

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Cambridge Texts and Studies. Vol. I. Parts II. and III
Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and
Patristic Literature: edited by J. Armitage Robinson,
B.D. Vol. I. No. 2. *The Passion of S. Perpetua: with an*
***Appendix on the Scillitan Martyrdom*: by the Editor. 4s.**
net. Vol. I. No. 3. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*:
by Frederick H. Chase, B.D. Cambridge, 1891. Pp. viii.
131; xii. 179. 5s. net.

A. Plummer

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 03 / March 1892, pp 111 - 113
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185075, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185075

How to cite this article:

A. Plummer (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 111-113 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185075

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS AND STUDIES. VOL. I. PARTS II. AND III.

Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature: edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B.D. Vol. I. No. 2. *The Passion of S. Perpetua: with an Appendix on the Scillitan Martyrdom*: by the Editor. 4s. net. Vol. I. No. 3. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*: by FREDERICK H. CHASE, B.D. Cambridge, 1891. Pp. viii. 131; xii. 179. 5s. net.

It was not to be expected that the exceptionally high value and interest of the first number of this welcome series would be often reached. Nevertheless the second and third numbers are worthy followers of their predecessor, although they almost of necessity take a lower rank as contributions to theological literature: and to most readers probably the second number will prove more interesting than the third.

The touching story of the martyrdom of S. Perpetua and her companions has been familiar to many from their childhood, if only through the popular and charming rendering of it by J. M. Neale. Interest in the sources of the history was roused to a considerable extent a year and a half ago, when Professor Rendel Harris, aided by Professor Seth Gifford of Haverford College, Pennsylvania, published at the Cambridge Press a complete Greek text of the Martyrdom, which he had been so fortunate as to discover in the Convent of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem early in 1889. It is a very pardonable fault in those who make discoveries, that they are apt to over-estimate their value. When Cureton discovered the abbreviated Syriac Version of the Ignatian Epistles, he was persuaded that now for the first time we were in possession of the genuine Ignatius: and Bishop Lightfoot has told us that for a time he was inclined to agree with him. In a similar way Professor Harris was at first disposed to maintain that he had been instrumental in making known to the world the original narrative of the sufferings of the Carthaginian martyrs, and that the Latin account on which we had depended so long was a translation of the Greek text which he had recovered. By printing Ruinart's passable, but not very accurate, Latin text of the *Passio* along with the Greek *Μαρτύριον*, he gave his readers a fair opportunity of judging of the probability of this hypothesis. It would be interesting

to know how many adherents it won. As Mr. Robinson points out, the hypothesis was antecedently paradoxical: 'for we naturally expect that the martyrdoms of a Latin Church will be chronicled in the Latin tongue.' But Mr. Harris, we are told, has already surrendered the position, and now regards the Latin as the original. But, if any one needs to be convinced on the point, he will find good materials for a decided opinion in the work before us. The editor shows that the Greek text has the most conspicuous marks of being a translation. It introduces explanatory words and phrases, not needed by those who can understand the Latin. It omits expressions which are difficult to translate or explain. It lacks the terse vigour of the Latin, becoming at times diffuse and proportionately weaker. Once at least we find a play of words in the Latin which is lost in the Greek. The Latin exists in two forms, a longer and a shorter, of which the longer is unquestionably the original; and the shorter Latin is sometimes found to agree with the Greek against the longer Latin form. The shorter Latin probably was produced when the longer was found to be too long for the annual commemoration, especially in places which had no special interest in Carthaginian martyrs. In one respect the short form is more full than the long one. It supplies the missing *Acta*, i.e. the trial, with the discussion between the martyrs and the Roman magistrate, in which spurious narratives of martyrdoms are commonly so rich. In the present case the internal evidence of this addition to the original narrative is fatal to its admission as genuine. In short, the abbreviator 'has marred everything that he has touched.'

In two interesting sections the editor shows that the visions of the martyrs were probably influenced by material that they had derived from the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Apocalypse of Peter*. Even if the coincidences which he has collected for us were fewer in number, this view would be probable enough with respect to the *Shepherd*. For a century or more after its coming into circulation about A.D. 150 it received a very wide recognition as an inspired book, and for a time was far better known and more generally accepted as Scripture than one or two books which are in our N.T. In some places the *Apocalypse*

of *Peter* was similarly recognized, but probably much less widely than the *Shepherd*.

