צֵר), and the dirge (קִינָה) upon the ‘king of Tyre’ (מֶלֶךְ צֵר). I will not waste time in proving that the ‘prince’ and the ‘king’ are the same person, though a small number of interpreters have ventured to deny it. It is true that the term נְיִיר does not happen to occur elsewhere in Ezekiel, but in the historical books it is applied repeatedly to the kings of Israel, and hence its use in this passage presents no difficulty. There is, however, a considerable difference between the earlier verses of the chapter and the dirge which follows, inasmuch as the former deals mainly with the actual situation and pretensions of the king, while the dirge goes back to describe his antecedents, in particular the circumstances which had furnished him with a pretext for claiming to be a god, sitting in the seat of God.

The mere fact that the king of Tyre is accused of claiming to be divine can scarcely astonish us, for we know that many potentates have made this claim, and in Isaiah xiv 13, 14 we find a very similar accusation brought against the king of Babylon.

It is when we come to the dirge that the real difficulty presents itself. Though Ezekiel does not, of course, admit the king's claim to divinity, he nevertheless seems to place him far above the rest of mankind. He asserts that the king of Tyre was 'in Eden, the garden of God,' 'in the holy mountain of God,' that he 'walked to and fro in the midst of the stones of fire,' that he 'was perfect in his ways from the day that he was created until iniquity was found in him.' It is obvious that the imagery employed here is not simply borrowed from the account of the Garden of Eden and of the fall of man in the early chapters of Genesis, for some of the features which are most prominent in Ezekiel's description—for example, the holy mountain of God and the stones of fire—have no counterpart in Genesis. Nor can we regard these things as mere embellishments arbitrarily inserted by the prophet. The manner in which he introduces them shows that they were already known to his readers, that they formed part of a current religious tradition.

In order to account for this fact most recent interpreters have had recourse to the hypothesis that the two descriptions—that in Ezekiel and that in Genesis—are both reflexes of some ancient myth which was presumably the common property of the Israelites and the neighbouring peoples. In other words, there was a legend about a glorious being, a kind of demigod, who dwelt in a Paradise, on the summit of a lofty mountain, whence he was expelled, as a punishment for some offence against the gods, stripped of his brightness and humbled to the dust. Each of the two Hebrew writers adapted the legend to his purpose, and thus both the resemblances and the differences are explained. So far as I know, the most elaborate statement of this theory is to be found in a treatise by Dr. O. Procksch published last year (1902) under the title *Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Ueberlieferung bei den vorexilischen Propheten*: see pp. 161-164.

The object of my paper is not to controvert the hypothesis adopted by Procksch. But I would venture to point out that, even if he were proved to be in the right, the problem before us would still remain unsolved. The question is not merely, *Whence did Ezekiel derive the notion of a demigod expelled from Paradise?* but rather, *Why is the king of Tyre in particular compared to this mythical being?* Is the comparison to be regarded as a mere



caprice on the part of Ezekiel, or was there some real connexion between the king of Tyre and the legend of a primeval Paradise?

Let us consider, first of all, what were the circumstances which distinguished the king of Tyre from other potentates. Ezekiel lays stress upon his wisdom, his external splendour and his vast wealth. The magnificence of the Tyrian palace might conceivably have suggested a comparison with the Garden of Eden, but does not account for other features in the description, which imply that in virtue of his office the king of Tyre was invested with a certain religious dignity quite distinct from the material grandeur of ordinary monarchs. His abode is the holy mountain of God, and his offence consists in the fact that he has profaned his sanctuaries (דְּשָׁנָה הַקְּדוֹשִׁים ver. 18). This latter expression is particularly remarkable, for it seems strange that a Hebrew prophet should regard the profanation of a Gentile sanctuary as a crime of the first magnitude. I venture to think that here we have the clue to the problem. The king is treated by Ezekiel as the occupant of the Tyrian sanctuary, and the Tyrian sanctuary was, for some reason or other, a place of unique importance.

Unfortunately the direct information which we possess with regard to the Tyrian sanctuary is very meagre. But there is one source of indirect information, which, in the present case, must be considered exceptionally valuable. We know from the Book of Kings that Solomon was closely allied with the king of Tyre and that the temple at Jerusalem was built by Tyrians. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the style and decorations of the Solomonian temple were mainly, if not entirely, copied from Tyrian models. Furthermore it is certain that Ezekiel was acquainted with the Solomonian temple and that he, like the compiler of the Book of Kings, was aware of its Tyrian origin. Putting these facts together, we come to the conclusion that the Tyrian sanctuary, as Ezekiel figured it to himself, must have borne a great resemblance to the temple at Jerusalem.

Now if we turn to the description of the Solomonian Temple, we find that its internal decorations were evidently intended to suggest the idea of a garden. The walls and the doors were covered with representations of Cherubim, palm-trees and flowers (1 Kings vi 29, 32). The combination of the Cherubim with trees and flowers, is in accordance with Gen. iii 24, where the



Cherubim are described as keeping watch over the Garden of Eden. The vexed question as to the origin and primitive meaning of the Cherubim I do not wish here to discuss. It is enough for our present purpose to observe that they are a feature common to the Garden of Eden and to the Temple. We are thus led to inquire, What is the connexion between the Garden of Eden and the Temple? Is there any reason why a sanctuary should be constructed so as to resemble a garden? The answer, it appears to me, is obvious. As Robertson Smith has so ably shown in his book on the *Religion of the Semites* (2nd ed., pp. 102 seq.), the oldest sanctuaries of the Semites were natural gardens, that is to say, spots naturally fertile with a perennial supply of water. It must be remembered that in Syria and Palestine such places are far rarer than in our part of the world, and accordingly they could not fail to impress the imagination of the primitive Semitic nomads. To the inhabitants of the steppe, the oasis with its luxuriant vegetation appeared to be, in a literal sense, an abode of the Deity. It was in these exceptionally favoured spots that agriculture was first practised and the oldest settled communities were to be found. Hence followed two results equally important in the history of ancient religion. On the one hand, the idea arose that the garden of the gods, that is, the oasis, was the primitive home of mankind; on the other hand, when men began to build houses for their gods they made the artificial sanctuary after the pattern of the natural sanctuary where their forefathers had worshipped. I do not venture to speculate as to which of these two results came first in order of time, that is to say, whether the legend of the Garden of Eden is older or later than the building of the earliest Semitic temples. In any case it would appear that the two things were closely connected; the legend of the primæval garden served to explain the decorations of the sanctuary, and the sanctuary, in its turn, seemed to an uncritical age a standing witness to the truth of the legend.

If, therefore, we have reason to believe that the sanctuary at Jerusalem was a Tyrian importation, it is natural to infer that the legend of the Garden of Eden, in some form or other, was introduced among the Israelites from the same quarter, as an interpretation of the symbolic figures wherewith the sanctuary

was ordered. And if the Solomonian Temple was held to be a representation of the *Castles of Ebla*, it is evident that the Tyrian Temple the prototype of the Solomonian, had an even greater claim to be so regarded. Thus, it appears to me, is the central idea in Ezekiel's dirge upon the king of Tyre, as it enables us to explain a number of details which would otherwise be unintelligible.

In the first place, the king of Tyre is said to have been 'the holy mountain of God' (viii. 24) and he is to be cast as gold 'out of the mountain of God' (viii. 26). These expressions scarcely apply to Tyre as a whole, for Tyre was built partly on a strip of coast, partly on two small islands neither of which could properly be described as a mountain. On the other hand, the phrase 'holy mountain' is familiar to us from the *Prophets* and the *Psalms* as a designation of the sanctuary of Jerusalem. In most places, the local sanctuary seems to have stood on a eminence overlooking the city (Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 2nd ed., p. 172). This was the case at Jerusalem, and was probably the case at Tyre also, for according to Renan, who carefully investigated the site, the great temple of Melkar at Tyre stood on the highest part of the larger island. Hence the conventional phrase 'holy mountain' might be applied to the sanctuary, though it could not be applied to the city generally. With regard to the 'stones of fire,' it is worth while to notice that according to Herodotus ii 44, the temple at Tyre contained, in addition to many other rich decorations, a column of emerald which shone by night.

Another point, to which, I think, more importance must be attached, is the list of precious stones worn by the king. In the *Massoretic text* nine stones are mentioned, the *Peshitta* has eight, and the *Septuagint* twelve. But these variations do not affect the essential fact—which has often been noticed but never explained—namely, that all the stones here mentioned by Ezekiel reappear in the description of the high priest's breastplate in *Exod. xxviii 17 seq., xxxix 10 seq.* Now if the Tyrian sanctuary was the prototype of the Solomonian, as I have endeavoured to prove, the resemblance between the garb of the Tyrian king and the garb of the Israelite high priest is particularly significant. The list ceases to be an idle enumera-



tion, as it must otherwise appear; it is inserted by Ezekiel with a distinct purpose, that of emphasising the status of the king as minister of the sanctuary.

I now come to the most difficult part of the subject, namely, the allusions to the Cherub in this chapter. It is well known that according to the Hebrew text, as vocalised by the Massorettes, the king of Tyre is himself a Cherub (vv. 14, 16), while in the Septuagint the king and the Cherub are treated as distinct. Almost all recent interpreters here follow the Septuagint—rightly, as it seems to me. But unfortunately the Septuagint does not enable us to construct an altogether satisfactory text. On the *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον* כְּרֻבִים in ver. 14 I have no suggestion to offer, but I venture to defend (against Cornill and Bertholet) the genuineness of כְּרֻבִים both in ver. 14 and ver. 16, although the Septuagint omits it. This word is elsewhere applied to the Cherubim in the inner sanctuary, stretching out their wings over the ark (1 Kings viii 7, 1 Chron. xxviii 18: cf. Exod. xxv 20, xxxvii 9), and hence, if my interpretation be correct, it is quite appropriate here. It may of course be urged that an inanimate object like the Cherub of the sanctuary could not be said to destroy or drive out the Tyrian king (v. 16). But when we are dealing with a highly rhetorical passage this objection does not seem to me valid. The functions ascribed to the living Cherub in Paradise may, by a very natural figure of speech, be ascribed also to the symbolical Cherub in the Tyrian Temple.

A. A. BEVAN.



## PALAEOGRAPHY AND ITS USES.

[An Inaugural Lecture delivered in the University of Aberdeen on April 29, 1903.]

ON the establishment in the University of a new Lectureship, which should deal with Greek and Latin Palaeography, some have been moved to ask, 'What is it?'; even more perhaps to ask, 'What use is it?' It seems, therefore, not unfitting that the person who has been selected by the University Court to represent and expound this subject to students should, at the beginning of his first course of lectures, explain in a general way, such as it is hoped will appeal to open minds, both what palaeography exactly is, and the advantages which come from the pursuit of this study.

The advantage of the study of languages is generally admitted. If it be asked why we study languages, we must reply that the motives are many. Students, as a rule, study the ancient languages, because they have been compelled thereto by a system, wisely introduced by our ancestors, who realised how valuable they are as a training for the intellect. The ancient languages can also, however, be studied with a view to the apprehension of the thoughts treasured in the literature and even to the understanding of the ancient habit of mind. The student of ancient life in the external sense will read the authors for the information about manners, customs, and institutions which they contain. The motives for studying modern languages are to a certain extent the same, but there are differences. The training to the mind is not so great, but there is the overbalancing advantage that it is possible to visit the countries where persons speak these languages without effort in a perfectly natural way, and from intercourse with such to obtain pleasure, information, wider sympathies, and deeper thought. What is it that runs through the whole study of languages, ancient and modern? What alone is it that makes such study tolerable? It is the

touch of humanity pervading them. These languages were or are spoken by beings such as ourselves, with just those little differences, which allure us on to spend time in realising the characters of the people behind them. It is because speech is in the highest sense peculiar to human beings that the study of language has such charms for many minds.

And if speech is a peculiarity of human beings, much more is the concrete evidence of speech, the written word. I am afraid we do not often enough reflect on the grandeur, one might almost say the divinity, of language and writing. That a few scratchings of a pen, a few blows with a chisel, should be made a means of communication between one and many souls, a means of rousing the intellect, or thrilling the emotions, must be to all who think a fact calculated to arouse wonder. Writing may be said to be an even more glorious possession than speech. Human memories, though generally much more powerful in ancient than in modern times, could scarcely have preserved, amid the accidents of life and history, the most precious thoughts of man, especially as on the whole the greatest monuments of the world's literature are also the longest. Writing and books, 'the life-blood of master spirits,' may well be styled of all the possessions of humanity the most glorious, the outward sign of the higher life of man.

The beginnings of writing are hidden in the mists of antiquity. As research goes on, we shall learn more and more of its earliest stages; but it is unlikely that we shall ever be able to say that such and such a man, in such and such a place, in such and such a year, was the first to inscribe words which conveyed a definite meaning to another person. It does not fall within my scope or ability to deal with the alphabets of Eastern nations. It is, however, sufficiently certain that the Greeks derived their alphabet mostly from Phoenicians, with whom they came in contact, and that the Romans in turn derived theirs from the Greek colonists of South and Central Italy. When we reach the Latin writing of the republic, we are at the beginning of a history of writing, which can be traced by concrete examples from that time to the present day. Nearly all the hands of Europe, our own included, are descended by well-ascertained steps from the writing of the Romans. And while Latin writing has thus developed



itself, the Greek handwriting has in the East run its own course up to the present, and can be similarly traced. This is, in itself, the first reason why we ought to study palaeography. It is a department of history, and to understand how our own writing took its present form, we must know something of the writing of Western Europe for the past two thousand years.

Palaeography, secondly, can be studied from an artistic point of view. Writers are distinguished as beautiful, ugly, and those who are neither one nor the other. The ugly writer may be perfectly intelligible to the reader, and fulfil his purpose so far. But in every age of the world's history, and to a great degree in some ages, there have lived persons who have taken a pride in their writing and cultivated it to a high pitch of excellence. Excellence, in this department too, is quite independent of size. A handwriting need not be tiny to be elegant. Some of the larger inscriptions on stone, and similarly some of the largest hands in manuscripts, show a beauty of lettering which cannot be excelled by the smallest handwritings extant. Of all scribes the neatest have been those of the monasteries of the Latin Church in the Middle Ages. The enormous numbers of cloistered monks had to find employment, and many of them gained a livelihood for themselves and the means to distribute alms by copying manuscript books for the use of their own or other monasteries, and for the libraries of kings and nobles. At first the most that could be achieved was beauty of lettering. This can be studied now without inspection of actual ancient manuscripts in photogravure facsimiles of select leaves, such as our own and most University libraries contain. These are almost perfect copies of the originals. Later, the illumination of manuscripts was introduced. Most of us have seen one or more illuminated manuscripts. The arrangement of these lovely colours, which even after centuries dazzle the eye, is almost a lost art. The Irish were particularly distinguished in this connexion. An historian of the twelfth century tells how he saw at Kildare a manuscript of such intricately ornamental designs that it seemed rather to be the work of an angel than of a mortal man. The more closely he examined it, the more it excited his admiration<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 140.



Not only were letters, especially initials, highly illuminated, but exquisite miniatures were introduced into the margins and other parts of the page. These frequently illustrate scenes of Holy Scripture, recording the interest of the passage or the piety of the writer. Those whom the author cannot enthral, will find in these illustrations a charming field for novel research.

This leads me to mention what I may call a further fruit of the study of palaeography. The date of a manuscript, which is an important fact of our science, is often to be determined by the differences of handwriting which characterise successive ages; often minute, the habit of estimating such distinctions cultivates an almost indefinable quality of mind. What taste is for the critic of works of art, this is for the scholar. It is something akin to the right appreciation of the use of words and grammatical forms. It is something akin to a true estimate of the right proportion of the phrases of a musical theme. But it is neither of these. It is a power most resembling that by which we are enabled to say, 'Demosthenes could not have written this,' and again, 'this passage must be Cicero.' If the study of palaeography cultivated such judgement alone, it would be worth our while.

Let us turn now to the more objective advantages which come from the study of palaeography. These can be summed up in a word as the recovery of the true text of ancient documents, and the knowledge resulting therefrom. When we speak of the 'true' text, we do not mean literally true—such literal truth is perhaps never entirely attainable—but essentially true, and approximating as closely as may be to the literal truth. That such discovery of the true text need not be uninteresting to any one, let me prove by one or two examples. Take the name 'Grampians,' applied to our great range of mountains. If this name, which was first given to the range by Hector Boece, the first Principal of our University, be traced back to its origin, it will be found to rest on a misreading of a passage in Tacitus. In his copy of Tacitus, based on a late MS or late MSS, Boece found the expression *Mons Grampius*. This is now known from the discovery of better authority to be a mistake for *Mons Graupius*, the exact locality of which is unknown. Thus a scribe's

error, innocently repeated by a Principal of a Scottish University, has given its name to a great range of mountains. Again, the brave queen of the Iceni in East Anglia, was called in Latin Boudicca, the form with which we are familiar from Cowper's poem being a corruption in our later manuscripts. In both instances the corruption may be said to be an improvement upon the original in sound, but it is at least interesting to know on how slender foundations are built some of the most permanent associations of our lives. To turn to common nouns; there is an English word *celt*, meaning 'a cutting implement.' This word owes its origin to a misreading of a passage in the Vulgate version of the Book of Job, where *celte* appears for *certe*<sup>1</sup>.

Greek and Latin manuscripts may be divided into, first, Biblical; second, Patristic, i. e. non-biblical, but Christian; third, those which are neither biblical nor patristic. The order in which I have mentioned the three classes may seem to some peculiar, but it is justified by the fact that with few exceptions the biblical excel the patristic, and the patristic the third class, in age, accuracy, and art.

A few words about the third class, to which we shall afterwards return. Nothing has been more remarkable in the history of learning than the steady production of editions of what are generally called the 'classical' authors. The present texts of these are based on a long succession of manuscript copies, supplemented by the labours of scholars in endeavouring to arrive at the true text which underlies the corruptions of these manuscripts. It is hardly too much to say that at the present time practically every copy of importance of every 'classical' author has been collated and valued, and that only the appearance of a new copy of importance or the few certain emendations which even the most thorough expert can hope to make, will produce any improvement in the existing form of the text. Yet no sane person will deny that many of our authors are still full of corruptions. Take, for example, Aeschylus among the Greek authors, and Propertius among the Latin. Have we then reached to the limit of the attainable in this direction? I think not.

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay, *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation*, pp. 16 f.



Much advance can still be made, if scholars will only turn to the older and better manuscripts of the two former classes, and learn what they can from them. Meantime let us consider those first two classes, which are well worthy of study for their own sake.

First, then, the biblical manuscripts. As to the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, at least, we may congratulate ourselves that, owing to the labours of Tischendorf, Hort, Westcott, and others, we are in a very much surer position than our forefathers were. The oldest Greek copies, unknown to scholars of the eighteenth and previous centuries, have been carefully collated, and their readings made known to the world. We possess in Westcott and Hort's text one which has deserved and gained confidence everywhere. But much yet remains to be done. Later copies have been shown to be of real importance. They frequently derive from originals of equal antiquity with the great manuscripts, and show variant readings to the value of which only the prejudiced can be blind. Generations will have to work at these later manuscripts, and their classification is a necessity for the attainment of a truer text. The Greek version of the Old Testament, commonly called the Septuagint, has been most unworthily neglected until recent years. Both Oxford and Cambridge Universities have done splendid work in the endeavour to obtain the best possible text, a necessary preliminary to the study even of the New Testament, as this Septuagint was the Bible of the early Christians, was quoted habitually by St. Paul, and occasionally even by our Lord Himself. But the Latin manuscripts are hardly, if at all, less important, and here, there is a very wide field for investigation. Roughly speaking, we may say there were two Latin versions of the Bible in antiquity, the Old Latin, translated directly from the Greek, and the revision of it which Jerome made, called the Vulgate. Various portions of the Old Latin, which exist in manuscript, have been published from time to time, but they have not yet been unified so as to form anything like a complete text, since the middle of the eighteenth century. The great work of the Benedictine Sabatier can be vastly improved by later discoveries. As to the Vulgate, the Bishop of Salisbury and Mr. White have produced a sound text of the Gospels, and have the rest of the New



Testament in preparation. But there remains the whole of the Old Testament, in which the Vulgate text differs but little from the Old Latin.

Closely connected with the study of the biblical manuscripts is that of the patristic. The writings of the Fathers during the first eight centuries of the Christian era are in many respects of the highest value. There was a time, not far distant, when they were thought to exhibit a kind of ecclesiastical jargon unworthy of the name of Greek or Latin. In dictionaries, words were labelled 'ecclesiastical.' *Christianum est! non legitur.* Many men, of many countries and dispositions, were lumped together under this term. What are the facts? The best and most highly educated men of their time were those Fathers. Latin existed as a language spoken by ordinary people in many parts of Europe till the eighth century. Greek has never ceased. Why should the writings of the best men of that period be railed off from the non-Christian writings? Why should Latin be considered to cease at the year 150 A.D., Greek at 300 B.C.? The division is a most artificial one. We have been asked to believe that nothing really good was produced in either language after those dates. Just when the Roman Empire was passing through its best period of prosperity, people ceased to be able to write Latin! As well say that no one has been able to write English prose since the days of Bacon and Hooker! The Roman Empire developed between the time of Cicero and Marcus Aurelius in much the same way as the British Empire has developed since the sixteenth century. On such reasoning, De Quincey and Matthew Arnold, for example, would be condemned. The truth is that the Renaissance, good as it was in itself, was really Pagan in its character. Those who did most to popularise the newly found literature were men who in disgust or indifference kept apart from the Roman Church of the day, and we are the heirs of this division. We, who live in an enlightened country, which owes its greatness to the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the men whose spiritual nourishment they were, have foolishly neglected the most precious heritage of antiquity. This neglect has led to a carelessness in the production of their works. Had it not been for the Benedictine monks, who did all they could to restore Augustine, Ambrose, and others

to their original form, the works of the ancient teachers of the Church would be even in a much worse state than they are. The excuse cannot be given that the manuscripts are bad. They are, on the contrary, so good, that if almost any classical author existed in MSS of the age and quality, in which patristic works are preserved, the textual critics would have been saved much wearisome examination of late and poor copies, and their almost hopeless attempts to restore classical texts by the light of nature. Those authors whose text is best preserved owe this to the value placed upon them by the Church, for example, Plato, Virgil, and Juvenal. Only within the last forty years has a worthy attempt been made to gather in this rich harvest. These attempts are associated with the Academies of Vienna and Berlin. But the programmes of these learned institutions do not and cannot include more than a certain number of these authors, and there is much room still for the enterprise of British and American Universities. As an instance of the enormous gain which can be obtained from an examination of ancient copies as compared with more recent, there is the case of a fourth-century Latin work<sup>1</sup>, which has come under my notice, the printed text of which can be improved by their aid in about three thousand places. It is not too much to say that it is possible to recover the very words of some of these authors in all but a few passages, a thing which is not possible in the case of most classical authors. Dr. Goldwin Smith left the classical field many years ago, because there was nothing more to be done<sup>2</sup>. Only let the word 'classical' be extended in meaning or done away with altogether: there is work for hundreds of men in extracting from the many extant MSS the texts of valuable authors. And while the text of such authors is worth attaining for itself alone, the study is most valuable for the text of Scripture. All the Fathers quote Scripture largely, and the patristic quotations have long been recognized as of the utmost importance for the study of the text of the Bible. There is no use, however, in studying the printed editions of the Fathers for this purpose, except where they are

<sup>1</sup> The Pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII* (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xxxv 2213 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Mayor's *Latin Heptateuch*, p. lvi. I owe much to Professor Mayor's articles and prefaces, also to Professor Ramsay's advice (*Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 448 f.).



known to be based upon ancient or good MSS, whose readings are fully reported. The Bible as represented in Latin Fathers is as yet little known: when it is known, the Western Text, rejected by Westcott and Hort, will in all probability come to its own. Any one who will devote himself to such work, now made possible for the Universities of Scotland by post-graduate Scholarships and Fellowships, can with little trouble become an authority in his subject and gain the ear of learned Europe. Whereas, the person who confines himself to the production of an edition, however good, of a well-thumbed author, may remain unknown to fellow workers in other countries, just as Tyrrell and Purser's edition of Cicero's *Correspondence* remained unknown to Germany's greatest Ciceronian expert till about five years ago, or nearly twenty years after the publication of its first part. If any one imagines that to devote one's self to these later authors is to be a traitor to classical scholarship, to destroy one's taste, and unfits one for the writing or teaching of prose in the Demosthenic or Ciceronian style, let him hearken to the witness of the greatest scholars. The great scholars of the past few centuries, who have made the most valuable contributions to scholarship, have been equally at home in both classical and sacred philology. This is true of Erasmus, Bentley, Porson, Lachmann, Haupt, Lightfoot, Hort, Field, the brothers Mayor, and others. I do not say that their greatness is entirely owing to their breadth of view, but I maintain that breadth of view and width of reading are the necessary preludes to good and sane work in a scholar's career. The man who, by ascending the mountain, gets the wide view of plain beneath, is best able to choose a suitable point for a residence. This is true of scholarship also. Narrow its view and it becomes blind.

To return to classical study. Our method has been all wrong. We have plunged young children into very difficult authors, who, apart from the difficulty of language, lived in different surroundings, and thought in different ways from ourselves. The result has been to torture them and in the end to leave them with a few scraps of grammatical knowledge, but no healthy power of reading and enjoying authors for themselves. The natural method, which we ought to have followed, is to begin with the easy, and go on



to the more difficult. The Bible itself, and many of the Fathers in both languages, are very easy to follow. The child is acquainted with Christian ideas from the first. Let him first approach the ideas with which he is familiar, and he will then naturally go on to the comprehension of the strange ideas, which are difficult to grasp. The same applies to palaeography. The late classical manuscripts have been microscopically examined. Take Propertius as an example. The oldest MS of his poems is about fourteen hundred years removed from his autograph. How can one hope to attain to a correct text, or anything like a correct text? Clearly not by examining the late manuscripts further, for that will only add to the number of hideous errors committed by scribes. The method is to examine carefully the manuscripts of later authors, removed from the authors' autographs by only one, two, three, four hundred years, as the case may be, and traceable perhaps through one medium only to the autograph itself. Every manuscript has errors. Classify those errors systematically, indicating the date of the MS and the country in which it was written. No one man can be expected to spend his life or all his leisure examining the mistakes of manuscripts, but each person who edits one text could easily give a list of the errors he had found in a left-hand column and the correct forms in a right-hand column, the former arranged in alphabetical order. These could afterwards be collected into a dictionary of errors, which would be of the highest use for the man who would remove the corruptions of the classical authors. It is much more scientific to make a list of errors that have actually been made than to show that such and such a mistake could have been made. And this is not all the advantage which would accrue to classical authors from the study of early MSS of later authors. The orthography of the former would be greatly improved. Very few manuscripts of classical authors can be trusted in regard to orthography. After the eleventh century Latin orthography is a hopeless muddle. It is true that some of the monstrosities of modern printed texts never or very rarely appear, even in the worst MSS, but still the manuscripts after the year 1100 are often not trustworthy. The manuscripts of Fathers, however, often guide us to the actual spelling employed by them in the third, fourth, or fifth centuries, and from this we can safely reason

back to the spellings of the classical period, as the difference in spelling between the two periods were of the most trifling details. It is true that we can recover forms which would otherwise be lost to us, and which shed a flood of light as well on the Latin of classical times as on the etymology of Latin words. The same is true, but probably in a lesser degree, of Greek. The study of the later language helps the study of the earlier in many ways. Blase has drawn valuable material for Demosthenic criticisms from later authors such as Dio Cassius, Libanius, and Isidorus of Pelusium, who were influenced by Demosthenes; and his results would be still more valuable, if we were in possession of a trustworthy text in every case.

I have perhaps said enough to show how such a study appeals to the scholar that undertakes it. It may not be on a par with the interpretation, or the translation—in the true sense of the word—of the great authors of antiquity; but it has for those who pursue it a fascination equal to those greater high-road of scholarship. And many who could not traverse the latter, will find themselves at home in the journeyman work of manuscript-collation. What help I can give to those who are ready to undertake this humbler path will be readily given, and, I hope, willingly accepted.

A. SOUTER



## THE GREEK MONASTERIES IN SOUTH ITALY. II.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCRIPTORIA.

THE development of scriptoria and the growth of the literary instinct is gradual, and is chiefly to be traced in the life of Nilus.

The life of Elias Junior not merely gives no sign of any literary taste on the part of the saint, but affords positive evidence that he regarded it as a sinful tendency. On one occasion he and Daniel were making an expedition from Salinae to Pentadattilo<sup>1</sup>, and while they were crossing the marshy ground (now drained) known as Il Lacco, Daniel produced a beautiful copy of the Psalter, which he had written himself. 'I vero,' said Elias<sup>2</sup>, 'atque illud in stagnum projice.' Daniel did so, knowing, says the writer, the meaning of obedience. After they had gone six miles, Elias sent Daniel back to look for the Psalter, and it was recovered unhurt. 'Tua,' said Elias, 'obedientia, fili, codicem servavit incolumem. Verumtamen operae pretium est, paupertatem summo nos studio complecti; ne forte rideant nos caelestes illae mentes, qui mundo scilicet remisisse ac monasticum institutum sequi profiteantur. Sicuti enim quis valere minime dicendus est, qui vel uno corporis membro laboret, ita nec monachum vere inopem, et ab aegritudinibus animi immunem, qui aliquo uno caducarum rerum desiderio teneatur.'

Elias's sentiment is excellent from the perverted point of view of an illiterate monk, but it shows clearly that the scriptorium in any monastery with which he had to deal would be small and insignificant.

Elias Spelaeotes was more literary than his namesake. He was not, so far as his life tells us, especially famous in this direction, but he appears to have spent some portion of each day, while

<sup>1</sup> See p. 528, inf.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 497 A (should be B).



he was at Patras<sup>1</sup>, in writing. It would also seem that he had some knowledge of theology and philosophy, since he educated Lucas not merely to a knowledge of the scriptures, but also to 'profunda mysteria ac philosophorum subtilitates et latibula.'

Cod. Evg. 60 bears the name of an Elias Spelaeotes. But it is dated 1021, was written in Castro de Colonia, and is not, I think, a South Italian MS. It is perhaps evidence, though slender, for thinking that Elias did write a manuscript, for the name may have been copied from an older MS. It is very common for scribes to copy colophons without acknowledgement.

Beyond the passage already quoted there is no evidence that Lucas was literary or that he was famous as a scribe, and I do not think that it really means more than that he was eloquent in discourse about philosophy and theology. Vitalis, too, admitted and perhaps regretted his ignorance, 'parum quasdam litteras novi' said he to the catapan of Bari<sup>2</sup>.

Nilus, on the other hand, was extremely literary, and probably founded a distinct school of calligraphy, for there are many references in his life to the systematic production of MSS, and to his interest in literary and intellectual pursuits.

From his youth up he seems to have been fond of learning. He was familiar<sup>3</sup>, we are told, with the lives of the great saints, such as Antony, Saba, or Hilarion, and he used to read them with great eagerness and care. It was this knowledge, and the skill which he seems to have possessed in expounding it, which made him famous when he was on Mount Mercury.

Frequently, we are told<sup>4</sup>, the brethren in the monastery of Fantinus, in which Nilus was, used to come and ask him to expound the meaning of the scriptures; and, hearing the words of grace which fell from the mouth of Nilus, and admiring the resplendent virtue of Fantinus, they looked on them as a new Peter and Paul. And a little further on we find that he had a dispute with John, the Abbot of another little monastery on Mount Mercury, perhaps that which was afterwards known as Giovanni de Lauro, as to the interpretation of a passage in Gregory Nazianzen; the old man silenced him by accusing him of youth and inexperience<sup>5</sup>, a reproof which Nilus accepted

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 858 d.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* Oct. vi p. 338 f.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* Mart. ii p. \*29 B.

<sup>4</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 20 A.

<sup>5</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 33 C.

<sup>6</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 36 D.

in all humility in spite of the efforts made by the devil, who appeared in the specious guise of SS. Peter and Paul to suggest passages which might bear on the point at issue; but the next day, touched by the gentleness of Nilus, John admitted that he had only been testing the young man's character, and that the latter's interpretation was really right.

When he was at S. Adrian's his reputation was so great that several Greek officials went out to interview him<sup>1</sup>, more it would seem from curiosity than from any higher motive. The scene is worth reproducing, for it shows the great power of Nilus and his appreciation of the ethical character of Christianity.

'There will be but few saved,' he had warned his hearers. 'Ah,' they in effect replied, 'this cannot affect us; *we* have the sacraments; *we* adore the cross; *we* are members of the Church.' 'Take it as a certain fact,' said Nilus, 'that unless you lead virtuous lives, and love virtue, not one of you will escape damnation, in spite of the things on which you rely.' His hearers returned to the argument, 'We are told that even a cup of cold water given in charity has its reward.' 'This,' said Nilus, 'was said to those who had no possessions; but what will happen to you, who are rich, and yet take away from the poor even the cold water which he has?' The visitors thought it better to change the subject, and asked whether Solomon had been saved, and what was the fruit which Adam ate in Eden.

The first inquiry Nilus answered by saying that the more important question for the inquirer concerned his own salvation; and when in reply to the second some one suggested that the forbidden fruit was a wild apple, and was laughed at by the others, he settled the point summarily by saying, 'Do not laugh: the reply was as sensible as the inquiry!'

And in the same spirit, so far superior to the usual ecclesiastical logic and perverted reasoning of the period, he dealt with all his sensation-seeking questioners.

Did Nilus write any original works? There are none mentioned in the *Patrologia Graeca*, but there are in Cod. Crypt. Δ. γ. xxi<sup>2</sup> two poems attributed to him: (1) concerning S. Benedict of Monte Cassino, (2) concerning Nilus of Sinai. This is a paper MS of the eighteenth century. Its evidence is alone scarcely

<sup>1</sup> P. G. 120, p. 88 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Codices Cryptenses*, by Dom Rocchi, ad loc.



sufficient; the internal evidence of the hymns would be valuable but they are not published, and the matter must be left undecided.

That Nilus was a great scribe is as certain as that he was a mean theologian and student of literature. Almost the first thing that we are told of his career, after his admission to the monastic order at S. Nazarius, is that he spent the greater part of each day in writing<sup>1</sup>, in order to leave a record of the work of his hands and to avoid the charge of not working for his maintenance. Nor was this a merely complimentary payment: that his calligraphy had a real and marketable value is shown by an interesting episode in his life on Mount Mercury<sup>2</sup>. He had received a monk into his monastery, who had with him three pieces of money. Nilus made him give these to the poor, and taught him the 'difficult art' of calligraphy. But after a time the discipline of monastic life became irksome to him, and wishing to go away, he asked for the return of his money. 'Very well,' said Nilus, 'if you will write a transference to me for the reward which would have been yours in the kingdom of heaven, I will pay you back your three pieces of money.'

The monk, curious to see how the penniless saint would fulfil his promise, wrote a transference as he was directed and placed it on the altar. Nilus went to a neighbouring monastery, perhaps at Seminara, and borrowed three pieces of money, which he gave to the monk, who, as the story adds in a naive parenthesis, soon died. Then he set to work to write three Psalters, finishing them in four days each, in order to satisfy the debt which he had incurred at 'the command of Christ.'

In this case he had a definite object in writing, but it would seem as though the making of manuscripts was always a part of his daily routine. From the break of day until terce he used to write 'swiftly and elegantly,' filling four sheets a day with his small and compact writing. How much does this mean? Obviously it depends on the size of his sheets, which, it may be mentioned, we find Stephen going to buy at Rossano; but if we take the two MSS which seem to be most probably written by the hand of Nilus (Crypt. B a xix<sup>3</sup> and Crypt. B a xx), we find

<sup>1</sup> Sirletto's Latin. v. *P. G.* 120, p. 31 c.

<sup>2</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 49 n.

<sup>3</sup> *Codices Cryptenses*, ad loc. Possibly these MSS have both been cut down, as they were probably once bound together, but they must have been of nearly equal size.



that both are 25 x 19 cm., a medium size, of which a skilful scribe might well fill a quaternion in three hours, though I do not think that many men could do so.

The handwriting of Nilus and his school is a somewhat important subject in Greek palaeography, and not quite a simple one. A considerable amount of research in Italy will have to be accomplished before it is possible to treat it in a really satisfactory manner; but it is already possible to indicate several well-established points, to show what are the problems which must be solved, and to suggest tentatively the results which may be looked for.

i. The evidence for attributing Cod. Crypt. B a xix, xx to Nilus is in each case good, but requires further investigation.

(1) Cod. B a xx<sup>1</sup> contains on f. 59 *verso* the subscription τῷ ἑξακισχιλιοστῷ τετρακοσιοστῷ ἑβδομικοστῷ τρίτῳ τοῦ κόσμου ἔτει ἔπαυεν Μανουὴλ τοῦ πατρικίου εἰς τὰ ῥήματα καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ῥήματα ἐλήφθει καὶ ἡ κουθησία ἐγένετο μεγάλη σφόδρα. Καὶ χειρὶ Νεσολχ<sup>2</sup> μοναχοῦ ἐγράφη ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου Δωροθέου πτύξ.

I do not know where Rhemata was, but it seems clear that a place of some kind is intended. I suppose it was in Sicily, as Manuel's expedition was directed against that country. Dom Rocchi suggests *ρήματα = ῥύματα = fluentia*: I do not see that this is any easier to understand, and more probably it is Rometta<sup>3</sup> near Messina. This subscription seems decisive in favour of Nilus's authorship, unless it be suggested that it was written by another Nilus; but it must be noticed that Dom Rocchi says on f. 62 v. <sup>4</sup> Versus cum acrostichide alphabetaria scripsit Paulus monachus . . . opello haec subscribebat: Μεμῆσθε Παύλου ταπεινοῦ μοναχοῦ τοῦ γράψαντος οἱ ἀναγνωσκοντες διὰ τὸν κύριον, Ἀμήν. He does not say whether this acrostic and the subscription are in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript or not. As he regards the manuscript as the work of Nilus, there can be little doubt that it is not.

(2) The case of Cod. B a xix is similar. At the end of the treatise of Diadochus (f. 83) there are the following verses<sup>4</sup> :—

<sup>1</sup> *Codices Cryptenses*, ad loc.

<sup>2</sup> Νεσολχ (not Νεσολχ, as Rocchi has inadvertently printed) is the cryptographic mode of writing Νεῖλον, according to the usual method.

<sup>3</sup> Sometimes spelt Rametta.

<sup>4</sup> *Codices Cryptenses*, ad loc.

Ν ἔμοις μοι, σῶτερ, λιταῖς τοῦ διαδόχου  
 Ἐ ὑνοίαν γνώμης τῆς εἰς σέ θυμιάς  
 Λ ἔγειω καὶ πράττειω τὰ σοὶ φίλα δεδόντως  
 Ὁ κιστα πνεῦμα παρέχων μοι τὸ θεῖον  
 Ἔ λης παθῶν με καθαίρων τὸν σὸν λάτρον.

These form a single acrostic, of which the initial letters give the word Νέλον, and this is probably meant as an indication of the name of the scribe.

It is curious and important that here also there are some extracts from Basil in the hand of Paul, the first abbot of Grotta Ferrata, who wrote Cod. B a i, the celebrated Isidore MS, at the command of Nilus in 986; but Rocchi thinks it is not the same hand as that which wrote the note in Cod. B a xx.

These two MSS, B a xix, and B a xx, were once bound up in one volume together with B a xxi, which is also probably in the hand of Nilus, but has no subscription. They were divided and bound separately by Dom Jos. Cozza<sup>1</sup>.

There is no good reason therefore for doubting that these MSS were written by Nilus of Rossano; the name, the beauty of the writing, the date, and the connexion with Paul of Grotta Ferrata all point to the same conclusion. The only point which is at all adverse is the mention of Rometta (if, indeed, *ρήματα* is Rometta). Batiffol seems to think that this implies that the MS was written at Rometta, but it is quite unnecessary to suppose that a MS which records the capture of a town in a given year was written in it. On the contrary, it is extremely probable that it was written at a safe distance outside of it.

ii. The palaeographical characteristics of these MSS are very marked, as compared with Greek MSS of the same date from the Levant. The vellum on which they are written is much inferior, it is not so smooth and it is not so white, and though the writing is compact and beautiful, it has a distinct individuality, and perhaps a certain stiffness which is easy to recognize, though it is almost impossible to describe; but the most characteristic point is the colouring and ornamentation. A constant feature is a kind of plait of different colours (but never, I think, gold), with tags at the corners, which is placed at the beginning of a book.

<sup>1</sup> *Codices Cryptenses*, p. 100.



Initial letters are filled up with a wash of transparent ink<sup>1</sup> (generally yellow), and marginal notes and titles are usually covered in a similar way, by a wash of yellow ink. I do not think that this is ever found in Greek MSS written in the East.

A full description of these palaeographical details is given in Mgr. Batiffol's *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 89, though he is actually describing other MSS. His views on the subject demand attention, although I think that he has missed the true significance of some of the facts which he gives. He has collected all the dated MSS of the same kind as that described, and formed from their evidence the theory that the origin of this school of calligraphy is to be found in the neighbourhood of Capua, and traced to the influence of the Lombardic type of Latin MSS such as are found at Monte Cassino. This theory is probably true, but it is not the whole truth. So far as the connexion with Lombardic MSS is concerned it may be taken as certain; no one can compare a Lombardic MS, an ordinary Greek MS, and one of the Nilus MSS, without seeing that the last has many points of peculiarity in common with the first as compared with the second. But the other point, the connexion of the school with Capua, demands more attention.

The facts which Mgr. Batiffol gives are these. He knows of six dated manuscripts of known *provenance* which belong to this school of calligraphy. Without repeating the description which he gives of each manuscript, it will be sufficient to say that these, arranged chronologically, are:—

1. Crypt. B a xx, A.D. 965, written by Nilus.
2. Crypt. B a iv, between 970 and 991, written by Luke of Vallerucio, formerly of St. Zacharias on Mount Mercury. This MS is reproduced in Pal. Soc. II 104, but the dating is erroneous and should be as I have given it here<sup>2</sup>.
3. Vat. 2138, A.D. 991, written by Kyriakos of Capua.
4. Vat. 2020, A.D. 993, written by Kyriakos of Capua.
5. Laurent. xi 9, A.D. 1021, written by Luke of the monastery of S. John (? the Reaper, at Stilo).

<sup>1</sup> This was, I believe, first noted by the late Abbé Martin in his 'Quatre MSS importants des Évangiles,' a treatise on the Ferrar group.

<sup>2</sup> For the full details see p. 537 inf.



6. Vat. 1650, A.D. 1037, written by Theodore the Sicilian at Reggio.

Mgr. Batiffol has been struck by the fact that of the few older MSS the two Capuan MSS are the ones which have the palaeographical features alluded to previously most clearly marked, and therefore he thinks that the writing is that of a primarily Capuan school.

But, surely, far more important are the facts that the earliest MS was written by Nilus in 965 (that is to say, while he was at S. Adrian's at Rossano); that the second was written by a monk who lived in the monastery which the Abbot of Monte Cassino gave to Nilus, and who had come from the community on Mount Mercury of which Nilus had been one of the chief ornaments; and that the Capuan MSS were written just after the time when Pandolfus had welcomed Nilus, obtained for him the monastery of Vallerucio, and even wished to make him Bishop of Capua.

The life of Nilus, therefore, seems to give the key to the history of these MSS, and they may be considered to have a considerable claim to be regarded as a monument to his practice and teaching of calligraphy, rather than simply as specimens of a school which took its rise at Capua. Nilus, not Capua, is the important fact.

Mgr. Batiffol, however, also quotes three other MSS:—

1. Vat. 1673, which is not dated, but contains a note by the first hand, *εἵνε περ βασιλεια, οὕτως γὰρ καὶ νῦν ἡμῖν τοῖς ταπεινοῖς Ταυρομενίταις ἐκ πλῆθους ἀμαρτιῶν πολυειδῶν ἐπήλθει ὁ ὄλεθρος, καὶ δικαίως.*

This, he thinks, refers to the capture of Taormina in 902.

2. Vat. reg. Gr. 75, copied by Simeon at Malvito (to the north of the Sila). It mentions in a note by a contemporary hand the expedition of Otto in 982.

3. Vat. 1633, undated, but which, from a partly legible note, seems to have come from Bisignano, near Rossano.

There is nothing in the last two to conflict with the theory advanced, but the first requires consideration.

If it is exactly as Mgr. Batiffol thinks it shows that this school of calligraphy is earlier than Nilus; but (1) he says himself that the palaeographical appearances are less marked in this MS. (2) It seems to be doubtful whether the disaster referred to is the

capture of Taormina, and, even supposing that it is, whether the MS was written immediately afterwards. Therefore I think that this MS does not overthrow the theory advanced, although it would be desirable to examine it more closely.

