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](#)

Recent Publications dealing with the Latin Fathers Q. Sept. Florent. Tertulliani Opera ex recensione Aug. Reifferscheid et Georg Wissowa. Pars I. Vienna, Tempsky, 1890. Mk. 15.60. Patristische Studien I. II. III. IV. (from Sitzungsberichte d. Kais. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien. Phil.-Histor. Classe, Band cxx.) By Dr. Wilhelm von Hartel. Vienna, Tempsky, 1890. Mk. 5.80. Studia Ecclesiastica. Tertullianus. I. Critica et Interpretatoria scripsit DR. J. Van Der Vliet. Leyden, Brill, 1891. 2s. 6d. Gai Vetti Aquilii Juvenci Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor. Ed. J. Huemer, Vienna, 1891. Mk. 7. 20. Ueber das Evangelienbuch des Juvencus in seinem Verhältniss zum Bibeltext. By K. Marold. [Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliclie Theologie, 1890, pp. 329–341.] Geschichte der Christlich-lateinisehen Poesie. By M. Manitius. Stuttgart, 1891. 12 Mk.

W. Sanday

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 45 - 50
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184628, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184628

How to cite this article:

W. Sanday (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 45-50 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184628

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

RECENT PUBLICATIONS DEALING WITH THE LATIN FATHERS.

Q. Sept. Florent. Tertulliani Opera ex recensione AUG. REIFFERSCHIED et GEORG WISSOWA. Pars I. Vienna, Tempsky, 1890. Mk. 15.60.

Patristische Studien I. II. III. IV. (from *Sitzungsberichte d. Kais. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien. Phil.-Histor. Classe, Band cxx.*) By Dr. WILHELM von HARTEL. Vienna, Tempsky, 1890. Mk. 5.80.

Studia Ecclesiastica. Tertullianus. I. *Critica et Interpretatoria* scripsit DR. J. VAN DER VLIET. Leyden, Brill, 1891. 2s. 6d.
Gai Vetti Aquiliani Juvenci Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor. Ed. J. HUEMER, Vienna, 1891. Mk. 7.20.

Ueber das Evangelienbuch des Juvencus in seinem Verhältniss zum Bibeltext. By K. MAROLD. [*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1890, pp. 329-341.]
Geschichte der Christlich-lateinischen Poesie. By M. MANITIUS. Stuttgart, 1891. 12 Mk.

TERTULLIAN is a very difficult writer to edit. It were greatly to be wished that some one of our own classical scholars instead of spending his labour for the hundredth time over authors out of whom there is really little more to be got would follow the example of Prof. J. E. B. Mayor and turn his attention to the early Christian writers. Among them all there is none who would at once tax his powers and repay his toil so abundantly as Tertullian.

To edit Tertullian in the 'grand style' would be the work of a lifetime. The first thing to be done would be to trace the history of the text and of such MSS. as could be found in the monastic catalogues of the Middle Ages. With the helps now available this should be fairly easy. Then would come the tracking out of the MSS. now lost which are known to have been used in the early printed editions. This would be merely preliminary to the constituting of a text, which again would need prolonged study of the diction and usage of Tertullian as well as much thought and skill in the emending of corruptions. Further to add a commentary would mean nothing less than entering into the very heart of the life at once of the Church and of the Empire at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. I cannot easily imagine a subject which would be more varied or more interesting. It would also be strange if in the process something

of a more personal and living sympathy were not excited with this stern and fiery African battling for the purity of the faith, with his back to the wall, against enemies as he thought not only without but within.

If I cannot help pointing out this field for the energy of English scholars, it is from no lack of gratitude towards the German editors (one of them alas! gone to his rest before he could see his work published) who have contributed to the volume which heads this notice. It was Augustus Reifferscheid whose report on the MSS. of the Latin Fathers laid the foundation for the series of texts in which his own will have an honourable place. He bore the brunt of the preparations for the edition of Tertullian, and the first part now issued is mainly his work. He left the materials for it almost ready for the press, and the printing has been carried through with the help of his brother Alexander Reifferscheid and Professor Wissowa, who succeeds to the task of editing, with the superintending care of Dr. W. von Hartel to whom the series as a whole is so much indebted. Though himself a close student of Tertullian von Hartel has evidently thought it an act of piety to interfere as little as possible with the text as Reifferscheid had left it, and although a few of his suggested emendations appear in the notes his maturest criticism is reserved for the *Patristic Studies* which have been coming out in the *Transactions of the Vienna Academy*.