Mr. Robinson is inclined to believe that the Vision of Perpetua is given to us pretty much in her own words; and that the like may be true of the Vision of Saturus. He feels 'justified in saying that Perpetua has a distinct style of her own, which marks off her writing from that of the compiler of the *Martyrdom*.' Both she and Saturus exhibit 'extreme simplicity' in their narratives. When the redactor takes up the narrative it becomes 'full of epigram and chastened rhetorical contrast.' The editor inclines strongly to the view that the unnamed redactor is Tertullian, and the internal evidence which he marshals for us makes a good *prima facie* case.

In the Appendix Mr. Robinson gives us what he believes to be the original Latin form of the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs, which he discovered in the British Museum (Codex No. 11, 880) August 30th, 1890. It is said to be of the 9th century: and he has since discovered at Vienna and Evreux MSS. of the same *Martyrdom* of the 11th and 13th centuries, which correspond closely with the one in the British Museum. In 1881 Usener published the *Martyrdom* in a Greek form from a MS. at Paris dated 890, which Aubé thought was the original. Usener himself contended that it was a translation from a lost Latin original; and the British Museum recension confirms this view. If it is correct, Mr. Robinson has the honour of editing for the first time 'what may perhaps claim to be the earliest consecutive piece of Christian Latin which has been preserved to us.' He prints it side by side with the Greek form, so that his readers can easily judge the rival claims. And he appends the two other Latin recensions, as given by Baronius and Aubé, from which the details of this martyrdom were previously known. 'Almost every word of the ancient form is preserved in one or other of these recensions, which have modified their original in different directions.' The editor is once more to be congratulated upon the opportunity which he has won for himself, and the admirable use which he has made of it.

In the third number of this excellent series we enter upon altogether different ground. In it Mr. Chase discusses the position of the *Lord's Prayer* in the *Early Church* and the bearing of this upon its original form. In the Gospels we have two forms of it, a longer one which St. Matthew tells us that Christ spontaneously gave to

the disciples in public; and a shorter one, which St. Luke tells us that He gave to His disciples in private, in answer to the request of one of them that He would teach them to pray. Mr. Chase supposes that neither form is in the strictest sense original. 'For in the period which intervened between the occasion when our Lord first taught the Prayer and the time when the Evangelists gave it a place in the Gospels, it had passed through one stage, and had already entered upon the second stage of its history.' It had been used first of all privately by the disciples; and afterwards publicly in the Christian synagogues. Only the latter point is open to investigation; and in connexion with it Mr. Chase endeavours to establish the following points. (1) The Lord's command, 'After this manner pray ye' (Mt. vi. 9), was obeyed; and in the Early Church the Prayer was in constant daily use. (2) The Prayer was originally in Aramaic, and was quickly translated according to existing requirements. So that, when a version of the Gospels was made, a translation of the Prayer had always preceded it and was ready to the translator's hand in a form sanctioned by devotional use. (3) The disciples adapted the Prayer for use on special occasions, either by alterations or by additions.

Thus (i.) by substituted or added clauses the Prayer was made more suitable for the Laying on of hands and perhaps Baptism: (ii.) by changes in the petition for *daily bread* the Prayer was adapted to morning and evening use: and (iii.) by various doxologies it was rendered more suitable for Eucharistic use.

A new edition of Dr. Lightfoot's book *On Revision* has recently been published. It contains not only the famous discussion of the term *ἐπιούσιος*, but also the equally famous discussion of the clause *ἰῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. Hitherto the latter has been accessible only in the pages of the *Guardian*, and the republication of it in a convenient form is a very great boon. On the first point Mr. Chase is of opinion that *ἐπιούσιος* is no part of the original form of the petition, but is due to liturgical use, and that in the first instance the clause ran thus, 'Give us our (or the) bread of the day.' On the latter, to the consideration of which he devotes 97 out of 176 pages, he decides with Bishop Lightfoot for the masculine interpretation. It is scarcely necessary to add that he considers the doxology given in some texts of St. Matthew's Gospel to be no part of the original Prayer. This doxology, *as such*,

seems not to be original, but to be a conflation of two earlier forms, ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δόξα and ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα, the former of which is very possibly of Jewish origin. It will be remembered that the latter occurs

in the *Didaché*, appended not only to the Lord's Prayer (viii. 2) but to another for the gathering together of the Church (x. 5).