It is possible that it may prove that Nilus only developed a style of calligraphy which had already been begun, as, from what Mgr. Batiffol says, the general features of the school are much less marked in the Taormina MS than they are in the other MSS.

There is also another type of manuscript which may be traced to the school of Nilus, the tachygraphical MSS of what has been called the Grotta Ferrata school. These MSS are discussed in Mr. T. W. Allen's *Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts*. Any long discussion of this very technical subject would be out of place. I would only suggest that unintentionally Mr. Allen has given a rather exaggerated idea of the closeness of the connexion of this school of writing with Grotta Ferrata.

The chief MSS which can be dated are:—

- (1) Crypt. B a xix (vide supra, p. 521), A.D. 965.
- (2) B. M. Addit. 18,231 (A.D. 972).
- (3) Crypt. B a 1 (A.D. 986).
- (4) Crypt. B a iv (before A.D. 992).

All these were written before the convent at Grotta Ferrata was founded<sup>1</sup>. The writer of (2) is unknown. (3) was written by Paul, afterwards Abbot of Grotta Ferrata, another fragment of whose writing was found by Mr. Allen in the *Vallicelliana* (Cod. Lat. D 43); and the tachygraphical part of (1) is not (according to Rocchi) in the same hand as the rest of the MS, but is in that of the above-named Paul.

Although, therefore, the tachygraphical forms may have flourished at Grotta Ferrata, they did not originate there, but were brought from the South by Nilus and his friends, especially Paul.

The conclusion then that has been reached is that the development of the scriptoria in Basilian monasteries of Italy seems to be traceable to the practice and teaching of Nilus, who, probably

<sup>1</sup> The present library at Grotta Ferrata is really a collection made by Menniti, and probably contains very few really Grotta Ferrata MSS. To this point I shall refer at a later stage.



influenced by the Lombardic school of Latin MSS, either founded or at least developed, a special school of calligraphy and tachygraphy, which he took with him as he gradually went further north.

In this way the Greek monks spread over South Italy. Unless all the arguments here advanced are wrong their history is that of a gradual progress towards the north, which started from very slight beginnings, and by degrees covered with monasteries the land which the Latin monks had left in the days of Gregory the Great. The question naturally suggests itself why these Greek monks held their own, in spite of the attacks of Saracens and other foes, although the Latins had gone at the first blow?

The reason seems to be partly that their lack of organization helped them. They lived, at least at first, in the deserts and among the rocks, and could easily elude their enemies. Their monastery was, for them, simply the spot where they were staying, and it did not connote the fixed building and elaborate organization that the Latin monks required. In this respect the Greeks offer a striking parallel to the history of the Celtic Church in England, which inhabited and evangelized the north, when the Roman missionaries found it impossible to do anything. The Roman organization and its tendency to live in the centres of population and govern the people, cannot but command respect and admiration, but under certain conditions it was not so effective as a less organized church, which, living away from the towns, appealed to the imagination and conscience by example from a distance rather than by actual teaching, and was protected in times of trouble by its remoteness from the centres of life.

This is partly the explanation of the success of the Greek monks. But it is impossible to read the lives of the Saints, especially that of Nilus, and not be struck by the beauty of their characters. They were superstitious, but it was an age of superstition; and the important thing which impressed their generation was that they were poor without being either lazy or beggars. In some respects we have improved upon their Christianity, but there are not many stories which breathe a nobler spirit than that of the last meeting between Otto and Nilus<sup>1</sup>. Nilus had

<sup>1</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 153 B.



rebuked both the Emperor and the Pope for their cruelty to Philagathus, but as his words were of no effect, he retired to Serperi. After a time the Emperor, who had been stricken with penitence, came to see him. He offered him many things, which the Saint refused, and at last he said, 'Ask what you will, and I will give it you.' The old man laid his hand on the Emperor's shoulder and said, 'I ask nothing of you save the salvation of your own soul. For, Emperor though you be, you are the Subject of death, and shall one day give an account of all your deeds, whether they be good or whether they be evil.' The man who could, under such circumstances, thus speak, deserves the title of saint by some better canonization than that of the mediaeval Papacy, and we cannot wonder that he was famous, and successful in spreading the monastic order which he adorned.

THE FOUNDATION AND SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE  
MONASTERIES MENTIONED IN THE LIVES OF THE  
SOUTH ITALIAN SAINTS.

It is not always easy to fix the exact place in which the early monasteries were founded, and there is a lamentable lack of evidence as to their subsequent history. Possibly more may be found in the Vatican library and archives, especially in Cod. Vat. Lat. 8201, the cartularium of S. Salvator of Messina, and in the 'dossier Basiliani' in the Vatican, a collection of documents from various sources. Both of these will certainly repay investigation, and probably lead to the discovery of more facts; but it is improbable that much of any fresh material thus obtained will relate to the Pre-Norman monasteries.

I have brought together in this section all that I can find in the *A. SS.* about the early foundations; it would perhaps have been possible to do this in a more connected form, but I think that the superior clearness obtained by keeping each convent separate is an adequate equivalent for the abruptness, and for the small amount of repetition, which the plan has involved.

(i) *Salinae*. The position of this place has been disputed. The Bollandists and Gaetani<sup>1</sup> think that it was identical with Aulinae, which, as will be shown, was near Palmi and Seminara

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 497 A.

to the north of Reggio. Their reasons are that the author of the life speaks sometimes of Salinae, sometimes of Aulinae, and that when, after the death of Elias Junior, Daniel asks Elias Spelaeotes to come and live with him, in accordance with the dying wish of the first-named, it is to Salinae that the Speleote goes, although it is plain from the earlier life that Elias Junior had been living at Aulinae just before his death, and that he was buried there. Therefore they argue Salinae and Aulinae are identical. There would be considerable force in this argument if Salinae were not a well-known place. But it can be found marked on the Italian survey maps close to Capo del Armi (Leucopetra), and Amari has accepted this identification unhesitatingly. It may, however, be well to test this suggested position, and to see if it be possible to explain by it the localities which are mentioned in connexion with Salinae. The passages in the life of Elias which throw light on this point are:—

(1) The description<sup>1</sup> of Elias's and Daniel's departure from Salinae for Rome: 'Cum ei necesse esset ad Pentadactyli agrum ire ac stagnum quod ibi esset una cum Daniele pervaderet... S. Pantaleonis oratorium ingressus... ad gallicinium Romanum iter tetendit.' Pentadattilo is marked on the map immediately south of Saline. The *stagnum* does not at present exist, but it is represented by the name Lacco (λάκκος = a pond), which is still given to part of the neighbourhood between Saline and Pentadattilo. The oratory of S. Pantaleone is represented by a hamlet which bears that name between Pentadattilo and Reggio. Minasi has suggested that it was once a monastery, and he translates *oratorium* as *monasterio*. Surely this is unwarranted; the Greek must have been προσευχή, and need not mean more than a wayside shrine. I cannot trace Minasi's statement that the monastery of Pantaleo passed into the control of the cathedral of Bova. He gives no authority, and I can find none in Agresta, Rodota, or any lists of visitations.

Is *ad gallicinium* a note of time or of place? I think it is probably the former, as the Bollandists give no note on the subject, and do not print it with an initial capital. I therefore suggest that they found *gallicinium* in their old Latin version and ἀλεκτοφωνίαν in their Greek (v. Ducange, s. v. *galliciniale*).

<sup>1</sup> A. SS. Aug. iii p. 497 A (= D)-E.



Minasi, however, has not noticed this possibility, and thinks that they put no note because they did not understand the word (whereas the Bollandists constantly add notes to explain that they do not know the meaning of phrases), and points out that there is still a district north of Pantaleone called Galliciano. This is a very interesting suggestion, but I can hardly believe that if the Bollandists had had *γαλλικίσιον* in their Greek text, they would have simply transliterated it without comment.

(2) The description of Daniel's journey<sup>1</sup> home from Salonica with the dead body of his master: . . . 'ad Ruscianorum (Rossano) oppidum appellitur, ac post equo vectus in Besianum castrum venit . . . ad Salinas proficiscitur sancti translationem fratribus significaturus . . . omnes tamen libenti alacrique animo in Taurianum . . . illi obviam processere.'

At first sight the mention of Tauriana seems to imply that Salinae was close to that city. But it is certain that Elias was buried at Aulinae. If, therefore, Aulinae and Salinae are the same place or close together the narrative has no sense, for it implies that the monks on hearing that their founder's corpse was being brought to Aulinae for burial straightway went off to Tauriana, a town which by that route it would never go near. But the whole story becomes simple if it is supposed that Daniel went first to Salinae to announce that he was taking the body to Aulinae round the Aspromonte by the road which runs along the coast through Tauriana—the only practical course, for it would have been a very serious task to have taken it over the top of the mountain. It remains to identify *Besianum castrum*. The Bollandists cannot; but Minasi suggests that it is a mistake for *Mesianum castrum*, an old tower on C. Mileto. This fits in with the rest of the narrative and is very probable, as in Greek minuscule MSS  $\mu$  and  $\beta$  (written  $u$ ) are constantly confused.

As the result of this investigation it is clear that the evidence is in favour of identifying the old Salinae with the modern Saline. The convent there is interesting, because it is the first of the Basilian monasteries of whose foundation we hear the story in a trustworthy narrative, but it cannot claim a long or famous history. Elias and Daniel left<sup>2</sup> it in 888 and took refuge at Patras, on account of the attack which the Saracens were making

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 507 B-C.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 498 A.



on Reggio. Probably they joined Elias Spelaotes and Arsenius in this flight, but unlike the two last, who remained at Patras for eight years, Elias Junior and Daniel soon returned. First of all they went back to Salinae<sup>1</sup>, but soon afterwards they sought a quieter life in the hills of 'Mesobianum'<sup>2</sup>, a district which no one seems to be able to identify certainly. It may mean generally the Aspromonte; but as it is mentioned in the life of the Speleote in connexion with S. Christina, a village east of Seminara, it is perhaps the northern side of the mountain. It was probably at this period that Elias founded the monastery of Aulinae, for only one more visit to Salinae is recorded and the rest of the story is concerned with Aulinae. Only once more can I find any trace of the monastery of Salinae. This is in the life of Elias Spelaotes<sup>3</sup>, where it is recorded that Daniel went to live at Salinae after the death of Elias Junior, and in obedience to a suggestion which Elias Junior had once made, invited the Speleote to come and live with him. Elias came, and there is an amusing account of the way in which Daniel kept him waiting outside the convent in order to test his perseverance; and, on the other hand, of the way in which Elias rebuked Daniel for his laziness in wishing to go to bed instead of reciting the Psalter.

But Elias did not stay there long, and retired to a cave on the hills, probably near Melicuccà<sup>4</sup>.

Nothing more is known of Salinae, nor is there anything to show whether Daniel had many followers or lived almost alone.

If we may judge from the absence of all further information, we may guess that Salinae was destroyed by some invasion of the Saracens before the end of the ninth century, or possibly at the beginning of the tenth, and that it was never rebuilt.

(ii) *Aulinae*. Aulinae was the second monastery founded<sup>5</sup> by Elias Junior. The time in his life when he founded it is open to doubt. As was said above, Elias Junior and Daniel in 888 retired from Salinae to Patras, fearing the advancing strength of the Saracens, but after a short time returned to Salinae. The account of what he did next is rather difficult to follow, and the Bollandists say that the Greek MS is deficient at this point;

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 498 B.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 498 B.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 862 E.

<sup>4</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 863 C.

<sup>5</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iii p. 498 A.

there is, however, no real reason for doubting the substantial accuracy of the old Latin version which was made before the MS was mutilated. According to this he was much disturbed by constant visitors who were attracted by his fame, and retired<sup>1</sup>—‘*pacatiorem vitam exacturus*’—to the ‘Mesobian’ hills. This probably means the foundation of Aulinae, though the fact is not expressly stated. He did not stay there long, as he was warned of a new attack which was soon to be made on Reggio, and consequently moved back to Salinae in order to be in a spot more convenient for preaching to the inhabitants of Reggio and warning them of their danger. The disaster referred to would seem to be the fall of Reggio in 900–1.

After this, perhaps because of this, Elias again retired to Aulinae and does not seem to have ever returned to Salinae. With the exception of a visit to Amalfi, apparently just before the fall of Taormina in 902, he remained at Aulinae until he was summoned to Constantinople by Leo VI. He died, on his journey thither, at Salonica in 903, and his body was brought back to Aulinae by Daniel.

The situation of Aulinae is fixed by tradition as on the western extremity of the mountain which overlooks Palmi and which is pointed out to the traveller as the Monte Elia. It is said that there are some ruins there: this may be true, but it is very improbable that the original monastery of Elias ever was built so strongly as to have survived to this day. Confirmation of this site may be found in the reference which is made in the Life of Elias Junior to Christina, a town which still appears on the map. We are told<sup>2</sup> that ‘*ea itaque clade impendente, Elias ac Daniel, viri plane admiratione digni, Christique cultores egregii in Sanctae Christinae castrum proficiscuntur. Ibi dum de paenitentia . . . verba faciunt, auditores . . . incolumes servantur . . . His gestis in monasterium (i. e. Aulinas) revertuntur.*’

This suggests that Christina was near Aulinae, but does not define its exact position. Similarly, in the life of S. Philaretus we read that Philaretus<sup>3</sup>, going from Reggio, ‘*inde in Aulinas . . . adventavit . . . ibi in quodam oppidulo Sinopoli . . . suum domicilium collocarunt.*’

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Aug. iiii 498 B.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 498 F.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* Apr. i p. 609 B.



After Elias Junior's death we are told in his Life that Leo VI<sup>1</sup> endowed his monastery, 'census et praedia . . . libentissime attribuit.' This is a statement which cannot be checked. To some extent it depends on whether we believe the story that Leo sent for Elias. I confess that I should hesitate to attach much weight to it, not because there is no documentary evidence, but because it is a story which was so likely to be invented. The monastery did obtain *census* and *praedia*, and no title could be more satisfactory than an imperial gift, therefore the story would naturally arise. I do not see how it is possible to decide either way.

It is of the flourishing and rich monastery endowed with *census* and *praedia* that we obtain a picture in the next document, nearly 150 years later, the Life of S. Philaretus. By this time the monastery was known as that of S. Elias and the body of the saint was its most precious relic. Philaretus was a Sicilian by birth, who was taken in his childhood from his home in Traina to Reggio and thence to Mount Aulinas, where he lived in the little town of Sinopoli. With the leave of his parents Philaretus entered the monastery and remained there all his life, attaining a great reputation for sanctity. It is important to note the conclusion of the Life of this saint, for its bearing on the further history of the monastery. 'Ut te,' it runs<sup>2</sup>, 'beatissimum et fortunatissimum inter omnia monasterium appellem, quam longa de encomiis contexi potest oratio quoniam geminos in te continens soles divinis sane thesauris opulentum enitescis.' It is obvious from the whole tenor of the Life that the author is living in the same monastery in which S. Philaretus and Elias had lived, i.e. the one which the Life of Elias calls Aulinae; and this *encomium* shows that already S. Philaretus had been placed on a level with Elias. We should therefore naturally expect to find that S. Philaretus soon came into the title of the monastery. Now in 1329 we find in the *Cartularium* of the monastery of S. Salvator of Messina (Cod. Vat. Lat. 8201) a reference to the monastery of SS. Elias and Philaretus, in the following document:—

'Anno 1329 3 Octobris XII indictionis apud monasterium Sancti Eliae et Philareti pertinentiarum (?) terrae Seminariae

<sup>1</sup> A. SS. Aug. iii p. 507 D.

<sup>2</sup> A. SS. Apr. i p. 618 D.



Joannis Papae XXII anno XIV F. Neophitus humilis abbas dicti monasterii propter gravem infirmitatem et longam, et propter senectutem nimiam impotens ad dictam curam exercendam renunciat dictum abbatium apud Reverendum in Christo Patrem et Dominum Dom Niphum Archimandritam Maioris Monasterii S. Salvatoris de Lingua Fari Messanae, et ob ejus absentiam in manu venerabilis F. Neophiti Abbatis S. Pancratii de Scilla generalis procuratoris et oeconomi dicti Archimandritae.<sup>1</sup> Either this is a reference to the old monastery on Aulinas, or to a colony of it. I see no reason for thinking that it must be the latter, and regard the document as a sign that the monastery was one of those in Calabria which in the great Norman reorganization were placed under the monastery of S. Salvatore.

Another hundred and fifty years elapse before we find any further reference to the monastery of SS. Elias and Philaretus.

It appears in the *Liber Taxarum* of 1482, preserved in Vat. Lat. 9289, and printed by Mgr. Batiffol<sup>2</sup>, as paying to the *Camera Apostolica* a yearly tribute of seventy florins. This shows that it was still maintaining a fair position among the smaller monasteries, though of course it could not compare with the great foundation of S. Maria of Grotta Ferrata, which paid 900 florins<sup>3</sup>; but like all the Basilian monasteries it was falling upon evil days, and when in 1551 it was visited by Marcellus Terracina he only found five monks<sup>4</sup>. The last record of all speaks for itself: it is a bill sent in by Giovanni Santamura<sup>5</sup>, a scribe of Cyprus, for making manuscripts for the use of the church. When monks have so far sunk as to employ a secular scribe to write their manuscripts, they can scarcely claim our sympathy in their decadence and speedy extinction.

In this short account of the few traces which seem to remain of the monastery which Elias Junior founded on Mount Aulinas, I have assumed that the identification with the monastery of SS. Elias and Philaretus is correct. If so it may be noted that it enables us to fix its exact situation, as Terracina says<sup>6</sup> that it

<sup>1</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 109 f. Cf. Montfaucon, *Pal. Gr.* p. 112, and Cod. Paris. Lat. 13,081, fol. 1-6.

<sup>4</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 124. There are several MSS by this scribe in Paris and Rome. Possibly this bill may help to trace their history.

<sup>5</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 110.

is two miles from Seminara, and I believe that ruins are still to be found on that spot. If, however, the identification be not correct, we must suppose with Minasi that at some period after the death of Philaretus the monks left Aulinae and went to the new monastery. He thinks that the original monastery was nearer to Palmi. I fail to see that any passages in the lives of Elias or Philaretus necessarily imply the one situation rather than the other, and the mere presence of a few stones on the Palmi site proves little. The point must be left open, but it could probably be solved if some scholar would pay a visit to the neighbourhood and examine all the ruins which he can find on both sites.

(iii) *Armo*. The Armo of to-day is a little village, about nine miles from Reggio and less than three from an old castle called S. Agatha, and Elias and Arsenius about 886 took up their abode near a church called S. Eustrazius, close to Armo<sup>1</sup>. I do not see any reason for thinking that this was then a monastery; but there seems to have been one (either here or in the immediate neighbourhood) a little later, when Elias had gone to Melicuccà, as we are told that a certain monk named Luke<sup>2</sup> was sent by Elias to the monastery near the castle of S. Agatha. I should conjecture that the stream of monks which begins to become noticeable in the time of Elias Junior, and drove him to leave Salinae in order to lead a quieter life, had taken possession of the old hermitage of Elias and Arsenius, and turned it into a monastery.

Minasi<sup>3</sup> suggests that this may have been replaced at a later time by the monastery in that locality of S. Maria Trapezomata, which was built by Count Roger of Sicily.

(iv) *Melicuccà*. Melicuccà is the great monastery founded in a cave by Elias Spelaeotes. It illustrates the gradual development of monastic life from a collection of hermits living near each other, and joining in a common worship, to a true coenobium; and the record is specially valuable as it is no doubt typical of what happened elsewhere, although we have not always documentary evidence of the change.

In 888 Elias went from his hermitage at Armo, near Reggio,

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 854 F.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 867 a.

<sup>3</sup> *Lo Spelaeota*, p. 168.



to Patras<sup>1</sup>, probably going with Elias Junior and Daniel, and certainly with the old hermit Arsenius, whom he had joined. At Patras he stayed eight years, and then Arsenius and he returned<sup>2</sup> to Armo. Arsenius died about 900-2, and after the death of Elias Junior, Elias Spelaeotes went to live for a short time with Daniel at Salinae. He did not stay here long, but retired with two other monks, Cosmas and Vitalis, to a cave<sup>3</sup> in the 'Mesobian' mountains, at Melicuccà. There is no difficulty about identifying the situation of this monastery, as the tradition is firm and the ruins are indisputable. It is about three miles to the east of Seminara, and therefore not far from the monastery of Elias Junior on Mount Aulinae. Cosmas and Vitalis did not stay long with Elias, as they wished for a more secluded life and were disturbed by the number of monks who came to live near Elias and formed a Laura. After a time Elias found the original cave was too small, and the monks moved to a larger cave in the immediate neighbourhood. This was improved by the addition of a window, and it was dedicated to S. Peter and S. Paul.

This monastery at Melicuccà remained under the rule of Elias until his death, and seems to have been the training-school for all the most celebrated monks of the district. It produced Lucas of Armento, or Demena<sup>4</sup>, the founder of the Basilian monasteries in the Basilicata; and probably Fantinus, Zacharias, and John of the Mercury monasteries, which will be dealt with later.

There were periods when the monastery, in common with the rest of the district, was threatened by the Saracens, and the monks usually scattered for a time; and in one of these periods Lucas went to the Basilicata, and Fantinus to Salonica. It is a curious fact, which I am unable to explain, that there is no mention of Elias Spelaeotes in the Life of Nilus, who was living in the cave of S. Michael, in the neighbourhood, from about 940-50.

The subsequent history of Melicuccà is doubtful. Minasi<sup>5</sup> repeats a story, which he was told by a priest at Melicuccà, that the Byzantine emperors endowed it. It is said that there are documents (? at Melicuccà) to support this, but they are not

<sup>1</sup> *A. SS.* Sept. iii p. 856 E.

<sup>2</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 860 F.

<sup>3</sup> *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 865 C.

<sup>4</sup> The meaning of Demena is uncertain. It is thought to be a locality in Sicily.

<sup>5</sup> *Lo Speleota*, p. 236.



published, and the story sounds suspiciously like an echo of the similar one about Aulinae in the Life of Elias Junior.

It is also said that Robert Guiscard in 1062 confirmed the privileges of this monastery; but here again the only evidence is Minasi's account of the statements of the priest of Melicuccà. Other than this I can find no trace of the monastery until its visitation in 1551 by Terracina<sup>1</sup>, who found living in it a solitary monk. This dilapidated and deserted condition accounts for its absence from the *Liber Taxarum* of 1482<sup>2</sup>.

(v) *The Monasteries of the Mercurion.* In the Life of S. Nilus mention is made of the monasteries of the Mercurion. This has been misunderstood, and taken to imply the existence of some monastery dedicated to S. Mercurius. It is, however, clear from the language of the Life that Mercurion is the name of a district, not of a monastery; for instance we find that he speaks of τὸ περὶ Μερκούριον μοναστήρια<sup>3</sup>, and again of τοὺς πατέρας ἐν τῷ Μερκουρίῳ<sup>4</sup>. Later on the writer speaks of at least two monasteries in this district, S. Fantinus<sup>5</sup> and S. John<sup>6</sup>, and perhaps a third, S. Zacharias<sup>6</sup>, should be added. So far as I have been able to find out, these monasteries never afterwards attained to any importance, but there are two mentioned in Terracina's visitation which must be the same foundations. They are near Seminara, and Terracina<sup>6</sup> says: 'Die 28 Aprilis decessimus a monasterio Sancti Heliae et Sancti Philareti et accessimus ad monasterium S. Johannis de Lauro et invenimus ecclesiam quasi speluncam latronum et sine cultu divino. . . Die predicto discessimus a monasterio S. Johannis de Loro et accessimus ad abbatiam S. Phantini de Seminaria ubi invenimus corpus S. Phantini, sed ecclesiam destructam a Mauris.' These sound as if they were the two monasteries mentioned in the Life of S. Nilus, and if so their history must have been the same as that of the neighbouring monastery of SS. Elias and Philaretus, for they appear in the list of Calabrian monasteries which were in the control of S. Salvator of Messina. Probably the *Cartularium* of S. Salvator (Cod. Vat. Lat. 8201) contains a document bearing on this point.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 110. (N.B. *pro* Willicona & Melicuccà).

<sup>2</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 107 f.

<sup>3</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 33.

<sup>5</sup> *P. G.* 120, pp. 24, 33, and *Cod. Crypt.* p. 62.

<sup>6</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 110.

It will be noticed that this account says nothing of the monastery of S. Zacharias. This silence is probably explained by a note in Cod. Crypt. B a iv<sup>1</sup>. 'Ἐτει 57 Ἰνδ. ἔ Λουκάς ἡγουμένος μονῆς τῆς λεγομένης τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς Ζαχαρίου εἰς τὸ Μερκούριον μηνὶ Νοεμβρίῳ εἰκάδι, νοσήσας χρόνον δεκαμήνιον, κεκοίμηται ἡμέρα σαββάτου καὶ κεχώμισται ἐν τῷ ναρθῆκι τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀγγέλου ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Βαλλελοκίῳ σὺν Βαρνάβῳ τῷ ἡγουμένῳ καὶ Νεοφύτῳ τῷ καλλιγράφῳ καὶ Θεογνώστῳ τῷ πολυμαθεὶ καὶ Ναυκρατίῳ, Ἀνδρέῳ καὶ Μαρκίανῳ . . . τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Ὁ λεχθεὶς καὶ τὴν βίβλου ἔγραφε ταύτην.

This notice suggests that in the great exodus of 950 the monastery of Zacharias was abandoned, and that Luke the abbot sooner or later joined Nilus.

If then we accept the two little monasteries of Johannes de Lauro and Fantinus as the representatives in later times of the monasteries of the Mercurion, the latter name must be explained as probably due to some memory of a temple of Mercury which used to exist on the hill near Seminara. There is evidence that this district was, and probably is, so called, as is shown by a quotation which Minasi<sup>2</sup> gives from the *Notizie storiche e topografiche intorno Metauria e Tauriana* (pp. 99-100). The important part of the reference is the following: 'Alla contrada *San Filippo*, la quale viene attraversata della strada tra Palmi e Gioia, fa continuazione verso sud est, l'altra, detta *Sidaro*, tutta declive scoscesa in più luoghi è limitata in basso da una vallata poco profonda, che la divide da un'altra contrada chiamata *san Mercurio*, la quale per buon tratto trovasi dal lato opposto fiancheggiata da un altro avvallamento,' etc.

It is difficult to follow this description, but it seems to point to the district north of Seminara.

(vi) *S. Nazarius*. When the governor of the province prevented the monks of the community on Mount Mercury from accepting Nilus as a monk, he was sent to the monastery of S. Nazarius, where he was received. Agresta and the Bollandists<sup>3</sup> say that this monastery is S. Philaretus (Aulinae). This is doubtful, for two reasons:—

(1) Nothing would have been gained by going to Aulinae, which was in the same district.

<sup>1</sup> Rocchi, *Codices Cryptenses*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *San Nilo*, p. 266.

<sup>3</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 24 D (quoting the notes of the Bollandists).



(2) Bartholomew says that on his journey Nilus had the sea on his left hand and the bushes on his right. But the Mercurius was north of Seminara, two miles from which is S. Philaretus, and therefore if Nilus were walking with the sea on his left hand he cannot have been going to S. Philaretus.

It is therefore more in accordance with the narrative to suppose that S. Nazarius was a monastery to the north of the Aspromonte and outside the Byzantine district. Assuming that these events took place about 940-5, it is difficult to say exactly how far north this would be, but it is probable that the Lombard rule extended down to the north of Calabria, or at all events that the effective Byzantine rule did not extend to the northern limit of Calabria.

On the other hand, I do not feel that these arguments are quite decisive. Agresta says that S. Philaretus was once called S. Nazarius. He gives no evidence, but he was in a far better position to know than is Minasi<sup>1</sup>, who rejects his statement as unfounded. If Agresta should prove to be correct, and no monastery of this name should be found in the north (at present none is known), I should be inclined to argue (1) that the difficulty about the road is not insurmountable, as all travellers know that the winding of a road in a mountainous district sometimes makes them go for a time almost in the exact opposite of their real direction; (2) that the argument about the Byzantine jurisdiction is based on an exaggeration both of the closeness with which the officials would or could watch the district of the Aspromonte, and of the law-abiding character of monks. After all, the situation was a simple and common one; Nilus had deserted his wife<sup>2</sup>, and wished to become a monk. The Byzantine law forbade this, and his wife seems to have invoked its help; a messenger<sup>3</sup> was sent to the monasteries on Mount Mercury and threatened the monks. The monks yielded, but Nilus went to another monastery, on the neighbouring hill, Mount Aulinae, which had not been warned. No doubt the government officials might have been more energetic and the monks more law-abiding, but the Aspromonte was a long way off, and unless Nilus's wife was very rich she could do nothing more.

<sup>1</sup> *San Nilo*, p. 286.

<sup>2</sup> *P. G.*, 120, p. 24 B.

<sup>3</sup> *P. G.*, 120, p. 21 B f.



The whole proceeding was illegal and unjustifiable, but it can hardly be said to be inexplicable.

There is another argument in favour of Agresta's view, though it is not to be pressed, in the fact that, so far as we have seen, there is very little evidence for thinking that the Basilian monasteries had spread beyond the Aspromonte in 940-5; and to suppose, as Minasi does, that there was a monastery of S. Nazarius in the north of Calabria is contrary to all the facts which we know about the spread of Basilian monasticism in South Italy.

Therefore, although admitting that the monastery on Mount Aulinae is not indicated by the narrative, I do not think that Minasi is right in summarily rejecting the statement of Agresta.

(vii) *S. Anastasia*. According to the Life of Nilus<sup>1</sup>, this nunnery was founded by Euprasios, the Imperial judge in the district, who had placed a monk named Antonius in charge of it. Antonius, on his deathbed, sent for Nilus and asked him to look after it. Nilus found it in a neglected state, and worked hard to reduce it to proper order. I can find no trace of its subsequent history, but Agresta<sup>2</sup> adds, 'hoggi appellato S. Biase di Valo o come altri vogliono S. Marco.'

(viii) *The Convent at Arenario*. Nilus is represented<sup>3</sup> as sending the mother and sister of his companion Stephen to a nunnery in the district called Arenarion. Agresta<sup>4</sup> identifies it with one near Rossano, once called S. Opoli, and in more recent times Varco del Rinacchio. Minasi<sup>5</sup> rejects this identification, on the ground that Nilus was, at the time referred to, still in the Mercurion. He thinks therefore that Arenarion means the country near the town Arena, about twenty miles north of the Mercurion. I do not feel convinced that Minasi is justified in this argument. It seems to me that this part of the Life of Nilus deserts the strict chronological order in order to bring together all the stories in which Stephen plays a part. The most convincing proof of this is the mention of Fantinus in the story of the broken saucepan, for we have been already told of Fantinus's departure (to Thessalonica). Minasi also thinks that the ignorance<sup>6</sup> which the writer expresses as to whether

<sup>1</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 85 B.

<sup>2</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 64 A.

<sup>3</sup> *S. Nilo*, p. 296.

<sup>4</sup> *Vita di S. Basilio*, p. 352.

<sup>5</sup> *Vita di S. Basilio*, p. 351 (? 352).

<sup>6</sup> *P. G.* 120, p. 64 A.

Theodora, the abbess at Arenarion, is the same as a Theodora who knew Nilus as a child, shows that the convent was not near Rossano in which Nilus passed his boyhood. I fail to understand this argument. Surely the whole point of the statement is that although circumstances would suggest that the Theodora of Nilus's childhood is the same as the Abbess Theodora, the writer has no certain knowledge on the subject. So far as it goes this seems to be an argument in favour of some monastery near Rossano, but it is not a point on which stress could be laid.

The situation of this convent is therefore doubtful. In any case there is nothing known of its further history. Agresta merely mentions that its ruins could be seen in his day, and it is not mentioned in the census list of the Rossano diocese of 1437<sup>1</sup>.

(ix) *S. Adrian of Rossano*. Nilus left the district of the Mercurion when the Saracens began to render it uninhabitable or dangerous, and retired north to his native district, Rossano. Probably there were no monasteries here at this time, but there was at some distance from the city a shrine of S. Adrian. Here Nilus, with Stephen and George as his companions, established himself. It appears from the account in his Life that, although Nilus was the most prominent figure and the real chief in this monastery, Proclus<sup>2</sup> was the titular abbot. They stayed at S. Adrian's until Nilus, fearing an attack by the Saracens (this was just after Kasem's invasion, and so probably about 976), decided to go further north, and departed to Monte Cassino.

The remaining history of S. Adrian is obscure. It appears from the census list<sup>3</sup> of the diocese of Rossano, which is bound up with a Graeco-Latin Psalter in Cod. Barberin. v 17, that in the fourteenth century it was the seat of an archimandrite, and paid three ounces of gold annually to the bishop of the diocese. But in the last years of the fifteenth century it suffered many misfortunes, owing to the grasping and cruel conduct of the monks towards the Albanians<sup>4</sup>, who, taking refuge from the Ottoman persecution in the dependent houses of S. George and 'della Macchia,' were treated by the officers of S. Adrian with extra-

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Barber. v 37, f. 8, printed in *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 117 f.

<sup>2</sup> p. 40. Extract from *A. SS.*

<sup>3</sup> *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 117 f.

<sup>4</sup> Rodota, *Il Rito Greco*, ii p. 193 ff.



ordinary severity. 'Finally,' says Rodota, 'per far respirare i sudditi dalle insoffribili oppressioni,' the Pope placed S. Adrian's in 'commenda.'

In 1743 Pope Benedict XIV restored to it its income, and gave it civil jurisdiction over the territory of S. Demetrius and the two houses of S. George and 'della Macchia,' on condition that it paid the abbot in 'commenda' 1500 scudi. This was ratified by the Bull of Sept. 22, 1743.

But before thirty years were past, the monks of S. Adrian's were again in trouble. They were convicted by Cardinal Giuseppe Spinella of trying to obtain by false pretences the control of the Benedictine house of S. Maria di Giosafat. The result, in Rodota's words<sup>1</sup>, was that: 'I Basiliani, combattuti per qualche tempo da contrarii affetti, agitati da diverse passioni, considerando l'incertezza dell' esito della lite, sono venuti all' amichevole e perpetua composizione di quelle ritenere con aumentare altri scudi 500 all' annuo precedente canone, che forma l'intera somma di scudi 2000, da pagarsi liberamente in Roma ai futuri commendatarii.'

This arrangement was ratified by the Bull of March 30, 1759, of Clement III. It is perhaps not without its bearing on this incident that probably Cardinal Spinelli was himself the commendatory who would receive this increased income, though Rodota's words are a little ambiguous on this point.

Minasi has so misread the story as to represent the whole matter as a triumph for the monks of S. Adrian's, who received both the abbey of S. Mary's and also an increased income of 2,000 ducats.

In 1794<sup>2</sup> the monastery was suppressed in order to supply funds for the Greek College in Rome.

(x) *Vallelucio*. This monastery was a dependency of Monte Cassino, in which Nilus and his friends stayed for some years. It cannot be reckoned as a Basilian monastery.

(xi) *Serperi*. After leaving Vallelucio, Nilus established himself at Serperi near Gaeta. He stayed here until he and the monks who were with him moved to Tusculum. Apparently it was not afterwards used as a monastery.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> Rodota, op. cit., p. 125.



(xii) *The Monastery at Noia*<sup>1</sup>, *S. Julian's of Armentum, Rapora*. Of these and the other monasteries mentioned in the Lives of Lucas and Vitalis I can find no trace at a later period. The whole monastic life of Greeks in the Basilicata seems to be gathered up in the history of the monastery of Elias of Carbo, and its dependencies, which will be dealt with later.

(xiii) *S. Mary's at Grotta Ferrata*. This convent does not come within the scope of this essay. Its history can be found in Dom Rocchi's books *La Badia di Grotta Ferrata* and *Di Coenobio Cryptoferratensi*.

This list of monasteries is not necessarily a complete record of all the monasteries which were founded during the early period. It is only intended to be an account of the foundations which are mentioned in the Lives of the local saints; there may have been others. At the same time, as I have already stated, the impression made on my own mind by reading these Lives is that there were not many others until a later date.

K. LAKE.

<sup>1</sup> Agresta mentions the existence of a monastery of S. Peter at Noia, but gives no details.

(To be continued.)

## THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION.

UNDER this title there appeared, in the January (1903) number of the *Y. T. S.*, a paper by the Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, which had for its main object to suggest that the purpose of the Transfiguration, viewed from the disciples' standpoint, was to manifest to them, as it were by anticipation, the post-resurrection appearance of our Lord, to the end that they might be able to recognize in the glorified Jesus the same Jesus whose disciples they had been: such recognition being, of course, essential to their ability to testify to the Resurrection.

In support of this thesis the author drew his readers' attention to—

1. The word used to denote the Transfiguration, *μετεμορφώθη*, a term that recalls St. Paul's *σήμερφος τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* of the resurrection bodies of believers.

2. The *δόξα* manifested at the Transfiguration, with its parallel in the *δόξα* ascribed by the apostolic age to the appearance of the risen life whether of Christ Himself or of His followers.

3. The charge not to speak of the Transfiguration until the Son of Man was risen from the dead.

The arguments here referred to are naturally presented with more persuasiveness than they possess when thus baldly summarized, but even as marshalled by Dr. Kennedy they appear too slender to be convincing. There are, moreover, considerations pertinent to the enquiry not touched upon in the article. I would therefore invite attention to these considerations (which seem to me inconsistent with his conclusions), and would also suggest another reading of the Transfiguration, regarded, as he regards it, from the point of view of its effect on the disciples. If we hold that the chosen three were permitted to



view the Transfiguration in order that they might, as witnesses of it, be in a position to recognize the risen Lord—we should expect to find, I will not say that the record of the post-resurrection manifestations actively bears out our theory, but at least that the record is passively consistent with it. But what are the facts? Our risen Lord's first appearance was to Mary Magdalene<sup>1</sup>, His second most probably to the company of women returning from the sepulchre<sup>2</sup>, and His third to the two on the way to Emmaus<sup>3</sup>. None of the persons were present at the Transfiguration, yet they recognized the Lord, and furthermore testified to others of His resurrection, and that in two of the cases as His chosen messengers. A witness of the Transfiguration comes on the scene at the fourth appearance, that to St. Peter<sup>4</sup>. But no stress is laid on this appearance; it is recorded merely in a report of some words of the apostles given by St. Luke, and is mentioned again by St. Paul<sup>5</sup>. Next comes an appearance to the eleven<sup>6</sup>. St. Luke's account of this would lead us to suppose that none of the eleven had any difficulty in recognizing Him: the only question in their minds was whether He were not now 'a spirit' and this was set at rest by the evidence of the wounds of the Passion (cf. Jo.), and by His taking food. The next appearance that is at all relevant in this connexion is that on the shore of the Lake<sup>7</sup>. On this occasion Peter and James and John were all present. 'Jesus stood on the shore, but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus.' He addressed them, but still He was not recognized, though the exchange of question and answer imply reasonably close proximity. It was when His words recalled a similar occasion in the old days that St. John knew Him: and not, I imagine, by any experience gained on Hermon, but, to quote Bishop Westcott, 'by a certain sympathy with Him.'

This examination of the record of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ seems severely to shake Dr. Kennedy's theory; it makes the object he would ascribe to the Transfiguration so to speak superfluous, for the record leads us to the conclusion that recognition of the risen Lord depended, like His appearances,

<sup>1</sup> Jo. xx 14 ff.; Mc. xvi 9.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. xxviii 9 f.

<sup>3</sup> Lc. xxiv 13 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Lc. xxiv 34.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. xv 5.

<sup>6</sup> Mc. xvi 14; Lc. xxiv 36 ff.; Jo. xx 19 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Jo. xxi 1 ff.



on His own pleasure: when He would He was seen<sup>1</sup>, and when He would He was known, and not otherwise.

Abandoning therefore the attempt to reach an explanation of the purpose of the Transfiguration on the lines indicated by Dr. Kennedy, I would invite attention to two considerations through which it seems possible to arrive at a conclusion, tentative indeed, because the evidence is somewhat scanty, but at the same time not open to objections similar to those which confront the theory I have been discussing.

I. The setting in which the Transfiguration is found seems of great importance to any attempt to interpret the meaning of the occurrence; for the setting is both well defined and possessed of marked characteristics. There is a distinct break in the narrative immediately before Mc. viii 27 (Mtt. xvi 13, Lc. ix 18), marked in the first two gospels by the mention in the verse immediately succeeding of a journey from Bethsaida to Caesarea Philippi. The section here begun ends with Mc. ix 50 (Mtt. xviii 35, Lc. ix 50). Let us set out its skeleton as contained in St. Mark.

Mc. viii 27 'Whom do men say that I am?'

St. Peter's confession.

31 He began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things. The overruling of St. Peter's remonstrance.

34 The 'hard sayings.' The kingdom of Heaven is not as this world: its crown means this world's cross.

ix 2 The Transfiguration.

11 The question about Elias, which gives occasion for a reference to His tribulations, and a further declaration of the sufferings that await the Son of Man.

14 The demoniac boy is healed<sup>2</sup>.

30 The journey through Galilee. The second prediction of the sufferings of the Son of Man.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Jo. xx 25 with *ibid.* 27.

<sup>2</sup> This miracle appears to stand in a chronological rather than in a logical relation to its context, unless, indeed, we regard it as a further revelation of His 'glory.'

Mc. ix 33 Capernaum. The question about the disputation by the way, and the declaration of true greatness, followed by an exposition of the standards of the kingdom (which are seen to be quite other than the standards of the world) together with the declaration that no obstacle, whatever the cost of its removal, must be allowed to bar the way to it.

The contents of this section, as given by the other synoptists, are substantially identical with St. Mark's narrative. St. Luke is more brief, and St. Matthew adds a considerable passage on the duty of forgiveness, but the variations are not important for our present purpose.

Reviewing the section we may say that it begins with our Lord's eliciting the disciples' conception of His Person. This conception, as expressed by St. Peter, was correct, and was therefore accepted. But though their central idea was accurate it was encrusted with false notions<sup>1</sup> as to His relation to the world and the world's relation to Him, and so He proceeded to correct these false notions by a declaration of the hardships, the trials, the sufferings that in this world awaited Him and His followers; He proceeded also further to extend this teaching by showing how different were His standards and His estimates from those of the world. The central arresting incident set in the record of all this is the Transfiguration.

II. There is a point in St. Luke's narrative of the event itself that deserves attention. He records the subject of the colloquy with Moses and Elias, *ελεγον τῷ ἐξοδῷ αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*. Dr. Rendel Harris in his *Memoranda Sacra* has dwelt upon the suggestiveness of the word which our version renders 'decease' and has pointed out how St. Peter in a passage<sup>2</sup> clearly reminiscent of the Transfiguration uses the same word of his own approaching death.

I would endeavour to interpret one side of the Transfiguration by considerations drawn from these two points and would suggest that one of its purposes was to teach the disciples both the reality and the true nature of the blessings they were to enter into through the power of the Lord. His kingdom in which they were to

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mc. viii 32 ff.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. i 13 ff.

share was not of this world ; to enter into it necessitated the revision of many estimates, the abandoning of many cherished standards, the surrender of much that appealed to the natural man, and the embracing of much that was repugnant to him. But yet it was a real kingdom. The cross would be followed by the crown. The setting of the Transfiguration taught the first : the Transfiguration itself assured them of the second. That the lesson was learnt by one at least of those who witnessed the transcendent scene, appears to be clearly shewn by the fact that at the close of his own life he speaks of his approaching departure by that term, at once alien from his former mind and instinct with associations of deliverance and liberty, that had been used on the Mount of the consummation of the Lord's Passion. St. Peter had learnt so to revise his estimates of things that he could now speak of Death, not as the dreaded enemy, but as the harbinger of exodus.

R. HOLMES.



## NOTES AND STUDIES

THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF  
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IN the course of the Rev. J. C. Lambert's comments in a late number<sup>1</sup> of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES on the Rev. G. H. Box's interesting theory as to the 'Jewish antecedents of the Eucharist,' he discusses the well-known discrepancy between the Lucan account of the Institution and that which is common to the other Synoptists in a manner that shows how unlikely it is that critics will be content for long that 'the whole passage should be treated as at least doubtful.' The longest and most detailed account of an occurrence can never be simply neglected, unless it is proved to be of entirely secondary authority; and in this case acquiescence in failure would be so serious as to throw doubt on the possibility of any satisfactory solution of the Synoptic problem. I need not apologize then for offering even on so well-discussed a question a theory which has not, so far as I can ascertain, been considered as to the relation of the constituent parts of the Lucan account to one another and to the other narratives of the Institution: in so complicated a question even a slight alteration of a previously attempted solution may at least suggest possibilities.