The chief merit of Reifferscheid's work is his minutely exact collation of the famous *Codex Agobardinus* (saec. ix.). His plan was to edit first the treatises contained in this MS.; and seven of the ten now published are found in it. Full account is also taken of the editions which stand to us in the place of lost MSS.: that of Gangneius (Paris, 1545) with its margin which represents in uncertain proportions *Cod. Agobardinus* and some other unknown *codex*, seen through the medium of Gangneius' not very trustworthy editing; the edition of Gelenius (Basle, 1550 A.D.) who used a copy sent to him by Leland, *ex coenobio ultimae Britanniae Masburensi* (which, as Dr. Hort suggests to me, most probably stands for 'Malmesbury'); and the edition of Pamelius (1579 A.D.) with its notes of the readings of a certain *Codex Joannis Clementis Angli* for some six treatises, three included in this

volume. Unfortunately these notes are very slight; and in the case of the other lost MSS. it is extremely difficult to tell what in the printed text is due to the MSS. and what to the editors. Reifferscheid attaches rather more weight to the readings both of Gangneius and Gelenius than von Hartel, who perhaps with reason suspects them of representing rather the man than the MS. Still Gelenius at least was one of the best editors Tertullian has ever had; and judged by their intrinsic merits, even though they were devoid of MS. authority, his readings deserve all attention. Along with Gelenius one would be inclined to bracket Rigault.¹ Of the other editors, Latino Latini, Fulvio Orsini, and Junius all hit upon right readings every now and then, but their contributions to the definitive text of Tertullian as a whole are less considerable. Speaking of these older editors generally they have more of what the Germans would call 'Genialität'—a freer and a lighter though a less scrupulous hand—than the moderns. Nothing could be more painstaking than Reifferscheid himself. His collations may no doubt be trusted absolutely; and in the case of the worn and injured *Cod. Agobardinus* he is most careful to indicate not only the words but the letters which are at present illegible; he has also evidently turned over in his mind the conjectures both of others and his own much and often; but the gift of divination as well as that of sure judgment must be denied him. In these respects he is surpassed, I cannot but think, a long way by von Hartel. Indeed the latter's *Patristic Studies* seem to me to be quite the most important contribution to our knowledge of Tertullian since Rigault. They are not merely confined to conjectural emendations but contain incidentally many valuable remarks on the characteristics both of the leading MS. and of the style and language of the writer.

To take as a specimen Part I., which is all that I have by me as I write. This deals with the *De Spectaculis* and *De Idololatria*. Here the best of all von Hartel's conjectures seems to me to be in a passage where previous editors have only succeeded in making confusion worse confounded, *Idol.* c. 23 (p. 56, l. 10 ff.). Reifferscheid prints as follows: *pecuniam de ethnicis mutuantes sub pignoribus fiduciati iurati cauent et se negant; se scire uolunt scilicet tempus persecutionis et locus tribunalis et persona praesidis*. This is

altered by von Hartel to *iurati cauent etsi negant se scire; uolunt scilicet* etc. If this is not final it is at least far nearer to the truth than anything ever proposed before. Another excellent emendation, keeping close to the best MS., is in the much quoted passage as the end of the *De Spectaculis* (c. 30, p. 28, l. 23 ff.) which stood thus in the MSS. and leading editions:

A (= Cod. Agobard.) *scilicet flammis saeuferunt² insultantibus contra christianos*.

B (= ed. Gangneii) *sauioribus quam ipsi flammis saeuierunt insultantibus contra christianos* (*christianis* Cod. Jo. Clement).