A. PLUMMER.

LEO'S EDITION OF THE *CULEX*.

Culex carmen Vergilio ascriptum recensuit et emendavit FRIDERICUS LEO. Accedit Copa elegia. Berolini apud Wiedmannos. MDCCCXCI. (117 pages, 3 Marks.)

THE latest editor of the *Culex* shall first say in his own words how he has dealt with the critical materials collected by his predecessors. 'Haec igitur sylloga,' that is to say, of the *septem ioca iuuenalia Vergilii*, 'Culicem nobis tradidit, i.e. Codex Petri Bembi nunc Vaticanus saeculi IX. . . . et saeculo uno duobusve recentiores eius cognati . . . huius codicis variam lectionem ipsi carmini adnotavi, usus Ribbeckii copiis ut fecit Baehrens; discrepantes a reliquis Bembi scripturas ubi videbatur significavi, interdum Bembi cum uno alterove consensum indicasse satis habui; omnino de archetypi lectione non saepe dubitari potest. accedunt excerptorum Parisinorum scripturae nonnullae . . . ad archetypum autem reliquorum per multos corruptionis gradus redit codex s. XV. Vossianus, cui multum editores recentiores omnes tribuerunt, plurimum Baehrens. lectionem habet ab homine docto audacibus correcturis interpolatam neque quicquam utile praebet praeter conjecturas; sed in ultima carminis parte exemplar eius variam lectionem habuisse videtur ex fragmento codicis nunc amissi ascriptam qua de re explicatius disseram ad v. 318.'

Those who study these announcements and the mode in which they are carried out in the 'varia lectio' and its occasional supplements in the commentary will feel some wonder and at first perhaps some envy at the smallness of Prof. Leo's critical apparatus. They will observe to begin with that many readings of the Bembinus and its cognates are missing from the foot-notes. These will be found to occupy, without adorning, the text. They will further observe the omission of all reference to the Roman codex discovered by Mr. Ellis, *Journal of Philology* xvi. pp. 153 sqq., though an emendation of R. Unger from the

same volume is quoted on p. 43. Lastly they will see that the casting overboard of the Vossianus as 'interpolated' has still further lightened the critical ship. By an arbitrary hypothesis which must be judged on intrinsic grounds only, seeing that no external evidence has been produced in its favour, the editor has limited the defenders of this codex to the first three quarters of the poem; but he has stated the charge in such a way that it can easily be tested. *V*, he says, contains nothing useful but conjectures. Now in 249 'impietate fera uacordem Colchida matrem' the Bembinus (*B*) and the other MSS. read 'conchida,' but *V* has 'colchita.' This can be no conjecture; for it means nothing. It must then be a genuine remnant of the original 'Colchida' which Leo with all other editors accepts. In 194 'talī' is similarly unmeaning; but it points to 'talīs' (editors including Leo, *B* and the rest having 'tales.') In the second line 'atque ut araneoli tenuem formauimus orsum' (so Leo and editors with *V*, *B* 'ursum') if 'orsum' with its rare use and form is a conjecture, it is not one to be expected from the ordinary corrector. Few more certain emendations, Leo's rejection notwithstanding, have been made than Baehrens' in 245 'otia quaerenti (-em *codd.*) frustra ceruice, puellae,' of the Danaides, which is based on *V*'s 'ceu uite' (*B* 'siblite'). Interpolations in *V* there undoubtedly are. In 236 Leo seems right in regarding 'conati quom sint quondam rescindere caelum' (*B* etc. 'inscendere mundum') as a correction from Virgil of the Homeric account of Otos and Ephialtes; and 'uere nouo' ('notet' *B*) in 71 may be another Virgilian importation. Nor are 'nemoris' (laticis *B*) 18 and 'iterabat Ityn' for 'Ityn edit Ityn' 252 honest mistakes. But there are also interpolations in the Excerpta; and in the Cantabrigiensis, a 'cognate' of the Bembinus, as I shall presently show. Even the Bembinus is not exempt; 'metuenda' 332 is an example pointed out by Leo. The origin of these