It is unnecessary to do more than indicate briefly the difficulties of St. Luke xxii 17-20, since they have been stated so fully by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Plummer in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. If we adopt with Westcott and Hort the 'Western' reading of this passage, we not only reduce the special parallelism with 1 Cor. xi 23-5 to a single word, but are left still with the inexplicable variation in the order of the Bread and the Cup, which discredits either St. Luke's version or that of St. Paul and the Synoptists. Nor is it clear that the shorter version is to be preferred on the *a priori* ground that the temptation is usually rather to expand than to contract a narrative; for the expansion in this case only introduces fresh confusion. If the longer reading of the Textus Receptus is retained we have to explain *either* the erroneous connexion of certain phrases with the Tradition of the first cup *or else* the double mention of the same cup; in either case it is possible that the impression, to say the least of it, that Eucharistic language is used of the first cup, may have

<sup>1</sup> *J. T. S.* vol. iv pp. 184 ff.

led to the 'Western' omission of the second. But in my opinion the presence in St. Luke's account of additional details so striking as the words recorded in xxii 15, 16 and 21 calls even more urgently for a complete explanation, since it is difficult to think that mere details arose simply from an independent source similar to those used by St. Luke for his independent sections, unless that source was something quite distinct from the tradition common to the Synoptists, while the details in question certainly have not the character of literary additions or inventions by the author of the Gospel himself<sup>1</sup>.

I venture then to propound my hypothesis that the whole section, Luke xxii 14-23, is not the Synoptic tradition with additional details perhaps affected by St. Paul's version, but a deliberate, though intentionally incomplete, conflation of two distinct, independent, and perhaps equally original narratives of the Institution. Postponing for the moment the question of the remarkable differences between the evidently allied versions of St. Paul and the Synoptists, I shall set out at length the verses which I suppose to belong to the specially Lucan narrative, which may be called L, and then those belonging to the common narrative which I will call S, distinguishing the two forms which it assumes as S<sup>P</sup> (for St. Paul and St. Luke) and S<sup>M</sup> (for St. Mark and St. Matthew). I use the Revisers' Greek Testament, as Westcott and Hort are committed to one side on an important point in the case.

To L I should attribute St. Luke xxii 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21.

καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῃ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. πλὴν ἰδοὺ, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

With St. Mark xiv 25.

ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκέτι μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πῖω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

And St. Matthew xxvi 29.

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πῖω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

To S would remain the points which are more or less common to St. Paul and the Synoptists, which may be subdivided as follows:—

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Frankland (*The Early Eucharist*, pp. 46-7 and App. A) has recently applied the 'two autograph' theory of St. Luke's Gospel to the latter part of this narrative; but his reconstruction by inclusion of all the details of his 'six accounts' seems to me highly uncritical.

S<sup>p</sup>

St. Luke xxii 19, 20.

καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδομένον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

I Cor. xi 24, 25.

ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ εἶπε, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὅσας ἂν πίνετε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

and S<sup>m</sup>

St. Mark xiv 22, 23, 24.

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλόγησας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, Λάβετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

St. Matthew xxvi 26, 27, 28.

ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλόγησας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπε, Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

The next step is to attempt a restoration, necessarily very rough and conjectural, of the two independent narratives L and S, premising that, if St. Luke's account is really a conflation, the author would omit phrases which were identical or very similar, even if he thereby to some extent confused the two versions, though he did not intend to render them altogether indistinguishable.

The first narrative, which I call L<sub>1</sub>, would be something like this:—

καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ [λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλόγησας] εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῶν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῶν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νέου [ἐκ] τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. πλὴν ἰδοὺ, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

In this reconstruction I have preferred the briefer form of the words which follow the Tradition of the Cup because St. Luke would hardly have cut down the striking phrase, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πῖω [μεθ' ὑμῶν] καινόν, unless he had some authority for so doing, while St. Mark and St. Matthew do not agree as to the exact wording of what I suppose to be an attempt to expand the meaning of ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου in a mystical sense; on the other hand I have preferred their ἐκ τοῦ



St. Luke's ἀπό because the latter may have come from the preceding ἀπό τοῦ νῦν.

The second narrative is more difficult to reconstruct, owing to the differences between S<sup>p</sup> and S<sup>m</sup>; but may have run originally somewhat as follows:—

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυρόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

As this may seem merely an arbitrary conflation of the two parallel versions, I will explain that it proceeds on the idea that St. Paul's, though the earliest account in point of time, is freer in point of statement, especially in the phrases ὡσαύτως, ὡσάκις ἂν πίνητε, and μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, and that in these points he has *directly* affected St. Luke, though the latter by retaining τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον and τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυρόμενον shows that he was not entirely dependent on St. Paul. I have followed S<sup>p</sup> on the other hand rather than S<sup>m</sup> in the important difference ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, because that phrase could hardly be considered a legitimate development from τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης, while the latter may have been produced from the former, partly by the influence of the Old Testament, partly by assimilation to τὸ σῶμά μου, and partly by an unconscious desire to find a more accurate construction for τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυρόμενον. This implies that S<sup>m</sup> is a later version than S<sup>p</sup> of S, and has been perhaps affected by liturgical formulae in λάβετε or λάβετε, φάγετε, and Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. The differences between St. Mark and St. Matthew are normal, and the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν can hardly be anything but a gloss due to the latter author. The differences between St. Paul and St. Luke are not greater than would be expected between a writer who is quoting from memory in the course of an argument and one who has both the original document and his friend's quotation before him or within his recollection.

The parallel verses Mark xiv 25 and Matthew xxvi 29 raise a more difficult question; but the phrases they contain seem so much more coherent with the rest of L than with the end of S, that I incline to regard them as an accretion from the one account on to the other in the latest stage of the development of the Synoptic narrative before it took literary form at all.

On these lines it would not be very difficult to answer the next question that arises, namely, in what manner the four extant accounts are derived from the original narratives L and S. No doubt this problem would be simplified if one adopted the 'Western' text in St. Luke; but on the

whole I think it more likely that the 'Western' text itself is due to the desire to simplify. Subject then to what has been said about the difficulty of reconstructing S out of S<sup>p</sup> and S<sup>m</sup>, and about the fragment of L which is appended to S<sup>m</sup>, we may characterize the four accounts as follows:—

(1) St. Paul's version is the oldest in its present form and also the simplest. It appears to be a slightly condensed form of S, as quoted from memory; and S may have been in St. Paul's time not a document at all but an oral narrative incorporated in an inchoate liturgy.

(2) St. Mark gives S from a document, after it has absorbed a fragment of L probably from oral tradition, and after it has been affected by the liturgical formulæ of the Eucharist.

(3) St. Matthew, as usual in plain narrative, uses St. Mark or his documentary authority with considerable freedom.

(4) St. Luke must have been acquainted with both L and S. It is probable that he used both St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Gospel of St. Mark. But, unless he simply invented, he must also in the course of his researches have come across the other narrative which I have called L, and considered it of such importance that he conflated it and the current version with a minimum of alteration, viz. the omission of words actually common to both and the retention in its proper place only of the sentence about the fruit of the vine which had strayed (in disguise) from L into S. He preserved both the phrases about the Tradition of the Cup because they were different; he omitted the phrase about the Breaking of the Bread because it was the same, though it is difficult to see why he made the omission in the first rather than in the second part of his compound narrative.

But however closely this working hypothesis might account for the phenomena of the four existing versions, it would be useless and worthless if the two narratives, supposed to be the original constituents of them, were not in themselves plausible. It is therefore necessary to consider carefully the various possibilities as to the origin and relation of L and S.

(1) That they should be different halves of the same original account of the same stage in the Last Supper is in the highest degree improbable, since, though it is no doubt possible to fit them into one another in various ways<sup>1</sup>, of which perhaps the best would be to place the words in L accompanying the Bread and the Cup in either case before the words of tradition in S, the various versions as they stand would almost inevitably show distinct traces of having been formed by separation. And it would be even more difficult to account for St. Luke's transpositions than for the Synoptists' omissions, if there was an original

<sup>1</sup> For instance, as in the Prayer of Consecration.



narrative containing all the points. But they may be (2) different accounts of the same stage of the Last Supper, or (3) accounts of different stages of it, or (4) traditions of unequal value, at any rate as to the words which accompanied our Lord's acts in the Institution of the Eucharist.

(2) The simplest hypothesis as to two different versions of the same events is that one of them, probably S as apparently more generally current, contains St. Peter's recollections of our Lord's language, while the other (L) represents those of another disciple, possibly St. John, especially if the phrases about the kingdom of God and the fruit of the vine can be taken as the speaker's thoughts uttered out loud, rather than as His explicit directions to the whole table. It may be remarked that the phrases of L, if they really refer, as I am supposing, to the Institution itself, resemble St. John's Eucharistic discourses in being indirect and inferential; it is perhaps accidental that a Hebraism similar to that of Luke xxii 15 occurs in John iii 29, and in close connexion with the word *πενήρηται*. There is no inherent improbability in supposing that even at so solemn a moment witnesses might differ as to their memory of the actual phrases; and that the attention of one disciple might be arrested by the mysterious promises or prophecies, while the more practical mind might be observing the symbolical actions and the words more distinctly referring to them.

(3) But it is probably more natural to interpret the two narratives as referring to different, though perhaps not widely separated, stages of the same incident, which may or may not have been originally included in the same narrative. In the accounts of the Last Supper, even in St. John's Gospel, we read in a few minutes all that is recorded of the proceedings which occupied some hours, and we cannot suppose that we have every word and act recorded and correctly spaced. It is possible that the vaguer phrases of L represent the *εὐλογία* and *εὐχαριστία* by which the acts of Institution were prefaced. It is perhaps more tempting to conjecture that as the bread and the cup, delivered with this antithetic and almost poetical language circulated among the Twelve, some questioning word or glance elicited an explanation of the acted and spoken symbolism in terms which did not differ materially from the phrases of S. These, as more distinctly impressive and more easily remembered, would inevitably tend to supplant the original sentences, especially if at an early period they were seen to be available for liturgical purposes. If then S could be regarded as an authentic and immediate exposition of L in the words in which they differ, this would explain not only its superior prevalence but the manner in which it is treated by St. Luke, when he brings it into juxtaposition with L, without actually obliterating the distinction between the two. I do not say that



there is any evidence for such a supposition; but it is at least in our Lord's manner to explain without much delay His acted as well as His spoken parables or allegories.

(4) If, however, the supposition which I consider the most plausible, viz. that L and S are independent traditions of different stages of the same scene, were held to be too complex, it would no doubt be necessary to pronounce one account superior in authenticity and antiquity to the other. In that case I should not hesitate to assign priority to L over S. It may sound paradoxical to prefer the later to the earlier writer; but this is not unfrequently done where there is reason to believe that our author is intentionally, even if tacitly, correcting a predecessor, as is apparently the case in many of the differences between St. John and the Synoptic tradition. If we bear in mind how rarely we are able to consider any historical utterances as actually *verbatim* reports of the language used, we might even regard both narratives as attempts to recall the same acts and words. But I think we should consider that the phraseology of L, with its Hebraisms, its parallelism, and its indirectnesses, is the more likely to be correct in substance. If the disciples bore in mind, I will not say the language of the longer Eucharistic discourses about the True Bread, the Bread from Heaven, the Bread of Life, but merely the phrases which their Master had just used of Himself as the True Vine, they would surely have paraphrased the words of L in some such form as S; but on the other hand we can see nothing in S which could naturally suggest so intangible an interpretation of its language as L. Even if S were not original, then, it might be what I may call a justifiable gloss upon L. The command to take the bread and all drink of the cup are not more expressive than the acts of delivery; or at any rate St. Mark did not think so. The explanation of the elements as the body given and the blood shed on behalf of the disciples for the initial step in the establishment of a new and Christian Covenant, is implicit in the ideas of eating this last and first passover and of drinking the fruit of the vine next in the completed kingdom of God. There may have been liturgical formulae which influenced the earliest stages of that account which we know primarily from St. Paul; but the extent to which St. Paul himself would have been prepared to infer it as a practical restatement of the words of Institution as supposed to be given in L may be estimated from his own comment on the meaning of the rite itself—*ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πάντες, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ* (1 Cor. xi 26).

It will be observed that this theory, if accepted, would fall in with the view, which I believe to be the only one consistent with the statements of the Gospels taken as a whole, that the Last Supper was an anticipated Passover, and that the Lord's Supper is a dematerialized perpetuation

of the Paschal 'sacrament.' I propound it, however, simply as a solution of the notorious difficulties of the Lucan narrative, and on the chance that the consideration of it by more learned critics may suggest some corroboration from the stores of textual and patristic evidence which are now applied so successfully to the elucidation of our documents.

HERBERT E. D. BLAKISTON.

### ON THE EARLY TEXTS OF THE ROMAN CANON.

It is proposed in this paper<sup>1</sup> to examine the various readings of the early texts of the Roman Canon as contained in the mass-books from the seventh to the ninth century, with a view to ascertain how they may fall into classes or families; and to indicate briefly some of the questions which the results of the comparison raise.

The texts to be considered are those in the following books: (1) the Bobbio Missal, Paris B. N. lat. 13,246, Delisle *Mémoire*, No. vi (cited as *B<sup>o</sup>*). (2) The Stowe Missal, now in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy (*St*)<sup>2</sup>. (3) The Missale Francorum, MS Vat. Regin. 257, Delisle No. iv (*F<sup>r</sup>*). (4) The *Gelasianum*, MS Vat. Regin. 316, Delisle No. ii (*G<sup>V</sup>*). (5) Rheinau MS 30 at Zurich, Wilson's R, Delisle No. ix (*R*). (6) St. Gall MS 348, Wilson's S, Delisle No. x (*S*). (7) The Angoulême Sacramentary, Paris B. N. lat. 816, Delisle No. xv (*Ang*). (8) The Gellone Sacramentary, Paris B. N. lat. 12,048, Delisle No. vii (*Gell*). (9) Paris B. N. lat. 2296, a MS which, though of late date and widely departing from its congeners, must be classed with the MSS of the eighth-century revision of *Gelas*; Delisle No. xlv (2296). (10) Cambrai MS 164, see *supra*, pp. 413-6 (*Ca*). (11) MS Vat. Regin. 337 (*Reg*). (12) MS Vat. Ottobon. 313, Delisle No. xxxv (*Ott*).

Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 have been examined by me. Thanks to the extreme kindness of M. Omont, Conservateur of the Department of MSS at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and of M. de la Roncière, Conservateur adjoint, a friend was able to take for me at once photographs of 1 and 8. The readings of 4, 5, 6 are taken from Wilson's edition of the *Gelasianum*, iii 16 and appended notes. For 2 I follow the edition of Dr. McCarthy (*Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, Literature and Antiquities*, xxvii 208-19, 220), which among other advantages has that of distinguishing by difference of type the original text from that of the interpolator Moelcaich; Dr. McCarthy has also recovered a not

<sup>1</sup> The following addition should be made in the previous article at p. 418 l. 2: In like manner, to the third Sunday of Lent is added (c. 39, note u) a 'super populum' which in both MSS is that of the Thursday following. Also: p. 417, l. 22, for '240' read '241.'

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately in his account of the Fulda MS (see *Book of Cerne*, pp. 235-6) Witzel gives only those portions of the Canon that were strange to him.



inconsiderable portion of the erased original at a critical point (p. 270, footnote on f. 24<sup>a</sup>)<sup>1</sup>. For 3 I use Tommasi's own edition (1680), but Dr. Mercati has kindly re-examined the MS for some minutiae as to which I desired further security. Besides this, all the editions of the various missals, Mabillon, Vezzosi, Warren, &c., have been always under my eye. I refrain from entering on questions as to the dates of the various MSS; the object of this paper is to inquire what the texts themselves have to say as to their own history; for dates of MSS Delisle can be referred to. The current spelling is (except on one or two occasions) used in the Table, and variants merely orthographical are as a rule disregarded. But here discrimination is necessary; incorrect forms sometimes supply precisely the most valuable indications of the interrelations of the MSS. But both for clearness and eventual sureness in conclusions division of labour is best observed, and the part of the palaeographer or the philologist best reserved for the expert; in saying this I have particularly in view *Bo*<sup>2</sup>. So far as the MSS of *Greg* are concerned I have thought it better not to complicate a case perhaps already sufficiently involved by adducing readings from any other MSS than *Ca*, *Reg*, *Ott*; the first of these recommends itself by its date whilst *Reg* and *Ott* represent (so far as I have seen, and speaking generally) the extreme of conservatism and the extreme of innovation in their respective renderings of the *Greg* Canon. The Ambrosian Canon is not brought into the comparison, as this would only entail unnecessary and unprofitable elaboration. It affords, however, a small number of particularly interesting readings, and these will be adduced in their place<sup>3</sup>; but that Canon as a whole can be usefully dealt with, I venture to think, only as part of a formal and systematic analysis of the Ambrosian mass-book.

The only other texts to be mentioned are MS O 83 of the Prague Chapter Library, and MS B 8 of the Vallicellana which seems for the present at least inaccessible (Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, p. 205, n. 1). But as the latter according to Tommasi (ed. Vezz. v, p. xxxv, 2nd pagination) was 'undecimo ut serius, decimo ut citius scriptum,' it is not likely to be of use for the present purpose. The former, according to Ebner (pp. 379-80, 366, 368 note 1) is a MS of the eighth-century recension of *Gelas*. When the evidence of the MSS of this class is reviewed, it

<sup>1</sup> By some mischance the words 'pro spe salutis et incolumitatis suae' have fallen out of the reconstruction in *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie* (1892) p. 481 l. 10 after 'suarum.'

<sup>2</sup> But I may observe that *Bo* substitutes 'o' for 'u' more commonly than usual; e.g. writing not merely 'incolumitatis,' 'inmacolatam,' but 'eonctae,' 'in conspecto,' 'sereno vultu,' 'seo' (= seu).

<sup>3</sup> For the Biasca MS Ceriani's print is used; for the Bergamo MS that of Solesmes. Both MSS appear to be saec. ix/x.



will I think plainly appear that the absence of the collation of a single MS of the group is not likely to affect in any appreciable degree the results obtained. There remains the Monte Cassino palimpsest, the only hope left, apparently, of a text of the Canon of an earlier type than any which has appeared in print. Of its character I know nothing; but it will in any case be useful to take stock of what can be known on the subject before that MS is edited<sup>1</sup>.

On a collation of the twelve texts available (*a*) it is found that a certain number of readings are unique; several of these are mere and obvious blunders of the scribe; a few are of interest in themselves; not one, I think, is likely to prove of any real value for the history of the Canon. (*b*) When these unique readings are removed, and that late work, the saec. viii *Gelas*, is left out of account, the readings of the other MSS on being tabulated fall into two classes or families, the one represented by *Bo*<sup>2</sup>, *St*, *Fr*, the other by *GV*, *Ca*, *Reg*, *Ott*. (*c*) It then appears that the readings of the group of saec. viii *Gelas* MSS (viz. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9) follow on the whole (as might be expected) the second of these two classes, but many readings of the other class are found sometimes in one, sometimes in more than one, MS of the group.

The kernel of the present inquiry manifestly lies in the readings contemplated under (*b*); those under (*a*) and (*c*) being of altogether secondary consideration. I propose therefore to throw into a Table the readings contemplated under (*b*); to relegate to the foot of the page those under (*c*) in so far as they differ from *GV*; and to collect the unique readings in a note at the end of the paper. After a few remarks on the results of the collation as shown by the Table, it will be necessary to consider particularly the small number of variants between *Reg* and *Ott* with a view to determine which gives the purer tradition. One of these variants is of sufficient importance to call for special treatment. From Muratori's print (col. 4) it would appear as if the Memento of the dead were contained in both MSS. This is not the case. After 'replemur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum,' *Reg*, omitting entirely the Memento, passes directly on to 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus.' Moreover *Ca* agrees in this point with *Reg*. As is well known *GV* presents the same feature. All the texts of the Memento of the dead will therefore be excluded from the following Table<sup>3</sup>, and a consideration of the question will form the closing section of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> In *Leon* the Canon is wanting.

<sup>2</sup> I place *Bo* first throughout because it is the oldest MS.

<sup>3</sup> I have also taken no notice of the names added to the recitals in the 'Communicantes' in the different MSS (Hilary, Martin, &c.) and in the 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus' (*Ang* adds, after 'Anastasia,' 'genouefa, scolastica'; the Canon of 2296 breaks off, imperfect, with the word 'Barnaba'). The crosses are best dealt with independently and after the texts; this question is therefore not touched on.

<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>Fr</i>
1. acceptum habebas <sup>1</sup>	accepta <sup>1</sup> habebas	acceptu(m?) <sup>2</sup> habebas
2. pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica	pro tua sancta ecclesia catholica	= <i>St</i> .
3. una cum devotissimo famulo tuo . . . <sup>3</sup> papa nostro . . . sedis apostolicae et antistite nostro et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae . . . fidei cultoribus	u. c. beatissimo f. t. N. p. n. episcopo s. a. [e. o. o. a. . . apostolicae f.] <sup>4</sup> c. [et abbate nostro N. episcopo] <sup>5</sup>	u. c. o. o. a. . . apostolicae f. c.
4. tibi reddunt	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
5. Communicantes [two variables inserted <sup>7</sup> ] sed et memoriam	= <i>Bo</i> <sup>7</sup>	C. s. e.
6. imprimis gloriosae semper . . . virginis	= <i>Bo</i>	m. = <i>Bo</i>
7. Petri Pauli	Petri et Pauli	= <i>Bo</i>
8. Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae quam tibi offerimus in honorem . . . . .	H. i. o. s. n. s. e. c. f. t. q. t. o. i. honorem Domini nostri J. C. et in commemorationem beatorum martyrum tuorum in hac ecclesia quam famulus tuus ad honorem nominis gloriae tuae edificavit,	H. i. o. s. n. s. e. c. f. t. q. t. o. i. honore Domini . . . . . beati martyris tui illi et pro peccatis atque offensionibus nostris ut omnium delictorum nostrorum remissionem consequi mereamur <sup>8</sup> .
. . . . . nominis tui Deus, . . . . .		q. D. u.
quaesumus Domine ut	q. D. u.	

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*<sup>9</sup>.

On No. 3: (a) 'beatissimo' and 'nostro' interlined by another hand *Ang*; (b) 'episcopo' omitted *R, S, Gell*; 'et antistite illo' (with 'nostro' interlined by another hand *Ang*); (c) *R, S, Ang, 2296* omit 'et omnibus . . . cultoribus'; *Gell* and corrector of *S* as *St* ('et . . . cultoribus').

On No. 6: 'semper' *S, Gell*; 'que' erased in *Ang, 2296*.

On No. 7: 'Petri Pauli' *R, S, Ang, Gell, 2296*.

<sup>1</sup> 'acceptum abeas' *Bo*. Is it certain that the original script of *St* recovered by Dr. M<sup>c</sup>Carthy, p. 210 footnote to fol. 24<sup>a</sup>, had accepta? Cf. No. 25 where *St* reads twice 'acceptu.'

<sup>2</sup> "acceptu" clarissime; sed "ha" (ad calcem lineae) videtur scriptum in rasura; porro littera abrasa quantum video "m" est. So Dr. Mercati.

<sup>3</sup> i. e. the same reading as in *Bo*, but for clearer apprehension of the Table has seemed best to refer *Ca, Reg, Ott, to GV*, instead of these four texts to *Bo*.

<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>
1. accepta habeas	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
2. pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica <sup>a</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
3. una cum famulo tuo . . . papa nostro illo	u. c. beatissimo f. t. . . p. n. i.	= <i>Ca</i>	u. c. f. t. p. n. i.
et antistite nostro illo episcopo <sup>b</sup>			e. a. n. i. e. o. o. a. catholicae et apostolicae f. c.
4. tibi reddunt	= <i>GV</i>	tibique reddunt	= <i>Reg</i>
5. Communicantes . . . . . . . . . et memoriam	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
6. imprimis gloriosae semperque virginis	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
7. Petri et Pauli	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
8. Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
quaesumus Domine ut			

<sup>a</sup> A space of three letters in which 'ill' is written by another hand.

<sup>b</sup> The words in brackets are restorations taken from the text of the interpolator Moelcaich.

<sup>c</sup> 'Et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholici fide cultoribus' interlined in Tironian notes.

<sup>d</sup> See McCarthy, p. 211 note b on fol. 24<sup>b</sup>; the variable for Christmas is that of *Gelas* I 4 not that of *Greg* col. 8.

<sup>e</sup> This text 'pro peccatis . . . mereamur' is utilized for the 'Hanc igitur' of the 'Missa pro peccatis' in the Carolingian Supplement to *Greg*, Muratori II 200. It is evident that the three formulae of the 'Hanc igitur' in *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* are closely related; indeed the text of *Fr* becomes intelligible only when brought into juxtaposition with *St*. The form 'Hanc igitur . . . quam offerimus in honorem,' &c. does not occur in *Leon* or *Greg*; and but once in *Gelas*, viz. III 95, one of the collection of masses for the dead of *Gelas*, as to the late and non-Roman origin of which see *Book of Cerne*, pp. 269-72; and III 95 happens to be one of the masses that incorporate part of a prayer of a mass for the dead in the Toledo missal



<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>Fr</i>
9. ut placatus accipias [‘ac’elided; ‘sus’ added in marg. by another hand] <sup>11</sup>	<sup>11</sup> u. p. suscipias <sup>28</sup>	= <i>St</i>
10. ab aeterna damnatione nos eripe (?=eripi)	a. a. d. n. eripias	= <i>St</i>
11. Quam oblationem te <sup>13</sup> Deus	= <i>Bo</i>	Q. o. tu D.
12. facere digneris quae nobis corpus et sanguis fiat <sup>14</sup>	f. dignareque <sup>14</sup> (=quae) n. c. e. s. f.	f. dignare quae n. c. e. s. f.
13. dilectissimi Filii tui Domini autem <sup>15</sup> Dei nostri	d. F. t. Domini ni . . . nostri	= <i>Bo</i>
14. accepit <sup>16</sup> panem	accipit <sup>29</sup> p.	= <i>St</i>
15. elevatis <sup>17</sup> oculis [‘suis’ interlined by another hand]	e. o. suis	= <i>St</i>
16. in caelos <sup>18</sup>	ad caelum	= <i>St</i>
17. . . . gratias agens benedixit	tibi g. egit b.	= <i>St</i>
18. accepit <sup>19</sup> et hunc praeclarum calicem	accipit <sup>19</sup> e. h. p. c.	= <i>St</i>
19. ex eo omnes	e. hoc <sup>20</sup> o.	= <i>St</i>
20. calix sancti sanguinis mei	= <i>Bo</i>	calix . . . sanguinis mei
21. in remissione	in remissionem	= <i>St</i>
22. in mei memoriam ‘faci[ae]tes’ <sup>21</sup>	i. m. m. faciatis	i. m. m. facietis <sup>22</sup>
23. Christi Filii tui Domini . . . nostri	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*.

On No. 10: ‘eripias’ *R*, *S* (?); ‘eripi’ *Ang* but the second ‘i’ on erasure; ‘eripe’ *Gell* and *Sacr. Godelgaudi* (Ménard, *Notae*, p. 16, Migne, *P. L.* lxxviii. 276).

On No. 12: quae n. c. & c. *R*.

On No. 13: ‘Domini nostri’ *R*, *S*, *Gell*.

On No. 21: ‘in remissionem’ *S*, *Gell*; ‘in remissionē’ *Ang*.

On No. 22: ‘faciatis’ *R* (‘meae’ *Gell*).

On No. 23: ‘Domini nostri’ *R*; so too *Ang* originally, but ‘Dei’ interlined by same hand.

at the close of the eighth century cited by Elipandus, not now found in *Moa*, but adapted into a preface in *St* (M<sup>c</sup>Carthy, p. 232, Warren, p. 248). I may be allowed to repeat here with some further extension and precision what I have said elsewhere (*Book of Cerne*, p. 260): the more closely the texts of *Leon* and *Gelas* are examined, the more thoroughly they are investigated, the more imperatively does the question impose itself whether the Irish were not concerned in the manipulations to which these Roman books were subjected in Gaul and in Northern Italy in the seventh century. In this connexion the ‘collectio ad panis fractionem,’ unique in Gallican books, in *M. Goth*, No. xxxvi, is not to be overlooked; see Forbes’s ; p. 99, though he has failed to see what this text really ‘resembles.’

<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ost</i>
9. ut placatus accipias <sup>10</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
10. ab aeterna damnatione nos eripi <sup>10</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
11. Quam oblationem tu Deus	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
12. facere digneris ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
13. dilectissimi Filii tui Domi- ni . . . Dei nostri	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
14. accepit panem	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
15. elevatis oculis <sup>10</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
16. in caelum	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
17. tibi gratias agens <sup>10</sup> be- nedixit	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
18. accipiens et hunc prae- clarum calicem	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
19. ex eo omnes <sup>10</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
20. calix . . . sanguinis mei	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
21. in remissione	in remissionem	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
22. in mei memoriam 'faciaetis'	i. m. m. facietis	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
23. Christi Filii tui Domini Dei nostri	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>

<sup>9</sup> For the corrector of *S* see Wilson's notes to *Gelas*, III 16.

<sup>10</sup> See note 3 *supra*.

<sup>11</sup> 'ut placatus suscipias' Biasca and Bergamo MSS of *Ambros*.

<sup>12</sup> For the continuation of the text of *St*, see *infra* p. 577, note 1, No. 10.

<sup>13</sup> 'v' interlined over 'e' by another hand.

<sup>14</sup> 'Facere digneris quae nobis corpus et sanguis fiat' Biasca and Bergamo MSS of *Ambros*; M<sup>c</sup>Carthy, p. 213, prints *St* 'facere: dignareque nobis,' treating 'que' as 'and' (see his footnote); in view of the texts this appears clearly a misapprehension.

<sup>15</sup> Both the Biasca and Bergamo MSS of *Ambros* have 'autem.'

<sup>16</sup> Doubtless a mere orthographical variant, but in view of the affinities of *St* and *Fr* it seems to be one worth recording (cf. No. 18).

<sup>17</sup> Mabillon prints '[&] elevatis'; 'et' is not in the MS nor in *St*, *Fr*, &c.

<sup>18</sup> 'Ad caelos' Biasca and Bergamo MS of *Ambros*.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. No. 14.

<sup>20</sup> i. e. the Vulgate reading of Matt. xxvi 27; but cf. Sabatier *in loc.* ('hoc' is the reading of the fragment of the Canon in the *de Sacramentis*, as to which see p. 567 *infra*).

<sup>21</sup> So the MS seems to read at present, but 'ae' from the hand of a corrector; 'facietis' Mabillon.

<sup>22</sup> So, clearly, in the MS.

<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>Fr</i>
24. vultu aspicere dignare <sup>23</sup>	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
25. et acceptum <sup>24</sup> habere sicuti acceptum habere dignatus es	e. acceptu h. s. acceptu h. d. e.	= <i>St</i> <sup>25</sup>
26. Supplices te rogamus	S. t. r. et petimus = <i>Bo</i>	= <i>St</i>
27. per manus sancti angeli tui <sup>26</sup>	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
28. in sublimi altario tuo	i. s. altari t.	= <i>St</i>
29. ex hoc altari participa- tionis	e. h. a. sanctifica- tionis <sup>27</sup>	= <i>St</i>
30. partem aliquam socie- tatis donare digneris	p. a. et socie- tatem d. dignare	p. a. et socie- tatem d. digneris <sup>28</sup>
31. Perpetua Agne Cecilia Felicitate, Anastasia, Agatha, Lucia, Eogenia	P. Agna C. F. An. Ag. L.	
32. intra quorum nos con- sortio	i. q. n. con- sortia	
33. 'non stimatur meritis sed veniam quæsomus largitur admitte'	non aestimatis meritis sed 'venia' quæsumus largitor admitte	
34. <sup>29</sup> Divino magisterio edocti et divina institutione . . . . audemus dicere	<sup>29</sup> D. m. e. e. d. i. formati a. d. = <i>Bo</i>	<i>St. Gall MS 1394</i> <sup>29</sup> = <i>St</i>
35. Libera nos Domine ab omni malo praeterito praesenti et futuro	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*.

On No. 24: 'dignare' *R*.

On No. 28: 'in sublime altare tuo' *Ang* (originally; but 'o' altered to 'ū'), *Gell*.

On No. 29: 'ex hoc altaris participatione' *S* (corrected to 'hac'); 'participationes'? *Gell*.

On No. 30: 'et societatem' *R*, 2296; *S* doubtful; 'societatis' altered by another hand to 'et societatem' *Ang*.

On No. 32: 'consortio' *R*, *Gell*.

On No. 33: 'non estimatur meritis sed ueniam qs largitor emitt[as?]' *Ang* (corrected by another hand to agree with *Ca*; 'non estimatur meritis sed ueniam quæsumus largitur admitte' *Gell*; *R* and *S* show the same text as *Ca* (but in *S* 'the last syllable of "estimator" is written over an erasure.' Wilson, p. 239, note 70).

On No. 35: *Ang* originally written 'Liberata nos quæsumus Domine'; 'quæsumus' erased and interlined by same hand after 'Domine.'

<sup>23</sup> Cf. 'sereno vultu digneris respicere' *Bo*, p. 357; 'ita nos dignare respicere,' p. 380.

<sup>24</sup> 'acceptū abere,' *cod*. I think; the abbreviation is clear in the next line (cf. No. 1).

<sup>25</sup> "'Acceptu . . . acceptu" clarissime, sine compendio, neque in rasura.' So Dr. Mercati.



<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>
24. vultu respicere dignare	v. r. digneris	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
25. et accepta habere sicuti accepta habere dignatus es	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
26. Supplices te rogamus <sup>27</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
27. per manus angeli tui	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
28. in sublime altare tuum	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
29. ex hac altaris participa- tione	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
30. partem aliquam societa- tis donare digneris <sup>27</sup>	p. a. et societa- tem d. d.	as <i>Ca</i>	as <i>Ca</i>
31. Felicitate Perpetua Agatha Lucia Agne Cecilia Anastasia	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
32. intra quorum nos con- sorti]um] <sup>30</sup>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
33. 'non stimamur meritis sed veniam quaesumus largitor admitte'	non aestimator meriti s. v. q. l. a.	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
34. Praeceptis salutaribus mo- niti et divina institutione formati audemus dicere	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
35. Libera nos quaesumus Domine ab omnibus malis praeteritis praesentibus et futuris	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>

<sup>26</sup> 'Ascendat oratio nostra per manus sancti angeli tui ad divinum altare tuum, Domine' *Bo*, p. 351, ed. G. H. Forbes, p. 311.

<sup>27</sup> See note 3 *supra*.

<sup>28</sup> *Ambros*: 'ex hac altaris sanctificatione' *Biasca MS*; 'ex hoc altari sanctificationis' Bergamo MS and 'codd. alii veteres et edd. antiquae Missalis Ambrosiani' (so Ceriani, *Notitia Liturgiae Ambrosianae*, p. 70).

<sup>29</sup> *Fr* breaks off at this word, imperfect.

<sup>30</sup> 'V has now "consortia," but apparently "consortium" was first written' (Wilson, p. 239, note 69).

<sup>31</sup> Warren, *Liturgy of Celtic Ch.* p. 177, M<sup>c</sup>Carthy *Stowe Missal*, p. 234.

<sup>32</sup> From this point *Stowe* offers only a rescript of the interpolator Moelcaich. The form in *St* occurs in *Missale Gothicum*, p. 228 (missa in cathedra S. Petri); another variant *ibid.* p. 297 (a Missa Dominicalis: 'D. m. docti et salutaribus monitis instituti a. d. '), this latter being found also in *Moz.* 276. 83-85 (sixth Sunday after Pentecost) and 430. 21-23 (missa plurimorum martyrum). The genuine Visigothic formulae of preface to the Lord's Prayer are of a quite different cast, and there can be no doubt that all the various forms mentioned above are to be referred to the preface in *Gelas* and *Greg* for their original, and all date from the seventh century. The influence of the *Gelas-Greg* preface is also perceptible in *Moz.* 315. 59-65 (in Cathedra. St. Petri), 333. 79-80 (in Nativ. S. Joh. Bapt.), 364. 96 (Assumption), 437. 96 (missa unius virg.); and possibly 273. 18, the fourth Sunday after Pentecost.





<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>
36. et intercedente pro nobis beata et gloriosa sem- perque virgine Dei geni- trice Maria et sanctis apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo atque Andrea da propitius	i. b. e. g. sem- per v. D. g. M. e. beatis a. t. P. e. P. d. p.	= <i>Ca</i> [adding :  atque Andrea <sup>93</sup> ]	
37. pacem . . . in diebus nostris	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
38. et a peccatis simus liberi semper	e. a peccato s. l. semper	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>

sanctis' has been added in margin of *S*); *R* after 'Andrea' adds 'et beatis confessoribus tuis illis.'

On No. 38: *Ang* as *Ca*; in *S*, 'o' of 'peccato' over erasure (*R* and *Gell* as *GV*, except that *Gell* reads 'ad' for 'a').

<sup>93</sup> For the addition in *Ott* between 'Andrea' and 'da propitius' see p. 570 below.

dissent from it is the rule. To take, on the other hand, an item of detail: that a scribe, with the correct form 'accepta' familiar to him from practice and lying under his eye, should, in the exercise of his choice of readings to adopt from the *St-Fr* text, change it to 'acceptum' (see Nos. 1 and 25), is surely an assumption much less reasonable than that of descent from a common vitiated ancestor. The natural conclusion, in face of the facts, and the only safe working hypothesis, is that the original of *Bo* belonged to the *St* class, but that in this particular MS certain readings of the *GV* class have been adopted. Indeed (unless there be some feature of the case that escapes me) to assume the contrary would be perversity. I therefore take *Bo* as in its origin a member of the *St*, not of the *GV*, class.

Next, within the group *Bo, St, Fr*, certain minutiae deserve attention. Although on the whole *St* and *Fr* agree as against *Bo*, yet No. 13 (perhaps also 7 and 11, cf. also 1, 20, 22, 30) shows that *Fr* is not the mere reproduction of a *St* text, that no one of these MSS directly descends from one of the others—as indeed might be expected from the fact that one of them is found in Ireland, one in France, one in Northern Italy—and that all three descend from an ultimate original that lies some distance behind them. For although *Fr* agrees very closely with *St*, yet its original must have embodied at least one feature (No. 13) characteristic of the original of *Bo* (i. e. in which this original differed from the original of *St*). On the other hand, the close affinity as well as the ultimate common origin of *Bo* and *St* is evidenced by a feature proper to these two MSS, viz. the existence of the word 'sancti' before



'sanguinis' in the recital of institution; and (what may by some persons be considered even more significant if the two items are taken in account together) the crying blunder (see No. 11) 'quam oblationem te Deus in omnibus benedictam . . . facere digneris,' instead of 'h.' The ultimate common origin (from a single ancestor) of the text of the Canon as found in *Bo*, *St*, *Fr*, may therefore, I think, be taken as sufficiently established.

Of the two recensions of the Canon evidenced by the Table, which is the earlier? Taking first the indications afforded by the MSS, I still believe the view put forward in the article on the Stowe Missal in the *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie* in 1892 (pp. 489-90) to be just, viz. that when we find in the seventh century at Bobbio, a monastery founded by the Irish, a 'Missa Romensis' which is identical with a mass found in Ireland containing a *commemoratio defunctorum* (or diptychs) specially designed for Ireland and dating from about the year 630<sup>1</sup>, the conclusion seems inevitable that these two texts derive from a common progenitor current either in Ireland or among the Irish in quite the early years of the seventh century. On the other hand, when the question of the earlier recension of the *Gelasianum* (*GV*) comes to be dealt with, it will, I believe, appear that the MS from which the single extant copy of *Gelas* (*GV*) derives, left Rome not after, but before, the masses of the B. V. and Holy Cross were embodied in it, i. e. *at the latest* in the very first years of the seventh century. But even if this be so, it does not necessarily follow that the text of the Canon found in this single extant MS of *Gelas* (*GV*) was the text contained in the Roman original from which it derives. In *GV* (written at the close of the seventh century or early in the eighth) the text of the *Gelasianum* has evidently been manipulated, and much foreign matter has been inserted. Among the changes it is quite possible that a text of the Canon of the type found in *Greg* MSS of the ninth century may have been substituted for the text which existed in the Roman manuscript brought into France a century earlier<sup>2</sup>. So far, then, as the general evidence afforded by the MSS is concerned, it points to an attestation of the *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* text earlier than that which can be adduced with any confidence on behalf of the text now found in *GV*, for in the one case we can through the combined evidence of three MSS trace back the original of their Canon to a MS at the latest of the first years of the seventh

<sup>1</sup> This is not in the least affected by the question of 'Mael ruen,' important only for the date of the MS.

<sup>2</sup> I need only mention the (?parallel) case of the 'baptismal' creed. It is impossible to touch on any problem presented by these early books without involving the case of other problems. But each is best dealt with, first of all, separately, on its own merits. By-and-by will come the summing up of the whole matter.

century, whilst in the other we have no security that the text of the Canon in the one existing MS may not have been (as so much else certainly was) introduced later, and in France.

On turning to seek for any indications of anteriority that may exist in the texts themselves, I call attention to a note by Dr. M<sup>o</sup>Carthy on the 'Supplices te rogamus *et petimus*' of *St* (see No. 26 of the Table), and the omission from *Bo* of the last two words. He writes: 'The insertion arose perhaps from the scribe remembering "rogamus et petimus" in the opening of the Canon' (p. 215, note *b* on fol. 27<sup>a</sup>). This may possibly be the case; at the same time Dr. M<sup>o</sup>Carthy had not observed that *Fr* has the same reading, and (as it is no mere copy of the original of *St*) affords independent testimony. And another explanation is possible. It will be observed (No. 9) that *St* and *Fr* read 'Hanc igitur oblationem . . . quaesumus . . . ut placatus *suscipias*'; and that the original 'accipias' of *Bo* is corrected to '*suscipias*,' thus showing that the *St* reading of the Canon at this point was known and indeed preferred, if not that the type of text afforded by *St* was as a whole current, in the circle in which the corrector lived. Moreover, not merely do *St*, *Fr* agree in reading 'supplices te rogamus et petimus,' but they continue (and herein are supported by *Bo*) . . . 'iube haec perferri in sublimi altari (altario *Bo*) tuo' (No. 28). Now the fragment of the Canon quoted in the (?) pseudo-Ambrosian treatise *de Sacramentis* lib. iv cap. 6 reads: '*et petimus* et precamur ut hanc oblationem *suscipias in sublimi altari tuo . . . sicut suscipere dignatus es,*' &c. (cf. too note 20 to the Table). In view of the persistency of the tradition of verbal minutiae evident in the various early MSS of the Canon, in spite of all their variants, I think it will be allowed that these resemblances if slight are not to be lightly dismissed as just accidental, but are rather to be viewed as indications possessing a positive and substantive value<sup>1</sup>. This is not all. The 'Hanc igitur' is one of the few variable clauses of the Roman Canon, thus affording means of verification; and I think there are distinct indications that '*suscipias*' was the word used in the 'Hanc igitur' of the original of *GF*. The detail is thrown into a footnote<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It is significant, too, that while *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* do in fact preserve, as shown above, readings of the close of the fourth century, there should immediately follow in the prayer for the communicants in *St*, *Fr*, the remarkable variant (No. 29) 'ex hoc altari sanctificationis,' a reading which was evidently that of the original of *Bo*, and which long survived at Milan. The quotation of the Canon in the *de Sacramentis* unfortunately breaks off at the point where it might be expected to turn to the prayer for the communicants, and we are thus deprived of what might have been decisive testimony on the subject now under inquiry.

<sup>2</sup> In *Greg* all the 'Hanc igitur' formulae read 'ut placatus accipias.' In *Gelus*, I 24, 26, III 24, 49, 50, 52 (second form), 53, 54, 73, 106 read '*suscipias*.'



The indications therefore uniformly point to the conclusion that the group *Bo, St, Fr* preserve an earlier recension of the Roman Canon, whilst the group *GV* and the ninth-century MSS of the Gregorianum present a later one. On this several interesting questions suggest themselves; but the time, I think, is not yet come to deal with them, or to enter formally on the subject of what I may call the Antiquities of the Roman Canon; certainly this is not the place to do so, the object of this paper being merely to disengage the elementary facts that, on an analysis of the early texts, emerge from apparent confusion. I propose to distinguish the two recensions as recension A (that of the group *Bo, St, Fr*) and recension B; and at any rate it seems undesirable in future to designate the text of the Canon in *GV* as 'Gelasian'; if a descriptive

I 40, 45, 89, 94, 98, 100, probably 101, 102, 106, III 52 (first form), 93, 98, 99, 103 read 'accipias.' It is unnecessary to mention other variant forms here. As regards I 89, &c., the closing numbers of the first book of *Gelas* are, as a whole, Gallican interpolations; whilst III 93, 98, 99, 103 belong to that series of masses of the dead which I have elsewhere pointed out as being also of late date and not part of the original Roman copy. There remain I 40, 45 and III 52 (first form).