Rigault *sauioribus quam ipsi contra Christianos saeuierunt flammis insultantibus*.

E. Klusmann *sauioribus quam ipsi saeculi flammis saeuierunt contra Christianos*.

Reifferscheid [*item praesides persecutores dominici nominis*] *sauioribus quam ipsi flammis saeuierunt insultantes contra Christianos liquescentes?*

In the last *insultantes...liquescentes* is very intolerable. Von Hartel rightly as I think starts from *saeculi flammis* of A, and also I think rightly throws out *quam ipsi saeuierunt* as a gloss, probably of Gangneius himself. Thus he reads: *item praesides persecutores dominici nominis saeculi flammis sauioribus, insultantibus contra Christianis, liquescentes* ['he will also see] governors, persecutors of the Lord's name, being consumed with worse than earthly fires, while the Christians look on and mock them.' I am afraid that the thought is in keeping with the fierce eloquence of Tertullian, in our judgment of which it is only fair to remember that he himself had seen the fires blaze and those who were dear to him perish at the stake. One can imagine the force of the reaction in that strong and by no means wholly regenerate nature: 'You may burn us; but a day will come when you will burn!'

In nearly all the instances in which von Hartel defends the reading of the manuscripts against that of the editors I believe him to be right. So notably in *Idol.* c. 10 (p. 40, l. 16) *nondum*; c. 20 (p. 54, l. 11) *commemoremmini*; *Spect.* c. 2 (p. 3, l. 11) *angeli*; c. 11 (p. 13, l. 23) *mortuarii*; c. 25 (p. 25, l. 10) *Lib[eri]*. I am not sure that he might not have gone a step further in this direction. For instance in *Spect.* c. 18 (p. 20, l. 8) Reifferscheid adopts and von Hartel passes a conjecture of E. Klusmann's,

² It is curious, but hardly more than a chance coincidence, that Huemer notes the interchange of *i* and *f* as 'not rare' in the leading MS. (C, *saec.* vii.) of Iuuenius (*Proleg.* p. xxvi.).

¹ What an admirable correction, for instance, is *crucis* for *xps* of the MSS. in *Idol.* c. 12 (p. 43 l. 15).

caestus for *gestus* (AB) which seems to me to be pretty certainly wrong. The passage runs thus: *et palaestrica diaboli negotium est: primos homines diabolus elisit. ipse—caestus vel gestus—colubrina vis est, tenax ad occupandum, tortuosa ad obligandum, liquida ad elabendum*, 'wrestling too is a work of the devil: the devil threw our first parents' etc. Surely the metaphor of wrestling is still kept up in what follows and the introduction of the *caestus* is quite out of place; *gestus* on the other hand will do quite well—'the very motions of the wrestler are snakelike, strong to hold, writhing to grip, slippery to elude.' I cannot see any sufficient reason for altering with Orsini and Reifferscheid *parte* (AB) to *arte* in *Spect.* c. 22 (p. 23, l. 1). I should be inclined to leave as it is, without mark of *lacuna* or anything else, *Spect.* c. 7 (p. 9, l. 6) *uiderit ambitio sive frugalitas eius* (sc. *pompae*) *sit: deum offendit qualiscumque pompa circi* 'it matters not whether the procession be on a large scale or a small one, any procession is displeasing to God.' I strongly suspect that in *Idol.* c. 5 (p. 34, l. 26) *fures balneatores* (AB) should be allowed to stand and not be changed either into *balneares* with Oehler and Reifferscheid or *balnearios* with Gelenius. On the one hand there would be the analogy of such a phrase as *equus bellator*, and on the other hand the Latinity of Tertullian is quite capable of admitting a confusion in meaning between *balneator* and *balnearis*.

I cannot go either with Reifferscheid or Hartel in their emendation of a passage in *Idol.* c. 3 (p. 32, l. 30 sqq.) which Reifferscheid prints thus: *εἶδος Greece formam sonat: ab eo per diminutionem εἶδωλον deductum; aequae apud nos <forma> formulam fecit*. Hartel objects to the insertion of *forma* as subject of *fecit*, and proposes *deductum, quae* (sc. *diminutio*) *aequae* etc. This satisfies every test but one—the test of ear. The sense is sufficiently good, and the reading transcriptionally probable; but can we imagine a Latin writer admitting a jingle like *quae aequae* (or *aequae quae*)? The alternative *quae* alone might pass, but I should be inclined to prefer *aequae* which is found in some MSS. of Isidore who quotes the passage (others *equae* or *atque*). It might be worth while investigating the passage with the help of the MSS. of Isidore, which are much better than those of Tertullian. I assent to von Hartel's criticisms of the readings proposed in *Spect.* c. 23 (p. 24, l. 3) but should be tempted to combine his own reading with Orsini's *muliebribus curis utatur* (rather than *curis*

curatur). I hardly know whether it is worth while to make in passing two small suggestions. *Spect.* c. 5 (p. 7, l. 20) corrupt inscription on the *metae*.

CONSUS CONSILIO MARS DUELLO LARES †
COILLO POTENTES

COILLO A, CUM ILLO B, COMITIO Gelenius, COMPITO Heinsius. An <DOMI>CILIO?

ibid. c. 21 (p. 22 l. 17) *qui insigniori cuique homicidae leonem poscit, idem gladiator atroci petat rudem et pileum praemium conferat, illum uero confectum etiam oris spectaculo repetat* (Reifferscheid).

etiam oris Latini: *etiam amoris* AB, *etiam ore* Scaliger, *spectaculi* Scaliger. An *etiam amore spectaculi*?

The specimens which have been given over a limited area will perhaps give sufficient idea of the character both of Reifferscheid's edition and of von Hartel's critical notes upon it. Of the one accessible MS. there is probably nothing more to be made, and the criticism which is based upon this has advanced a clear step; but we are still some way from the end.

Van der Vliet's *Studia* is a production of far less importance. It begins with a rather interesting discussion as to how far Tertullian deserves the name, given him by Sittl, of *Tacitus Christianus*. Even here Van der Vliet seems to me to miss the point. No doubt it is true that Tertullian does not profess, as Tacitus professes, to write *sine ira et studio*; it is true too that there is a great difference between narrative and didactic or polemical treatises. But the real question is whether, *allowing for* these differences, there is not visible behind or through them some essential affinity in the qualities of mind and temper that go to the making of style. I should answer this question, with Sittl, in the affirmative. No doubt Tacitus is the greater artist; though Tertullian also is an artist after the manner of an inferior age; he cannot exercise the same self-criticism; he often shows that he does not know when to stop. But Tertullian's sentences have a real Tacitean ring about them. He too has found the secret of that compressed and nervous force, of which the Latin language beyond all others is capable. If there is a Tacitus on the roll of the Latin Fathers, it is he.

As to the rest of Van der Vliet's tract, it is written in clear and readable Latin and contains a few more or less apt illustrative parallels. I cannot feel that much is added otherwise to the interpretation, and after going through the various readings sug-

gested in the treatises which Reifferscheid has edited only a small proportion, and those by no means recondite or striking, commend themselves to me. Here is one of the worst. In *Idol*. c. 19 (p. 53, l. 17) arguing on the subject of military service rather less seriously than is his wont, Tertullian supposes precedents quoted in its favour: *et virgam portavit Moyses, fibulam et Aaron, cingitur loro et Iohannes, agmen agit et Iesus Nave bellavit et populus, si placet ludere*. On the ground that *populus* needs definition and that in another place (*De Anima* c. 9. p. 312, l. 2 *sqq.*) *Cod. Agobardinus* twice reads *populus* for *Paulus*, Van der Vliet would substitute for it here *Petrus*! Every Biblical student knows that *populus* (ὁ λαός) needs no further definition and that the passage is perfectly right as it is. Still in spite of much superfluous or ineffective emending, not all as bad as this, the tract is one which the future editor of Tertullian should not altogether neglect.