(a) The 'Hanc igitur' of I 39 and I 40 (for Holy Thursday) are with slight variants the same. The corresponding 'H. ig.' of *Greg* (col. 55) is either an abridgement of these or the original on which they are built up. If the purport of the additional clause 'ut per multa curricula,' &c. and the nature of the feast be taken into consideration together, it will not be doubted, I think, that the second alternative is the true explanation and the improvements of I 39 and 40 are a barbarous conception.

(b) If the 'H. ig.' of I 45 (ad missam in nocte, Holy Saturday) be compared with *Leon* 24. 30-25. 2 and *Greg* col. 66, it will, I think, again appear that the text of *Greg* is that on which the other two (with their 'ascription in the book of the living') are built up.

(c) Once more, if III 52 first form (nuptial mass) be compared with *Leon* 141. 3-8, and *Greg* col. 245, it is once more clear that *Greg* is either an abridgement or the original of the other two. It will be observed that the additional element in *Leon* and *Gelas* 'sic (eam) consortio maritali tuo munere copulatam desiderata sobole gaudere perficias atque ad optatam seriem cum suo coniuge provehas benignus annorum' is pieced up out of the nuptial blessing of *Greg* ('quae maritali coniungenda est consortio,' 'ad optatam perveniat senectutem').

In every case therefore the formulae of 'Hanc igitur' which read 'placatus accipias' betray marks of derivation, of later date. The masses of book III which have 'suscipias' in the 'H. ig.' need not be particularly examined; some of these are without doubt Gallican interpolations. It is otherwise with I 24, 26. These, one the mass for Saturday of Lent Ember days with a 'Hanc igitur' for the newly ordained, the other for the third Sunday of Lent and first Sunday of the *Scrutinies* with a 'Hanc igitur' for the 'electi,' are both most authentic and ancient portions of *Gelas*, and both read 'suscipias.'

Such treatment as it were by scraps in a note is eminently unsatisfactory but may at least serve to illustrate the need of minute and close examination and comparison of the texts of *Leon*, *Gelas*, *Greg*, and not the least of *Leon* which contains, I believe, certainly some texts (in the form there found) of a date very little if at all earlier than the single extant MS itself.



name must be given to it, this, it would seem, should rather be 'Gregorian.' I should like also to be beforehand with any suggestion that the Ambrosian Canon is the source for recension A of the peculiar readings common to the two: a comparison of recension A as a whole and the Ambrosian Canon as a whole, as known in the early MSS, shows that this is not the case, but only that the latter exhibits a few readings that are characteristic of A as compared with B.

The variants between *Reg* and *Ott* have now to be considered in order to determine, if possible, which is the more authentic text of recension B of the Roman Canon.

(a) It is evident that the words 'et antistite nostro illo' (see No. 3 of the Table) are an addition, and that *Ca* and *Reg* with the mere mention of 'papa nostro illo,' preserve at this point the original Roman text<sup>1</sup>.

(b) The clause 'et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicæ et apostolicæ fidei cultoribus' (No. 3) is wanting in *Ca* and *Reg*. The observation of the Micrologus on this clause in his chapter 13, *Quid sit superfluum in canone*, are just: 'after the names of the Pope and their own Bishop (he says) some are wont to add the clause "et omnibus . . . cultoribus"; but this is superfluous. The very next words, "Memento Domine famulorum famularumque tuarum," allow us to commemorate all the living as many as we will.' It may be added that all these 'orthodox adherents of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith' and no others had already been prayed for as 'Thy Holy Catholic Church.' When, moreover, it is seen that *Reg* is supported in the entire omission of these words, not only by *Ca* but also by *GV* as representing the seventh century, and by *R, S, Aug*, 2296 as representing the eighth, that the MSS in which the clause is represented vary in their readings, and that in *Ott* alone of the texts reviewed is it found in full, the natural conclusion seems to be that it formed no part of the text of the Roman Canon, but was an interpolation made in A.

(c) *Ott* stands alone in prefixing to the clause '. . . qui tibi offerunt' the words 'qui tibi offerimus vel,' which in the MS are written by the original hand and as if an integral part of the text<sup>2</sup>. There is no need to say they are an interpolation.

(d) *Ott* reads (No. 13 of Table and the readings of saec. viii *Gelas*) 'dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri,' *Reg*. 'd. F. t. Dn. Dei n.'

(e) *Ott* reads 'Unde et memores Domine'; all the other MSS read, as originally written, 'U. et m. sumus D.' (The word 'sumus' has been erased in *S, Aug*, 2296, and *Ca*.)

<sup>1</sup> It is not improbable also that 'beatissimo' is the genuine Roman reading and its omission in *Ott* is only due to a French tradition represented in *GV*; whilst the absence of both Roman pope and diocesan bishop in *Fr* is probably due to accident.

<sup>2</sup> The addition is made in a later hand in *Aug* but in the same order and terms as *Ott*.

(*f*) *Ott* reads (perhaps only by a slip of the scribe) 'in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae'; the other MSS 'in conspectu d. m. t.'

(*g*) In the *Libera* after the Lord's Prayer, *Ott* reads 'atque Andrea [then occurs an erasure of the space of about fifteen letters] necnon et beato Dionysio martyre tuo atque pontifice cum sociis suis Rustico et Eleutherio et beato Chlodoaldo confessoribus et omnibus sanctis de propitius pacem'; *Reg* reads 'atque Andrea da propitius pacem.' That the text of *Ott* is not pure is obvious<sup>1</sup>.

The conclusion to be drawn cannot be doubtful; viz. that of the two MSS *Reg* preserves the genuine *Greg* text of the Canon, and *Ott* offers a corrupt text. But it is interesting to observe that (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), and the 'et omnibus sanctis' of (*g*) are found in the present Roman Canon, which must therefore descend from a MS of the type of *Ott*, and consequently may be (since *Ott* was written for the Church of Paris) the Parisian recension in the ninth century of the text of *Greg*.

Finally, the question of the Memento of the dead remains to be considered. It is wanting in *Ca* and *Reg*, the best witnesses to the text of *Greg*; in *GV*, the earliest extant copy of recension B of the Canon; also in *S* and 2296, MSS of saec. viii *Gelas*. *Gell* has the single word 'Memento'. *Ang* gives a quite different text<sup>2</sup>. This is not all. Amalar's lengthy comment on the Canon (*De offic.* iii capp. 25, 26 written about 827-32) passes directly from the clause 'Supplices . . . replemur' (ed. Hittorp 1610, col. 425 D) to 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus' (col. 426 E), and says nothing of the Memento. It is also absent from two expositions of the mass, which embody the text of the Canon, printed by Gerbert from a MS of the tenth

<sup>1</sup> The considerable variation in the texts of the MSS. at this point (see No. 36) seems to evidence successive interpolations. It looks as if *St* most nearly preserved the original text; cf. the omission of 'et' before 'beatis' in *De* (Mabillon has 'et' in error).

<sup>2</sup> This is mentioned by Martene, *De ant. ecl. rit.* lib. I cap. 4 art. VIII § 24.

<sup>3</sup> As follows: 'Memento mei Domine hanc tibi sancte pater licet meis manibus offerantur quia nec inuocationem tui nominis dignus sum et quia per sanctum atque sanctificatum filii tui nominis oblationes offerantur, sicut incensum in conspectu tuo cum odore suauitatis accendatur et eorum nomina qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei per xpm dnm nostrum (fol. 119). This, altered and reduced to the rules of grammar, is entered by a later hand in *Ott* in margin opposite the Memento of the dead (Muratori II, col. 4, note y) but for the words 'et eorum nomina . . . fidei' is substituted 'meque emundatum a delictis omnibus tibi Deo soli immaculatum concede famulari.' With slight revisions the prayer in this form found its way into this place of the Canon of many later Sacramentaries, see Ebner, p. 419, *Bona Rev. liturg.* II 14 (x). 'Sed et haec inconsulto hic posita est' says Bona; *Ang* (where it really embodies a Memento of the dead) explains how the anomaly arose. (In Muratori read 'et licet haec'; the first two letters of 'licet' are still legible in the MS.)



century<sup>1</sup>. One of these, he says, commonly has this note in MSS of south-western Germany and Switzerland: 'expositio haec a coenobio S. Dionysii venit.'<sup>2</sup> From the time of abbot Fulrad (died 784) S. Denis had cells in Alsace through which such a document could easily pass to monasteries of that region. The tract is thus of interest as showing at Paris a text with a different tradition from *Off.* On the other hand *Off.* is supported by *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* as testimony for the seventh century and by *R* for the eighth<sup>3</sup>.

Were a literary production in question, the clause, in face of such MS evidence, would doubtless be pronounced spurious, an interpolation which (like the clause 'omnibus orthodoxis . . . cultoribus') arose in A and passed thence to *Off.* The case is not so easily settled where liturgical texts are concerned. Circumspection is needed to avoid conclusions that may be as false as they are facile. External circumstances, too, have to be taken into account. These texts were for practical use in very varying circumstances; they were widely spread, from Ireland to Calabria; they made a very direct and intimate appeal to persons and races of very different minds, temperaments, traditions.

I have elsewhere pointed out<sup>4</sup> that the terminology of the Memento of the dead under discussion is not native Spanish, French, Irish, but Roman, or Romano-African, if that be preferred. Nor, until the body

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. liturg. Aleman.* II 280, 288.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 282, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> The Memento is also incorporated (but in such a way as to make nonsense) in a 'post nomina' prayer of the *Missale Gallicanum*, Tommasi, p. 438, Mabillon, p. 333. The following is the text of the Memento in these books: 'Memento etiam Domine et eorum [rubric:] nomina [for the last three words, 'famulorum famularumque tuarum ill. et ill.' *Off.*] qui nos praecesserunt cum signo ['signum' *Bo*] fidei et dormiunt in somno ['somnia' *R*] pacis. Ipsi ['Domine' *Fr*] et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus locum refrigerii lucis et pacis ut indulgeas deprecamur.' *Fr* is the only one of these texts which still shows the word 'nomina' obviously as a rubric; in *Bo* the commemoration of the names of the dead is transferred and comes after 'pacis,' and 'nomina' is allowed to remain as if part of the text, though making nonsense, as it does also in *Gall.* This is duly perpetuated in later texts, the solecism from habit passing unnoticed by skilled and unskilled alike. See, however, the correction of an expositor, Gerbert, *Mon. Lit. Al.* II 165 'et eorum nominum qui.' Though the *Micrologus* (end of s. xi) in cap. 13 uses the Gregorian form, he still has at cap. 23 'M. et. D. et eorum nomina qui.' As is well known, besides having the Memento of the dead in the usual place, *R* inserts one also after the Memento of the living (see p. 577, note 1, No. 26), but in this case uses the form 'famulorum famularumque tuarum . . . illorum et illarum,' thus betraying the influence of the later Gregorian tradition. Ebner (p. 422) has already pointed out the explanation of this anomaly in *R*, 'in Reminiscenz an ältere Übung' in Gallic lands, according to which the names of living and dead were commemorated together.

<sup>4</sup> *Book of Cerne*, pp. 267 seqq.



of evidence there brought together is challenged<sup>1</sup> and the case generally put on some other footing, do I see how the Roman origin of the clause can well be doubted although (whilst it figures in the earliest attestations of the Roman Canon) it be absent from many MSS of the period (750-850) in which the Gregorian mass-book was generally propagated in France; that is, absent from the Canon, for it appears in all these MSS (with some slight variants) in the mass for the dead. Still, its absence from the Canon is a difficulty which calls for an explanation. This I will endeavour to give in some measure at least, though necessarily by way only of briefest indication.

The Lyons deacon Florus (died c. 860) writes categorically thus: 'After the words "qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis" it was the ancient custom, *which is also still observed by the Roman Church (sicut etiam Romana agit ecclesia)*<sup>2</sup>, immediately to recite the names of the dead from the diptychs, that is the *tabulae*, and then after they have been read, the clause "Ipsis et omnibus" is said'. Unfortunately Gallic and other expositors or partisans have had a trick of squaring the facts to their fancies in these matters. This is shown in

<sup>1</sup> As the occasion offers I may be allowed to advert to a question put in these pages, vol. IV, p. 148. In writing p. 275 *Book of Cerne* I meant to say no more than this, that *as a fact* the all-familiar 'Requiem aeternam,' &c., does embody the characteristic expressions of what I venture to think are two very different religious types, the Gothic and the Roman, though I dare say I expressed myself awkwardly. But then I believe that the present Roman Office of the dead and the discipline connected therewith and the antiphonal parts of the mass of the dead are not of Roman origin at all, but Frankish and Carolingian. I may add that the earliest example known to me of the 'Requiem aeternam,' &c., occurs in the 'capitella' (see *Downside Review*, xix, p. 45) of the 'Orationes in agenda mortuorum' of the Carolingian Supplement (no. civ), and it does not occur in the contemporary forms of Burial Service (cf. *Sacr. Godelgandi* in Ménard, *Notas*, p. 260, Migne P. L. lxxviii 467). I understand the text of the Supplement to give only the versicles; for full texts of *℟* and *℣* see, for instance, Tommasi ed. *Verzosi* II 562). In other words the first known use of the formula dates from the end of the eighth century and proceeds from English circles. Does an Irish 'source' lie behind? See in Canon 27 of the Council of Cloveshoe the earlier form on which Alcuin, giving it a liturgical stamp, improved in the Supplement; this must have been already in 747 a popular prayer ('lingua . . . sua Saxonica dicunt') derived by the people at large from their teachers. Which? The antiphonal parts of the mass for the dead (apart from their phraseology) bear crying witness to Frankish origin in the 'dimidiation' of the Offertory and Communion, a unique case, if I remember rightly, in the Roman Missal. The value of isolated facts like these, however, can only appear when put in their proper setting. But merely to say so much, and mention the name of S. Riquier, is to open up a vista of inquiries.

<sup>2</sup> 'Pseudo-Alcuin' (sacc. 10 or 11) betters him thus 'sicut etiam *usque hodie* Romana agit ecclesia.' As to the use of Florus in 'Pseudo-Alcuin' and the groundlessness of the ascription of the Treves 'Liber Officiorum' to any 'Amalar,' see Ad. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg, Herder, 1902), pp. 368 seqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Opusculum de expositione missae*, cap. 70 (Migne P. L. cxix 62).

all ages from the general introduction of Gregorianism in the ninth century to the 're-establishment of the Roman rite' in France in the nineteenth. It is necessary therefore to scan the statements of this class of writers somewhat closely. A difficulty at once suggests itself. If the statement of Florus be correct, how comes it that the *Ordo Romanus I* (a document which, so far as I have been able to test it, proves itself eminently and singularly trustworthy) not only says nothing of the reading of the diptychs but describes the recital of the Canon in a way which excludes such observance? The ninth century produced on this side of the Alps very many ritual tracts explanatory of the Roman rite, called forth by the liturgical changes of the time. Some embody personal reminiscences of what the writer had seen in Rome or had heard from those who had been there, and notice matters elsewhere taken for granted, or deliberately ignored or even misrepresented<sup>1</sup>. Two of these tracts supply an explanation which at least fits the facts. One says: 'on week-days from Monday to Saturday masses for the dead may be said, and the names of the dead are commemorated in the mass; but such masses are not to be said on Sundays, nor are the names of the dead recited on that day, but only the names of the living'<sup>2</sup>. The second, an exposition of the mass by question and answer, says: 'after the "Supplices te rogamus" come two prayers, one "super diptichos" (viz. "Memento . . . pacis") and one ("Ipsis . . . deprecamur") after the recitation of the names, and this on week-days, that is on working-days. only'—'et hoc cottidianis, id est in agendis tantummodo diebus'<sup>3</sup>. If this be so, and the Memento of the dead was not made in the Canon on Sundays in the then rite of Rome (and I see no reason for discrediting the statement, except the novelty of the idea to the modern mind), it helps to explain how it is that this Memento is absent from some at least of our Sacramentaries (e. g. *Ca*<sup>4</sup>), whilst it is found in the meaner, everyday, codices like *B $\theta$* , *St*.

<sup>1</sup> For instance, as regards the *Gloria in excelsis*.

<sup>2</sup> Gerbert, *Mon. liturg. Aleman.* II 173.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165 (a fragment is printed by Mabillon as his fourth *Ordo*, *Mus. Ital.* II 61-2; see what he says p. 560 and p. 52. The whole question of the MSS seems very obscure even after the lengthy explanations of Ad. Franz, *Die Messe*, pp. 377 seqq. and especially 388-9). The passage quoted in the text is cited in Du Cange under *Agenda*; I have ventured on a risky rendering of the word which at any rate makes sense. I do not think the text can mean 'on week-days, and then only in masses for the dead,' a rendering which (apart from other objections) runs counter to the *Ordo* cited just above.

<sup>4</sup> I have said *Ca* is a 'Prachtexemplar.' The supplementary matter added by later hands sufficiently shows, I think, that it was specially designed for the use of the bishop. It comprises, roughly, the following items: ff. 2-24<sup>a</sup> benedictions; ff. 24<sup>a</sup>-25 prefaces 'in unius confessoris,' and of St. Vedast, 'of post confirmationem,' and 'Deus qui apostolis' (*Mur.* II 91), a 'Bened.,' and an 'Absolutio' (long and



Another consideration suggests itself. The Memento of the dead was just the point where difficulty would be most probably found in popularizing the Roman rite in Gaul in the seventh and eighth centuries. In the end, indeed, the old native custom asserted itself in those regions, though in extra-liturgical fashion. I proceed to explain. The 'diptychs,' which accident has left embodied in some texts of the Liturgies, Eastern and Western, 'St. James,' 'Stowe,' make a considerable figure in the pages of the Ritualists (to use Maskell's favourite term). But in fact (apart from their interest for that article of the creed, the Communion of Saints) they belong to the department of ecclesiastical etiquette rather than popular religion. Even to the Irish of the ninth century<sup>1</sup> the 'Stowe' diptychs, native though be the names, must have been as wearisome as to Witzel centuries later,—'nostris temporibus obscurissima, ignotissima,'—or as Matt. i 1-16 on the feast of the Immaculate Conception in the Roman rite or on January 2 in the old Anglican Lectionary.

The recital of the names of the dead in Gaul in the seventh century had quite a different character; one living, intimate, personal. Throughout the land it was, too, a prominent feature of the service on those days precisely when the Churches were full, Sundays, feast days. They were read aloud so that all present might hear, distinct and apart from the text of any prayer. The names of the saints and holy men that form the substance of the extant 'diptychs' are not once mentioned in the large collection of 'nomina' prayers in the Gallican missals<sup>2</sup>, but these prayers

Gallican<sup>1</sup>; ff. 26-33<sup>b</sup> ordinations (ostiar to priest); ff. 34-35<sup>a</sup> miscellanies; f. 204<sup>a</sup>, (mass of All Saints, also found at f. 240<sup>b</sup>); ff. 204<sup>b</sup>-205 'Of ad infantes consignandos'; ff. 206-221<sup>b</sup> prefaces and benedictions; ff. 222-239<sup>b</sup> 'ordo ad inungendum infirmum' with prayers for agony, funeral, masses of dead; ff. 239<sup>b</sup>-241<sup>b</sup> masses for 'Dom. post ascensionem' and vigil and feast of All Saints; ff. 241<sup>b</sup>-245 more benedictions. If (as I think appears from this review) the additions have generally the special requirements of the bishop in view, this MS was intended for use precisely on days (be they Sundays or feasts) when the Memento of the dead in the Canon was omitted.

Whether the commemoration of the dead was in fact thus passed over at Cambrai, even by Bishop Hildaard, by whose order the volume was written, is another matter. In the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* (Mon. Germ. SS. vii 415) one fact, and one fact only, is recorded of Hildaard, viz. that 'he caused two handsomely carved ivory tabulae to be made in the twelfth year of his episcopate (801-2) as appears on the same tabulae.' Was he providing thus for the continuance in his church of its traditional practice of reciting publicly the names of the dead on Sundays and feasts, no less than on other days? The idea seems not unreasonable. If so, here would be another explanation of the omission of the Memento in *Ca*.

<sup>1</sup> This I presume to be the date of the MS (original hand) of *St* at the latest.

<sup>2</sup> But see in *Mos.* mention of the saints 15, 12-23, 27, 83, 345. 9 ('confessorum' 435. 44 has quite another meaning). The saints are mentioned once in (the print



continually dwell on the names of the dead, friends or relatives known to all, 'our dear ones' as the Gallican formulae are never weary of calling them with that strong affection and deep sense of family relationship that, inherited from a remote past, characterizes the French people still. It is no accident that All Souls day originated in France. This public recital of the names of the dead and recommendation to the prayers of all in the seventh century touched the nature and piety of those Gallic people in their tenderest point.

The Roman method was a complete contrast. When read without preconceived notions, or *parti pris* derived from present practice (of which later), the very text of the Memento shows that a simple mention of the names as an integral part of the celebrant's prayer is all that is contemplated: 'Remember Thy servants, so and so, who have gone before us with the sign of faith.' There is no room here for 'the diptychs.' Nor does there seem anything to bar the conclusion naturally suggested by the documents that, at least from the date when our present text of recension A was settled, the names of the dead were in the rite of Rome commemorated in the Canon silently by the celebrant as at present.

This and no more is what was offered in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries to those in Gaul adopting the Roman rite in place of the touching solemnities hitherto observed. The result of the shock of the new system and the old, the foreign custom and the native, was a compromise, the precise steps of which it may, or may not, be possible one day to trace in detail; but its nature is seen in those mediaeval bidding prayers and the *prône* that continues till to-day, in which this section of the Gallican mass is perpetuated much in its ancient form and almost in its old position. It can be no cause for surprise if the Sacramentaries of the period of transition, the eighth and ninth centuries, bear traces of the conflict of two incompatible practices, and if the Memento of the dead be absent from the Canon of not a few of them.

Having proceeded so far, I may before concluding glance at another point. Whilst the prayers of the Gallican books, *Richenov*, *Goth*, *Gall*, are rich in detail for the 'recitation of the names,' the Bobbio missal is as markedly sparing in them. But such as the material is (three or four items only), it offers a singular medley. At p. 332 is a scrap on the subject, drawn from the *Missale Gothicum*, thus a Gallican source; p. 359 from *Moz.*, and therefore Visigothic; thirdly in the 'missa pro principe,' p. 379, which (as stated above) is no part of the original

of *Bo*, and this text arrested the attention of G. H. Forbes for the reasons he explains, p. 348, note j. But the whole mass in which this mention occurs ('missa pro principe') is not a part of the original MS; it is written by another hand on an inserted leaf.

book, is a mention of 'sanctorum nomina' only. Finally, in a mass for *vivis et defunctis*, is a text proper to the *Bobbiense*, found nowhere else. This is, if I mistake not, a genuine piece of Irish work betraying the style and method of a race whose influence is of such incalculable religious importance in the seventh century as the medium through which the transition from one rite, practice, observance, to another was most easily brought about, and the age of fusion of very disparate religious elements most efficaciously prepared. This is the text: '... tam pro vivis quam et solutis debito mortis... quorum animas *ad memorandum conscripsimus* vel quorum nomina *super sanctum altarium scripta adest evidenter*' (p. 363). Here is a middle term that does not belong to either use, Roman or Gallican, but shows a compromise between the two. The same spirit and method is to be observed in the Memento of the dead in the Canon of the Bobbio missal. The rubric 'nomina' in spite of grammar is made part of the text, and the recitation of the names is deferred and intercalated between the two clauses of which the Memento consists, i.e. between the words '... somno pacis' and 'Ipsis Domine et omnibus...'; this again is a compromise which will allow either of the silent recital of the names by the celebrant, or of the insertion of 'the diptychs.' This latter operation has been actually effected, in an awkward manner, in the Stowe missal; whilst the other alternative (viz. the recitation of the names between the two clauses of the Memento) has, in derogation of its ancient practice still evidenced by the words of the Memento themselves, been by-and-by adopted by the Roman Church, is now prescribed by the *Ritus celebrandi* § ix 2, and is inculcated by common consent of the authoritative rubricists (Le Vavasseur, De Herdt, Martinucci<sup>2</sup>, &c.).

To sum up. The early texts of the Roman Canon fall into two classes or recensions ('A' and 'B'). A, which seems the earlier, can be traced back (among the Irish) to the early years of the seventh century. B is first found at length in the only extant MS of the older recension of

<sup>1</sup> In the Gallican books the expression is: '*ante altare tuum nomina recitantur*' (*M. Richenov*, missa iv, cf. *M. Goth*, No. lxx); '*hos quos recitatio commemoravit ante sanctum altare*' (*Goth*, No. xxvii). In *Moz.* '*ante altare*' 257.99; '*coram altario*' 217.100, 441, 101 (this is the text copied in *Bo*). The formula '*oblationis sacratarum virginum*' in *Leon* with its mention of the recitation of their names 'before' the altar, '*quarum ante sanctum altare tuum oblata nomina recitantur*' (36. 22-23) has no bearing on the questions relating to the seventh and eighth centuries under discussion here.

<sup>2</sup> This arrangement, first found in the Bobbio missal, is also that of the mass of the dead in *Greg* (Muratori II 270), to the anomalies of which attention is called *Book of Cerne*, pp. 266-7. The question will by-and-by have to be considered whether in all existing MSS. of *Greg* certain changes of detail have not been made of the Roman text sent by Hadrian; for a case see p. 419 *supra* note 1; the mass of the dead may be another.



*Gelas* and offers the same type of text as the MSS of *Greg* of the ninth century. Both A and B existed in France in the seventh century. Of the two copies (from *Reg* and from *Ott*) of the Canon of *Greg*, printed by Muratori, *Reg* is the purer; but the Canon in the present Roman missal descends from a text like that in *Ott* (a MS of the church of Paris). The Memento of the dead, found in *Ott* but not in *Reg*, is a genuine portion of the Roman Canon in both recension A and recension B.

The unique readings of the various MSS are appended in a footnote<sup>1</sup>.

EDMUND BISHOP.

<sup>1</sup> The following are the unique readings of the MSS additional to any already given in the Table; although some are mere blunders, I have thought it best to record them.

I. Of *Bo*, *St*, *Fr*: 1. supplices te rogamus *St*. 2. et unare *St*. 3. totum orbem terrarum *Bo*. 4. after 'episcopo' (see No. 3 of Table): *Hic recitantur nomina vivorum*, *St* (M<sup>c</sup>Carthy p. 210 note on f. 24<sup>a</sup>). 5. Memento etiam Domine famulorum tuorum N. famularumque tuarum (i. e. the living) *St*. 6. beatissimorum apostolorum *Bo*. 7. Thomae et Jacobi *St*; Thomae Item Jacobi *Gell*. 8. et omnium sanctorum tuorum qui per universo mundo passi sunt propter nomen tuum Domine seu confessoribus tuis quorum meritis *Bo*. 9. muniamur auxilium *Bo*. 10. placatus suscipias eumque (cf. No. 8 of Table) atque omnem populum ab idolorum cultura eripias et ad te Deum verum Patrem omnipotentem convertas dies quoque nostros *St*. 11. *Fr* omits 'ex hoc omnes' after 'manducate.' 12. et ad te *St*. 13. postquam *Fr*. 14. caenatum (no 'est') *St*. 15. (chalice) in sanctas et venerabiles *Fr*. 16. Inde et memores *Fr*. 17. nos servi tui *St*. 18. In *Bo* 'caelos' of 'in caelos gloriosae ascensionis' has been changed to 'caelis' by another hand; *Ca* also reads 'caelis.' [The same reading appears in the printed text of *GV*, but this is an error, H.A.W.] 19. jube perferri (omits 'haec') *St*. 20. omni benedictione (omits 'caelesti') et gratia *St*. 21. Between 'somno pacis' and 'Ipsius' of Memento of dead, rubric: *Commemoratio defunctorum*, *Bo*. 22. donare dignare (in 'Nob. quoque pecc.') *St*. 23. Before 'Libera nos' rubric: *Post Pater noster*, *Bo*.

II. Of saec. viii *Gelas*: 24. *Gell* omits 'et benedicas.' 25. *Ang* inserts: *Memento Domine famulo tuo rege nostro illo* before the usual Memento of the living; cf. an interlineation in Tironian notes at this place in *GV*: *Memento Deus rege nostro cum omni populo* (Wilson p. 238 note 11). 26. *R* inserts between 'incolumitatis suae' and 'tibi reddunt': *Memento etiam Domine et animabus famulorum famularumque tuarum fidelium catholicorum in Christo quiescentium, qui nos praecesserunt, illorum et illarum, qui per eleemosynam et confessionem*. 27. *Ang* appends to the 'Hanc igitur' of *GV* the following, with the rubric 'Item infra actionem': *Hanc igitur oblationem quam tibi hac si indignus pro emendatione vitiorum et remissione peccatorum meorum offero et pro gloria martyrum et confessorum et pro salute vivorum vel requiem defunctorum, propitius aspiciendo sanctificas sanctificando benedicas. Per quem te suppliciter deprecamur diesque nostros in tua pace disponas per xpm dnm nrm*. This is the original of the marginal entry by later hand in *Ott* (see Muratori II, col. 3, note k). 28. gregem numerari *Gell*. 29. Hic est enim calix sanguis mei novi *Gell*. 30. ad inferis; sed et in celo *Gell*. 31. panem sanctae vitae aeternae *R*. 32. jube et perferri *Gell*.



THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF THE  
PROPHETICAL BOOKS.

IN preceding numbers of the JOURNAL<sup>1</sup> I have given reasons for believing that the task of translating the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel into Greek was in each case divided between two translators. The striking fact that the break in each book comes at nearly the halfway point suggested that this division of labour was the result of the collaboration of two *contemporary* translators. It must, however, be admitted that another explanation is not impossible, namely that the earliest Greek version of both books was an incomplete one, which was afterwards supplemented by another worker. The question as to which of these views is correct could only be decided by the discovery of some sure linguistic criteria for distinguishing a Greek translation made in the second century B. C. from a translation belonging to one of the succeeding centuries.

May we equate any of the four hands which we have traced in these two books? The second hand in Jeremiah (Jer. β) and the second hand in Ezekiel (Ez. β) each present certain distinctive features of their own, and can certainly not be equated, nor (apart from the reappearance of Jer. β in the book of Baruch) is there any trace of either of these two hands elsewhere in the prophetic books of the Greek Bible. But the earlier portion of the Greek Jeremiah (Jer. α) and the remaining portion of Ezekiel (Ez. α and γ) together with the version of the Minor Prophets show a considerable affinity in their vocabulary, which renders it not improbable that they were all produced at about the same time, if not actually by one and the same hand.

In dealing with large groups of books such as this, it is difficult to *prove* identity of translators. All that can be attempted here is to show that these books or portions of books have very many details in common, and that as translations they are sharply distinguished from the Greek Isaiah.

33. omne benedictione celeste *Gell*; omnem? benedictionem *S*. 34. de multitudinem *Gell*. 35. Anastasia cum ('et' added by another hand) *Ang*. 36. prestes *R*. 37. Before Lord's Prayer, rubric: *Orat*, *R*. 38. Before 'Libera nos,' rubric: *Sequitur oratio*, *Ang*; *Item sequitur oratio*, *S*, *Gell*.

The following, though not *unica*, must also be mentioned here: 39. 'ut' omitted before 'placatus accipias,' *R*, 2296. 40. dispone (for 'disponas') *R* and *Sacr*. *Godelgaud* (see Ménard, *Notae*, p. 15, Migne *P. L.* lxxviii 276). 41. Simile modo *Bo*, *Gell*. 42. novi aeterni testamenti, *R*, *S*, *Gell* (and Bergamo MS of *Ambros.*). 43. effundatur *Bo*, *Gell*. 44. praeclaræ majestatis *Bo*, *Gell*. 45. benedices et praestas, *Bo*, *Gell*. 46. opem misericordiae, *Bo*, *Gell*.

<sup>1</sup> *J. T. S.* vol. iv, pp. 245 ff., 398 ff.

With regard to the Minor Prophets, the discovery of the two hands in Jeremiah and the two in Ezekiel had led me to expect to find a similar division of labour in this group also. In this, however, I have been disappointed. The Greek versions of the Minor Prophets are linked together by the recurrence in the opening and closing books and throughout the collection of certain rare words and usages. I have failed to detect any clear indication of the work of more than one hand. The following are some instances of words and uses which occur in more than one of the Minor Prophets but not elsewhere in the LXX. Ἀποσταλάζειν (Am.<sup>1</sup> Jl.<sup>1</sup>): ἀρετή = רִיב (Hb.<sup>2</sup> Zech.<sup>1</sup>): διώκειν = יָרִי (Am.<sup>1</sup> Hb.<sup>1</sup> Hg.<sup>1</sup>): κατακονδυλίξειν (Am.<sup>1</sup>)—κονδυλίξειν (Am.<sup>1</sup> Mal.<sup>2</sup>)—κονδυλισμός (Zeph.<sup>1</sup>): πρόσφυλον (Am.<sup>1</sup> Zeph.<sup>1</sup>): σκοπός as the equivalent for בְּרִיחַ 'a first-ripe fig' (Ho. ix 10, Na. iii 12): χάος = חַי (Mi.<sup>1</sup> Zech.<sup>1</sup>).

A noteworthy connecting link between the versions of Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets is found in their rendering of the Divine name 'Lord of hosts' (יהוה צבאות), a phrase in the rendering of which a well-marked distinction in the books of the LXX may be observed. It is rendered (1) Κύριος σαβαώθ in 1 Kings (five times), and Isaiah (about fifty-seven times)<sup>1</sup>, (2) Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων in the Psalms (*passim*) and in some few passages elsewhere, (3) Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ in Jeremiah (in both parts, about fifteen times in all: in numerous instances the phrase 'Lord of hosts' occurs in the Hebrew where it is omitted in the Greek), the Minor Prophets (Hos. Am. Mic. Na. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal.), in some few passages in 2 and 3 Kings and 1 Chron., and in the Greek books. The Hebrew phrase, it should be noted, is absent from Ezekiel. In this case, it will be seen, Jeremiah *α* and *β* are not distinguished from each other.

I have already in Table I in my first paper<sup>2</sup> noted several instances where the first portion of Jeremiah agrees in its renderings with Ezekiel (the agreement is usually confined to Ezekiel *α* and *γ*) and the Minor Prophets. Thus, in the second of the instances there quoted, we find that the two words *τάσσειν* and *ἀφανισμός* occur frequently in Jeremiah *α*, Ezekiel (*α* and *γ*) and the Minor Prophets as the renderings of two not uncommon Hebrew words, but are unrepresented in Isaiah. This mutual agreement of Jer. *α*, Ezek. *α* and *γ*, Min. Prophets, and the exclusion of Isaiah from this group may be attested by numerous examples. As I have said, I think that it points to the translation of the group being a single undertaking, that is to say, the translations were made at one time, and, if not by a single translator, at any rate by a small group of *collaborateurs*. It is probable, as will be shown later,

<sup>1</sup> Also in Jos. vi 17 B (Heb. simply יהוה), Zech. xiii 2 (om. σαβ. AQ), Jer. xxvi 10 AQ (om. σαβ. BN).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. iv, pp. 247 ff.



that the version of Isaiah had been already made, and that the rest of the prophetic group or the bulk of it was then translated *en bloc*. It is quite possible that a closer examination than I have yet made will reveal divergences of rendering within the group, but the general agreement is, I think, unmistakable.

The following table contains a selection of some of the most striking examples where Jer. *a*, Ezek. *a* and *γ*, and Min. Prophets or two of these three books (the Minor Prophets in the Greek must, as was said, be treated as a single book) stand alone<sup>1</sup>, or nearly alone in their rendering of a Hebrew word or phrase, or in their employment of the same Greek word<sup>2</sup>.

Table IV.

		( <i>a</i> ) Jer. <i>a</i> Ezek. <i>a</i> and <i>γ</i> and Minor Prophets.
1.	פָּלַט	ἀνασώζειν ( <i>οἱ ἀνασωζόμενοι</i> ). Jer. <sup>9</sup> chaps. xxvi, xxvii, xxviii [li 14] (Lam. <sup>3</sup> ): Ezek. <sup>9</sup> ( <i>α'</i> β <sup>1</sup> ): Min. <sup>7</sup> (Am. Jl. Ob. Zech.). The Greek word occurs elsewhere in Hist. books <sup>3</sup> , Maccab. <sup>8</sup> The Heb. is rendered elsewhere by σώζω, ἁρσώζω and (Psalms) ῥύεσθαι.
2.	Heb. various	*διεκβολή. Jer. <sup>1</sup> (xii 12): Ez. <i>γ</i> <sup>2</sup> : Min. <sup>9</sup> (Ob. Zech.). The verb occurs in Joshua.
3.	יָצַר	εἰσδέχεσθαι. Jer. <i>a</i> <sup>1</sup> : Ez. <i>a</i> <sup>2</sup> : Min. <sup>8</sup> (Hos. Mi. Hb. Zeph. Zech.). Only else in Greek books.
4.	usu. קָרַע or עָרַשׁ	ἐκδικεῖν. Jer. <i>a</i> <sup>10</sup> (to xxviii 52): Ez. <i>a</i> <sup>10</sup> (to xxv 12): Min. <sup>21</sup> The verb is not common in other translated books. Is. has it once only (= יָרַע).
5.	misc.: in Ezek. עָרַשׁ	ἐνθύμημα. Jer. <i>a</i> <sup>3</sup> : Ez. <i>a</i> <i>passim</i> <i>γ</i> <sup>1</sup> : Mal. <sup>1</sup> Else only i Ch. <sup>3</sup> , <i>ψ</i> <sup>1</sup> , Sir.
6.	עָרַע	ἐπιγινώσκειν. See Table III 2.

<sup>1</sup> These instances are indicated by an asterisk.

<sup>2</sup> It will be seen that Lamentations agrees with this group in some renderings. Both the recent Bible dictionaries (s.v. 'Lamentations') assert that this book cannot have been translated by the 'translator of Jeremiah.' The original authority for this statement is Nöldeke (*Die alttest. Literatur*, 1868, p. 144). The only reason which he gives is that 'die [Übersetzung] der Klagelieder ist recht wörtlich, die des Jeremia frei und sehr nachlässig,' and this dictum is unsupported by any examples. I was at first inclined to think that Lamentations might belong to the group containing Jeremiah *a*. So far as vocabulary goes, they have a certain amount in common: witness the use of ἀπίσπασμα, ἀτιμοῦσθαι, ἀφανίζειν, ἐραστής, κατάγειν ἕθνη. But some differences, e. g. the regular rendering of עַל in Lamentations by καὶ γὰρ, and the rendering of יָרַע by βάρις (Jeremiah *a* uses ἀμφοδον and θεμέλιον), now lead me to think that the Greek of Lamentations is the work of another and a later hand.



7. usu. *ἐρουστής*. Jer. a<sup>5</sup> (Lam.<sup>1</sup>) Ez. a<sup>6</sup>: Hos.<sup>5</sup> Also twice in pi. חכמ Wisdom.
8. No Heb. τὸ παράπαν. Jer. a<sup>1</sup> (vii 4 with οὐκ): Ez. a<sup>4</sup> γ<sup>2</sup> (with μῆ): Zeph.<sup>1</sup> (iii 6). Also in 3 K. xi 10.
9. usu. חתח πτοεῖν. Jer. a<sup>14</sup> (to xxviii 56): Ez. a<sup>3</sup> (β<sup>1</sup> cod. A): Min.<sup>6</sup> (Am. Ob. Hb.). Also in Is.<sup>1</sup>, and in a few other isolated passages. Cf. ἀπτόητος, Jer. xxvi 28, xxvii 2.
10. נאנ φρύαγμα. Jer. a<sup>1</sup> (xii 5 φρ. τοῦ Ἰορδάνου: contrast ἐκ μέσου τοῦ Ἰορδάνου xxix 20): Ez. a<sup>2</sup>: Min.<sup>2</sup> (Hos. iv 18, Zech. xi 3 τὸ φρ. τοῦ Ἰορδάνου).  
Other renderings ὕβρις Jer. xiii 9, xxxi 29, Ez. β<sup>4</sup>, Min.<sup>10</sup>, &c.: ὑπερηφανία? Jer. xxxi 29, Ez. a<sup>3</sup>, Min.<sup>1</sup>, &c.  
(δ) Jer. a and Ezekiel.
11. βελόστασις. J. xxviii 27: Ez. a<sup>4</sup>. Also in 1 Macc.<sup>2</sup>
12. רכב \*ἵππάζεσθα. J. xxvii 42: Ez. a<sup>2</sup>. Heb. usu. rendered ἐπιβαίνειν, as in Min. Proph., and (with ἄρματα) twice in Jer. a. Cf. ἵππασία below.
13. \*πέλυξ. J. xxiii 29 (A πέλεκυς): Ez. ix 2. Elsewhere, including J. xxii 7, πέλεκυς.
14. שלטים φαρέτρα. J. xxviii 11: Ez. xxvii 11. See Streane, R.V. 'shields' *Double text*, p. 296. The Greek renders other Heb. R.V. mg. 'suits of armour.'  
(Note also προμαχών, J. v 10, xl 4: Ez. iv 2; \*ὕγρασία, J. xxxi 18: Ez. vii 17, xxi 7.)  
(ε) Jer. a and Minor Prophets.
15. ἀναξηραίνειν. J. xxvii 27: Hos. xiii 15 [Sir.<sup>2</sup>].
16. ערב ἠδύνειν τι ('to please'). J. vi 20 (αἱ θυαίαι) = Hos. ix 4 (αἱ θυσ.). Elsewhere the verb occurs seven times with the accusative or in the passive.
17. (טרנבה) \*ἵππασία. J. viii 16: Hab. iii 8. Cf. ἵππάζεσθα above.
18. τὸ Ἰταβύριον<sup>1</sup>. J. xxvi 18: Hos. v 1. So in Josephus τὸ Ἰταβύριον ὄρος: elsewhere in LXX Θαβάρ.
19. Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ. See above.
20. נבור μαχητής. Jer. a<sup>9</sup>: Min.<sup>9</sup> Else only Jd. A<sup>1</sup>, 1 Ch.<sup>1</sup>  
Other renderings are γίγας Ez. β &c., δυνατός *passim*, ἰσχυρός Jer. a and β &c., κραταίος, δυνάμενος, ἐπηρμένος.
21. טשא λῆμμα. Jer. a<sup>7</sup> (Lam.<sup>1</sup>): Min.<sup>7</sup> (Na. Hb. Hg. Zech. Mal.). Also in 2 K.<sup>1</sup>, 4 K.<sup>2</sup>, Job<sup>1</sup>. Not in Isaiah, which has δρασις (κατά), τὸ δράμα, τὸ ῥῆμα (τὸ κατά).

<sup>1</sup> The mountain in Palestine is called Ἰταβύριον in Polybius v 70 6. This form of the name indicates a connexion between the Hellenized form of Tabor and mount Atabyris or Atabyrium in Rhodes.

22. חַיִּים 'a troop' = ληστής in J. xviii 22 and Hos. vii 1 only. The Heb. is rendered in a variety of ways elsewhere: γέδνοι, ἔφοδια, μόνόζωνος, πειρατής (Hos. vi 9), πειρατήριον, σύστημα, &c.
23. With \*πνευματοφορεῖσθαι, J. ii 24 cf. \*πνευματοφόρος, Hos. ix 7, Zeph. iii 4.
24. \*σμῖλαξ. J. xxvi 14 (י'בס): Na. i 10 (נאנב).
25. חַנְּנִי \*συκῶν. J. v 17; Am. iv 10. Elsewhere, including J. viii 13, Min.<sup>10</sup>, συκεῆ.
- (d) Ezekiel a and γ and Minor Prophets.
26. \*ἀποκωφῶν. Ez. iii 26, xxiv 27; Mic. vii 16. Elsewhere κωφείειν, κωφῶν Ψ.<sup>2</sup>, κωφός Ψ. Is., ἄλαλος Ψ.<sup>2</sup>, ἄφωνος Is.<sup>2</sup>
27. ἐκστρέφειν. Ez. a<sup>2</sup>; Min.<sup>3</sup> (Am. Zech.). Only else in Deut.<sup>1</sup>
28. חֶפְצָן ἐκφυσᾶν. Ez. a<sup>2</sup>; Min.<sup>3</sup> (Hg. Mal.). Else only twice in Greek books.
29. καθόλου. Ez.<sup>3</sup> (τὸ κ. μὴ): Am.<sup>3</sup> [Ex.<sup>1</sup>, Dan.<sup>1</sup>].
30. μετεωρίζειν. Ez. a<sup>4</sup>; Min.<sup>2</sup> (Mic. Ob.). Else Ψ<sup>1</sup> Gk. books<sup>2</sup>.
31. μνησικακεῖν. Ez. a<sup>1</sup>; Min.<sup>3</sup> (Jl. Zech.). Else Gen.<sup>1</sup> Prov.<sup>1</sup>
32. \*παροικεισία. Ez. xx 38; Zech. ix 12. Cf. κατοικεῖν Ez. vi 14 (Lam.<sup>1</sup> Ψ<sup>1</sup>).
33. חֶרֶס \*παροιστρᾶν. Ez. ii 6; Hos. iv 16.
34. \*πεμμα. Ez. γ<sup>11</sup> (= חֶמֶן): Hos.<sup>1</sup>
35. συμφύρεσθαι. Ez. a<sup>1</sup>; Hos.<sup>1</sup> [Sir.<sup>1</sup>].

This positive evidence may be supplemented by a certain amount of negative evidence, namely the absence from this group of books of such common words as καθά (one doubtful instance in Ez. a and one in Jonah), σὺν, παῖδιον, πάλιν (one instance in Jer. a), παραγίεσθαι, παύειν (one instance at the end of Jer. a), ποτέ, συναπτᾶν, συντάσσειν.

In some instances Jeremiah a diverges from the group, and Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets seem to be somewhat more closely related to each other than they are to Jeremiah. Thus, the following, which are used in common by Ez. a and γ and the Minor Prophets, are absent from Jer. a: ἐχόμενος (-ου -α), κατέναντι, ἐν τρόπον, ὑπεράνω.

The instances given above in Table IV may not in themselves be sufficient to establish identity of translators. Some of them might be due to imitation. I think, however, that the general agreement in vocabulary existing in these prophetic books affords strong cumulative



evidence that we have here another group<sup>1</sup> answering to that earlier group of the five books of the Greek Pentateuch for which the earliest tradition and all intrinsic evidence indicate a common origin.

As to the position of *the Greek Isaiah*, its rendering of 'Lord of hosts' is sufficient by itself to distinguish it from the group which we have been considering. The translator is, moreover, less competent on the whole than the translator or translators of the Jeremiah group<sup>2</sup>, though he tries to hide his ignorance by paraphrase or abbreviation, occasionally giving the general sense of a passage, while omitting to render the difficult words. Such deliberate deviation from the original is quite foreign to the translators of the other prophetic books, who honestly, although often with little success, try to find an equivalent for every word in the Hebrew. On the other hand, the Isaiah translator, while careless about producing a literal rendering, employs a Greek which much more nearly approaches the classical style than the Greek of the more painstaking translators of the other prophetic books. This may be illustrated by his use of connecting particles. Καί, δέ, γάρ are freely inserted, where there is no corresponding Hebrew word; we may note also the use of καί νῦν, διότι νῦν (iii 8), τοίνυν (iii 10, v 13), τοίνυν διὰ τοῦτο (xxvii 4), νῦν δέ (xxxvii 28), ἀλλά νῦν (iii 13), τοιγαροῦν (v 26), οὐ γάρ . . . ἀλλά (v 24). The greater ease of style, and the tendency to give a free rather than a *verbatim* rendering, are, I think, marks of a comparatively early date. Another characteristic of the Isaiah translation, which perhaps also points to an early date, is the agreement which it shows in some of its renderings with the book of Exodus. An ephah is rendered by μέτρα τρία only in Ex. xvi 36 and Is. v 10; ἦ (usually rendered πάροικος or προσήλυτος) is represented by the strange word γιώρας (γειώρας) only in Ex. xii 19 (ii 22, Philo, *De Confus. Ling.* 17) and Is. xiv 1; the anthropomorphism by which Jehovah is called 'a man of war' is avoided by the same paraphrase συντρίβων πολέμου in Ex. xv 3, Is. xlii 13. Cf. also the use of the words θήκη and κόσμυβος, and the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον (Ex. xiv 13, Is. seven times). With Genesis the Isaiah translator uses κόνδυ and συναγωγή ὕδατος (Is. xix 6, xxxvii 25, Gen. i 9)<sup>3</sup>.

Further results may, I believe, be obtained in the grouping of the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Ryle says, on the other hand, 'The only considerable portion of the translation done at the same time and by the same hands is the Pentateuch' (*Canon of the O. T.*, pp. 146 f.).

<sup>2</sup> Swete, *Introd. to O. T.*, p. 316.

<sup>3</sup> A characteristic phrase of the Isaiah translator is μικρὸς καὶ μέγας (ἀπὸ μικροῦ ὡς μεγάλου). He seems to have recourse to this when in doubt as to the meaning of the Hebrew. It occurs as the equivalent of five different Hebrew phrases (ix 14 (13), xxii 5, 24, xxxiii 4, 19), none of these being the common הוּרָה וְעַיִן יַקְרָה which the Greek phrase ordinarily renders in other parts of the LXX.



books of the LXX by a careful study of their style and vocabulary. As an instance of this I should like, in concluding this note, to mention that, just as the Greek Isaiah stands apart from the other prophetic books, so 1 Kingdoms seems to stand apart from the other three Books of Kingdoms and the Book of Judges. Although, owing to a large admixture of Hexaplaric readings<sup>1</sup>, it is difficult to arrive at the earliest text in these books, and there is no clear evidence of so close a connexion as appears to exist between the later prophetic books, yet there are certain features common to, and practically confined to Jd., 2, 3 and 4 Kingdoms, in which, as in other respects, they are distinguished from 1 Kingdoms. Thus, the peculiar use of *ἐγὼ εἰμι* (= אָנֹכִי) before a finite verb (*ἐγὼ εἰμι ἕσομαι* and the like) is practically confined to Jd. (B text five times, A text once), Ruth, 2 K. (seven times: also vii 29 *σὺ εἶ ἐλάλησας*), 3 K. (once), 4 K. (three times)<sup>2</sup>. *Κερατίνη* for 'trumpet' (שַׁרָפָה) is confined to Jd. (B and A texts ten times), 2 K. (four times)<sup>3</sup>, 3 K. (three times), 4 K. (once), 2 Ch. A text (once), and Nehemiah (twice); whereas *σάλπιγξ* is used in 1 K. and elsewhere. The same combination is seen in the use of the superlative *μονώτατος* (לְבָר) with the sense of the positive; it is confined to Jd. (once), 2 K. (thrice), 3 K. (five times), 4 K. (twice), and 2 Chron. vi 30 A. 1 Kingdoms uses *μόνος*, which is found along with *μονώτατος* in 2, 3 and 4 K. Note also the use of the following in 1 K.: *βίαια* (= שֵׁשׁ 'guilt-offering'), the transliteration *γεδδοῦρ* (= גִּדְדוּר: 2, 3, 4 K. render by *μονόζωνος*, *ἐξοδία*, *σύστρεμμα*), *δικάζειν* and *δικαστής* (שֹׁפֵט: Jd. Ruth, 2, 3, 4 K., &c., use *κρίνειν*, *κρίτης*), the adjective *λοιμός* to render '(sons of) Belial' (*παράνομος* in Dt., Jd., 2, 3 K., &c.). Many of the renderings in Jd., 2, 3, 4 K. mentioned above find attestation in some part of the Hexapla. I should be inclined to say that the original Greek of these books, when all due allowance has been made for the subsequent intrusion of Hexaplaric readings, was akin in many respects to that of the later Greek versions (Aquila, &c.), and that the versions of these historical books were made at a comparatively late date. 1 Kingdoms represents the first attempt to translate 'the earlier prophets' (נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים), as the Greek Isaiah exhibits the first attempted rendering of 'the later prophets' (נְבִיאִים אַחֲרִיתִים). It is curious to note that it is only in these two books that the Divine title יהוה צבאות is consistently represented by *Κύριος σαβαώθ*.

<sup>1</sup> A striking instance is seen in 3 Kingdoms, in which book most of the large lacunae in the B text of the LXX are supplied in cod. A from Aquila (see viii 1, ix 15 ff. &c.).

<sup>2</sup> Also Job xxxiii 31, Ez. xxxvi 36 A.

<sup>3</sup> *Σάλπιγξ* in 2 K. ii 28, vi 13; *κερατίνη* in 2 K. xv 10, xviii 16, xx 1, 22. There is other evidence for a distinction between the earlier and later portions of this book.

It may be worth while briefly to state the conclusions reached :—

1. Isaiah was the first of the prophetic books to be rendered into Greek.

2. The first half of Jeremiah, the greater part of Ezekiel, and the whole of the Minor Prophets were afterwards translated *en bloc*, possibly by a single hand, possibly by a small group of *collaborateurs*.

3. The remaining portions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel exhibit a style quite distinct from that which is found in the last-named group. These portions may have been made at the same time as the last group (this part of the work, with a view to expediting the translation of these two long books, being entrusted to persons not conversant with the methods of the translator or translators of the rest of the group), or they may be the work of a still later date, the earliest versions of these books having been only fragmentary.

4. In the case of Ezekiel, and possibly in other books, the rendering given of the lessons read on the great festivals, such as Pentecost, in the synagogues at Alexandria, formed the basis on which a complete translation was afterwards engrafted.

5. 1 Kingdoms was like the Greek Isaiah, a first attempt at rendering one of the main divisions of the Hebrew Bible, and exhibits a different style from that of the later versions of 2, 3 and 4 Kingdoms.

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

#### ON SOME CHRISTIAN GRAVESTONES FROM OLD DONGOLA.

A FEW months ago Mr. Carl Armbruster, of King's College, Cambridge, and now of the Nubian Civil Service, sent to Cambridge three fragmentary gravestones with Greek inscriptions which had been long used as building material near Old Dongola. They are of interest as coming from so far up the Nile, for Old Dongola is about halfway between the great dam of Aşwân and Khartum itself. There is also a further feature of interest arising from the fact that one of the stones is dated 812 A. D., a curiously late date for a Greek inscription from the heart of Nubia. The other two stones, however, look earlier, and may be assigned to the seventh and eighth centuries. But in any case they seem to be later than the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt.



(a) ΖΩΗ

† Ο Θ̄Σ ΤΩΝ ΠΝ̄ΑΤΩ[Ν ΚΑΙ ΠᾹΣΗΣ]  
 ΣΑΡΚΟΣ Ο ΤΟΝ ΘΑΝΑ[ΤΟΝ ΚΑΤΑΡΓΙ]  
 ΣΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΔΗΝ [ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΗΣΑΣ]  
 ΚΑΙ ΖΩΗΝ ΤΩ ΚΟΣΜ[Ω ΧΑΡΙΣΑΜΕ]  
 ΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΟΝ ΤΗΝ [ΨΥΧΗΝ]  
 ΤΟΝ ΔΟΥΛΟΝ ΣΟΥ ΜΑΡΙ[ΔΑΝΟΝ]

(sic) ΔΡ̄ Μ̄ΑΝ ῙΣ Τ̄Λ̄ Λ̄ΑΡ̄ Σ [ΜΕΤΑ]  
 ΑΒΡΑΑΜ Σ ΙΣΑΑΚ Σ ΙΑΚ[ΩΒ]  
 [ΕΝ ΤΟΠΩ] ΦΩΤΙΝΩ ΕΝ [ . . . . ]  
 . . . . .

'LIFE'

† O God of the spirits and of all flesh, who didst abolish death  
 gavest life to the world, give rest to this soul, even thy servant Maria  
 Archimandrite (?) . . . (?), and with (?) Abraham and Isaac and Ja  
 in the place of light may he dwell (?).

(β)

ΤΩΝ ΠΝΩΝ ΣΠΑΧΗΣ ΣΑΡ ΚΟΣ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΚΟΛ ΠΟΙΣ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ Σ ΙΣΑΑΚ Σ ΙΑΚΩΒ ΕΝ . . . . . . . . . ΠΡΣΑΝΑ . . .
---

. . . . . God] of the spirits and of all flesh, give rest to his soul  
 the bosoms of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the chambers (?)  
 God the Father (?) may he (?) rest.

(γ)

ΣΠ. ΑΝ . . . . .  
 ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΑΡΤΙ . . . . ΑΡΝΗΣΜΝΙ  
 ΧΟΙΑΧ ΚΒ ΑΠΟΔΙΟΚΛΗΕΨΟΣ  
 ΦΚΗ ΙΝ Ε. ΤΑΓΔΙΕΓΕΤΓΗΛΑΥΤΣ  
 ΔΟΘΣ ΑΥΤΩ ΩΓΡΙΣ ΕΝ ΕΠΙΤΗΣ  
 ΓΗΣ. ΞΗΟΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΤΩΝ  
 ΛΙΩΝΩΝ ΧΣ . . . . .  
 — C . . . . .



. . . . .] Marcus, archbishop (?) of \*\*RNE, in the 22nd of Khoiakh in the year of Diocletian 528, Indiction 5. Now his years which God ordained for him on the earth were 68. O King of the ages, Christ, [give rest to his soul . . .]

This date is Dec. 18, 812 A.D., a year in which the Indiction was 5.

The wording of the inscriptions represents the common form of Christian gravestones in Egypt, over twenty of which are edited in Böckh, *C. I. G.* 9113-9133. The most curious point about these simple and dignified formulae is that in some of them the name of the dead person is put in apposition to ψυχή—we pray God to give rest to 'the soul so-and-so,' not to 'the soul of so-and-so' (see stone *a* and Böckh, 9120). The prayer that the departed may rest with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is found in the Sacramentary of Serapion as well as the adaptation of Numbers xvi 22 (*J. T. S.* i 268). May we not therefore venture to take ἡ ψυχή in the Sacramentary as meaning 'this person'? Thus τὴν ψυχὴν, τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἀνάπαυσον ἐν τόποις χλόης, ἐν ταμείοις ἀναπαύσεως μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἀνάστησον ἐν ἡ ἡμερᾶ κ.τ.λ. might be rendered 'As for this person, give rest to his *spirit* with Abraham Isaac and Jacob and all the saints, and raise up his *body* at the appointed day.'

The curious Egyptian order 'Soul, body, spirit,' noted by Mr. Brightman (*J. T. S.* ii 273), comes on this theory to mean 'the living man, including his body and his spirit,' this ψυχή being divided at death into its two elements, viz. the πνεῦμα which rests with the Patriarchs and the σῶμα which remains in the grave awaiting the resurrection.

The Editor has pointed out to me that the adaptation of Numbers xvi 22, together with the mention of the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is found in the Liturgy of S. James and in the Liturgy of the Syriac Jacobites (Brightman, *L. E. W.*, pp. 57, 95; cf. also p. 108). The nearest parallel to ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων Χριστός, besides 1 Tim. i 17, appears to be a ferial hymn in the Nestorian Rite which is also used for commemorations of the dead (Brightman, p. 299, note).

F. C. BURKITT.

### ON CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (*h*)

CODEX CLAROMONTANUS of S. Matthew, known among the Old Latin MSS of the Gospels as *h*, was bought by Pius VI and is now numbered *Vat. Lat.* 7223. It formerly belonged to the Jesuit College at Clermont. Codex *h* was used by Sabatier; it has been edited in full by Mai, and afterwards by Belsheim (Christiania, 1892). Some of Mr. Belsheim's reprints are said to be not very accurate: it may therefore be well to state that the only corrections to be made in Matt. xxvii,

xxviii, which I collated for the sake of test edition, are the addition of *iterum* after *autem* fol. 63 b, and the spellings *terre motu* (xxvii 5), *sepulcrum* (xxvii 54), *fili* (xxviii 19). The sacri in the usual way. In xxvii 22 *h* has *ih̄m*, in : *dn̄s* (not *d̄ms* or *d̄om̄s*), in xxviii 19 *spiritus* is w is divided up into short paragraphs, not repres means of initial letters of a slightly larger size, xxvii 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, &c. S. Matthew ends on the At the end of the column is written *euangeli xp̄* |, and the second column is blank. The blank, so that it looks as if nothing more was i Gospel is divided into 74 sections, as in C (practically) the Irish MSS.

No good facsimile of *h* has as yet been assigned to the fifth and to the seventh century much like that of the Codex Fuldensis, but c and I think we need have little hesitation in p of the sixth century.

As is well known, Codex Claromontanus cor Old Latin, followed by Mc., Lc. and Joh. in part of the MS might be called *clar*, reservi portion. The handwriting of *clar* is quite diffi product we may suppose of another scriptori much later, certainly not later than the seventh of the earliest surviving Vulgate MSS. It cont chapter numbering agrees more nearly with t e. g. Joh. viii 1 begins section xvi. It appears with a few singular readings. Thus it read White *quippini* in Lc. xi 28, and agrees with th ing *cotidie* for the Clementine *hodie*. In Lc. *Martha, sollicita es et turbaris erga plurima, cu Maria optimam partem elegit*, &c. This readi but I do not think there are many of a similarl the same time, if it could be ascertained wh world Codex Claromontanus originally came fr might throw an interesting light upon the earl Mr. Lawlor in his *Chapters on the Book of Mul out how interesting the question of the provenar of the earliest Irish texts: is it not time there both parts of Codex Claromontanus seriously the history of each?*

## TWO NOTES ON ENOCH IN SIR. xliv 16.

## I.

THE Greek of Sir. xliv 16 (ed. Swete) is—

Ἐνώχ εὐηρέστησεν Κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη,  
ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς.

[*μετανοίας*] Edersheim in the *Speaker's Commentary* gives 'of wisdom' as the Coptic, with the suggestion *διανοίας* (?); and quotes the Syro-hex. and MS 253 for the rendering 'an everlasting example to the generations,' the one reading *דלעלם* and the other *alāwos*, cf. verse 17 *διδάσκαι* (Heb. באור) *alāwos*.

In the Cairene Hebrew the verse runs thus—

Enoch was found perfect and walked with יהוה ;

And he was taken, a sign of knowledge to generation and generation.

M. Israel Lévi in *L'Écclesiastique* suggests *ἐπινοίας* for *μετανοίας*, and notes that Nöldeke proposes *ἐννοίας*.

It has been pointed out that נמצא חמים, *he was found perfect*, is a repetition from the next verse, on Noah; and Dr. Peters well remarks that this assimilation of the two verses accounts for the omission of verse 16 in the Syriac.

Looking at דעת, *a sign of knowledge*, in its context I find it strange, and think that it may be corrupt. Omitting דעת we get the clear sense, 'he was taken away, a sign to successive generations,' with a natural construction for דעת, which usually stands without epithet or complement. The addition עולם, *alāwos*, as in Isa. lv 13 and Sir. xliii 6, is not wanted in Sir. xliv 16 (cf. li 30) before לדור ודור.

The next verse ends—

לעת (ב' marg.) כלה היה תחליף ;

If לעת or בעת, like נמצא חמים, was brought into verse 16 from verse 17, it may have been corrupted (1) into דעת, and (2) into עולם. Compare Sir. iv 23 Heb. בעולם, Syr. בעתו, Gr. בעת שלום.

In the Greek of verse 16 suppose a rendering—

ὑπόδειγμα γενεαῖς καὶ γενεαῖς.

Then, repeating the *μα*, read

ΜΑΓΕΝΕΔΙΔΙ,

and change *γ* and an *ε* into *τ* and *ο*. Thus we get all the letters of

ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ,

and then *μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς*, cf. Matt. xii 39 f., Luke xi 29 f. σημεῖον . . . μετενόησαν. In the received Greek text *μετανοίας* seems to correspond to



μετετέθη in the previous hemistich. But, according to the Hebrew, this should end at *Κερίω*, and the second (without *μετανοίας*) would be

καὶ μετετέθη ὑπόδειγμα ταῖς γενεαῖς.

Although in the 'Henochsage,' on which see Hamburger's *Real-Encyc.*, Enoch 'kennt alle Geheimnisse,' it may be doubted whether Ben Sira himself wrote *אמת רעת*. Rashi (cf. Gen. Rab. 25. 1) describes Enoch as *righteous but quick in his mind (רעת) to repent and do wickedly (לשוב להרשע)*. If *μετανοίας* in its ordinary sense is to be retained as a rendering of *רעת*, compare the sayings that repentance is *תכלית הכנסה* (*Jewish Fathers*, p. 70) and *σύνεσις μεγάλη* (*Herm. Mund.* iv 2. 2).

C. TAYLOR.

## II.

It is, I venture to think, possible to explain and justify the reading both of the Hebrew 'sign of knowledge' and of the Greek 'sign (or 'pattern') of repentance' by means of the early Jewish exegesis of the story of Enoch contained in Gen. v 21-24. His repentance is indeed easily inferred from v. 22 'Enoch walked with God after that he begat Methuselah,' although the context seems to show that the writer thought only of the continuance of a consistently good life. But once the principle of interpreting the Old Testament characters as types of human nature was applied to the text, it is obvious that the translation of Enoch (inferred by LXX from the Hebrew 'he was not for God took him') must become a change of mind or repentance. Accordingly we read in Philo (*de Abrahamo*: ed. Mangey, ii 4) 'Now after Hope *Repentance for sins and Amendment* holds the second place; and therefore the record follows of him *who changed from the worse mode of life to the better*, who is called among the Hebrews "Enoch," or as the Greeks might say "the highly favoured." Now of him it is said "Enoch pleased God and he was not found for God translated him." For translation implies a turning and change, and the change is for the better, because it comes about by the providence of God.' And so, as we might expect, Noah who is 'Rest' or 'the Just' follows '*him that repented*.' The same generalization of the story is expounded in *de Praemiis* (ed. Mangey, ii 410).

So also Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii ed. Potter, p. 466): 'Moreover does not God, next after the pardon bestowed upon Cain, not much later introduce Enoch *who repented*, showing plainly that repentance is wont to produce pardon?'

It is then natural that a translator acquainted with the Alexandrian methods of exegesis followed by Philo and Clement, should transform 'sign of knowledge' to 'sign of repentance,' in order to expound the significance of the life of Enoch and that his unknown successor should

render  $\text{דעת}$ , as if it were Aramaic, by  $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\sigma$ . The 'sign of knowledge' belongs to another investigation.

In the Book of Jubilees (chap. iv 17: ed. Charles, pp. 37 ff.) it is said of Enoch that he was *the first among men who learnt writing and knowledge*: having foretold the future to the children of men, he testified to the fallen 'watchers,' and now sits in Eden to record the sins of men as 'the scribe of righteousness'—'*for there he was set as a sign that he should recount all the deeds of the generations until the day of condemnation.*'

I submit that the enigmatic 'sign of knowledge' is a fair summary of this view which was ousted by the more obviously appropriate notion of 'repentance.' 'Knowledge' is to be taken in the ethical sense prevalent in the Wisdom-literature (see B. D. B. s. v.  $\text{דעת}$ ): Enoch in his life and end is himself a sign thereof (cf. Lc. ii 34, xi 30). The difference between the Hebrew and the Greek of Ben Sira is due to the different environments of grandfather and grandson, for the Book of Jubilees stands for Palestinian Judaism, Philo for the beginnings of Alexandrian Hellenism.

J. H. A. HART.

SIR. xlvi 17, a, b.

THE Hebrew has 'Hezekiah strengthened his city by turning into the midst water,' and no version offers any substantial variant in (a), save that the Syriac translator renders 'Hezekiah built the city ( $\text{בנה עיר}$ ),' and thus obliterates the usual paronomasia ( $\text{חוקיהו חוק}$ ) on the name of the hero commemorated. But in (b) certain MSS of the Greek version offer some perplexing variants for which the Hebrew and Syriac texts in their present form offer no explanation. A with the cursives 55, 106, 155, 157, 248, 254 and the Latin version follows the Hebrew and Syriac reading 'water'  $\tau\omicron\ \upsilon\delta\omega\rho$ ; B has  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \Gamma\omega\gamma$ , N<sup>e</sup>  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \text{H}\omega\gamma$ , N<sup>o.b.</sup>  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu$ ; while the cursive 70 reads  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \eta\eta\omega\rho$ . The Syro-Hexaplar reproduces the reading of its Greek authority  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \upsilon\tau\omega\rho$  which explains the corruption of 70 and also offers a clue to the text underlying that of B and N.

For according to 2 Chron. xxxii 30 the water in question was the brook *Gihon*, and the evidence of the versions, here and elsewhere, proves that *Sior* was in some way identified therewith and also that there was a tendency to substitute a vague word for the benefit of readers less interested in the topography of Jerusalem or the minute accuracy of every detail.

Thus in 2 Chron. xxxii 30 the Alexandrian text of the Septuagint



follows the Hebrew 'the waters of Gihon,' but the Syriac version reads 'the waters of the spring (ܩܝܗܘܢ)' and the Vatican Greek reads 'the water of Sion,' a corruption of the comparatively unknown *Sior* which is guaranteed by Origen in the passage cited below.

Again, in 2 Chron. xxxiii 14, where *Gihon* is preserved in the Hebrew, the Syriac and the Vatican Greek, the Greek vulgate has *ueros* for *ueros*, i. e. the word is unfamiliar and liable to corruption.

Finally, in Jer. ii 18, where the Hebrew and Syriac read *Sior* (ܩܝܗܘܢ) the Greek and Arabic (Walton) have *Geon*: the Syro-Hexaplar notes the Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotus have *Sior* (so Q mg), and S. Jerome (quoted by Field *Hexapla* ad loc.) comments 'Pro *Sior* nos *turibian* interpretati sumus quod verbum Hebraicum significat pro quo communis editio habet *Geon*.' This reading of the LXX here mentioned is corrected by Origen by reference to a corrupted text of one of 'the other' Greek translators:—'Moreover also Jeremiah rebukes them that are fain to drink the water of Egypt and forsake that which comes down from heaven, saying, "What hast thou to do with the way of Egypt to drink the water of *Geon*"—or, as the Hebrew has it, "to drink the water of *Sion*," (in Jo. vi 47: ed. Brooke i 166)—the context proves that he read *Sion* and not *Sior*. It may also be mentioned that Theodoret in discussing a *Quaestio* 'what is the meaning of *Geon*?' states that it means the Nile, and thence also Siloam, either by a certain irony as being very small or because it also has a hidden source: for this view compare 3 Ki. i 33, 38, 45, where the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin read *Gihon*, but the Syriac and Targum of Jonathan *Shiloh*.

It appears, then, that on the authority of B<sup>8</sup> we should restore *gion* in the Greek text and *גִּיחֹן* in the Hebrew of Ben Sira, since the evidence of 2 Chron. ll. c. shows that it was the older name, that the reading *gion* is a legitimate and natural variant, and that the 'water' of the Hebrew Syriac and Alexandrian Greek is a mere simplification (this conclusion is supported by the fact that it has been reached independently by Mr. Burkitt); further that there are two if not three types of text fragmentarily and confusedly preserved in the Greek MSS resting on different recensions of the Hebrew, and that the version of the younger Ben Sira is a trustworthy guide to the restoration of the archetype where it can itself be certainly recovered.

J. H. A. HART.



NOTES ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS OF  
ST. ANDREWS FROM A. D. 1093 TO A. D. 1571<sup>1</sup>. I.

THE destruction, or, at least, the total disappearance of any episcopal registers of the mediæval Church in Scotland<sup>2</sup> (supposing such to have existed), renders the task of tracing the succession of the Scottish bishops one of peculiar difficulty. The papal letters, published by A. Theiner in his *Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scottorum historiam Illustrantia* (Romæ: 1864), deal with the period from 1216 to 1547; and, though suffering from several serious *lacunæ*, serve to throw light on some obscure questions connected with the episcopal succession. The same may be said of the records now in process of publication under the title of the *Calendar of Papal Registers*, edited by Mr. W. H. Bliss, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. Up to the present there have appeared four volumes of *Papal Letters* (running from 1198 to 1404) and one volume of *Petitions* (1342-1419)<sup>3</sup>.

For the bishops of the twelfth century we possess few more sources of information than were available to Bishop Robert Keith when in 1754 he published 'A large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland (4to, Edinburgh).' But the inquirer of our day enjoys the advantage of being able to examine the chartularies (which Keith was compelled to consult in MS) in the well-indexed editions issued by the Bannatyne, Maitland, Spalding, and Grampian Clubs. Again the *Great Seal Register* of Scotland, the *Exchequer Rolls*, and other public records of that country, which were but imperfectly known to Keith are now, to a large extent, available in print, competently edited by distinguished charter scholars. But those who are best qualified to judge must always look on Keith's work as a great monument of laborious research, undertaken and carried through with singular success, considering the difficulties which he had to encounter<sup>4</sup>.

The design of the following notes is much more restricted than that of Keith. He aimed at giving some account of the lives of the prelates with whom he had to deal. I shall confine myself, almost exclusively, to

<sup>1</sup> The writer will be grateful for corrections or additions to these notes.

<sup>2</sup> The four Chartularies that have been printed under the misleading titles *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, 2 vols.—*Moraviensis*, 1 vol.—*Aberdonensis*, 2 vols.—and *Bruchinensis*, 2 vols., are not episcopal registers, but registers of the property of the respective deans and chapters, together with (occasionally) cathedral statutes, and some miscellaneous matter.

<sup>3</sup> We trust that there is no foundation for the rumour that the Master of the Rolls has ordered the discontinuance of the *Petitions*.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Russel's edition of Keith (8vo, Edinburgh: 1824) corrects some errors, but imports others.

determining (as far as that is possible) the dates of the election (or papal provision), consecration, and death (or resignation), of the several bishops.

When the information is forthcoming I have also recorded, as matters of ecclesiastical interest, the mode of the election, the confirmation by the Pope, or his refusal to confirm, the names of the consecrators, and a few other particulars, chiefly from the *Calendar of Papal Registers*.

The death of Malcolm Ceanmore and his queen, St. Margaret of Scotland, has been chosen as a starting-point. Those who are interested in the tangled problems connected with the earlier bishops who had their seat at Kilrymont (St. Andrews), and who represented the early Celtic Christianity of the country, will consult Dr. W. F. Skene (*Celtic Scotland*, ii 323-65).

Anglo-Norman influence in matters ecclesiastical, which had already made itself felt during the reign of Malcolm, became dominant after his death (1093). The decadent Celtic clergy were incapable of seriously stemming the inflowing tide; and in almost all respects the ecclesiastical arrangements of Scotland became soon assimilated to those of the southern kingdom.

The following abbreviations are used in citing authorities:—B. = Brady's *Episcopal Succession*, vol. i (Rome: 1876); B.C. = *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland preserved in H. M. Public Record Office, London*, edited by Joseph Bain; C.P.R. = *Calendar of Papal Registers*, edited by Bliss; C.S.C. = *Chronicon Coenobii S. Crucis Edinburgensis* (Bannatyne Club); M. = *Chronica de Mailros* (Bannatyne Club); R.A. = *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis* (Spalding Club); R.B. = *Registrum Episcopatus Brechinensis* (Bannatyne Club); R.G. = *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis* (Bannatyne Club); R.M. = *Registrum Episcopatus Moraviensis* (Bannatyne Club); R.P.S.A. = *Registrum Prioratus Sancti Andree* (Bannatyne Club); R.M.S. = *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum* (Record Publications); R.S.S. = *Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum* (still in MS, preserved in H. M. General Register House, Edinburgh); Sc. = Fordun and Bower's *Scotichronicon* (Goodall's edition, 2 vols. folio, 1759)<sup>1</sup>; T. = Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, &c. The chartularies of religious houses (edited for the Bannatyne Club, the Grampian Club, &c., or for private persons) are cited by the name of the house. Thus *Liber de Melros* is cited as 'Melrose'; *Liber S. Marie de Calchou* as 'Kelso,' and so, generally, with the rest. W. = *The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, by Andrew de Wyntoun (David Laing's edition, 3 vols. 1872-79). Wyntoun, though a late writer, had, perhaps as being a canon regular of St. Andrews,

<sup>1</sup> When Skene's edition of Fordun's part of the work is referred to the fact indicated.

access apparently to the records of the see. At any rate, he can certainly claim to be an original historian, and is especially full in his treatment of St. Andrews. When he can be tested he nearly always bears the test well.

**TURGOT** (Turgod), prior of Durham. Perhaps the confessor of Queen Margaret and author of the *Vita S. Margarete*.

Simeon of Durham (Twysden, 207, 237) twice states that Turgot died 1115, and adds that his episcopate was for eight years, two months, and ten days. Now his consecration was on [Sunday] Aug. 1, 1109 (M. s. a.), and his death was on Aug. 31, 1115 (Id. s. a.; *Lib. Vite Dunelm. Ecl.* 145, 151). His episcopate must accordingly have been reckoned by Simeon from the date of his election, which gives us June 20 (?), 1107. Simeon (s. a. 1107) tell us that Turgot was elected, and that 'for a year and more' his ordination (i. e. consecration) was delayed on account of dissensions between the churches of York and St. Andrews. This fits in well with the inferential date of the election.

In the end he was consecrated by Archbishop Thomas of York, at the command of Henry I, king of England, on the request of King Alexander. The disputes were suspended for the time by the reservation of the rights of both sees. Simeon of Durham gives 'iii. kal. Aug. (July 30) die Dominica,' as the date of his consecration<sup>1</sup>. But Hoveden (i 167, Stubbs' edit.), who had Simeon before him, writes 'in kal. Aug.' And this date is also given by M. (s. a. 1109), and by Florence of Worcester (s. a. 1109), who notices that it was the *Sunday* on which Thomas received the pall. Further 'iii. kal. Aug.' was not a Sunday in that year while 'kal. Aug.' was. And the common law of the Church was that bishops should be consecrated on Sunday. Therefore we may conclude that the consecration of Turgot took place on Sunday, Aug. 1, 1109. It is not difficult to account for the error in the text of Simeon as printed. Nothing would be easier than for a copyist to mistake 'in kal. Aug.' for 'iii. kal. Aug.'<sup>2</sup>

It is right to notice the perplexing statement of *Scotichronicon* (vi 24). Under the year 1109 the chronicler writes 'Turgotus, Prior Dunelmensis, electus est in translatione S. Augustini, et consecratus stetit episcopus fere septem annis.' Setting aside the fact that he was consecrated only six years and thirty days, we have to ask what is meant by 'in translatione S. Augustini.' Was the S. Augustine the bishop of Hippo or the bishop of Canterbury? None of the calendars which the editor has been able to consult give a translation of either saint in

<sup>1</sup> Bower (*Scotichronicon*, v 38) also gives 'tertio kalendas Augusti, 1109.'

<sup>2</sup> This view of the origin of the error, which the editor arrived at independently, is that taken by Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, II i 171), who print most of the evidence available on the subject of Turgot's appointment.



the month of June. Could it be that 'in translatione S. Aedwardi' was incorrectly read by a copyist? The suggestion is somewhat desperate; but the writer of these Notes has nothing better to offer.

Turgot died at Durham Aug. 31, 1115 (*M. s. a.* and *Lib. Vite Dunelm.*) and there was buried.

See void from Aug. 31, 1115, to June 29, 1120.

Almost immediately after the death of Turgot King Alexander wrote to Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, asking his advice and assistance in providing a fit successor to Turgot. It should be remembered that Thomas of York had died (Feb. 24, 1114) more than a year before Turgot, and that his successor, Thurstan, was not consecrated until Oct. 19, 1119. So that one need not suppose that Alexander would have resorted to Canterbury had the archbishop of York been consecrated. But (probably from the dislike of Ralph to interfere in what the archbishop of York held to be a matter within his jurisdiction) the see of St. Andrews remained void. It was not till 1120 that the archbishop of Canterbury, in response to the request of King Alexander, released Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury, with a view to his appointment to St. Andrews.

*EADMER*, a monk of Canterbury.

Elected June 29, 1120; 'elegente eum clero et populo terrae, et concedente Rege' (Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* v). There were difficulties about investiture, which however were overcome; and there were more serious difficulties as to who should consecrate him, and as to whether he would owe allegiance and subjection to an English archbishop if he were consecrated by either Canterbury or York. After prolonged disputations between him and the king, Eadmer, who had already rendered himself unpopular, apparently by attempts to enforce a more rigorous discipline, resolved to return to Canterbury. This he did in the following year (1121, *M. s. a.*).

As late as perhaps the early autumn of 1122 (certainly before Sept. 19) Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to King Alexander urging him to recall Eadmer to Scotland, but in vain<sup>1</sup>.

He is named 'Edmund' in *M.* and in *Scotichronicon* (vi 25); but the latter hastens to add that he called himself 'Eadmer.' While *M.* is correct in giving 1120 as the date of his election, and 1121 as the date of his return to his monastery, *Scotichronicon* (*l. c.*) is in error in making his election in 1117. The transactions connected with Eadmer are dealt with very fully by himself (*Historia Novorum*).

Eadmer became precentor of Canterbury, and died Jan. 13, 1124.

<sup>1</sup> The principal documents relating to Eadmer in relation to St. Andrews are exhibited conveniently in Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, II i 196-208).

**ROBERT**, prior of Scone<sup>1</sup>.

*Scotichronicon* (vi 24) tells us that there are two accounts of the length of his episcopate, both of these, apparently, placing his death in 1159, with which agrees M. (76-77), and Wyntoun (ii 199). But C.S.C. (*s. a.*) places his death in 1158<sup>2</sup>. Sc., then, placing his death in 1159 says that one account makes him 'elect' *per biennium*, and consecrated thirty-five years. It is this account which Sc. adopts, for it makes him elected in 1122. The other account, like the first, agrees that he was elect for two years, but makes him consecrated for only thirty-two years. This latter account accordingly by inference places his election in 1125 and his consecration in 1127 or 1128. But the fullness of the statement in M. *sub anno* 1124, brings us probably as near the date of the election of Robert as we are likely to reach. After mentioning the death of King Alexander in April of that year, the Chronicle says, 'in the same year, four months before his death, he had caused Robert, prior of Scone, to be elected bishop of St. Andrews, but his ordination (i. e. consecration) was delayed for a considerable time.' Accordingly we shall not be far wrong if we place Robert's election in January, 1124, perhaps after the news of Eadmer's death had reached Scotland.

The delay preceding the consecration of Robert was probably due to some claim on the part of the archbishop of York to a profession of fealty to the see of York. But in the end consecration was given by Thurstan, archbishop of York, without any profession of obedience being exacted<sup>3</sup>.

The date of Robert's consecration seems to be a matter of inference from the *data* already supplied. 'Per biennium' is somewhat vague; but if it may be trusted, we can hardly place his consecration later than sometime in 1126. The continuator of Florence of Worcester, indeed, places the consecration of Robert in 1128, under which year it appears as the first event recorded. And probably on the strength of this statement the year 1128 is commonly given as the year<sup>4</sup>. But there is extant a charter of 'Rodbertus Dei gratia Sancti Andree episcopus' quitclaiming cain, conveth, &c., to the priory of Coldingham, which is dated 'XVI kalendas Augusti in festo Sancti Kenelmi martyris (July 17)' in the year 1127 (see *National MSS of Scotland*, I. no. 27). Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, II i 214) print the charter, but they insert in

<sup>1</sup> He had been a canon of St. Oswald's at Nosthill, near Pontefract, in Yorkshire, and was brought thence, with five other canons regular of St. Austin, to Scone (Sc. vi Preface) in 1115 (M. *s. a.*).

<sup>2</sup> So the copy known to Keith; but the Bannatyne Club edition reads 1159.

<sup>3</sup> See Thurstan's acknowledgement in Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, II i 215).

<sup>4</sup> If the consecration took place in this year it must have been before Sept. 5, when Ranulph, bishop of Durham, one of the consecrators, died. *Contin. Florent. Wigorn.*, *s. a.* 1128.

the heading, summarising the contents, the word 'elect' after bishop of St. Andrews. Stubbs, however, seems to have, on consideration, rejected the date 1128 as given by the Continuator of Florence of Worcester, for in the second edition of *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* (p. 44)<sup>1</sup> he gives 1127 as the year of Robert's consecration<sup>2</sup>.

Thurstan had assisting in the consecration Ranulph, bishop of Durham, and Ralph 'ad Orcadas insulas iam olim in episcopatum ordinatum' (*Contin. Florent. Wigorn.* ii 89, edit. Thorpe), and, perhaps, John, bishop of Glasgow (Raine's *Historians of the Church of York* iii 51).

There does not seem to be any good reason for doubting that the consecration took place in 1126, or, possibly, 1127.

Charter evidence: there is an undated charter in which Robert appears as 'elect of St. Andrews' in the reign of David I (*Dunfermlyn*, p. 15). He also appears frequently as 'bishop' in the same reign (R.G. 11, 13; R.P.S.A. 182, 185, 187, &c.).

Robert's death (see above) is assigned to 1158, or, more probably, 1159<sup>3</sup>.

The see vacant for a year or more.

ÆRNALD (Ernald, Ernold, Arnold), second abbot of Kelso. He had been made abbot in 1147 on the elevation of his predecessor, Herbert, to the see of Glasgow (M. s. a.).

Elected to St. Andrews Nov. 13 (St. Brice's day), which was a Sunday, 1160 (M. s. a.)<sup>4</sup>.

Consecrated on the following Sunday, Nov. 20, 'in veteri ecclesia' at St. Andrews, in the presence of King Malcolm, by William, bishop of Moray, legate of the Apostolic See (M. s. a.)<sup>5</sup>. Sc. (vi 35) concurs.

<sup>1</sup> Published 1897, several years after the second volume of the *Councils*.

<sup>2</sup> In the charter referred to above there appears as a witness 'Rodberto fratre meo.' The recurrence of the same name among the children of one family is familiar to charter scholars.

<sup>3</sup> *WALTHEVE* (Waltheof, Waldeve). If we may credit a not very trustworthy writer, but one who in this instance may probably be accepted, Jocelin of Furness (cited in Sc. vi 25), on the death of Robert, Waltheve, abbot of Melrose, on the petition of the people, by the choice of the clergy (*cleri electio*) and with the assent of the princes, was chosen to succeed. The magnates of the land and the clergy came to Melrose to press the matter; and the abbot of Rievaulx, who happened to be present, urged him to accept the office. But from motives of piety and a presentiment that he was not long to live, he firmly declined. The abbot was a son of Matilda, queen of Scotland, by her first husband, Simon de St. Liz, earl of Northampton and Huntingdon. He was afterwards known as St. Waltheof. See Jocelin's *Vita S. Waltheni* in the Bollandists, AA. SS. August. i 248-77. Waltheve died Aug. 3, 1159 (M. s. a.).

<sup>4</sup> It has been verified that Nov. 13 in this year fell on Sunday.

<sup>5</sup> The legate's assent was probably taken as equivalent to a papal confirmation.



There is charter evidence, which it is unnecessary to cite more particularly, in Neubottle, Dunfermlyn, and R.P.S.A.

He died Sept. 13, 1162 (Sc. vi 35; C.S.C. s. a. : and, for the year, M. s. a.). Sc. (*ibid.*) says he was bishop for one year, ten months, and seventeen days, which is obviously wrong. His death is placed by W. (ii 200) in 1163, and the same writer says he was buried in the 'awld kirk' which is probably to be taken for the church of St. Regulus. He founded the 'great church' of St. Andrews (Sc. *L.c.*).

**RICHARD**: 'capellanus regis Malcolmi' (Sc. vi 35; M. s. a. 1163).

Elected 1163 (M. s. a.); elected *concorditer* (W. ii 200). This falls in well with a writ in the Chartulary of Scone (cited by Keith, p. 11) where 'Richard elect of St. Andrews' is a witness in the eleventh year of King Malcolm, that is the year ending May 23, 1164.

Wyntoun (ii 200) says that he 'Elyte twa yhere bad efftyr,' i. e. after his election.

Consecrated on Palm Sunday, 'que tunc evenit v kalendas Aprilis,' 1165, at St. Andrews in Scotland, by bishops of the same land (M. s. a.), in the presence of the king (Sc. vi 45). Wyntoun (*L.c.*) says that the bishops of Scotland 'be the Papys lettrys special' gave him confirmation and consecration. This is exactly what we might have expected from other cases where evidence is forthcoming<sup>1</sup>.

Sc. (vi 35) would lead one to suppose that Richard was elected as well as consecrated in 1165. But the text of Sc. goes on to say of Richard 'electus stetit per biennium et confirmatus xij. annis et uno mense,' and places his death in 1177 on 'tertio nonas Maii.' Which shows that Sc. really agrees with M. as to the date of Richard's election.

Richard died May 3, 1178 (M. s. a.), which date is supported by W. (ii 211). Sc. (vi 35) gives May 3, 1177; but again in another place (viii 25) the year 1178 is given by the same writer (Bower in both cases). *Liber Vite Eccl. Dunelm.* (p. 143) gives 'iii. Id. Maii' as his obit; but the other testimonies seem more fitted to be regarded. He died in the infirmary of the canons of St. Andrews (Sc. *L.c.*)<sup>2</sup>.

**JOHN**, called the Scot, though by birth an Englishman (born according to Sc. vi 35 at the vill of Podoth in the county of Chester). He had studied first at Oxford and afterwards at Paris. After a short stay at

<sup>1</sup> By independent calculation the fact that Palm Sunday fell on March 28 (v. Kal. April.), in the year 1165, has been verified.