THE need for a new edition of Juvencus was less pressing. The handy little edition by Marold in Teubner's series (1886) was constructed upon critical principles, on a survey of a large amount of material, and might well be thought to satisfy most practical purposes. Still, even apart from the impossibility of omitting Juvencus from a *Corpus* of Latin Ecclesiastical Writers, there can be no doubt that there was really room for an edition on a larger scale than Marold's. The present editor therefore, who has been already responsible for Sedulius in the Vienna series (*Classical Review* 1888, p. 20) and has had a long familiarity with Christian Latin poetry, has naturally treated his subject with greater fulness of detail though there is hardly a MS. on his list which Marold had not previously noted. The most conspicuous addition is that of a Reichenau MS. (A) of the eighth century, of which however the collation appears to be only partial, perhaps owing to the fact that a large part of the text of Juvencus is the upper writing of a palimpsest (cf. Mone, *Lateinische u. Griech. Messen* p. 116¹ ff.). This is tantalizing, as the MS. is an interesting one. I had already come to the conclusion from some peculiarities of spelling that it was probably not written at Reichenau (like the two other MSS., *K*₁ and *K*₂, now with it at Carlsruhe) when I found that Mone had drawn the same inference, at least as to the lower writing

¹ Not p. 145, as Huemer (p. xxviii.), probably by a misprint.

from the characteristics of the liturgy contained in it. He asks, 'Woher ist diese alte Handschrift?' and he answers 'Aus Frankreich.' I entirely agree: and I should be disposed to add 'from the South-west of France.'

Two of the leading MSS. (*CR*) and a third of less importance (*HL*) have been collated afresh for the Vienna edition, evidently (as we shall see) with great care, by A. Swoboda; two others (*P* and *Bb*) by C. Wotke; and several of the remainder including the Troyes MS. now at Montpellier which he had already used for the text of Sedulius, as we may infer, by the editor. It is pleasant to observe that there has been a free interchange of material between Marold and his successor. Marold in several places draws upon a paper in the *Wiener Studien* by Huemer, and Huemer borrows from him the readings of several MSS. (*V*₁, *V*₂ and MSS. at St. Omer and Madrid). Both have used the materials collected by Korn (*Die Handschriften d. Hist. Evang. d. Juvencus in Danzig Rom u. Wolfenbüttel*, Leipzig, 1870). [Since this was written it has been pointed out in a review by Preuschen (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Dec. 26, 1891, col. 650), from a comparison of Arevalo and Marold, that there is some incompleteness in the statement of the readings of *V*₁, *V*₂, *M*. Attention is also called to omissions in the Index, and to the rather strange absence of Biblical references. Preuschen however does less than justice to the positive merits of Huemer's edition.]

In the principles of criticism Marold and Huemer are substantially agreed. Both follow the lead of the oldest MS. *C*, the greatest among the treasures of the valuable library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Both also adopt very much the same practice in the rejection of verses as spurious. There can be little doubt that these rejections are justified, as many of the verses are clearly duplicates and they often betray an inferior hand, although they have already gained admission into a seventh-century MS. But besides the greatly increased number of variants noted, Huemer's edition marks a real advance in the constitution of the text. This is chiefly due to the renewed collation of *Cod. C*. Marold had left a rather considerable gleaning behind him here. Huemer seems to be pretty clearly right in the following readings, all derived from the MS. and all unnoticed by Marold: i. 141 *et uirgine (ex uirgine)*, 157 *duramque (duroque)*, 439 *uerbis (linguis)*, iii. 67 *matri (matris)*, 123 *mulcatur AC (mulcetur)*, 131

mirumque AC (miroque), 268 *paruisse (pars esse)*, a very good and necessary correction which would have been brilliant as a conjecture but which is found in the MS., 696 *dicta (uincla)*, iv. 468 *labanter (labenter)*, 577 *percontatum (percontantum)*. Other instances in which Marold notes what I strongly suspect, with Huemer, to be the right reading in his *apparatus* but does not adopt it in his text, would be these: i. 412 *longo (saecli)*, ii. 40 *sibi et* (for which Marold has Korn's conjecture *siet*), iii. 420 *secretum*, 434 *si forte liceret (si ferre liceret)*, iv. 163 *fuat (fuit)*, 448 *sic edere (sibi dedere)*—the last, I cannot but think, a very decided gain.