<sup>2</sup> The above statements as to the dates of the election and consecration of Richard serve to correct the date ('ante 1165') assigned by Mr. Cosmo Innes to a charter of King Malcolm, witnessed by 'Ricardo episcopo Sancti Andree' (R.G. i 16). It must be assigned to some date between March 28, 1165, and Dec. 9 of the same year when Malcolm died.

Incidentally we have a notice of the bishop's brother, Robert, and his sister Avicia (R.P.S.A. 134).

his home on his return from the schools, he went to St. Andrew he was honourably received by Bishop Richard, who on a occurring made him archdeacon of St. Andrews. After the Richard he was unanimously elected by the chapter in the 3 (M. s. a.) or (in error) 1177 (Sc. vi 35) in the presence of the pa Cardinal John de Caelio Monte<sup>1</sup>.

**HUGH**, chaplain of King William, the Lion, *intruded*. The of John had been without the knowledge of the king; and not he not give his consent to the result of the election, but he c own chaplain, Hugh, to be consecrated (1178, M. s. a.: 1177, for the church of St. Andrews, and expelled John from the John laid his case before the Pope (Alexander III) who qua election of Hugh<sup>2</sup>. The Pope sent Alexius (incorrectly calle in Sc. vi 36) as his legate to Scotland<sup>3</sup>. Alexius was with admitted to the kingdom. He soon caused John to be coi in the church of Holyrood Abbey in the presence of the le of four bishops, a fifth bishop, who was absent through sickne: his assent in writing<sup>4</sup>. The principal consecrator was Matthev of Aberdeen, who is said to have been John's maternal uncle.

As to the date of John's consecration there is some confusio the authorities. There is no question that the year was 1180. to the day there are differences. C.S.C. (*s. a.*), which (as the ction took place at Holyrood) is not improbably accurate, s octave of Pentecost.' In M. (*s. a.* 1180) we read 'octavis per scilicet, vi. idus Junii' which is true only when we take 'vi. id: to refer to Pentecost (which fell on June 8 in that year) and r octave. In Sc. vi 36 we read 'die Sanctae Trinitatis, vi. id: which error may have arisen from a misunderstanding of M. (Hoveden, ii 209 note) remarks that the ceremony having tak at Holyrood, the chronicle of that abbey is on this matter authority. The date therefore may probably be held to be 1180.

The struggle between the king and John, or rather th: defending the rights of the Church, is part of the civil h Scotland, and cannot be recounted here. It must suffice to

<sup>1</sup> That is, of St. Stephen in Caelio Monte. It would seem that he cardinal by anticipation. See Ciaconius, *Vitae et res gestae, &c.* (i 11 election to the college is assigned to 1191.

<sup>2</sup> From this expression, occurring in the Pope's letters, which Hoved has preserved, it would seem that there had been the form of a canonic in the case of Hugh.

<sup>3</sup> Alexius was at the time the Pope's sub-deacon, and was afterwa created a cardinal by Clement III. See Ciaconius, i 1140.

<sup>4</sup> See the Pope's letter in Hoveden (ii 210).

the controversy was partially adjusted in 1183, when both John and Hugh resigned their rights, or pretended rights, into the hands of the Pope, who was now Lucius III. Lucius soon granted St. Andrews to Hugh; and, Dunkeld having fallen vacant and John having been elected *concorditer* to that see, the Pope confirmed him therein (Sc. vi 40). But difficulties were still made by the king, and both Hugh and John returned to Italy to submit their present difficulties to the Apostolic See. After various incidents in the course of which Hugh was suspended and afterwards excommunicated, King William in 1188 consented that John should hold Dunkeld, together with such revenues as he had before his consecration. In that year (or perhaps 1187) Hugh again passed to Rome to obtain absolution from the sentence of excommunication. This he obtained, and died, a few days after, of the pestilence about six miles outside Rome on August 4, 1188 (Sc. vi 41).

From an ecclesiastical view-point Hugh can be accounted bishop of St. Andrews only from 1183 to August 4, 1188. Sc. (vi 41) represents him as bishop for 'ten years and as many months'; but though this, no doubt, is calculated from his *de facto* election, it would seem to be wrong. There is often evidence of much looseness in such calculations by Bower.

In charters, as might be expected, he appears as 'Bishop of St. Andrews' before his claims were allowed by the Pope. An example will be found in R.B. ii 269.

John, the Scot, survived till 1203, when, at Neubottle, he assumed the habit of a monk on his death-bed (Sc. vi 41).

**ROGER DE BEAUMONT**, son of Robert, earl of Leicester: cousin of King William, Ada, mother of William being sister of the earl; chancellor of the king of Scots (Sc. v 43).

Elected at Perth, April 13, 1189 (M. s. a.). It is to be noted that M. states that the day of the week was Friday (*feria vj.*). But April 13 in 1189 fell on Thursday. Sc. (vi 42) gives the same year, month, and day of the week. The following year (1190) meets the conditions; and I am not aware of any other evidence to help us to determine the question as to the year. The place of election is worth observing; perhaps it was chosen as allowing royal influence to be more effective, Perth being a frequent place of royal residence.

After a long delay of nearly ten years, or (if the year of election be 1190) of nearly nine years, Roger was consecrated on the first Sunday in Lent (Feb. 15) 1198, at St. Andrews, in the presence of the king (M.; Sc. vi 42) by Richard, bishop of Moray (Sc.); by Matthew, bishop of Aberdeen (Hoveden, iv 31). From Hoveden (*l. c.*) it appears that Roger had not received priest's orders till the time of his consecra-



tion. The fact that Hoveden places Roger's consecration in 1197 and not seriously disturb us. He perhaps meant 1197-8; and, in any case, he is rather careless in matters of chronology, as has been pointed out by Stubbs (Preface to Hoveden, vol. iv, xxv). But after all this seems to be a year's difference between the year intended by Hoveden and that intended by *Scotichronicon*, for the latter (vi 42) says 'sanctus electus x. annis, et consecratus iij. annis cum dimidio.' This statement, when compared with the date of his death (see below), shows that Bower understood Feb. 15, 1198, to mean Feb. 15, 1198-9. The method of the chronicle of Melrose is different; the year begins on Dec. 25 or possibly Jan. 1. And that chronicle places Roger's consecration, as stated above, in 1198. The weight of evidence seems in favour of 1197-8.

There is a mandate of Innocent III, dated vi. Kal. Mart. 1197 [i. e. 1198-9], addressed to 'R., bishop of St. Andrews' (C.P.R. i 5), which goes to confirm the belief that Roger's consecration was not later than the year 1198.

Roger died July 7 (Non. Julii), 1202, at Cambuskenneth, and was buried in the old church of St. Andrews (M. s. a.; Sc. vi 42). Wynton (ii 228), generally trustworthy, makes a curious blunder in placing Roger's death in the thirty-second year of King William.

**WILLIAM MALVOISINE** (Malvycyne), bishop of Glasgow. Postulated for translation to St. Andrews at Scone on Sept. 20 (xij. Kal. Oct.), being Friday, 1202 (Sc. vi 42).

Sept. 20 in this year did fall on Friday. Scone was a royal residence; note what has been said under Roger de Beaumont.

A charge was made against William by Eustace, one of the canons of St. Andrews, that before his postulation had been approved by the Apostolic See he had at St. Andrews exercised his office in things spiritual as well as temporal, and had on the Saturday in ember week in September (three days after his postulation) conferred orders as bishop of St. Andrews (T. no. 6). It is worthy of observation that in this charge it is said that his postulation was on the Wednesday (*feria quarta*) preceding, while Sc. (*ut supra*) places the postulation and translation on Friday. The September ember-days are the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after Sept. 14. Now in the year 1202 Sept. 14 fell on Saturday, therefore the ember-days were Sept. 18, 20, and 21. Excepting as regards the day of the week on which the postulation

<sup>1</sup> Elected to Glasgow in Oct. 1199 (Hoveden, iv 97): consecrated at Lyons on command of Innocent III by the archbishop of Lyons (Reginald de Forer) on Sept. 24, 1200 (*ib.* iv 139). The current form of the name is given as 'Mauvaynie' in *Chron. de Lanercost* (4). Apart from the name we have evidence that he belonged to France, for in 1211 'de voluntate et licentia domini regis transfretavit patriam suam et parentes [1 apud] Gallias visitaturus' (Sc. viii 78).

took place, the statement in the accusation of Eustace hangs well together with the statement of Sc.

Bishop William's translation according to Wyntoun (ii 229)—

'Wes that tyme done be a Legat  
That cald than wes Ihon be name  
At the instans off the Kyng Willame.'

If this is correct it will account for William's having at once proceeded to exercise episcopal functions in ordaining. The legate was John of Salerno, cardinal presbyter (of St. Stephen in Caelio Monte). He held a council at Perth early in December, 1201; and spent more than fifty days at Melrose in 1202 (M.), probably after his return from Ireland. William died July 9, 1238, at Inchmordauch<sup>1</sup>, and was buried in the new church of St. Andrews (Sc. vi 42).

*GEOFFREY* (Galfredus), bishop of Dunkeld<sup>2</sup>, postulated; but the postulation disallowed by the Pope.

Wyntoun (VII, chap. ix, vol. ii 244) writes—

'And eftyre that this Willame [Malvoisine] was dede,  
Thare postulyd intill his sted  
Off Dunkeldyn the Byschape  
Joffray. Bot till hym the Pape  
Be na way grawnt wald hys gud will;  
Bot leve the chanownys he gave till  
Agayne to mak electyown,  
And for to ches a gud persown.'

Sc. (vi 42) places the postulation of Geoffrey in 1238, and adds that it did not obtain the favour of the Pope and of Alexander II. At least as regards the Pope the statement is confirmed by T. (no. 98), a letter of Gregory IX, dated Feb. 12, 1239, addressed to the prior and convent of St. Andrews declaring that the postulation of the bishop of Dunkeld he had not admitted, 'non vitio personae,' but because he considered that neither urgent necessity nor evident utility required it. He, however, restored to the prior and convent the right to proceed to a canonical election of a fit person. This affords a good example of the value of Wyntoun's record.

**DAVID DE BERNHAM**, chamberlain of the king<sup>3</sup>.

Sc. (vi 42) tells that in 1239, leave having been obtained from the

<sup>1</sup> Inchmurtach,—a manor of the bishops of St. Andrews.

<sup>2</sup> This is Galfredus de Liberatione (Sc. ix 52) appointed to Dunkeld in 1236 (M. s. a.)

<sup>3</sup> In R.P.S.A. (p. 272) we find Robert de Bernham 'burgensis de Bernwick' making a grant of four shillings a year *ad luminare*, out of land in Berwick. Among the witnesses is 'Magistro David, fratre meo, camerarii domini regis.' And see W. ii 244; also T. no. 100.



King and the Pope to proceed to a fresh election, on June 3 David was elected *concorditer, per viam compromissi*. The result was submitted to the Pope (Gregory IX), and he committed (Oct. 1, 1239) to the bishops of Glasgow, Caithness, and Brechin to inquire into the election and the fitness of the elect; and, if they were satisfied, they were by the Pope's authority to confirm the election, and, after taking from David the oath of fealty to the Roman See, to bestow the gift of consecration (T. no. 100). W. (ii 244) states that the consecrators were the bishops of Glasgow, Brechin, and Caithness.

In the letter referred to (T. no. 100) the Pope gives his reason for transferring the examination of the election to the three bishops. Of the three canons sent as proctors from St. Andrews to lay in deed of election before the Pope one had died, another was detained by serious illness, and the Pope did not think fit to act on the testimony of the only remaining proctor, Master Richard Vairement.

As to the mode of the election, Sc. is confirmed by the Pope's letter. The prior and four of the canons were granted by the convent the power of making the election; and they unanimously chose Master David de Bernham, subdeacon, chamberlain of the king. It is added that it had been represented to the Pope that the king's assent had been given to the result of the election.

Consecrated by the bishops of Glasgow, Caithness, and Brechin on St. Vincent's day (Jan. 22), 1239-40 (Sc. vi 42), which falls in with the Pope's commission in T. (no. 100). The day was Sunday.

David de Bernham died 1253 (M. s. a.) on April 26, 1253 (Sc. vi 42; Lanercost 58), at 'Narthanthira' and was buried at Kelso (*ibid.*).

There is little doubt that Wyntoun (ii 254) is in error in placing De Bernham's death in 1252.

Narthanthira has been supposed to be Narthanshire or Narthashire, now Nenthorn in Berwickshire, about four miles to the north-west of Kelso. Wyntoun (*l.c.*) makes the place of his burial his own choice—

'He chesyd hys layre in till Kelsow;  
Noucht in the kyrk off Sayntandrewe.'

*ROBERT DE STUTEVILLE, dean of Dunkeld.*

Elected, *per viam compromissi*, on June 28, 1253; but the election was not admitted by the king, urged, as is alleged, by Master Abel, archdeacon of St. Andrews (Sc. vi 43). An appeal was made to the Pope, and the prior and canons of St. Andrews sent the elect to the Pope, while the king sent Abel with others to oppose the confirmation. According to Sc. (*ibid.*) falsity prevailed over truth, and the election was quashed, but (T. no. 162) *non personarum vitio*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> R. de Stuteville was elected bishop of Dunkeld (probably) in 1272, and on May 1,



**ABEL**, archdeacon of St. Andrews and (T. no. 164) papal chaplain.

On Feb. 20, 1254, the Pope intimates to the chapter of St. Andrews that the election of the dean of Dunkeld had been opposed by the provost and chapter of the Keledei of St. Andrews and by the archdeacon, Master Abel. The grounds of the opposition are stated, but need not be detailed here. The Pope declares the election null, and, of the plenitude of the apostolic power, provides Abel to the bishopric, and commands the chapter to receive him and render him obedience. On March 18, 1254, the Pope writes to the king, and at that date Abel is spoken of as 'now bishop' (T. no. 164). This falls in with Sc. (x 8), which says that Abel was consecrated by the Pope. *Chron. de Lanercost* (58) gives the first Sunday in Lent 1253 (i.e. 1253-4) as the date of his consecration. That Sunday fell on March 1.

It was generally believed in Scotland that Abel obtained the see unfairly. W. (ii 255) says 'That [the see] he purchast at the Pape'; but the old sense of the word 'purchase,' as equivalent to 'procure,' makes one hesitate to infer that W. thought that the see was bought.

Abel was at Durham on June 2, 1254 (probably on his return journey northwards), and granted an indulgence of forty days to those visiting the shrine of St. Cuthbert or the Galilee of Durham Cathedral (see Raine, 89). He must soon have passed on to St. Andrews, for he celebrated his first pontifical mass on June 29, 1254 (Sc. x 8). He witnesses a charter in October, 1254 (*Dunfermline*, 199).

Abel died on the morrow of St. Andrew (Dec. 1), 1254, and was buried in the new church, having held the bishopric 'ten months and two weeks' (Sc. vi 43)<sup>1</sup>. There was perhaps some evidence known to Bower which showed the *first* bulls of provision were dated in the middle of January<sup>2</sup>.

JOHN DOWDEN.

(*To be continued.*)

1273, Pope Gregory X commits to the bishops of Moray, Aberdeen, and Glasgow to consecrate him (T. no. 255).

<sup>1</sup> *Chron. de Lanercost* places his death on Aug. 31, 1254; but the *Dunfermline* charter shows this to be an error.

<sup>2</sup> On April 16, 1248, Innocent IV grants an indult to Master Abel, canon of Glasgow and papal chaplain, to be ordained priest, and to be elected bishop (but not confirmed or consecrated without papal mandate) notwithstanding that he is son of a priest: C.P.R. i 244. This is presumably the person afterwards bishop of St. Andrews. He is evidently, apart from the fact that he was a papal chaplain, a person trusted by the Pope, for on May 29, 1248, the Pope commands him to make order as seemed to him expedient about certain churches in the diocese of St. Andrews, which certain religious were holding and applying to their own uses to the prejudice of the churches (T. no. 136; C.P.R. i 245).

THE PUNCTUATION OF ST. JOHN i 3, 4,  
IN THE PESHITTO.

No one is more conscious than the editor that the *Oxford Tetraeuangelium Syriacum* is susceptible of improvement. For my own part, and expressing too what I am sure would have been the feeling of my colleague, P. E. Pusey, I heartily welcome criticisms which may tend to bring our work a little nearer to perfection. To Mr. Burkitt I tender my sincere thanks for his elaborate tabulation of readings of St. John i 3, 4; and if I do not forthwith apologize to all Syriac scholars for the reading which we have adopted, it is because a criticism of Mr. Burkitt's criticism only confirms my adherence to the punctuation given in the edition.

Mr. Burkitt attempts to settle the question from the Syriac words alone, without regard to systems of punctuation. His statement that ܦܘܕܐ is *masculine* is hard to reconcile with the usage of Syriac. In this particular passage, however, it is convenient in construing to connect ܦܘܕܐ with the following ܦܘܕܐ, which being prefixed to a masculine verb, the ܦܘܕܐ becomes of that gender, though in a different connexion it might be feminine. But having made this criticism, I hasten to add that I fully allow that Mr. Burkitt's construing yields the most simple rendering of the passage, on his principle of translating without regard to systems of punctuation, and that the introduction of a stop after ܦܘܕܐ results in a *scriptio ardua*.

It was not however my intention, nor the intention of my deceased colleague, to seek the *procliviorē scriptiōnem*, but to record in all cases the verdict of the MSS, and where there is a discrepancy, to follow the majority. Here I will confess that, in the present case, it would have been better to have inserted a fuller statement in the notes: I assumed too readily that the reader would accept a decision which the evidence before the editor seemed to necessitate.

Mr. Burkitt has examined and tabulated a portion of the evidence. I proceed to supplement his statements.

1. To the MSS which punctuate after ܦܘܕܐ must be added cod. 11, the Crawford Tetraeuangelium, a carefully and beautifully written MS, inferior to none of our sixth-century codices.

2. The same punctuation is found in the Florentine (cod. 26) and the Berlin (cod. 41) Tetraeuangelia. The latter is one of the oldest MSS in our apparatus, and seems to carry the evidence back to the fifth century.

3. Mr. Burkitt cites codices 14 and 17 as being 'assigned by Wright to the fifth century.' Of the former Wright says in his catalogue, 'the character is a large, regular Estrangēlā of the fifth or sixth century'; of the latter, 'this manuscript is written in an elegant Edessene hand of the fifth or sixth century.' Wright does not assign them without hesitation to the earlier period.

4. In the reading of cod. 12 I can give Mr. Burkitt a point. He thinks it would 'be difficult to get Syriac evidence for the stop after 100 later than the seventh century.' 12 (twelfth century) has ܐܘܢܐ ܡܘܨܝܐ ܐܘܢܐ ܡܘܨܝܐ. From the collation of cod. 40 sent to me from Rome, I inferred (as I have stated in my note *in loc.*) that 40 read as 12. I have now heard from Professor Guidi, who has kindly examined the MS again, that there is no trace of punctuation, but only the stop after the final ܐܘܢܐ.

I waive for the present the questions raised about the evidence of codices 4, 10, 20, 21, as I have not yet had an opportunity of making a fresh examination of these MSS; indeed I am ready to accept, not only *argumenti causa*, but as demonstrably true, the report of an observer so accurate as Mr. Burkitt; and we arrive at the following results:—

For Mr. Burkitt's punctuation we have codd. 14\*, 17\* (fifth or sixth century), 10 and a MS at Sinai (sixth century), 8, 20 (sixth or seventh century), 12 (twelfth century).

For my punctuation we have codd. 41 (fifth or sixth century), 1, 11, 26 (sixth century), 23 (sixth or seventh century), 7 (seventh century).

Thus there appears a conflict of evidence, as I fully admit; but it is too much to say that 'the earliest witnesses tell another tale' than that told by our reading. Besides these MSS, the evidence of the Massora, both Jacobite and Nestorian, is on our side. Mr. Burkitt, as I know, has a very high opinion of the value of the Massoretic codex *Add. 12, 138*. The grammatical difficulties, which appeal to outsiders, were not thought insuperable by the native writers and scribes, whose lead we have followed. It was no part of our purpose to choose an easy reading, under the influence of *a priori* considerations. I cannot therefore share Mr. Burkitt's regret at the punctuation of St. John i 3, 4 adopted in the Oxford *Tetraeuangelium*.

G. H. GWILLIAM.



## A POSSIBLE VIEW OF R

FATHER H. POPE has suggested what he ca above passage. It is one which will give no sa As, however, the subject has been started, ma a distinct view?

I. In the first place we have to give some a occurring as it does in three different contexts.

1. We have (ver. 8) τὸ ῥῆμα . . . τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τ as we infer from the original passage in the is 'thing,' the 'thing' enjoined. This is q ῥῆμα when it answers to the Hebrew דָּבָר. impossible with God?' (Gen. xviii 14). of no *thing*' (Deut. ii 7). 'On account of t bless thee' (Deut. xv 10). 'What is the *thin* (1 Sam. iv 17). 'See this great *thing*' (1 Sam

So it is said (Deut. xxx 11-14): 'This com is commanded thee) is not far from thee. . τὸ ῥῆμα) is very nigh thee, in thy mouth and hands to do it.' The thing is love of God a single heart. Philo in many places supp *Poster. Cain.* 24, *De Somn.* ii 26, *De Poenit.* 2 *Quod Omn. Prob. Lib.* 10.

So again in the present passage: 'What s arising from faith)? The thing (enjoined) is and in thy heart, that is, the thing "faith" w effect that, If thou shalt confess with thy n (Jehovah), and shalt believe with thy heart th the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the righteousness, and with the mouth confession i

2. We have (ver. 17) διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ. T with Num. xxxiii 2, διὰ ῥήματος Κυρίου. Here Hebrew term מִפִּי. And we are told that 'M out and their stages or stations by the *mouth* So in the Epistle before us, the meaning is: 'Sc on a message, and the message is by command 19, 20, Mark xvi 15, 16).

It may be added that the δέ in ἡ δέ ἀκοή is n of new departure, as Fr. Pope holds, but s often in S. Paul's Epistles. Thus, e.g. Gal. ii 1 of fourteen years, I again went up (ἀνάβην)

I went up (*ἀνέβην δέ*) by revelation.' A word is frequently taken up again with the addition of *δέ*.

3. We have (ver. 18) *τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν*, where, as is usual when the plural is employed, the simple sense of 'their words' is applicable.

II. Next, we have to draw from the passage an intelligible meaning, with special regard to *ἔγνω* in ver. 19. From ver. 11 to ver. 18 the sense is perfectly general and impersonal. After ver. 18 it particularly applies to Israel.

'For the Scripture saith, *Everyone* who believeth on Him (Jesus) shall not be disappointed. For there is *no distinction* of Jew and Greek; but the same is Lord of all, rich or replete with grace towards *all* who call upon Him. For *everyone* who calleth on the Name of the Lord shall be saved.' So far Jew and Greek are inseparably joined together. And the repetition of the same word and idea, 'calling on the Name of the Lord,' continues the conjunction.

'How then shall they (men) call on one in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in one of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they (men) preach except they be sent? As it is written, How seasonable are the feet of those who bring good news of blessings!' The term 'good news' (*εὐαγγέλιον*) is one highly applicable to the Gentile world.

'But (it may be said), It is not all who have obeyed, or responded to, the good news. True, for Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our message?' The surroundings of this passage in Isaiah seem to contemplate Gentiles as well as Israelites.

'So then' (as appears from the last question, and from what has preceded) 'faith results from a message, and the message goes by command of Christ.' This explains the *mission* of the messengers (*ἀπόστολοι*), 'Except they be sent.' The preachers must be authorized to preach; the message is by command.

'But, I ask, Has not the message been given? Or, more literally, have not they (men) heard (cf. ver. 14)? Aye verily, their (men's) voice has gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.' This is of course the voice of the preachers of the Gospel. The universality of the proclamation still demonstrates its general application. But now there is a reversal to Israel.

'But I ask (again), Has Israel not known?' What? The truth, as revealed in the message, that Jesus is Lord (Jehovah), and the Saviour of all that call upon Him (vers. 9, 13, cf. 2, 3). See Is. i 3, lx 16, Jer. xxxi 34, &c. Is Israel without knowledge of her Lord and Saviour? Alas! this is so. For 'first Moses saith, I (Jehovah) will move you to envy against what is not a nation, against a nation without intelligence

I will anger you. And Isaiah saith without reserve, I have been of those who seek me not, I have manifested myself to those who inquire not after me.' Both statements concern the Gentiles. In respect of Israel he saith, All the day long I have (with eagerness) extended my hands towards a disobedient and gainsaying people.

The argument accordingly, though it has its difficulties, is not without one. The message of salvation has been disseminated universally to Jew and Gentile alike. Some have accepted it, some have not. But Israel as a body remains ignorant of it, because it refuses to accept it. See Acts xiv 46, xxviii 28.

W. SPICER

### AN EARLY IRISH LITURGICAL FRAGMENT

PROFESSOR WILHELM MEYER, of the University of Göttingen, has recently found at Turin, in MS F iv 1 a large fragment of an early Irish Service-book, and has published it with introduction and notes in *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, logisch-historische Klasse*, 1903, Heft 2, pp. 163-214.

It consists of six leaves, or twelve pages, about 9" x 7", containing a Hiberno-Latin text, which Professor Meyer would assign to a date rather earlier than the date of the Antiphony of Bangor (A. D. 600) in consequence of the greater prevalence of semi-uncial letters and the absence of certain combinations of letters which are found in the Bangor book. He is probably right, but it is impossible for those who have not seen the MS or any facsimile of it, to offer an independent opinion on such a point. Irish MSS are specially difficult to date on purely palaeographical grounds.

There are two short rubrics or headings, viz. an Irish rubric on fol. 3r. 'ibfelib,' i.e. 'in diebus festis,' before No. 10; and another rubric on fol. 6v. 'si dominicus dies' before No. 21.

There are twenty-one separate liturgical pieces, viz. four Collects, or Psalms, two Hymns, and fifteen Collects. All of these, except the Collects, are found in the Antiphony of Bangor. The following is a list of them. In the list and in the notes which follow it

B = Antiphony of Bangor.

H = Harleian MS 7658 (Irish).

LH = Trinity College, Dublin, copy of Irish Liber Hymnorum.

LH\* = Franciscan copy of Irish Liber Hymnorum.

T = Turin MS fragment MS F iv 1.



## [Four Canticles or Psalms]

	No. in T.	No. in B.
Canticum Moysi. Exod. xv 1-19. Verses 1-7 inclusive are lost.	1	5
Canticum trium Puerorum. Dan. iii 57-88.	4	6
Tres Psalmi. Pss. cxlviii-cl. Only the four opening words of Ps. cxlviii are given in T as in B.	7	70
Te Deum laudamus. [Two Hymns]	17	7
'Ymnum dicat turba fratrum,' &c. Anonymous in T, but attributed in B to S. Hilary.	11	2
'Spiritus diuinae lucis gloriae,' &c. Only found here and in B.	14	12
[Fifteen Collects]		
Collectio super Canticum Moysi.	2	81
<i>Ditto.</i>	3	62
Collectio super Canticum trium Puerorum.	5	82
<i>Ditto.</i>	6	63
Collectio post Tres Psalmos.	8	83
<i>Ditto.</i>	9	deest
<i>Ditto.</i>	10	64
Collectio post Evangelium.	12	84
<i>Ditto.</i>	13	deest
Collectio de Martyribus.	15	87
<i>Ditto.</i>	16	67
Collectio post Laudate [= Te Deum laudamus]	18	126
<i>Ditto.</i>	19	deest
Collectio ad Horam Sextam.	20	29
A fragment.	21	deest

We subjoin the text of the four Collects which are not found in B, and only one of which is at present known to exist elsewhere.

## No. 9.

Te dominum de celis laudamus,  
Teque omnium regem regum rogamus,  
Cum excelsis angelis ymnum cantamus  
Per eternalia secula seculorum.

This Collect occurs in the Southampton Psalter (Irish), Fol. 99 v. after Ps. cl. The first line is found also in No. 10 of B.

## No. 13.

Laudis tibi, domine, hostia  
Pre ceteris probatur esse accepta,  
A maioribus ergo et nos traditos

Tuae maiestati canimus ymnos.

Miserere.

No. 19.

Deus omnipotens, qui es unus nec solus,  
terque unus et in tribus unus,  
pater in uerbo, filius in patre,  
cum spiritu sancto in secula seculorum.

No. 21.

Domine . . . . . um conditorem pio serui  
. . . . . eres dilectissimi uni  
. . . . . ut det nobis famulis.

In No. 17 we have preserved another early Irish copy of 'Te Deum laudamus.' It exhibits the following variations from the *Textus receptus* purely orthographical discrepancies not being taken into account:—

Verse 1. The anthem 'Laudate pueri dominum, laudate nomen domini' (Ps. cxii 1) is prefixed to the first verse. So B; LH; LH\*.

4. After 'proclamant' add 'dicentes.' So LH; LH\*.

6. + 'uniuersa' before 'terram'; substitute 'honore' for 'maiestatem' So B; LH; LH\*.

12. Substitute 'unigenitum' for 'et unicum.' So B; H; LH (meaning 'et'); LH\*.

16. *Te ad liberandum mundum suscepisti hominem, non uirginis uterum.* So B (with 'abornuisti'); H; LH; LH\*.

20. + 'nobis' after 'quesumus' as in B; H; LH.

21. 'Eternam fac cum sanctis gloriam numerari,' resembling but not identical with B; H; LH; LH\*.

23. Substitute 'seculum' for 'aeternum.' So B; LH; LH\*.

25. Substitute 'eternum' (fifth word) for 'saeculum.' So B; LH; LH\*.

+ amen. So B.

26. } *Deum.* So B; H; LH; LH\*.

27. }

28. 'Domine' before, not after, 'misericordia tua.' So B; LH; LH\*.

29. *Deum.* So B; H; LH; LH\*.

After verse 29 come the words 'Gloria et honor.' These are the opening words of the Celtic and Mozarabic forms of 'Gloria Patri' See B Part ii p. 75. In B it occurs at the end of 'Gloria in excelsis' but is not known to be elsewhere associated with 'Te Deum laudamus'!

F. E. WARREN

\* In the full text of 'Te Deum laudamus' given below, I have supplied this point from the last verse appended to 'Gloria in excelsis' in B. fol. 33 v. See note to

Part ii, p. 75. Expanded letters are in italic type ; lost or absent words or letters are placed within square brackets : the original punctuation is retained.

- 1 LAudate paueri *dominũm* laudate nomen *domini*. te *deũm* laudamus te *dominũm* confidemur.
  - 2 te ęternum patrem omnis tera [ue]neratur.
  - 3 tibi omnes angeli tibi celi et uniuerse potestates.
  - 4 tibi hirupin et sarupin incessabi uoce proclamant dicentes
  - 5 *sanctus sanctus sanctus dominus deus* sabaot.
  - 6 pleni sunt cęli ad uniuersa terra honore glorię tuę :
  - 7 Te glorihosus apostolorum chorus
  - 8 te profetarum laudabilis numerus
  - 9 te martirum candidatus laudat exarcitus
  - 10 te per orbem terrarum sancta confidetur ęclesia
  - 11 patrem inmensę maiestatis
  - 12 uenerandum tuum uerum unigenitum filium
  - 13 *sanctum* quoque paraclctum *spiritum*
  - 14 tu rex glorię *christe*.
  - 15 tu patris sempiternus [es filius]
  - 16 tu ad liberandum mundum suscipisti h[ominem non horru]isti uirginis uterum
  - 17 tu [deuicto mortis aculeo] aparuisti credenti[bus regna caelorum.]
  - 18 [tu ad dex]teram *dei* sedis in [gloria patris.]
  - 19 [iudex crederis] esse uenturus
  - 20 te [ergo quaesumus nobis tuis] famulis suuen[i quos pretioso sanguine rede]-  
misti
  - 21 ęternum fac cum *sanctis* glorię muneraris.
  - 22 saluum fac pop[ul]um tuum *domine* et be[ne]dic hereditati tuę
  - 23 et rege eos et extolle illos usque in seculum
  - 24 per singulos dies benedicimu : te
  - 25 et laudamus nomen tuum in eternum et in sęculum sęculi amen
  - 26 [*deest*]
  - 27 [*deest*]
  - 28 fiat *domine* misericordię tuę super nos quemadmodum sperabimus in te :
  - 29 [*deest*]
- Gloria et honor : [patri et filio et *spiritũui sancto*, et nunc et semper et in saecula saeculorum. amen .:]



## REVIEWS

## THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

*Das Buch Henoch.* Aethiopischer Text herausgegeben von Dr. JOH. FLEMMING.

*Das Buch Henoch.* Herausgegeben von Dr. JOH. FLEMMING, Bibliothekar an der Kgl. Universitätsbibliothek zu Bonn, und Dr. L. RADERMACHER.

IN the above two volumes Drs. Flemming and Radermacher have divided amongst them the task of editing the Ethiopic and Greek Versions of the Book of Enoch, and of translating the former version. Such co-operation, if it involves mutual help and mutual criticism, is of the greatest service in the field of scholarship. But, if the element of reciprocity be absent, as in fact it must for the most part be absent when one scholar is a Classic and the other an Orientalist, such division of labour can only tend to lower the quality of both contributions. Indeed Dr. Flemming seems to have confined his attention almost unreservedly to the Ethiopic Version. How otherwise could he have failed to remark so many readings in the great Berlin Ethiopic MS, where that MS stands alone in agreement with the Greek Version? Again, we can hardly be wrong in concluding that Dr. Radermacher is not a Semitic scholar, and yet he has to deal with a text which, in at least a score of passages, is unintelligible to the pure Classic. If we discount these undoubted disadvantages, we must acknowledge that the work of both scholars is excellent in many respects. This judgement, however, is subject to many qualifications in the case of Dr. Flemming.

We shall deal first with the German translation, next with the Greek version, and finally with the Ethiopic. Our criticism here will only deal slightly with these subjects: for a full criticism I must refer the reader to my article in the *American Journal of Theology* for April.

*The German translation.* The translation is scholarly. In two or more places Flemming has been able to point out errors in the earlier translations (as in lxvii 12, lxxxix 10, &c.). But in a considerable number of passages he has fallen into the errors of his predecessors, and swelled the list by errors of his own. Thus in xlv 3 'jaharî meġbârîhômû'

cannot be rendered 'wird . . . Auswahl treffen unter ihren Werken,' but only 'will choose their works.' In lviii 6, where he translates 'bis zu einer Grenze der Tage werden sie nicht kommen,' the word 'Grenze' is not a possible equivalent of 'ἡὐέλquā.' Again in xiv 25 'ich schlug mein Antlitz zu Boden,' the word 'schlug' is not a possible equivalent of 'ʿēnēssērō' which means simply 'I looked.' In the above cases the text is corrupt and the translator should not attempt to give sense to nonsense. I will now select two other cases where, though the German is a possible rendering of the Ethiopic, it is not the right one as we see from the Greek Version. In viii 1 the phrase 'ʿēbna ʿēmkuǎllū ʿēbēn kēbūra' can be translated 'das allerkostbarste Gestein,' but that is not its meaning here, but 'allerlei kostbare Gesteine'; for the Greek has παντοίους λίθους ἐκλεκτούς. Thus 'ʿēmkuǎllū ʿēbēn' above is a rendering of παντοίους, and not an attempt to render a superlative as linguistically it could. Again in xxi 1 'óděkū' should not be translated 'ich ging umher,' but simply 'ich ging,' as it is a rendering of ἐφώδευσα. Origen has 'ambulavi' here. Despite these and not a few other errors this translation is a very faithful representative of the Ethiopic Version as published by Flemming.

*The Greek Version.* We have few words of actual censure for Dr. Radermacher's work. It is throughout the work of a scholar, but of a scholar with limitations. His aim in this edition as well as his view of the two preceding English editions is best given in his own words (p. 14): 'Von den beiden Ausgaben, die sich nach Dillmanns Vorarbeiten das grösste Verdienst um die Gestaltung des griechischen Textes erworben haben, hat jede eine durchaus bezeichnende Stellung genommen; Charles hat die äthiopische Uebersetzung in einer meines Erachtens viel zu weit gehenden Weise zur Hilfe gezogen, Swete (*The Psalms of Solomon with the Greek Fragments of the Book of Enoch*, Cambridge, 1899) hat von ihr völlig abgesehen und lieber gelegentlich ziemlichen Unsinn gedruckt. Ich habe einen Mittelweg einzuschlagen gesucht.' This criticism is just.

Amongst Radermacher's emendations we might single out πτήξουσιν for πιστεύουσιν in i 5 and δέσμωσον for δήλωσον in x 11. The Greek Fragment in Syncellus, which goes back to an independent version of the original, has in the latter case δήσαν. That δήλωσον was a late corruption is proved by the fact that the MS still testifies to δέσμωσον or some verb requiring the accusative having been there originally: δηλωσαν . . . τοις λοιποῖς τοῖς . . . μνηστας (sic). Again Radermacher rightly points out that τρις should be emended into τέσσαρες in xxii 9.

We shall now point out some passages where the editor has been less happy. In vi 8 he emends οὗτοί εἰσιν ἀρχαὶ αὐτῶν οἱ δέκα into οὗτοί εἰσιν ἀρχαὶ αὐτῶν, οἱ (ἐπὶ) δέκα. But this would mean: 'these are their leaders,



those who are over ten.' But what we require is, 'those who are over ten' or 'dekarchs.' In xiv 8 he retains the impossible ἀνεμι... ἐξ-περί-οσάν με in the sense of 'the winds caused me to fly.' This verb cannot possibly be translated here. It is a corruption for ἐφεύρασα. Hence we have 'the winds carried me off.' The same corruption in the same connexion is found in one of the LXX MSS in Num. vi 3. Again in v 8 he accepts Dillmann's emendation of καταληθαι into ἀνιλήθη. But since his Ethiopic (barasfǝ) here = ኦፕፕ ለሰጋጃጃጃ, and in x 20 we have the same word in the Ethiopic corresponding to ἁσιβείας in the Greek, it seems conclusive that we should read ἁσιβείαν here<sup>1</sup>.

There are many unintelligible passages which Radermacher leaves without remark in the text, such as xv 4, xvii 7, xxv 5. But no attempt towards their emendation could be made save through Semitic. Most of the idiosyncrasies of the Greek to which he calls attention in an admirable appendix could be explained from the Semitic background, though this idea does not seem to have occurred to the editor.

*The Ethiopic Text.* Dr. Flemming had a great opportunity of giving the world a definitive Ethiopic Text of the Book of Enoch, but he did not avail himself of it. He was the first to make known the readings of three hitherto uncollated MSS of the first class as well as some others of the second. But he has not risen to his opportunities. His failure appears to be due to overhastiness to be first in the field. This overhaste has prevented him from making an accurate study of the MSS, and acquainting himself with the subject-matter of the text he was engaged on. The following remark of Dr. Geffcken (p. liii) in relation to the Sibylline Oracles applies just as strongly to the Book of Enoch: '... die Kritik der Handschriften und die historische Kritik des Sibyllenstoffes zusammenhängen aufs innigste, untrennbar.' But again the problems of the Ethiopic text involve a painstaking study of the Greek Version and of the Semitic original presupposed by both. To this last province of his work Dr. Flemming has given but little attention. At all events he has made no fresh contributions in it.

We shall now proceed to justify some of the above criticisms by a few examples. The true reading is to be found not infrequently in the notes and not in the text. Thus in vii 1, with four of the best MSS (Dr. Flemming mentions only one)<sup>2</sup> out of five, 'ēḏawa' (so Greek τῆς

<sup>1</sup> Radermacher rightly objects to the emendation ἀναμάτητοι in v 6 in the previous editions of Dillmann, Charles, and Swete, and to Bouriant's false transcription of the text ἀμαρτητοι on which the emendation was based. According to Radermacher the MS reads αματοι, which he emends into ἀματτοι. But the MS does not read αματοι but αμαρτοι. Though part of the ρ is obliterated, it is unmistakable. This reading is corrupt for ἀμαρτωλοί.

<sup>2</sup> The five best MSS are g m q t u.



*Borávas*) and not 'ĕḏaw.' Flemming thinks that the Ethiopic here cannot be a translation of the Greek. If he consults the Ethiopic Version of Wisdom xvi 12 he will find the same rendering as here. See also Jub. x 12 and the Hebrew Book of Noah in loc. Again in vii 4 the reading of *q* should have been given in the text and not in the notes as it is supported by *G* (=the Greek Version). In x 12 omit 'ĕm bef kuëllú rĕkuëš' with the four of the five best MSS, and so bring the text into line with *G*. In xiv 1 read 'maṣḥafa' with *q* and *G*. In xiv 8 read 'rá'ĕj kamaz' with all the best MSS and *G* instead of 'kamaz rá'ĕj.' Next we shall give some passages where the true readings appear neither in the text nor in the notes. In vi 7 we should read zentû for za with four of the five best MSS and *G* (*στρός*). In x 2 we should follow *m* which is supported by *G* against all the rest. In xx 3 the order of words in *mqu* should have been adopted as it has the support of *G*, and in xxv 7 the order of *g* for the same reason.

Throughout the entire book the evidence of the MSS is defectively cited; but these are not the most blameworthy shortcomings of the book. The evidence is not only defective but frequently misleading. Thus on p. 8, note 2, *m* is said to omit 'mahara,' and on p. 13, note 1, to read 'wajĕgaber.' In neither case is this so. On the latter page *q* is wrongly cited in note 3, and *m* in note 15. On p. 14, note 3, *gg* are wrongly cited, and *m* in note 15 on the same page. On p. 33, note 2, *m* is wrongly cited: in note 9 *q*, in note 10 *m*, in note 13 *g*, in note 15 *gw*. On p. 64, notes 3, 10 *m* is wrongly cited, in notes 11, 13 *g*. Similar inaccuracies are found on every page of the *Apparatus Criticus*.

Not infrequently Dr. Flemming follows the second class MSS against the first without any valid reason, and sometimes even a few MSS of the second class against all the first class and the majority of the second class. We must, however, concede that in most of these cases the sense is not affected, only the form or the order of the Ethiopic words. That both these matters, however, are important, scholars will readily acknowledge.

This review has grown beyond the intended limits and must now come to a close.

Notwithstanding its very many grave shortcomings Dr. Flemming's text is a meritorious achievement, and the present reviewer hopes to meet his contributions on kindred subjects in the coming years.

R. H. CHARLES.

## BIBLE STUDIES.

*Bible Studies, contributions chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the history of the language, the literature, and the religion of Hellenistic Judaism and primitive Christianity.* By DR. G. ADOLF DEISSMANN, Professor of Theology in the University of Heidelberg. Authorized translation by Alex. Grieve. (T. & T. Clark, 1901.)

IN the preface to his edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews the late Dean Vaughan refers to the 'impatience of an accumulation of parallel passages in illustration of the phraseology of the Greek Testament' felt by some theologians, and emphasizes the difficulty of examining, choosing, and refusing among 'the endless apparent parallels of which only one in ten or one in a hundred may be real.' Professor Deissmann also anticipates the possible criticism that many of the observations which may be made in comparing the Greek of the LXX and New Testament with other writings have 'only' a philological value, but he also indicates how such comparisons may be the foundation for general principles which are of primary importance in drawing conclusions as to the doctrinal language of the Greek Bible. Whether the reader agrees or not with the conclusions of Professor Deissmann, he cannot fail to find many suggestive thoughts in the volume before us, which incorporates the *Neue Bibelstudien* published in 1897, as well as the earlier *Bibelstudien* published in 1895<sup>1</sup>.

The first long essay deals with the *Biblical Letters and Epistles*. This gives a number of interesting facts in regard to the place of such letters in Greek literature, and the collection of letters genuine and forged, and distinguishes between different kinds of letters, such as the 'real letter,' the 'letter that has subsequently become literature,' the 'epistle,' the 'fictitious epistle.' The Papyri furnish many instances of the first class, viz. those which have 'served some perfectly definite and never to be repeated purpose in human intercourse'; the earliest example of the second is generally found in the so-called letters of Aristotle: of epistles, or literary letters, we have many illustrations beginning possibly with those of Lysias; the fictitious epistles belong to the Alexandrian or later ages. The importance of this at first sight purely literary discussion is

<sup>1</sup> The translator has given us a very readable and accurate translation, though he introduces occasionally such words as *machinises* (p. 65), *formulaic* (69), *clamant* (73), and such expressions as 'the nerve of the striking image' (91), 'the polemic of the missive gives us to know' (347). There are also a few mistakes or omissions in the accents of the Greek, e.g. pp. 223, 261, 365, a substitution of *Grammatic* for *Latinism* (p. 223 note), and a misprint in the English on p. 367 note 3. In connexion with the translation we may notice the graceful and appreciative recognition by Professor Deissmann, in his preface to the edition, of the work done in this field by English scholars.

seen in its application to the New Testament writings, some of which are 'real letters,' while others are 'epistles' lacking the personal notes of the 'letters.' This distinction is shown to have a bearing on arguments affecting the text, the exegesis, and the doctrinal statements of the literature in question.