Where MSS. are so plentiful, and comparatively speaking so near in date to the original, there is naturally not much room for conjecture. Still Huemer has some neat emendations: such as would be conspicuously: i. 210 *dictum in contraria signum* (= *σημείον ἀντιλεγόμενον* Luc. ii. 34, for *dicta in contr. sign.*), and 739 *celaris* for *caelare* of the best MSS. (*celare haec R* Marold), which restores the metre and has the support of the *Vetus Latina* (*ne cui dixeris, nemini dixeris*). I cannot say that I have noticed any case in which Marold's reading is clearly preferable to Huemer's, though in several (such as iii. 499 *gaza exstabat*, iv. 262 *malorum*) the later editor appears to adopt a reading of the earlier in preference to one for which he had himself previously contended. One is inclined to ask by the way if such instances ought not to be more expressly acknowledged.

A special feature in Huemer's edition is the care which he has taken to collect (1) the *testimonia veterum* as to Juvenecus himself, (2) the references to earlier writers, especially Virgil Ovid Statius, whom Juvenecus has imitated, and (3) in the *Prolegomena* and occasionally in the notes quotations which later writers have made from him. Yet even so many interesting problems are left as to the history of the text of Juvenecus. On one point Huemer is obviously wrong. He lays down (p. xxxvii.) that all the extant MSS. of Juvenecus are traceable to a single archetype, written in Anglo-Saxon characters and in the seventh century. Through the kindness of the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the friendly mediation of the Rev. J. R. Harmer, I have been allowed to obtain photographs of the Corpus MS. which is itself clearly of the seventh century and in a continental hand—I suspect French or Italian, though of this

I should not like to speak too confidently. In any case however it cannot be derived from an Anglo-Saxon archetype, as it must be some time later than any such archetype, to allow for its own deviations from it; yet the Anglo-Saxon hand was barely beginning to come into existence at the time when the MS. itself was written. Huemer's theory involves a palpable anachronism; nor would it really be borne out by the permutations of letters on which it is based.

Some day the attempt should be made to track out the history of the MSS. of Juvenecus through the ancient catalogues more thoroughly than has hitherto been done. It ought also to be possible to determine more exactly where the extant MSS. were written. Their distribution could then be studied in connexion with the families into which they are divided. We have certainly not yet got to the bottom of the questions which may be raised on this head. And another question of much interest is, Where and when did the spurious verses get inserted? Juvenecus underwent a process of editing in ancient times about which we ought to know more.

Besides his edition of the text of Juvenecus Marold has also turned his attention to the Biblical text which Juvenecus used. He devoted to this subject an article in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1890, the full title of which is given at the head of this notice. The general result to which he came was that the MS. or MSS. which the poet was in the habit of using was specially related to the group: Codd. Vercellensis (*a*), Corbeiensis (*f*₁) and Claromontanus (*h*). No doubt there were real coincidences in the readings noted; but these were few in number and the conclusion generally was more imperfect than it need have been. Marold does not appear to have had before him *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* Part II., in which a method was laid down and materials were collected which would have contributed directly to the solution of the problem before him. It is true that there are coincidences with the *a*-type of text; but there is a still more fundamental affinity with the African text as represented by Cyprian and Cod. Bobiensis (*k*). This may be readily illustrated. It is well known that the work of Juvenecus is based primarily and mainly on St. Matthew. We take therefore the first considerable section of that Gospel which is likely to present points of contact, the Sermon on the Mount. Some allowance must no doubt be made for metrical exigencies and for chance coincidence; still it

cannot be doubted that the choice of expression on the whole is significant. Expressions which are characteristically African are printed in small capitals, those which are distinctly non-African in italics.