The second essay is very much shorter, and travels over ground more familiar to the student of the Greek Bible. It deals with the use of the term 'Biblical Greek,' and its relation to the *κοινή*, in the light thrown by the language of papyri and inscriptions. Deissmann argues that Biblical Greek is an unmeaning phrase as applied to writers of such varied dates and places as those whose writings are preserved in the Bible. Neither the Greek of the LXX and N. T. nor that of the so-called *κοινή* is so uniform as to show the same characteristics throughout. The most interesting parts of the essay are those in which the writer discusses the principles of LXX translation, showing how the translators preferred to give the spirit rather than the literal meaning, in their effort to 'Egyptianize' the Bible, and 'chose the technical expressions of their surroundings.' These technical expressions from papyri belonging to the Ptolemaic period explain many passages of the LXX. Thus the use of *ἀφραῖς* for *water brooks* (Joel i 20) or for *channels of the sea* (2 Sam. xxii 16) is illustrated by the occurrence of *ἀφίημι* for opening the sluices, and *ἀφραῖς* for the sluice itself, in papyri dealing with irrigation. Another instance is afforded by the word *γραμματεὺς*, where the term seems to mean a military officer. Such a 'technical meaning was familiar to the Alexandrian translators,' and is found in papyri of the second century B. C. Another important general consideration suggested by the language of the inscriptions is that we find in them a terminology fixed, and often liturgical in its nature, independent of the LXX, so that those who used the LXX or New Testament later would be quite as likely to read their own meanings into these books as to derive new meanings from them. By the time of the New Testament there had set in a process of mutual assimilation between the religious conceptions already current in Asia Minor on the one hand, and 'Biblical' and 'Christian' elements on the other.

The greater part of the volume (including the *Neue Bibelstudien*) illustrates with instances, of varying interest and importance, the value of a study of inscriptions and papyri for an exact understanding of the Greek Bible. Words known only from the LXX or New Testament are shown to have occurred elsewhere, e. g. *ἀναφύλακτος*, *ἀντιλήμπτωρ*, *σουδάριον*, and the assertions of older writers like Cremer and Grimm have to be modified or withdrawn. Among the more important words on which welcome light is thrown may be mentioned *ἀναφέρειν*, *βεβαίωσις*, *βιάζομαι*, *δοκιμῖος*, *πλαστήριον*, *λικμάω*, *πρεσβύτερος*, *υιοθεσία*, *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, *χάραγμα*. In some



cases the actual meaning of these words is in question, in others the doctrinal significance, in others the history and associations of the term. The words *βούρω* and *λεμῶ* may be taken as illustrating the first class, *ἀσφύρευ* and *λαστήριον* the second, and *πρεσβύτερος* the third. The usage of the last term *πρεσβύτερος* is twice discussed at some length, and Deissmann writes as follows: 'There is no reason for deeming the technical term a peculiarity of the Jewish idiom. Just as the Jewish usage is traceable to Egypt so is it possible that also the Christian communities of Asia Minor, which named their superintendents *πρεσβύτεροι*, may have borrowed the word from their surroundings, and may not have received it through the medium of Judaism at all. . . . In any case it is not correct to contrast . . . the word *ἐπίσκοπος* as "the Greek coloured designation" with the term *πρεσβύτερος*. . . . The word was a technical term in Egypt before the Jews began to speak of *πρεσβύτερος*, and it is similarly to be found in the Greek usage of the imperial period in the most diverse localities of Asia Minor.' Though Deissmann disclaims any 'wish to touch upon the question regarding the nature of the presbyterial office,' and says 'it may have been developed quite apart from the name,' yet such facts as he has brought to light in regard to the use of the term cannot but have an importance beyond 'the philological purpose' for which he brings them forward, and indicate the value of such material as is collected in this volume.

The essays which follow in the English edition deal with a variety of points. The first of them discusses at some length an inscription on a lead tablet found at Adrumetum which dates from the third century A.D. The interest of it lies in the *formulae* of adjuration to a demon whose help is invoked in a love spell by one Domitiana. These *formulae* are, in Deissmann's opinion, derived from one of the current books of Magic in which passages from the Greek Bible are reproduced, but from memory, as would be done only by 'a man who lived and moved in the Bible and indeed in the Greek Bible.' The next study deals with four Bible names, Heliodorus, Barnabas, Manaen, and Saulus Paulus. For Barnabas he suggests a connexion with Βαρναβᾶς, a name occurring on an inscription, and explained as *son of Nabo*. The change of the termination into *as* is explained as intended to 'remove from the name its suspiciously pagan appearance,' while popular etymology gave a 'religious interpretation to the name thus defaced from motives of piety.' In regard to the double name given to St. Paul in Acts xiii 9, 'an ancient reader could only have taken it to mean "Saul, who was also called Paul,"' 'it cannot mean Saul who was *known-forth* also called Paul,' 'the *ὁ καὶ* [on the analogy of similar expressions elsewhere] admits of no other supposition than that he was called Saulus Paulus before he came to Cyprus.' The last study deals shortly with

a number of points, of which perhaps the most interesting is the discussion of the 'large letters' and 'the marks of Jesus' in Gal. vi. The latter are explained as 'sacred protective marks,' such as are perhaps referred to in connexion with Cain, and also in Isa. xlv 51, Ezek. ix 2, Rev. xiv 1, and other places. A striking parallel for the use of *βαστάζειν* in the sense of bearing such protective marks is found in a spell which describes a person as 'bearing' the tomb of Osiris (i. e. a model of it used as an amulet) and threatening to use it in case of being troubled. The relevant words are *βαστάζω τὴν ταφὴν τοῦ Ὀσίριως* . . . *εἴν μοι ὁ δέωσι κόπους παράσχη προσρέψω αὐτὴν αὐτῷ.*

Every student of the Greek Bible ought to feel grateful to Professor Deissmann for (in his own words) 'taking up the work of the industrious collectors of observations' in the eighteenth century, and giving us such an array of materials from the approximately contemporary products of secular Greek. What he has already given us ought to ensure a hearty welcome for the future studies which he promises in the preface.

LL. J. M. BEBB.

#### THE AGE OF THE FATHERS.

*The Age of the Fathers, being Chapters in the History of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries.* By the late WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. (Longmans, 1903.)

IN old days history was written from a purely literary point of view, and the writer gave free play to his own political or social or moral predilections. As an artist or a moralist he used his materials to effect the purpose which was nearest to his heart. He aimed at ministering to the gratification or the edification of his readers. If he had finished a chapter to his own satisfaction, he did not rewrite it because fresh evidence came to his knowledge that put a different colour on the facts he had recorded. He wrote, with a purpose, a historical romance. And he did not necessarily cite the authorities on which he relied. It would often, probably, have been difficult for him to do so. It was his own reading of the history that he wished to set forth.

Nowadays, of course, history is no longer written on these lines. These two large volumes, in which Dr. Bright's Oxford Lectures are given to the world, are inspired by the purpose of stating fully the facts and letting them speak for themselves. Where the evidence is insufficient or ambiguous, the reader is allowed to judge for himself, though he is ably guided towards the right conclusion. The writer's personal convictions are in no way disguised, but they are not allowed to colour the facts; and, as far as I am able to judge, no fresh knowledge of the period (A.D. 313 to A.D. 451) has been brought to light in



recent years which would affect the statements or the conclusions as they are here presented. The wide range and intimate character of the knowledge which Dr. Bright possessed of the ancient contemporary sources of information is visible on every page. This is, perhaps, the chief value of the book as a contribution to the history of the period. But it is, above all else, the manner in which the whole subject is treated that will secure the book a place in the historical literature of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. Dr. Lock and Mr. Turner are to be heartily thanked for the pains they have taken to give us, not only a worthy memorial of a great teacher, but also a delightful contrast to the works of some of the modern exponents of the 'scientific method of writing history. For the defects of method which detract from the usefulness of the Lectures in their published form the Editor cannot be held responsible. The plan was settled, and a considerable part of the first volume had been already printed, before Dr. Bright's death; and the Editors found themselves obliged to follow the lines on which the work had been begun.

Dr. Lock, who writes the very interesting Preface, speaks of the merits 'which we have long been accustomed to associate with Dr. Bright's work, an enthusiasm for great characters, a picturesque and almost poetic power of painting the chief episodes, and above all that delicate sureness of touch in handling questions of doctrine, that fear of exaggeration, that sense of balance, which springs only from a loyal reverence for truth, developed through years of mature reflection.' These characteristics are certainly conspicuous throughout this book. From beginning to end it is instinct with life. There is none of the cold detached spirit of criticism about it. Scene after scene rises before us, as we read, with singular fullness and freshness.

The great drama seems to be played before our eyes. We are brought into touch with the chief actors, we get to know them. We hear their voices as we read their very words, and we seem to see them in the spirit and in the flesh.

Scene by scene it is excellent. The accounts of events, the characterization of the great leaders of Christian thought and life and of the chief representatives of paganism, the explanation of the real points at issue in the doctrinal controversies, are all admirable; though there is room perhaps for a little more sympathetic appreciation both of the heretics and of the champions of the old gods.

It is easy to understand how Lectures such as these 'charmed and stimulated and inspired generations of Oxford students.' And now that they are given to a wider world in printed form it is not likely that any one who reads them will fail to 'catch some of the writer's enthusiasm for the Church and its Truth.'



On the other hand, one would not have been surprised to learn that real students of the history of the period attending the Lectures had been reduced to despair. Even in book-form it is difficult to use them for purposes of study, as a history of the whole period.

Frequently we have to make our way through so great an amount of detail, that it is difficult 'to see the wood for the trees.' And frequently the main course of the narrative is interrupted by long digressions which, though they lead up to the matter again, are at any rate confusing. No typographical help is given us, other than the division into chapters (forty-nine in over a thousand pages) and headings to the pages, which often have no relation to the subjects actually dealt with on the particular page. Some head-lines in the letter-press would have been very helpful. And it is impossible not to regret that it was not part of the plan which Dr. Bright adopted to give, either at the beginning or end of the chapters or else at the foot of the pages, at least the more important of the references to passages on which the statements in the text are based.

The absence of all such direct references to authorities, ancient and modern alike, deprives the book of much of its value, and relegates it to the class of histories which are of use either to those who already know the whole field or to those who never want to know it—with the only kind of knowledge that is really one's own. One who belongs to neither class will find the book somewhat disappointing. Again and again he will find bits of information which are fresh to him. He could usually, perhaps, trace out the source of them. But it would take a good deal of time, and it is not in the interests of scholarship that the reference should be left hidden away on the left-hand page of Dr. Bright's note-books, instead of being brought into the light for all to see at the foot of the printed page.

The book therefore seems to me to fail to be the great and valuable book which it might easily have been. It is described as 'popular,' though in the best sense—i. e. based on full and accurate knowledge. But really it contains a great deal too much about quite unimportant people and things to be 'popular.' It does not seize the outstanding features of the history and paint the broad effects. It does not steadily trace the plan of the great forces that were at work. The hand of the artist is visible enough at times—the artist who reads the spirit of a man's life and paints his portrait with sympathy and strength. But too often there is far too much photography.

It is really a book for students, and yet the student is denied the most useful kind of help which can be given him towards acquiring an independent knowledge of the facts, and prosecuting further his own investigations.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.

## ORIENTALIA.

*The Ethical Treatises of Berachyah.* Ed. by H. GOLLANZ. (London, Nutt, 1902.)

THE only work by which R. Berachiah can be said to have been at all known hitherto is the *משלי שועלים* or Fox Fables. Dr. Gollanz has therefore done well to rescue these two treatises from manuscript obscurity. The text is carefully edited from MSS at Parma and Munich, with an English translation. Berachiah's work is by no means original. He seems to have aimed at producing a popular manual of the philosophy of his more distinguished predecessors. The second of these two treatises (*ס' המצרף*, Book of the Refiner) is mainly an abridgement of the first (*ס' החיבור*, the Compendium) and both are based on, and consist largely of, extracts from Saadiah's *Kitáb al-amánát*, Bahya ibn Pakuda, Gabirol, and others. In making his selection Berachiah avoids the more strictly philosophical subjects and confines himself to the discussion of religious questions, such as repentance, the nature of the soul, the resurrection. Dr. Gollanz has made the composition of the work clearer by tables showing the correspondence between Berachiah and his originals. But the most interesting part of the book is perhaps the introduction, in which the editor deals at length with the difficult question of the author's date and country. He rejects Mr. Jacob's identification of Berachiah hanaqdan with the Oxford Jew, Benedict le puncteur, and decides that the author lived in the twelfth century in the south of France. He seems not to have known Arabic, but to have read Saadiah in the Hebrew translation of Judah ibn Tibbon or (Tabbon). On the other hand he was well acquainted with western Christian literature, and translated, for instance, the *Quaestiones Naturales* of Adelard of Bath in his *השאלות ה'*. Dr. Gollanz contends, however, that the Fox Fables are independent of the Ysopet of Marie de France, and are derived from the large stock of such tales current in the Middle Ages. The material is very clearly arranged, and, as this short sketch indicates, contains a great deal which will interest others besides specialists in rabbinical literature.

*Midrash Hag-gadol.* Ed. by S. SCHECHTER (Genesis). (Cambridge, 1902.)

DR. SCHECHTER'S edition of this Midrash has been long expected and will be eagerly welcomed. As the preface explains, the great Midrash is a sort of homiletic thesaurus, comprising comments on the

whole of the Pentateuch. Its value consists in the fact that it was compiled in the fourteenth century by a Yemen Jew who derived his material from works many of which are now either entirely lost or known to us only by their titles. Besides this it is based on MSS of the Talmud and early rabbinical literature with readings often differing from our texts. It thus makes important additions to Rabbinovicz's *Variae Lectiones*, since this Midrash was unknown to him. Indeed, it is only within about twenty years that the literature of Yemen has been known and the MSS brought to Europe. In editing such a work for the first time Dr. Schechter's task has been no easy one. The compiler quotes from both Talmuds, the Midrashim, often in forms modified for his purpose, the Arukh, Rashi, *רמב"ם*, *רמב"ן*, and others. He does not, however, name his authorities but simply introduces the quotations with *תנו רבנן* or *תנן*. Moreover he does not even subdivide his quotations. The editor has accordingly made it his business to separate texts from comments and to indicate the source of the latter, suggesting a possible origin when the passage is not found in any extant work. For such a difficult task certainly no one is better fitted than Dr. Schechter, and it is to be hoped that he will find time to complete it. With regard to the compiler, the suggestion, adopted by Neubauer, that he was David al-Adeni, is justly considered by Dr. Schechter to require further proof. This and other questions will no doubt be more fully discussed in the promised introductory essay on the Midrash when the whole text is edited. There are at least six MSS, more or less complete, in various public and private libraries. The present edition is based on two of these (belonging to Mr. Montefiore and Dr. Kohut) collated and completed by the copies at Oxford and in the British Museum. All the MSS, however, represent the same text, and the differences are inconsiderable. Students of rabbinical literature will be sincerely grateful to Dr. Schechter for presenting to them a wealth of interesting material in so attractive a form.

*Place of the Peshitto Version in the Apparatus Criticus of the Greek New Testament (Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, vol. v, pt. iii),* by G. H. GWILLIAM. (Oxford, 1903.)

EVEN those who do not accept the views of the 'Traditional' school should welcome this very clear and definite statement of them, for it is evident that no one can speak with better authority than the learned editor of the *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum*. The subjects of discussion are (1) the antiquity of the Peshitta version and (2) its value as a witness to the Greek Text. The former is subsidiary to the latter, since, as



Mr. Gwilliam says, the evidence of the version is important only with reference to the underlying Greek. From a detailed examination of Matt. i-xiv it is shown that the Peshiṭta supports the traditional text in 108 places and cod. B in 65. Again it appears that in 137 places in these chapters the Peshiṭta agrees neither with cod. B, nor with the usual Greek readings. In many of these it has the support of some other of the early versions, but in thirty-one places it stands alone, as far as we know at present. Hence it is argued that either the Peshiṭta will be found to agree in these passages with readings in cursives not yet examined, and that the cursives therefore have an independent value—or that the Peshiṭta is the only evidence for readings not now found in any Greek MS, and that it therefore represents a very ancient and authoritative type of text. Even if Mr. Burkitt's view be accepted, that the Peshiṭta is due to Rabbula early in the fifth century, the version, Mr. Gwilliam argues, is still as old as any of our Greek MSS, except  $\aleph$  and B. It may be assumed that such a work would be based on carefully chosen, authoritative MSS, and that it is thus evidence of an independent and ancient text. Quite apart from this, however, Mr. Gwilliam holds that the traditional text is so fully attested by 'the collective wisdom of the Church,' that it can well stand without the support of the Peshiṭta. The above very bald summary will give some idea of the points discussed in this essay. Whatever view be taken (and it is not proposed here to decide between Mr. Burkitt and Mr. Gwilliam, nor between Dean Burgon and Dr. Hort) there can be no question as to the able and lucid manner in which the case is presented.

*Apocrypha Syriaca* . . . ed. and trans. by A. S. LEWIS (*Studia Sinaitica*, xi). (Cambridge, 1902.)

THIS volume consists mainly of the Syriac text and translation of the Proteuangelium and the Transitus Mariae. They are derived from a palimpsest in the possession of Mrs. Lewis, of which the upper (Arabic) writing seems to be not later than the beginning of the tenth century. The lower (Syriac) writing, which must be much earlier, is assigned by Mrs. Lewis to the fifth or early sixth century. It is thus the earliest authority for most of the Syriac text of the two apocrypha. The text differs but little from that published by the late Dr. Wright, but as his work is now out of print, it was no doubt worth while to re-edit them. There are also comprised in the volume various fragments of other works from the same palimpsest: (1) seven leaves of the Qur'ān in a seventh- or eighth-century hand, very interesting palaeographically, of which facsimiles are given: (2) a few verses of the LXX of the seventh century, with Hexaplar variants: (3) four leaves of the Peshiṭta Gospels,

of the fifth and sixth centuries: (4) an Arabic deed of sale, of the ninth century, deciphered by Prof. Margoliouth: (5) three leaves of double palimpsest, containing, where legible, apparently parts of a Syriac homily: (6) a Syriac hymn of probably the ninth century: (7) some leaves of Mar Jacob and St. Chrysostom in Syriac: (8) two leaves of an Arabic text not identified. There is also an appendix of notes and corrections to the volume of Palestinian Syriac fragments (published in 1900 by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson), including a reprint of some verses of Ecclesiasticus in Palestinian Syriac, the only fragment of the book known to exist in that version. The texts are carefully edited and illustrated by eight double plates of facsimiles.

*The sixth book of the Select Letters of Severus, . . .* ed. and trans. by E. W. BROOKS. Vol. i (Syriac text), pt. i (1902), vol. ii (translation), pt. i. (Williams & Norgate, 1903.)

THESE are the first two publications of the new 'Text and Translation Society, established for the purpose of editing and translating Oriental texts chiefly preserved in the British Museum,' and it is much to be hoped that the society may receive the support necessary to enable its work to proceed on the lines laid down in the prospectus. There is plenty of material ready, or nearly ready, to be published, but the initial expenses are great, and the present limited funds will admit only of very slow progress. Of the letters of Severus only a few fragments exist in their original Greek, but almost the whole of book vi is preserved in the Syriac version by Athanasius of Nisibis, in two MSS in the British Museum, on which this text is based. Both of these belong to the eighth century, and are therefore only a century later than the date of the version itself. Mr. Brooks has done his work in a most scholarly manner, utilizing such parts of the Syriac as exist elsewhere, as well as the Greek fragments. The translation also is careful and clear. It is preceded by a short introduction giving an account of the Patriarch's life from Syriac sources. The letters are of great interest as illustrating the life of the Church at the beginning of the fifth century, and the translation makes them accessible to historical students who are not specially Syriac scholars.

A. E. COWLEY.



## MISCELLANEA.

*Prayer.* By the Rev. A. J. WORLLEDGE, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro. (Longmans, 1902.) 5s.

THIS book is a volume in the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' Many contributors to the series must have found the object of the editors not an easy one to carry out—'to translate solid theological learning into the vernacular of everyday practical religion.' Canon Worlledge has not shrank from the task which he accepted, nor has he failed in it. His pages could not be always easy reading, but he is nearly always clear.

Two chapters (ii and iii) are devoted to intellectual difficulties, and are therefore mainly concerned with prayer as petition. But the author insists that this covers but a small portion of the scope of prayer. That scope is communion with God in all its forms of praise, thanksgiving, confession, and petition—'the ascent of the mind and heart and will to God.' And the intellectual difficulties, he says, would be fewer and less serious if this were observed, and if ordinary Christian teaching followed more closely the lines of Holy Scripture and of the primitive Church. The language of the English Prayer-Book, as of the ancient prayers of the Church, is 'saturated with the hidden virtues of the Bible' (p. x). There are some justly severe remarks, in more than one passage of this book, on the careless language of popular hymnody and of many books of devotion; its sentimental familiarity with the name of the Saviour and with the presence of the Holy Spirit, or its irreverent misrepresentation of the character of God, 'so arbitrary or so lax, so unapproachable or so familiar' (pp. 78, 120, 203). Canon Worlledge insists strongly on the interdependence of private and public prayer. The fundamental idea of Christian prayer is 'Our Father'; and so-called individual relation to Him, because there is a 'family of God.' 'We pray [always] as members of the one Body; . . . and, often quite unconsciously, we are sustained by the prayers of the whole Church, into which our own personal life is taken up' (p. 127).

There are excellent passages on the coincident growth of the idea of prayer in the Old Testament with the growth of revelation, and on our Lord's gradual training of His Apostles in prayer from the Sermon on the Mount to the discourses of the last evening of His earthly life—our final divine lesson on the subject.

The later chapters will be read with ease and pleasure by all devout people. They are not less theological than the earlier ones; but Canon Worlledge writes with a simplicity and an absence of hardness



which are sure to commend themselves. In dealing with 'meditation,' for instance, he shows full consideration for the difference of capacity in different persons; and English Churchmen of quite opposite 'schools' will read with interest and with profit his very careful treatment of the subject of prayer for the departed (pp. 271 seqq.).

Indeed, the book is truly Evangelical. Its large references to writers of every age and kind are quite subordinated to a constant appeal to Holy Scripture. On the Psalms, in particular, it is almost a little commentary, for there is scarcely a page without its quotation from them. The author may rank as a master in the Christian interpretation of the Psalter. It was the work of deep and loving study to draw out, as he has done, that underflowing sense of the human soul's communion with God in all its moods, which makes the value of the Psalms so independent of questions concerning their dates or authorship, and must be a factor in the solution of these questions.

There is a useful note on prayer 'to distinct Persons in the Godhead' (p. 93).

*England and the Holy See.* An Essay towards Reunion, by the Rev. SPENCER JONES, M.A., &c., with an Introduction by the Right Hon. VISCOUNT HALIFAX. (Longmans, 1902.) 6s.

THE author has written this essay (which makes rather a long book) from an enthusiastic desire to shake English Churchmen out of their languid attitude towards reunion, and also to persuade them to acquaint themselves accurately, in the case of Rome, with the positions of the other side. He is also keenly distressed at the lack of discipline and the vagueness of authority which are palpable blots on their own Church. He wishes them to consider whether they ought not to acknowledge the 'Primacy' of the Holy See, and the claims of the Pope as Visible Head of the Catholic Church. In such a question almost everything depends on the definition of 'Primacy.' It was not worth while to devote many pages to the proof that S. Peter was 'prominent' among the Apostles, and the Church of the Romans 'prominent' from very early days among the Churches of the West and beyond them. The Anglican asks for evidence that this prominence implied in S. Peter's case *official* authority over the Eleven, and in that of other Bishops of Rome (granting him to have been first Bishop of Rome), a supreme jurisdiction over the whole Catholic Church. It is not much to the point that S. Peter's name occurs ninety-one times in the Gospels, and fifty times in the Acts. No one questions his personal eminence, or that force of character which made him continually the leader and spokesman of the Twelve, and also won for him from his

Romans as testify  
at that time: the  
their *faith* and *obe*  
xvi 19). It is cert  
Rome,' i 7) was a  
organized by S. Pe  
S. Peter not named  
with S. Peter, *thoug*  
Central Church of tl  
be given of the s  
Mr. Jones does not  
men. No one who  
intentional unfairness  
assumed from the fir  
He does, indeed, ar  
a leader ('or leaders'  
human societies can  
nor mainly, a visible  
argument from analog  
of its members is not  
Has Paradise also a  
remarked (in quite ano  
theology to give the C  
self-sufficient existence,  
Unseen in another cc  
tendency, and his view  
unspiritual

in its power to keep together in the bond of a living fellowship so many thousands of Christians' (p. 10). 'That the See of Rome is 'the Apostolic See, and is destined to become'—(why not 'has become?')—'the visible centre of Christendom' (p. 12). 'That England cannot formally remain as she is, except so far as she is infallible; [while] Rome cannot formally cease to be what she is, because she claims to be infallible' (pp. 15, 16). Can an Anglican grant these postulates? Mr. Jones holds, of course, that England cast off Rome, and, of her own self-will, separated from her. Is that an undisputed position? Students of history who have come to the contrary conclusion, will hardly feel moved by his appeal for 'loyalty to the Holy See' as it is.

The book is addressed to English Churchmen, and a reviewer who writes from that side must notice such obvious objections. He acknowledges none the less the excellence of Mr. Jones' purpose, and the temperate spirit in which he has put his case. If only 'explanations' can do all that he hopes, who will not be glad? But the chapter of 'Conclusions' is not a very clear summary of his work: it is spoiled by a discursiveness which weakens other parts of the book. It is a little difficult, after some re-reading, to number these conclusions. Certainly, the Bible lends no countenance to our 'unhappy divisions,' which it both foresees and condemns. Certainly, too, we ought all to pray, in our own words and perhaps with our own interpretation, 'Domine Jesu Christe, Qui dixisti . . . Pacem relinquo vobis . . . '—the old prayer with which Mr. Jones closes his essay, and the beauty of which no Anglican will depreciate because it is Roman.

*The Gospel of Work.* Four Lectures on Christian Ethics, by W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Vicar of Great S. Mary's, Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1902.)

THESE Lectures were delivered to Extension Students at Cambridge in the Summer of 1902. They deal with the dignity of work, the duty of diligence, the spirit in which work should be done, and its 'appreciation.' The last heading is somewhat puzzling, until Dr. Cunningham works out his subject, and explains that, as all people find an 'outside judgement' necessary to settle the standard of their own work and whether any particular work is 'worth while,' the Christian refers his work, as he does the rest of his life and conduct, to the judgement of God. As would be expected, Dr. Cunningham puts the standard of work very high. The supreme pattern is God Himself, the 'Unwearied Worker'; the bottom conviction is co-operation with God; and the motive, love of God. There are interesting passages on the weakness of Old Testament motives to diligence: they condemn



idleness, and, so far, 'reinforce the maxims of common sense'; but they do not inspire any enthusiasm for work; they suit and comfort, and may produce, 'the dour man who drudges because he must.' And he remarks critically on the 'reversion to Old Testament models' in the theology of the seventeenth century and later. Perhaps the reader of the Lectures may think the treatment of the whole subject a little severe and unemotional. When it has been laid down that the Christian's principle of work 'involves supernatural elements'—that he must work as a son and not as a slave, inspired 'by the child's proud consciousness that he is helping his Father'; he will possibly wonder that no appeal is made to his faith in the Holy Spirit, which (as Dr. Matheson has said), 'has elevated Christian morality into a Christian philosophy,' and has lifted it so far above the disconnected maxims of other systems of Ethics. Possibly Dr. Cunningham may have thought that the miscellaneous character of his audience debarred him from going beyond the example of Christ. He is deeply read in the theological writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, from whom he makes some quaint quotations, and he often refers to William Law. His 'conclusion' seems to be a little apart from his subject. It is a criticism of the Cambridge Rational Theologians. And, perhaps, the Students were not abnormally ignorant, if they wanted to know a little further who these were and what they did. Dr. Cunningham has added, in an Appendix, three Sermons which bear on points in his Lectures; one of them was preached in Cambridge after the murder of President McKinley, and the other two (on the Consecration of Secular Life and of Intellect) in America in 1899.

E. C. DERMER.

*The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland.* By H. ZIMMER. Translated by A. MEYER. (London: Nutt, 1902.)

THIS translation of the article on the Celtic Church in the new edition of Herzog's *Encyclopaedia*, suggested by Mr. Whitley Stokes, and made with the assistance, among others, of Prof. Kuno Meyer, must no doubt be regarded as giving a summary of the conclusions at which the best scholars of our time have arrived. Though none but special students of Celtic antiquities can criticize it in detail, it is obviously an admirable example of historical method, and its reasoning and narrative are equally clear and interesting. A comparison with the corresponding articles in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* shows how complete is the revolution which has taken place. It is now stated as ascertained fact that St. Patrick, who is Palladius, came to an already christianized Ireland and was the unsuccessful advocate of a non-monastic Christianity; and

that his memory remained in the neighbourhood of Wicklow as that of a mere local saint until the 'Patrick legend' arose in the seventh century out of the desire of the Irish to have a personal apostle of their nation. It helped, we are told, first to reconcile the South to conformity with the Roman Easter, and afterwards the North; the honour of being recognized as St. Patrick's successor being the inducement held out to the Abbot-bishop of Armagh. Prof. Zimmer dwells at some length on the demoralization of which the acceptance of this fiction was a symptom. Fully as he works out the evidence, one small point is omitted, the legendary connexion of the saint with Glastonbury, which would be much more likely to have an historical basis if his sphere of work had been in Leinster. Among other points of interest may be mentioned the suggestion that the Culdees had their origin from the rule of Chrodegang. The more familiar parts of the history, as we find them in Bede, are well stated and explained.

*Virgines Subintroductae.* By H. ACHELIS. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902.)  
2.50 m.

DR. HANS ACHELIS, who tells us that he is abandoning the study of Church History, in which he has hitherto distinguished himself, for that of the New Testament, has worked out very learnedly and completely what is known upon this curious subject; though perhaps the case of Indicia in Ambrose might have been discussed. But the startling point in his paper is the explanation of 1 Cor. vii 36 f. as a part of the chain of evidence for the custom. The suggestion was first made by E. Grafe in 1899, but it was left to Dr. Achelis to develop it. Before St. Paul there is in Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* a description, which closely resembles the familiar passage in Hermas, of an intimate spiritual relationship between members of the two sexes. We find the same thing in Cyprian's *Ep.* iv, where it is a mere accident that one of the men concerned is a cleric, and the attack is not upon clerical marriage, but upon a custom which, as the mildness of the verdict shows, was firmly established and reputed innocent. If we know most about the matter in regard to the clergy, this was because in their case it was easiest to suppress, and suppression, in the eyes of the bishops, was most necessary. Among the monks, who were not under canonical discipline, it survived much longer. Perhaps in regard to the laity silence implied frequent consent; perhaps, on the other hand, as there would be less enthusiasm among them, the custom in their case was less frequent. Its deep roots and wide extension show that it must date from the earliest and most unworldly age of the Church. Hence Dr. Achelis is not afraid to explain the Pauline passage in this sense. He takes



*ὑπέρευκος* of the man ; if exuberance of physical health become a moral danger, let him marry his virgin to some other man. As she would be his ward, he could not marry her himself. Whether or no this interpretation be accepted, the paper in which it is offered is the best account which has yet been given of a remarkable usage: remarkable above all for the singularly little evil which resulted from so ambiguous a relation.

*The Cambridge Modern History*. Vol. i. The Renaissance. (Cambridge, University Press, 1902.) 165.

It is impossible in this place to speak of more than the last four papers in this volume, though most of the others touch to a certain extent upon Church affairs, and the Italian policy of the Popes is inevitably prominent. The career of Savonarola, and the changes at Florence during his four years of activity, is the one episode of European history which is treated in detail ; and though its intrinsic interest, and perhaps its moral significance, make the subject worthy of the care which Mr. Armstrong has devoted to it, its importance is not so great as that of many others which are barely mentioned. This, together with the chapters on Italy and her invaders and Rome and the Temporal Power, comes in the directly narrative part of the volume ; and the contents of these last, which necessarily overlap one another, serve to supplement the two which are specifically devoted to the state of the Church. With equal learning, though the prosecutor has the ampler material as well as the less embarrassed case, Dr. Barry and Mr. Lea state the good and the bad sides of the Christianity of the Renaissance period. It might have been difficult, but surely not impossible, to find a scholar of equal learning who could have summed up the evidence impartially. Both aspects are set so vigorously and impressively before the reader that, unless he has already had occasion to consider the subject, he is likely to abandon in despair the attempt to gain a just impression. One consideration of some weight has been overlooked by Dr. Barry. The art of administration is of modern discovery ; the Middle Ages, except in a narrow area and in unusually favourable circumstances, as at Venice, were incorrigibly unbusinesslike. An Oriel audit, as described by Dean Church, if multiplied *ad infinitum*, must have resembled the affairs of the Roman Curia. Confusion inevitably tempts to dishonesty, and as the confusion was itself inevitable a large excuse must be made for those who were employed in the secular concerns of the Church.

The two other papers which directly concern us are those by Sir Richard Jebb and Dr. James. Sir Richard Jebb's, on the Classical



Renaissance, is in style and proportion and comprehensiveness the most perfect essay in the book, and describes the progress of sacred studies under the influence of the new spirit as fully as that of secular letters. But he might have carried back the history of Christian Mysticism in the West half a century behind Cassian. Dr. James, on the Christian Renaissance, gives an excellent summary of the patristic work done in the period, as it appeared in print. But the chief interest of his paper is the glimpse it affords of the science which is growing under his own hand. Such inquiries as his into the libraries and scriptoria of the later Middle Ages are adding greatly to our acquaintance with the state of knowledge and the conditions of its transmission during the period.

This first volume of the *Cambridge Modern History*, though it is doubtless the better for the freedom with which each writer has followed his own bent, one concerning himself with events and another with generalizations, cannot for this very reason serve as a textbook; but the student of ecclesiastical history will not only be the richer for the wealth of information which it contains, but will walk more surely in the light of a survey so broadly planned and so happily executed.

E. W. WATSON.

## RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

### (1) ENGLISH.

*Church Quarterly Review*, April 1903 (Vol. lvi, No. 111: Spottiswoode & Co.). Archbishop Temple—The Psychology of Conversion—The Church and the African in the West Indies—The Holy Eucharist: an Historical Inquiry, Part VII—The Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels: their Structure—Western Stories of the East: an Eastern Criticism—England and Rome in the Middle Ages—The Earliest Versions of the Gospels in Syriac—Missions to Hindus: III, The Methods—The Nash of South London—Short Notices.

*The Hibbert Journal*, April 1903 (Vol. i, No. 3: Williams and Norgate). G. L. DICKINSON Optimism and Immortality—A. SAYS PRINGLE-PATTISON Martineau's Philosophy—T. W. RHYS DAVIES Buddhism as a Living Force—J. OLDFIELD The Failure of Christian Missions in India—J. P. MAHAFFY The Drifting of Doctrine—B. W. BACON Recent Aspects of the Johannine Problem: I, The External Evidence—P. W. SCHMIDEL Did Paul write Romans?—G. B. STEVEN Auguste Sabatier and the Paris School of Theology—Discussion: P. GARDNER Gardner's *Basis of Christian Doctrine*: R. A. ARMISTON Catastrophes and Moral Order: J. R. WILKINSON Conybeare's Testal Theories: F. C. S. SCHILLER Jones's *Reflective Thought and Religion*—Reviews—Recent Theological Periodicals—Recent Dante Literature.

*Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1903 (Vol. xv, No. 59: Macmillan & Co.). H. ST. J. THACKERAY Translation of the Letter of Aristes—F. C. BURKITT The Hebrew Papyrus of the Ten Commandments—H. BERKOWITZ M. ROSENFELD *In the Sweet Shop* (translated from the Yiddish)—E. N. ADLER Auto de Fé and Jew (concluded)—C. TAYLOR The Wisdom of Ben Sira—D. PHILIPSON The Beginnings of the Reform Movement in Judaism—E. FINK Zur Geschichte der Zahl 7—I. GOLDZIEHER The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah—C. DE BETHENCOURT The Jews in Portugal from 1773 to 1902 (Appendix and Errata)—H. HIRSCHFELD Index to the Descriptive Catalogue of Hebrew MSS of the Montefiore Library.

*The Expositor*, April 1903 (Sixth Series, No. 40: Hodder & Stoughton). A. F. KIRKPATRICK Christianity and Judaism—H. B. SWETE The Teaching of Christ, II—W. O. E. OESTERLEY The Parable of the 'Unjust' Steward—E. C. SELWYN Dialogues on the Christian Prophets: VII The late Canon Bright on Montanism—G. ADAM SMITH Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem: IV, The Prelude—S. R. DRIVER Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah xi 9-xii 6.

May 1903 (Sixth Series, No. 41). G. ADAM SMITH Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem: V, The Beginnings of the History—A. E. GARVIE Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus: XI, The Companionship of the Twelve—S. R. DRIVER Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah xii 7-xvi 9—F. W. MOZLEY The Meaning of ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ—TH. ZAHN Missionary Methods in the Times of the Apostles.

June 1903 (Sixth Series, No. 42). H. B. SWETE The Teaching of Christ, III—A. CARR Hostile and Alien Evidence for Christ at Passiontide—T. H. WEIR Some Fresh Bible Parallels from the History of Morocco—N. J. D. WHITE The Johannine View of the Crucifixion—A. SOUTER A New View about 'Ambrosiaster'—T. G. BONNEY Science and the Flood.

(2) AMERICAN.

*The American Journal of Theology*, April 1903 (Vol. vii, No. 2: Chicago University Press). W. KÖHLER Emperor Frederick II, the Hohenstaufe—K. LAKE Dr. Weiss's Text of the Gospels—C. G. SHAW Religion and Morality—G. C. GOW Public Worship from the Point of View of the Christian Musician—H. A. REDPATH The Geography of the Septuagint—Critical Note: L. H. GRAY Brahmanistic Parallels in the Apocryphal New Testament—Recent Literature in Theology, Philosophy, and History.

(3) FRENCH AND BELGIAN.

*Revue Biblique*, April 1903 (Vol. xii, No. 2: Paris, V, Lecoffre, for the School of the Convent of St. Stephen at Jerusalem). A. VAN HOONACKER Une question touchant la composition du livre de Job—S. MINOCCHI I Salmi messianici: saggio di una edizione critica del testo ebraico—M. J. LAGRANGE L'ange de Jahvé—P. BATIFFOL L'Église naissante. Le Canon du Nouveau Testament (*suite et fin*)—Mélanges: E. KÖNIG De la tendance moderne à poétiser l'Ancien Testament: I. GUIDI Une terre coulant du lait avec du miel: A. JAUSSEN Coutumes arabes: J. MANFREDI Callirhoé et Baarou dans la mosaïque géographique



de Madaba : H. VINCENT Notes d'épigraphie palestinienne—Chronique : M. R. SAVIGNAC Le haut-lieu de Pétra : Fouilles anglaises (*suite*)—Recensions—Bulletin.

*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, May-June 1903 (Vol. viii, No. 3 : Paris, 74, Boulevard Saint-Germain). E. GRISSELLE Épisode de la campagne anti-quiétiste (1696-1699), d'après la correspondance de Bossuet, de son frère et de son neveu ; l'aventure de l'abbé Bossuet à Rome : III, Témoignages des amis et derniers efforts—A. LOISY Le discours sur la montagne : IV, L'Évangile et la Loi—Essais et notices : H. COCHIN Encore un mot sur Saint-Bénigne de Dijon : Un correspondant français de Pétrarque—Chronique biblique : A. LOISY Littérature et exégèse du Nouveau Testament (Lepin, *Le Magnificat doit-il être attribué à Marie ou à Élisabeth* : Conybeare, *The Eusebian form of the text Math. xxviii 19* : B. Weiss, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas* : Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels* : &c.) : Histoire et théologie bibliques (Friedländer, *Der Antichrist in den vorchristlichen jüdischen Quellen* : Schmiedel, *Die Hauptprobleme der Leben Jesu Forschung* : J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* : &c.)—J. DALBRET Littérature religieuse moderne.

*Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 1903 (Vol. viii, No. 1 : Paris, A. Picard). L. CLUGNET and J. PARGOIRE (1) Vie de Saint-Auxence (*texte grec*) : (2) Mont Saint-Auxence—S. VAILHÉ Sophrone le sophiste et Sophrone le patriarche (*suite*)—E. LEGRAND Nicéphore Mélassène, évêque de Naxos et de Cotrone—F. NAU and L. CLUGNET Vies et récits d'anachorètes (iv<sup>e</sup>—vii<sup>e</sup> siècles) : (1) Analyse du ms. grec de Paris 1366 (*suite*) : (2) Textes grecs inédits extraits du même ms. (*suite*)—H. LAMMENS Relations officielles entre la cour romaine et les sultans mamouls d'Égypte—A. P. La rebaptisation des Latins chez les Grecs (*suite*)—P. CHEBLI Le patriarcat maronite d'Antioche—Mélanges : L. PETIT Déposition du patriarche Marc Xylocaravi (Jan. 1467) : H. LAMMENS Russes et Noçairis—Bibliographie.

*Revue Bénédictine*, April 1903 (Vol. xx, No. 2 : Abbaye de Maré-sous). G. MORIN Hilarius l'Ambrosiaster—U. BERLIÈRE Aux Archives Vaticanes—B. ALBERS Le plus ancien Coutumier de Cluny—U. BERLIÈRE Bulletin d'histoire bénédictine—L. JANSSENS Le conciliabule de Munich—L. JANSSENS A. Loisy *L'Évangile et l'Église*—Analyses et Comptes-rendus.

*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, April 1903 (Vol. iv, No. 2 : Louvain, 40, Rue de Namur). G. RASNEUR L'Homoiouianisme dans ses rapports avec l'orthodoxie—F. BETHUNE Les écoles historiques de Saint-Denis et Saint-Germain-des-Prés dans leurs rapports avec la con-

position des *Grandes Chroniques de France (suite et fin)*—Mélanges : F. MAYENCE Note papyrologique : G. MORIN Un fragment du rouleau mortuaire du cardinal bénédictin Milon de Palestrina—Comptes-rendus—Chronique : H. COPPIETERS La collection des *Texts and Studies* : C. F. BELLET Le Saint Suaire de Turin : Nouvelles—Bibliographie.

*Analecta Bollandiana*, April 1903 (Vol. xxii, No. 2 : Brussels, 14, Rue des Ursulines). H. DELEHAYE S. Barlaam, martyr à Antioche (*texte grec*)—A. PONCELET Relation originale du prêtre Idon sur la translation de S. Liboire à Paderborn (*texte latin*)—A. PONCELET La plus ancienne Vie de S. Riquier (*texte latin*)—FR. VAN ORTROY Saint François d'Assise et frère Élie de Cortone—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques—H. THURSTON Visio monachi de Eynsham—[U. CHEVALIER Supplementum ad Repertorium Hymnologicum (*Quem pastores quaesierunt . . . Salvete, magni praesulis Ossa*).]

## (4) GERMAN.

*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1903 (Vol. lxxxv, No. 3 : Tübingen, H. Laupp). KELLNER Nochmals das wahre Zeitalter der hl. Cäcilia—SCHANZ Apologetische Zeitfragen—VAN BEBBER Der Teich Bethesda und der Teich Siloe (*continued*)—B. SCHWEITZER Glaube und Werke bei Klemens Romanus—Reviews—*Analecta*.

*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, May 1903 (Vol. xiii, No. 3 : Tübingen and Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr). R. OTTO Die mechanistische Lebenstheorie und die Theologie—J. KAPTAN Zur Dogmatik, II.

*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, April 1903 (Vol. xvi, No. 2 : Leipzig, O. R. Reisland). J. ALBANI Die Parabel bei Paulus—A. HILGENFELD Die Ignatius-Briefe und die neueste Verteidigung ihrer Echtheit—O. CLAUSEN Die Theologie des Theophilus von Antiochien (*concluded*)—J. DRÄSEKE Noëtos und die Noëtianer in des Hippolytos *Refutatio* ix 6-10—H. BOEHMER-ROMUNDT Über den litterarischen Nachlass des Wulfila und seiner Schule, I—F. GÖRRES Papst Honorius I—A. HILGENFELD Die Essäer ein Volksstamm—F. W. SCHIEFER Zwei Randbemerkungen zu neutestamentlichen Stellen—Review : A. H[ILGENFELD] A. Bolliger *Marcus der Bearbeiter des Matthäus-Evangeliums*.

*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums*, May 1903 (Vol. iv, No. 2 : Giessen, J. Ricker). C. A. BUGGE Das Gesetz und Christus nach der Anschauung der ältesten Christengemeinde—F. KATTENBUSCH Der Märtyrertitel—W. SOLTAU Die Herkunft der Reden in der Apostelgeschichte—P. CORSSEN Zur Chronologie des Irenaeus—E. B. VISCHER Die Zahl 666 (Apoc. xiii 18). Miscellanea : EB. NESTLE Eine lateinische Evangelienhandschrift des



X. Jahrhunderts: D. G. LINDER, O. HOLTEMANN, and K. G. GOTT  
Zur Salbung Jesu in Bethanien: M. FÖRSTER Nochmals Jesu Geburt  
einer Höhle: EB. NESTLE Zur Genealogie in Lukas iii: A. SULLMAN  
*Die Schlüssel des Himmelreichs.*

*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1903 (No. 3: Gotha, F. A. Perthes). L. CONRADY Das Thomasevangelium—C. STANGE Kaiser  
fürst Johanns Glaubensbekenntnis vom Mai 1530—R. OTTO Ein Vor-  
spiel zu Schleiermachers Reden über die Religion bei J. G. Schlegel  
—SCHWARTZKOPFF Wert und Möglichkeit von Beweisen für das Da-  
sein Gottes—Notes: J. A. BEWER Zur Literarkritik des Buches Ruth  
—Review: O. DIBELIUS W. Erbt *Jeremia und seine Zeit.*

*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, April 1903 (Vol. xxiv, No. 1: Gotha,  
F. A. Perthes). R. ROCHOLL Platonismus im deutschen Mittelalter  
—J. GOTTSCHICK Studien zur Versöhnungslehre des Mittelalters (*con-  
cluded*)—K. MÜLLER Luthers römischer Prozess—J. ZIEKURSKI August  
der Starke und die katholische Kirche in den Jahren 1697-1710, I—  
Analecta: TH. BRIEGER Zu Jakob von Jüterbock: G. BERBIG Katho-  
liche Bestätigung des Konsistoriums zu Coburg vom J. 1542: G. BERBIG  
Zwei Vorladungen vor das Konsistorium zu Coburg in Ebesbach vom  
J. 1563: G. BERBIG Eine Differenz Luthers mit dem Stadtrat zu Coburg  
im J. 1539—Miscellanea.

*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, March 1903 (Vol. xiv, No. 3: Leipzig  
and Leipzig, A. Deichert). W. CASPARI Über die gegenwärtigen  
Aufgaben des Predigers—J. HAUSSLEITER Die Universität Wittenberg  
vor dem Eintritt Luthers (*concluded*)—C. STANGE Die reformatorische  
Lehre von der Freiheit des Handelns—F. W. SCHIEFER Theologie  
als pädagogische Klassiker.

April 1903 (Vol. xiv, No. 4). M. PETERS Zur Frage nach dem  
Glauben, I—A. KLOSTERMANN Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des  
Pentateuchs, I—ROTH Die christliche Willensfreiheit—L. COHN  
Altchristliche Sagen über das Leben der Apostel, III.

May 1903 (Vol. xiv, No. 5). M. PETERS Zur Frage nach dem  
Glauben, II—A. KLOSTERMANN Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte  
des Pentateuchs, II—A. WIESINGER *Sola fide, nunquam sola*—J. HAUSS-  
LEITER Beachtenswerte Predigten eines Benediktiners.

June 1903 (Vol. xiv, No. 6). M. PETERS Zur Frage nach dem  
Glauben, III—R. SEEBERG Die Person Christi der feste Punkt im  
fließenden Strom der Gegenwart—R. KITTEL Die *Babel-Bibel-Frage*—  
SCHAEFFER Das Herrenmahl nach Ursprung und Bedeutung.



# The Journal of Theological Studies

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

VOL. IV

OCTOBER, 1902

No. 13

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
'CONTENTIO VERITATIS.' By the Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D. ... ..	1
A STUDY OF THE FIRST LESSON FOR CHRISTMAS DAY. By the Rev. W. EMERY BARNES, D.D. ... ..	17
THE HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL TERM 'SUBSTANCE': PART III. By the VERY REV. T. B. STRONG, D.D., Dean of Christ Church ... ..	29
PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION. By C. C. J. WEBB ... ..	46
DOCUMENTS:	
THE SYRIAN LITURGIES OF THE PRESANCTIFIED. By H. W. CODRINGTON	69
THE REPORT AND DEATH OF PILATE. By G. F. ABBOTT ... ..	83
AN UNCIAL FRAGMENT OF THE 'AD DONATUM' OF ST. CYPRIAN. By DOM RAMSAY ... ..	86
THE GENUINE PROLOGUE TO AMBROSIASTER ON 2 CORINTHIANS. By A. SOUTER ... ..	89
NOTES AND STUDIES:	
THE EDITIONS AND MSS OF EUSEBIUS: PART I. By the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, B.D. ... ..	93
THE ORDER OF THE TREATISES AND LETTERS IN THE MSS. OF ST. CYPRIAN. By DOM CHAPMAN ... ..	103
A QUESTIONABLE PLURAL IN HEBREW. By the Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY ... ..	124
SARBÖG, SHURUPPAK. By F. C. BURKITT ... ..	125
THE INTERPRETATION OF 'BAR-JESUS.' By F. C. BURKITT ... ..	127
THE PERICOPE OF THE ADULTERESS. By the Rev. C. TAYLOR, D.D. ... ..	129
A NEW SEPTUAGINT FRAGMENT. By the Rev. C. TAYLOR, D.D. ... ..	130
CYPRIANICA. By the Rev. E. W. WATSON ... ..	131
REVIEW:	
PELAGIUS' COMMENTARY ON THE PAULINE EPISTLES AND ITS HISTORY ( <i>Pelagius in Irland: Texte und Untersuchungen zur patristischen Literatur</i> , H. Zimmer). By C. H. TURNER ... ..	132
CHRONICLE:	
LITURGICA. By the Rev. F. E. BRIGHTMAN ... ..	142
RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES	166

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.

Price 3s. 6d. net. Annual Subscription, Post Free, 12s.

# Completion of Dr. HASTINGS' BIBLE DICTIONARY.

VOL. IV NOW READY.

'The general standard of excellence must be placed exceedingly high; it is as noticeable in the minor articles as much as in the larger ones; and the entire work fairly represents the best English scholarship.'—*Saturday Review*.

'A dictionary of this kind must be of great value. . . . It is hardly possible to over-estimate the value of the vast and varied amount of well-digested information contained in these volumes.'—*Athenaeum*.

'Indispensable to students.'—*Journal of Theological Studies*.

**This Great Work is now Complete in Four Vols. Imp. 8vo.**

Price per Vol. (each of which contains from 880 to 1008 pp.):

In cloth binding, 28s.; in dark purple, half Morocco, 34s.

Sets of the Four Vols. may also be had in other elegant bindings, as follows:

Maroon Levant, marble edges, 34s. per vol.; brown Morocco, 34s. per vol.; olive green

Morocco, gilt top, 35s. per vol.; maroon, polished Morocco, full gilt, 36s. per vol.

*Full Prospectus, with Specimen Page, free on application.*

**THE TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD.** Translated into English from the Syriac. With Introduction and Notes. By JAMES COOPER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Glasgow University; and ARTHUR J. MACLEAN, M.A., F.R.G.S., sometime Dean of Argyll and the Isles. Now Ready. Price 9s.

**THE CROSS AND THE KINGDOM,** as Viewed by Christ Himself and in the Light of Evolution. By Rev. W. L. WALKER, Laurencekirk, Author of 'The Spirit and the Incarnation.' 8vo, price 9s.

**THE APOSTLES' CREED:** its Origin, Purpose, and Historical Interpretation. By Prof. A. C. MCGIFFERT, D.D. Now Ready. Post 8vo, 4s. net.

**THE WORDS OF JESUS** considered in the light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language. By Prof. G. DALMAN, Leipzig. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

**NEW MAP OF PALESTINE:** Topographical, Physical, and Biblical. Compiled from the latest Surveys by J. G. BARTHOLOMEW, F.R.G.S., and Prof. G. A. SMITH, LL.D. Scale, 4 miles to 1 inch. With complete Index. On cloth, and in cloth case, 10s. 6d.; mounted on rollers and varnished, 15s.

**THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN:** an Inquiry into its Genesis and Historical Value. By Prof. H. H. WENDEY, D.D., Author of 'The Teaching of Jesus.' 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**DEMONIC POSSESSION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:** its Relations, Historical, Medical, and Theological. By WM. MENZIES ALEXANDER, M.A., B.Sc., B.D., M.D. Post 8vo, 5s.

**THE HISTORICAL NEW TESTAMENT.** Being the Literature of the New Testament, arranged in the order of its Literary Growth, and according to the Dates of the Documents. A new Translation, edited, with Prolegomena, Historical Tables, Critical Notes, and an Appendix, by JAMES MOFFAT, D.D. Second Edition, Revised. 8vo, 16s.

**THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY.** Critical and Constructive. An Exposition and an Estimate. By Rev. A. E. GARVIE, M.A. Oxon. Second Edition. 8vo, 9s.

**JUSTIFICATION AND RECONCILIATION.** By ALBRECHT RITSCHL. Edited by H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil., and A. E. MACAULAY, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo, 14s.

**PASCAL AND THE PORT ROYALISTS.** By Prof. W. CLARE, LL.D., D.C.L., Trinity College, Toronto. Price 3s. *In the Press*.

**HEGEL AND HEGELIANISM.** By Prof. R. MACKINTOSH, D.D., Lancashire Independent College. Price 3s. *In the Press*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & CO., LTD.



# MACMILLAN & CO.'S

## LATEST THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

---

BY THE LATE F. J. A. HORT AND JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

**CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA:** Miscellanies, Book VII. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Dissertations and Indices. By the late Rev. F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., and JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A., Emeritus Professor of King's College, London. 8vo, 15s. net.

J. R. ILLINGWORTH'S NEW BOOK.

**REASON AND REVELATION.** An Essay in Christian Apology. By J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A., D.D., Author of 'Personality, Human and Divine,' &c. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

BISHOP WELLDON'S NEW BOOKS.

**THE REVELATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.**

By J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Crown 8vo, 6s.

**"I LIVE":** being Hints on the Christian Life. By J. E. C. WELLDON. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

**THE CONSECRATION OF THE STATE.** An Essay. By J. E. C. WELLDON. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

---

**PEPLOGRAPHIA DVBLINENSIS.** Memorial Discourses Preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, 1895-1902. With Preface by the Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

BY THE LATE PHILLIPS BROOKS.

**THE LAW OF GROWTH AND OTHER SERMONS.** By the Right Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D. Crown 8vo, 6s.

*GUARDIAN.*—'The fascination of Bishop Phillips Brooks is felt at its highest in these sermons—a man to whom the single impossibility was to be for one moment commonplace, to bring out a single thought not minted in his own proper cast and expressed with his own unique charm. The breezy, refreshing personality is present in every line, and the spiritual elevation never flags.'

---

**THEOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS.** By H. C. KING, Professor of Theology in Oberlin Theological Seminary. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

**THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS OF RELIGIOUS FAITH.** Lectures by Prof. C. C. EVERETT, D.D., LL.D. Edited by Prof. E. HALE. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

---

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.



# MACMILLAN & CO.'S LIST.

WORKS BY THE NEW DEAN OF WESTMINSTER  
**THE UNITY OF CHRIST.** By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON. Crown 8vo.  
**SERMON ON KING EDWARD THE CONFESSOR.** By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON. Crown 8vo, 6d. net.

BY THE NEW CANON OF WESTMINSTER.  
**INNS OF COURT SERMONS.** By H. C. BEECHING. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

## Macmillan's English Theological Library.

General Editor: The Rev. FREDERIC RELTON, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington.  
New Volume. Ready shortly.

**HOOKE'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.** Book V. Edited by the Rev. RONALD BAYNE, M.A., late Heron Exhibitioner of University College, London. 8vo.

Already Published.

**William Law's Serious Call.** Edited by the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Gamley. 8s. 6d. net.

*CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.*—'The best edition that has ever been published.'

**Bishop Wilson's Maxims of Piety and Christianity.** Edited by the Rev. FREDERIC RELTON, A.K.C., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington. 5s. 6d. net.

*GUARDIAN.*—'Mr. Relton's edition will be found well worth possessing; it is pleasant to the eye, and bears legible marks of industry and study.'

**Butler's Analogy and Sermons.** Two Vols. Edited by the Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin. 7s. 6d. net.

*GUARDIAN.*—'Dr. Bernard's edition is "everything of value of Bishop Butler's reputation which has come down to us." Each one wants any better edition of the great Analogy.'

**Laud's Conference with Fisher.** Edited by the Rev. C. H. STAMMER, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford, Editor of the 'Life and Times of Archbishop Laud.' 8s. 6d. net.

*GUARDIAN.*—'Mr. Stammer's edition is all respects worthy of praise.'

*CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.*—'An excellent edition.'

Volumes I-IV Now Ready.

**A NEW HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.** Edited by the Very Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, B.D., Dean of Winchester, and the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. In seven vols., uniform binding. Crown 8vo.

**Vol. I. The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest (597-1066).** By the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. With Maps. 7s. 6d.

**Vol. II. The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I (1066-1272).** By the Very Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, B.D., Dean of Winchester. With Maps. 7s. 6d.

**Vol. III. The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (1372-1486).** By the Rev. CANON CAPES. 7s. 6d.

**Vol. IV. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary.** By JOHN GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D. With Maps. 7s. 6d.

Vols. V-VII. [In the Press.]

*GUARDIAN.*—'If it goes on as it has begun, the new work will be indispensable to all students of the history of the English Church.'

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

# The Journal of Theological Studies

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

VOL. IV

JANUARY, 1903

No. 14

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
A RELIGIOUS VIEW OF HUMAN PERSONALITY. By the Rev. R. C. MOBERLY, D.D. ....	161
THE CODE OF HAMMURABI, FRESH MATERIAL FOR COMPARISON WITH THE MOSAIC CODE. By the Rev. C. H. W. JOHNS ...	172
THE PASSOVER AND THE LORD'S SUPPER. By the Rev. J. C. LAMBERT, B.D. ....	164
A PARTITION THEORY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By the Rev. W. LOCK, D.D. ....	194
THE CONNEXION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND NORMAN RITES. By the Rev. W. H. FREER ...	206
DOCUMENTS:	
THE NEW SEPTUAGINT FRAGMENT. By J. H. A. HART ...	215
INVENTIONES NOMINUM. By M. R. JAMES, LL.D. ...	216
NOTES AND STUDIES:	
THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF JEREMIAH. By H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY	215
A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE (ISAIAH xlii 5-7). By the Rev. W. EMERY BARNES, D.D. ....	266
ON THE LXX OF ISAIAH v 14, 17, 18. By R. R. OTTLEY ...	269
THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION. By the Rev. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc. ....	270
A POSSIBLE VIEW OF ROMANS x 13-21. By the Rev. HUGH POPE, O.P.	278
NOTES ON THE BIBLICAL USE OF THE PRESENT AND AORIST IMPERATIVE. By the Rev. F. W. MOZLEY ...	279
THE XXXII CANON OF HIPPOLYTUS. By the Rev. J. AGENDISEN, Ph.D.	282
A RUSSIAN VIEW OF THE CREED OF CONSTANTINOPLE. By N. ORLOFF ...	285
REVIEW:	
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION (A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.). By C. C. J. WEBB ...	291
CHRONICLE:	
NEW TESTAMENT (ENGLISH BOOKS). By the Rev. H. N. BATE ...	301
CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. E. W. WATSON... ..	310
RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES	317

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.

Price 3s. 6d. net. Annual Subscription, Post Free, 12s. net.

*'The distinction of style and thought which has already given that periodical "The Pilot" its high place.'*—*ATHENEUM.*

*'One of the best of the weekly reviews.'*—*CHURCH TIMES.*

*'It has deserved well of every lover of cultivated opinion and distinguished writing.'*—*CLYDE.*

*'Its literary articles are better than in any other English weekly.'*—*FREEMAN'S JOURNAL.*

3d. **The Pilot.** 3d.

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, & LEARNING.

Edited by D. C. LATHBURY.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

*THE PILOT* is published on Saturday mornings, price 3d., and may be had at all Newsagents and Bookstalls, or weekly from the Office at the following rates: Per annum, Inland, 15s.; Abroad, 17s., post free. Per Half-year, Inland, 7s. 6d.; Abroad, 8s. 6d., post free.

OFFICES: 2 EXETER STREET, STRAND, W.C.

---

*Journal of Theological Studies.*

---

COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION:

Rev. Dr. INCE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford.

Rev. Dr. SWETE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

Rev. Dr. DRIVER, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

Rev. Dr. KIRKPATRICK, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.

Rev. Dr. LOCK, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

Rev. Dr. MOBERLY, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford.

Rev. Dr. ROBERTSON, Principal of King's College, London; late Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham.

Very Rev. Dr. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, Dean of Westminster; late Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

Rev. Dr. SANDAY, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford.

Rev. Dr. STANTON, Ely Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

EDITORS:

Rev. H. A. WILSON, Magdalen College, Oxford.

W. EMERY BARNES, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Peterhouse, Cambridge.



# MACMILLAN & CO.'S LIST.

BY THE ARCHBISHOP-DESIGNATE OF CANTERBURY.

**A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rochester.** 8vo, sewed, 2s. net.

**Primary Charge to the Diocese of Winchester.** 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

BY THE ARCHBISHOP-DESIGNATE AND CANON BENHAM.

**Life of Archbishop Tait.** In Two vols. Crown 8vo, 10s. net.

BY THE LATE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

**The Relations between Religion and Science.** Crown 8vo, 6s.

**Sermons preached in Rugby School Chapel.** Extra fcap. 8vo, 4s. 6d. Second Series, 6s. Third Series, 6s.

**A Charge delivered at his First Visitation.** 8vo, sewed, 1s. net.

**The Reservation of the Sacrament.** May 1, 1900. 8vo, sewed, 1s. net.

BY THE LATE DEAN OF WINCHESTER.

**A History of the English Church from the Norman Conquest to the close of the Thirteenth Century.** Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**Christianity and Islam.** Crown 8vo, 5s.

EDITED BY THE LATE DEAN STEPHENS AND THE REV. W. HUNT.

## A NEW HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

In Seven vols., crown 8vo. Vol. I (597-1066). By the Rev. W. HUNT. 7s. 6d. Vol. II (1066-1272). By Dean STEPHENS. 7s. 6d. Vol. III (Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries). By Canon CAPES. 7s. 6d. Vol. IV (Sixteenth Century). By JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B. 7s. 6d. [Vols. V to VII in preparation.]

## BOOKS REDUCED IN PRICE.

**Essays on the Work entitled 'Supernatural Religion.'** Reprinted from the *Contemporary Review*. By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Bishop of Durham. 8vo. Reduced from 10s. 6d. to 6s. net.

## The English Theological Library.

General Editor: The Rev. FREDERIC RELTON, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington. New Volume. Just published.

**Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.** Book V. Edited by the Rev. RONALD BAYNE, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Greenwich. 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

Previously Published.

**William Law's Serious Call.** Edited by the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Gumley. Reduced from 8s. 6d. net to 4s. 6d. net.

*CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW*.—'The best edition that has ever been published.'

**Bishop Wilson's Maxims of Piety and Christianity.** Edited by the Rev. FREDERIC RELTON, A.K.C., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington. Reduced from 5s. 6d. net to 3s. 6d. net.

*GUARDIAN*.—'Mr. Relton's edition will be found well worth possessing; it is pleasant to the eye, and bears legible marks of industry and study.'

**Butler's Analogy and Sermons.** Two Vols. Edited by the Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin. Reduced from 7s. 6d. net to 4s. 6d. net each.

*GUARDIAN*.—'Dr. Bernard's edition includes "everything of value of Bishop Butler's composition which has come down to us." Nobody could want any better edition of the great theologian.'

**Laud's Conference with Fisher.** Edited by the Rev. C. H. SIMPKINSON, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford, Author of the 'Life and Times of Archbishop Laud.' Reduced from 8s. 6d. net to 4s. 6d. net.

*GUARDIAN*.—'Mr. Simpkinson's edition is in all respects worthy of praise.'

*CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW*.—'An excellent edition.'

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

**MACMILLAN & CO.'S  
NEW THEOLOGICAL WORKS.**

**LIFE OF THE RIGHT REV. B. F. WESTCOTT,**

D.D. Late Lord Bishop of Durham.

By his Son, the Rev. ARTHUR WESTCOTT,

With Photogravure Portraits. Two Vols. Extra Crown 8vo. Ready-Sent.

BY THE LATE F. J. A. HORT AND JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

**CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: Miscellanies, Book VII.** The Greek Text, with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Dissertations and Indices. By the late Rev. F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., and JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A., Emeritus Professor of Exegetical College, London. 8vo, 15s. net.

*GUARDIAN*.—'Excellent edition. . . The student finds in this volume something more than an ordinary edition complete with indices and notes, and all the materials for textual criticism. There is a much needed introduction to the study of an author who has been unjustly neglected and even more unjustly slighted by some writers on Christian Doctrine.'

SECOND EDITION NOW READY.

**THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.**

The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. By HON. BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Hon. LL.D. (Dublin), Regius Professor of Divinity, and Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. 8vo, 15s.

**REASON AND REVELATION.** An Essay in

Christian Apology. By J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A., D.D., Author of 'Personality, Human and Divine,' &c. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

*GUARDIAN*.—'We thank Dr. Illingworth for his book, which will greatly strengthen the position of the believer and will help him in many dilemmas of faith.'

BISHOP WELLDON'S NEW BOOKS.

**THE REVELATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.**

By J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Crown 8vo, 6s.

*GUARDIAN*.—'A timely and interesting volume.'

**"I LIVE":** being Hints on the Christian Life. By

J. E. C. WELLDON. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

**THE CONSECRATION OF THE STATE.** An

Essay. By J. E. C. WELLDON. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

*SCOTTISH GUARDIAN*.—'Thoughtful men will enjoy this essay.'

**PEPLOGRAPHIA DVBLINENSIS.** Memorial Dis-

courses Preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, 1895-1902. With Preface by the Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

*GUARDIAN*.—'A series of discourses of unusual interest.'

**THE QUEST OF HAPPINESS.** A Study of Vic-

tory over Life's Troubles. By NEWELL DWIGHT HILLS, Pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, Author of 'The Influence of Christ in Modern Life,' &c. Crown 8vo, gill var., 6s. net.

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.



# The Journal of Theological Studies

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

VOL. IV

JULY, 1903

No. 16

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
ROBERT CAMPBELL MOBERLY. By the Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D. ...	481
THE KING OF TYRE IN EZEKIEL XXVIII. By A. A. BEVAN ...	500
PALAEOGRAPHY AND ITS USES. By A. SOUTER ...	506
THE GREEK MONASTERIES IN SOUTH ITALY. II. By the Rev. K. LAKE ...	517
THE PURPOSE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION. By the Rev. R. HOLMES ...	543
NOTES AND STUDIES:	
THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By the Rev. H. E. D. BLARISTON ...	548
ON THE EARLY TEXTS OF THE ROMAN CANON. By EDMUND BISHOP ...	555
THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF THE PROPHETICAL BOOKS. By H. ST. J. THACKERAY ...	578
ON SOME CHRISTIAN GRAVESTONES FROM OLD DONGOLA. By F. C. BURRITT ...	585
ON CODER CLAROMONTANUS ( <i>h</i> ). By F. C. BURRITT ...	587
TWO NOTES ON ENOCH IN SIR. XLV 16. By the Rev. G. TAYLOR, D.D., and J. H. A. HART ...	589
SIR. XLV 17, <i>a, b</i> . By J. H. A. HART ...	591
NOTES ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS OF ST. ANDREWS. I. By the Right Rev. JOHN DOWDEN, D.D. ...	593
THE PUNCTUATION OF ST. JOHN I 3, 4 IN THE PESHITO. By the Rev. G. H. GWILLIAM, B.D. ...	606
A POSSIBLE VIEW OF ROM. X 13-21. By the Rev. W. SPICER WOOD ...	608
AN EARLY IRISH LITURGICAL FRAGMENT. By the Rev. F. E. WARREN, B.D. ...	610
REVIEWS:	
THE BOOK OF ENOCH (Dr. J. Flemming). By the Rev. R. H. CHARLES, D.D. ...	614
BIBLE STUDIES (Dr. G. A. Deissmann). By the Rev. L. J. M. BESS ...	614
THE AGE OF THE FATHERS (Dr. W. Bright). By the Rev. J. F. BYNUM-BAKER, B.D. ...	621
ORIENTALIA. By A. E. COWLEY ...	624
NOBILITATEA. By the Rev. E. C. DERNER, B.D., and the Rev. E. W. WATSON ...	624
RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES	626

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

NEW YORK

Price 3s. 6d. net.



## OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

**THE SACRED SITES OF THE GOSPELS.** By W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., with the assistance of PAUL WATERHOUSE, M.A., F.R.I.B.A. With Sixty-three Plates. Crown 8vo, cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

**A TEXT-BOOK OF NORTH-SEMITIC INSCRIPTIONS.** By the Rev. G. A. COOKE, M.A. 8vo, cloth, with Fourteen Full-page Plates, 16s. net.

**NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BOOKS OF KINGS.** With an Appendix by the Rev. C. F. BURNLEY, M.A. 8vo, cloth, 14s. net.

**BAPTISM AND CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY.** By CLEMENT F. ROGERS, M.A. With many Illustrations. (*Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Vol. V, Part IV.) 8vo, cloth, 5s. net; paper covers, 4s. 6d.

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

*SPHERE.*—'One of the best of the literary organs.'

3d. **The Pilot.** 3d.

A WEEKLY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND LEARNING.

Every Saturday. Price Threepence.

OFFICES: 2 EXETER STREET, STRAND, W.C.

## *Journal of Theological Studies.*

### COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION:

- Rev. Dr. LUCE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford.  
Rev. Dr. SWETE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.  
Rev. Dr. DUNN, Regius Professor of History, Oxford.  
Rev. Dr. KIRKPATRICK, The Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity, Oxford.  
Rev. Dr. LOCK, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.  
Very Rev. Dr. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, Dean of Westminster, and  
Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.  
Rev. Dr. SANDAY, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford.  
Rev. Dr. STANTON, Dr. Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

### EDITORS:

- Rev. Dr. LUCE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford.  
Rev. Dr. SWETE, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

**MACMILLAN & CO.'S**  
**New and Forthcoming Theological**  
**Works.**

---

**LIFE AND LETTERS OF BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT,**  
D.D., D.C.L., sometime Bishop of Durham. By his Son, ARTHUR WESTCOTT.  
With Photogravure Portraits and Illustrations. In two vols. Extra Crown 8vo,  
17s. net.

THIRD EDITION NOW READY.

**THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.** The Greek Text,  
with Notes and Essays by BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., late Lord  
Bishop of Durham. 8vo, 14s.

**THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.** The Greek Text,  
with Notes by Bishop WESTCOTT. *[In the Press.]*

---

BY THE LATE ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE.

**FIVE OF THE LATEST UTTERANCES OF FREDERICK**  
**TEMPLE,** Archbishop of Canterbury. Crown 8vo, 1s. net.

NEW IMPRESSION NOW READY.

**THE RELATIONS BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.**  
Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1884 on the  
Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury. By the  
Right Rev. FREDERICK, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER (Archbishop Temple). Crown  
8vo, 6s.

**SIX LECTURES ON PASTORAL THEOLOGY. WITH**  
**AN APPENDIX ON THE INFLUENCE OF SCIENTIFIC TRAINING ON**  
**THE RECEPTION OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH.** By the Ven. JAMES M. WILSON,  
M.A., Vicar of Rochdale and Archdeacon of Manchester, Lecturer on Pastoral  
Theology in the University of Cambridge in 1903. Crown 8vo. *[Ready May 15.]*

**ADDRESSES ON THE TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD.**  
By the Rev. Canon E. L. HICKS. Crown 8vo, 3s. net. *[Shortly.]*

**LIBERAL JUDAISM.** An Essay. By CLAUDE G. MONTE-  
FIGUERE. Crown 8vo, 3s. net.

*TIMES.*—'A work of extraordinary interest. . . . It must be regarded mainly as a personal  
confession of faith; and we do not know where it would be possible to point to a better statement  
of what religious theism means to a liberal believer in it.'

**THE SOUL.** A Study and an Argument. By DAVID SYME.  
Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

---

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.



*'A remarkably high standard of excellence.'*—GUARDIAN.

3d. **The Pilot** 3d.

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, & LEARNING.

Edited by D. C. LATHBURY.

*THE PILOT* is published on Saturday mornings, price 3d., and may be had of all Newsagents and Bookstalls, or will be sent direct from the Office at the following rates: Per annum, Inland, 15s.; Abroad, 17s., post free. Per Half-year, Inland, 7s. 6d.; Abroad, 8s. 6d., post free.

**Clerical and Educational Advertisements** are printed in a readable type in the broad column of the paper, at the rate (if prepaid) of 1d. per word, minimum charge 2s. 6d.

*'Not a few of its articles have attracted wide notice by their extraordinary merit. . . . Always distinguished for insight and judicial fairness.'*—CHURCH TIMES.

*'Filled with varied articles, most of which combine the merit of being full of interesting fact or happy criticism with that of being excellently well written.'*—MORNING POST.

*'Most ably conducted by Mr. Lathbury. . . . A welcome addition to the comparatively small number of journals to which one looks for competent literary criticism.'*—ST. JAMES'S GAZETTE.

*'Certainly a most admirable journal. . . . full of excellent literary criticism; many bright middle articles.'*—BRITISH WEEKLY.

*'One of the very best of the Weeklies.'*—WESTMINSTER GAZETTE.

*'One of the best of the Literary Organs.'*—SPHERE.

At all Bookstalls and Newsagents. Price **THREEPENCE.**

OFFICES: 2 EXETER STREET, STRAND, W.C.

---

---

## MACMILLAN & CO.'S LIST.

---

**CHARLOTTE MARY YONGE.** Her Life and Letters. By CHRISTABEL COLBRIDGE. With Nine Photogravure Portraits and other Illustrations. 8vo, 12s. 6d. net.

**THE PRAYER-BOOK PSALMS RELIEVED OF OBSCURITIES, and MADE SMOOTHER FOR CHANTING, WITH SCARCELY NOTICEABLE ALTERATION.** By the Rev. E. D. CREB, M.A., Oriel College. Peap. 8vo, 2s. net.

*IMPORTANT NEW BOOK BY CHARLES BOOTH.*

**THE RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES OF LONDON.** In Seven Volumes (forming the Third Series of LIFE and LABOUR of the PEOPLE in LONDON). Geographical Order of Treatment:—Vol. I, The Outer Ring, North of the Thames. Vol. II, The Inner Ring, North of the Thames. Vol. III, The City and the West. Vol. IV, Inner South London. Vol. V, South-West London. Vol. VI, Outer South London. Vol. VII, Summary of Religious Influences. Extra crown 8vo, bound in parchment, with 20 large-scale Coloured Maps, mounted on linen, 5s. net per Vol., or 30s. net the Set.

**DANGERS OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE.** By the Right Rev. JAMES MOORHOUSE, D.D., Bishop of Manchester. New Issue. Crown 8vo, 3s. net.

*THE BOHLEN LECTURES, 1879.*

**THE INFLUENCE OF JESUS.** Delivered in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, in February, 1879. By the Right Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D. New Issue. Crown 8vo, gilt top, 6s.

**LECTURES ON PREACHING.** Delivered before the Divinity School of Yale College, in January and February, 1877. By the Right Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D. New Issue. Crown 8vo, gilt top, 6s.

---

### BY THE LATE DEAN FARRAR.

THE MESSAGES OF THE BOOKS. 8vo, 14s.

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION. 8vo, 16s.

COLLECTED EDITION OF SERMONS, &c.

In Ten Vols. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.

EPHPTHATHA; or, the Amelioration of the World.

ETERNAL HOPE.

FALL OF MAN, and other Sermons.

'IN THE DAYS OF THY YOUTH.'

MERCY AND JUDGMENT: A few last words on Christian Eschatology.

SAINTLY WORKERS.

SEEKERS AFTER GOD. The Lives of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES DELIVERED IN AMERICA.

SILENCE AND THE VOICES OF GOD, with other Sermons.

WITNESS OF HISTORY TO CHRIST.

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.



# THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

With some Proofs of their Independence and Mutual Relation.

By **J. H. KENNEDY, D.D.,**

*Assistant Lecturer in Divinity in the University of Dublin,  
Editor of 'Hippolytus on Daniel.'*

## Some of the subjects discussed:

The Date of the First Epistle to the Corinthians—The Disputed Visit to Corinth—The References to the Collection—St. Paul's Plans of Travel—The Abandoned Intention—The Mission of Timothy to Corinth, and his Mission to Macedonia—The Majority and the Minority—Who were the Minority?—The Visits of Titus to Corinth—St. Paul's Diplomacy—Internal and External Evidence—The Evidence furnished by the Epistle of Clement of Rome to Corinth—The Proposed Solution.

*THE ATHENEUM.*—'The arguments for the new theory could not be better stated than they are in this little book, and it will be necessary for English Theology to give them full consideration. Dr. Kennedy accounts in a very ingenious way for the curious chance which, if his theory is true, caused the end of one Epistle and the beginning of another to be joined together in one and survive in that form.'

*NOTE TO MOFFATT'S HISTORICAL NEW TESTAMENT.*—'For this argument, and indeed for an exhaustive presentment of the whole subject, one is glad now to be able to refer the reader to Dr. Kennedy's convenient and masterly volume, which is in several respects an advance even upon Schmiedel, particularly in the discussion upon The Character of the Minority (pp. 98-110), and in an account of the mechanical and material factors by which ancient manuscripts were rendered liable to such treatment as is implied in the hypothesis of 2 Cor. 10-13.'

*THEOLOGISCHE LITERATURZEITUNG.*—'Ja auch die Entstehung unseres zweiten Korintherbriefes aus zwei and-ern will noch erklärt sein, wiewgleich die Unmöglichkeit einer solchen Erklärung die früheren Resultate nicht über den Haufen werfen könnte. Kennedy verweist auf die von den LXX zusammengefassten Psalmen und den aus mehreren bestehenden homerischen Hymnus auf Apollo; namentlich über folgert er aus dem ersten Clemensbrief, der allerdings nur den ersten Korintherbrief kennt, dass der zweite erst später, ja vielleicht in Folge des Clemensbriefs publicirt worden sei, indem man zwei nur theilweise erhaltene Briefe in einen zusammenarbeitete.'

*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.*—'All the arguments for this finding are skillfully set out, and every aid is given that can be given to make us understand the circumstances under which both Epistles were written, and the Epistles themselves. It is a fine scholar's finest work, most interesting and most instructive. Let no student of St. Paul forget this volume.'

Professor MARCUS DODDS in the *BRITISH WEEKLY.*—'Several different lines of evidence in favour of this conclusion are brought forward by Dr. Kennedy, and the book is a fine specimen of the application of criticism to New Testament literature. . . . Dr. Kennedy has given us a thoroughly lucid and ingenious and profitable piece of criticism.'

*THE EXAMINER.*—'These views are not so familiar in England as they are in Germany. Still, Dr. Kennedy does not merely repeat Continental arguments. He has worked at the problem on his own account, and the result is a mass of clear acute reasoning, constituting a real contribution to the study of it that must be reckoned with by all persons who claim to have well-informed opinions on the subject. . . . It will not be easy to answer his arguments.'

*THE CHURCH REVIEW.*—'We approached the theory with considerable prejudice; we are not fond of new theories, but we have put down the book with the conviction that Dr. Kennedy must be met or accepted; he is not to be ignored.'

*THE CHURCHMAN.*—'The title of this book is somewhat startling at first, but a careful scrutiny will show that Dr. Kennedy has much to say for himself in the advancement of his main argument. . . . It is highly ingenious, carefully thought out, and likely to commend itself to scholars.'

*IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL GAZETTE.*—'Such is the interesting theory which Dr. Kennedy advocates with all his argumentative powers and extensive learning. The book itself also contains a vast amount of instructive comment on the character of the Pauline Epistles and on St. Paul as a correspondent.'

*ST. JAMES'S BUDGET.*—'The book should be read.'

Price 6s.

METHUEN & CO., LONDON,

# T. & T. CLARK'S LIST.

Now ready, price 12s. 6d. net.

**EXPLORATIONS IN BIBLE LANDS** during the Nineteenth Century. Edited by Prof. HERMAN Y. HILGERT.

A work of special importance. The section on 'Palestine' is by Prof. BERNARDI; 'Egypt' by Dr. STROHMAYER; 'Arabia' by Dr. F. HOMMEL; 'The Hittites' by Dr. JENSEN; and 'Assyria and Babylonia' by the Editor. The volume contains 850 pages, and is enriched by over 200 Plates and Maps specially drawn for this work.

**THE NOTE-LINE IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES**, commonly called 'Pica's' or 'Pasiq.' By the Rev. JAMES KENNEDY, D.D., the New College Library, Edinburgh. *(In the Press.)*

Now ready. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

**THE OLDEST CODE OF LAWS IN THE WORLD.** The Code of Laws promulgated by HAMMURABI, King of Babylon, B.C. 2285-2242. Translated by C. H. W. JONES, M.A., Lecturer on Assyriology, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Now ready. Demy 8vo, 8s. net.

**THE PAULINE EPISTLES.** Introductory and Expository Studies. By Rev. R. D. SHAW, M.A., B.D., Edinburgh.

**THE SACRAMENTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By the Rev. J. C. LAMBERT, M.A. *(In the Press.)*

**INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By Prof. S. R. DRIVER, D.D. Seventh Edition (eleventh impression). Post 8vo, 12s.

**THE CREATION OF MATTER; or, Material Elements, Evolution and Creation.** By the Rev. W. PROBERT, M.A. Now ready. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

**APOSTOLIC ORDER AND UNITY.** By the Rev. R. BRUCE, D.D., Hon. Canon, Durham Cathedral. Now ready. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

**HEGEL AND HEGELIANISM.** By Prof. R. MACKINTOSH, D.D., Author of 'From Comte to Benjamin Kidd.' Crown 8vo, 3s.

Now complete. In Four Large Volumes. Imp. 8vo.

**DR. HASTINGS' DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.** Price per Vol., *cloth bindings, 28s.* Also in *elegant half-morocco bindings*, prices on application. Full Prospectus, with Specimen Page, free on application.

**THE RELIGIONS OF ANCIENT EGYPT AND BABYLONIA.** The Gifford Lectures on the Ancient Egyptian and Babylonian Conception of the Divine. By Prof. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., Oxford. Post 8vo, 5s. net.

**THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD IN CHRISTIAN TRUTH AND LIFE.** By J. SCOTT LIDDETT, M.A. 8vo, 8s. net.

**THE CROSS AND THE KINGDOM,** as viewed by Christ Himself, and in the Light of Evolution. By the Rev. W. L. WALKER, Author of 'The Spirit and the Incarnation.' 8vo, 9s.

**THE CHRIST OF HISTORY AND OF EXPERIENCE.** By DAVID W. FORREST, D.D. Fourth Edition. Now ready. Post 8vo, 6s.

**THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY.** By Principal S. H. F. ALMOND, D.D. Fifth Edition, now ready. 9s.

**THE WORDS OF JESUS.** Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language. By Prof. G. DALMAN, Leipzig. Authorized English Translation by Prof. D. M. RAY. 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

**BIBLE STUDIES.** Contributions, chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions, to the History of the Language, Literature, and Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity. By G. A. DEISSMANN. 8vo, 9s.

**THE MAP OF PALESTINE: Topographical, Physical and Biblical.** By J. G. PHOENIX, F.R.G.S., and Prof. G. ADAM SMITH, LL.D. With Complete Index. Price, 10s. net, and in cloth case, with Index, 10s. 6d.; mounted on rollers and varnished, with Index, 15s.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & Co., LTD.



# MACMILLAN & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

*GUARDIAN*.—'If it goes on as it has begun, the new work will be indispensable to all serious students of the history of the English Church.'

*In Eight Volumes. Crown 8vo.*

EACH VOLUME IS SOLD SEPARATELY AND CONTAINS ITS OWN INDEX.

## A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE LATE VERY REV. W. R. W. STEPHENS, D.D., DEAN OF WINCHESTER, AND THE REV. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A.

- VOL. I. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH FROM ITS FOUNDATION TO THE NORMAN CONQUEST (597-1066).** By the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT. Second Impression. With Two Maps. 7s. 6d.
- " II. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE CLOSE OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.** By the late Very Rev. DEAN STEPHENS, D.D. With a Map. 7s. 6d.
- " III. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.** By the Rev. W. W. CAPES, M.A. 7s. 6d.
- " IV. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII TO THE DEATH OF MARY.** By JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., Hon. LL.D. Edin. With a Map. 7s. 6d.
- " V. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE REIGNS OF ELIZABETH AND JAMES I.** By the Rev. W. H. FRERE. [*In the Press.*]
- " VI. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I TO THE DEATH OF ANNE.** By the Rev. W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. With a Map. [*In the Press.*]
- " VII. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.** By the Rev. Canon OVERTON, D.D. [*In preparation.*]
- " VIII. **THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** By F. W. CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. [*In the Press.*]

---

## THE ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

*General Editor*—The Rev. FREDERIC RELTON, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington.

8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

**OF THE LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.** The Fifth Book. By RICHARD HOOKER. Edited by the Rev. RONALD BAYNE, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Greenwich, and late Heron Exhibitioner of University College, Oxford.

8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

**MAXIMS OF PIETY AND OF CHRISTIANITY.** By THOMAS WILSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. A New Edition, with Preface and Notes by FREDERICK RELTON, A.K.C., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington.

In 2 Vols. 8vo. 4s. 6d. net each volume.

**THE WORKS OF BISHOP BUTLER.** A New Edition, with Introduction and Notes. By the Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College and Dean of St. Patrick's; formerly Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity in the University of Dublin.

VOL. I. Sermons, Charges, Fragments, and Correspondence.

" II. The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature, to which are added two brief dissertations: (1) Of Personal Identity; (2) Of the Nature of Virtue.

8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

**THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN WILLIAM LAUD AND MR. FISHER THE JESUIT.** With an answer to such exceptions as A. C. takes against it. By the said Most Reverend Father in God WILLIAM LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. A New Edition, with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. C. H. SMPKINSON, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford; Author of the 'Life and Times of Archbishop Laud.'

---

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.



**MACMILLAN & CO.'S**  
**New and Forthcoming Theological**  
**Works.**

---

**THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.** The Greek Text,  
with Notes by Bishop WESTCOTT. Demy 8vo. *[In the Press.]*

---

THIRD EDITION NOW READY.

**THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.** The Greek Text,  
with Notes and Essays by BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., late Lord  
Bishop of Durham. 8vo, 14s.

---

**LIFE AND LETTERS OF BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT,**  
D.D., D.C.L., sometime Bishop of Durham. By his Son, ARTHUR WESTCOTT.  
With Photogravure Portraits and Illustrations. In two Vols. Extra Crown 8vo,  
17s. net.

---

**A SYNOPSIS OF THE GOSPELS IN GREEK.** Second  
Edition. Enlarged, with various Readings, Critical Notes, &c. By the Rev. A.  
WRIGHT, B.D., Vice-President of Queen's College, Cambridge. Demy 4to.  
*[In the Press.]*

---

**JUDAISM AS CREED AND LIFE.** By the Rev. MORRIS  
JOSEPH. Extra Crown 8vo. *[In the Press.]*

---

**SIX LECTURES ON PASTORAL THEOLOGY, WITH**  
AN APPENDIX ON THE INFLUENCE OF SCIENTIFIC TRAINING ON  
THE RECEPTION OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH. By the Ven. JAMES M. WILSON,  
D.D., Vicar of Rochdale and Archdeacon of Manchester; Lecturer on Pastoral  
Theology in the University of Cambridge in 1903. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

*TIMES*.—'Practically every beneficed clergyman is blessed with at least two churchwardens, and practically all churchwardens are possessed of at least one shilling and ninepence. If each pair of wardens will unite this amount of property and present their incumbent with Archdeacon Wilson's "Six Lectures on Pastoral Theology" we make bold to say that less will be heard of the intellectual incapacity of the clergy and still less of the chasm between the clerical mind and the lay mind.'

---

BY CANON HENSON.

**SINCERITY AND SUBSCRIPTION.** A Plea for Toleration  
in the Church of England. By H. HENSLEY HENSON, Canon of Westminster.  
Globe 8vo, 1s. net.

---

**ADDRESSES ON THE TEMPTATION.** By EDWARD LEE  
HICKS, M.A., Canon of Manchester. Crown 8vo, 3s. net.  
*EXPOSITORY TIMES*.—'Canon Hicks is searching and very helpful.'

---

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.