FELICES humiles, pauper quos spiritus ambit

(i. 454 ; cf. 461, 463).

Felices Cypr. *codd. opt.* : Beati *a b d k* etc.

(cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. xlv.)

Hoc modo *lugentes* solacia magna sequentur

qui lugent *a b* etc. (qui lugunt *d*) : plangentes *k* Cypr.

Vos estis mundi clarum (ne abscondite) LUMEN

(i. 477 ; cf. 479, 618).

lumen *d k* Cypr. *codd. opt.* : lux *a b* etc.

Ac si quis partem PALMA percusserit oris expalmauerit *k* : percusserit (*tantum*) *a b f ff₁* : percusserit alapam *d*.

AUFERET aut tunicam si quis ui iudicis instans

aufferre *k* : tollere *b f ff₁* (*def. a*) : accipere *d*.

Si quis EGENS POSCET uel si simulabit EGEN-TEM

(i. 558 ; cf. 668).

egens : cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cxiv.

poscenti *k* Cypr. *codd. opt.* (cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cxx.) : petenti *a b f* : qui te petit *d* (*ff₁*).

ILLIC *aerugo* et *tineae* dominantur edaces

Illic : cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cxvi.

aerugo (er-) et *tinea* *a b ff₁* : *tinea* et *erugo f* : *tinea* et *comestura k* Cypr. Aug.

CONDITE thesauros uobis in uertice caeli

condere thesauros *k* Cypr. Aug. : thesaurizare (*thens-*) *a b f ff₁*.

Cernis adhaerentem *festucam* in lumine fratris

festucam a b f ff₁ : *stipulam k*.

NE canibus sanctum DEDERITIS neue uelitis

Ne dederitis *k* Cypr. (cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cv.)
Nolite dare *a b f ff₁*.

Conuersique sues uasto uos uulnere *rumpant* dirumpant (*disr-*) *a b f ff₁* : elidant *k* Cypr.

These examples have been roughly chosen ; they were almost the first that offered ; but they will not give a wrong idea of the relation of Juvencus to the leading MSS. of the Old Latin. And the place which Juvencus holds has a not unimportant bearing on the question as to the origin and early history of that Version, which is now being so actively prosecuted.

It is impossible to quit Juvencus without a word of reference to the section which treats of him in the *Geschichte d. christlich-lateinischen Poesie* by Manitius (Stuttgart, 1891), which has just appeared. Manitius has long been known as a close and careful student of his subject, and his book will not disappoint the expectations which would naturally be formed of it. Indeed I cannot but think that it will surpass those expectations. For complete and searching knowledge one was prepared, but I do not know that an opportunity had been given for anticipating other merits which are equally conspicuous. The book is all that a history should be. The learning, profound as it is, is nowhere obtruded ; the proportions of treatment are admirable ; the literary judgments kindly and genial ; the style direct and easy ; the arrangement of matter most practical ; and the type a pleasure to read. As a specimen of marvellously compressed and exact information I may commend to the reader the second note on p. 60.

W. SANDAY.

INSCRIPTIONS OF PERGAMON.

Die Inschriften von Pergamon unter Mitwirkung von ERNST FABRICIUS und CARL SCHUCHHARDT, herausgegeben von MAX FRÄNKEL. I. Bis zum Ende der Königszeit. Berlin : 1890. 50 Mk.

THE epigraphic results of the German discoveries at Pergamon have been awaited with no little curiosity. As early as 1880 the first-fruits of the excavations were presented in the *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen zu Pergamon* edited by Professor Conze and others. In an interesting paper in the *Jahrbuch der*

Königlich preussischen Kunstsammlungen of 1888 Dr. Max Fränkel published some important specimens of his study of the stones, and expressed the hope that the labours of himself and his colleagues would soon be given to the world. At length the first volume lies before us. We are not at all inclined to complain of delay. Only those who have worked at the inscribed fragments dug up on ancient sites can understand how much of patient and unrecorded toil underlies the legible, reconstructed texts which adorn the well-printed