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](#)

Bindley's *De Praescriptione Haereticorum Tertulliani De Praescriptione Haereticorum: ad Martyras: ad Scapulam*: by T. Herbert Bindley. 8VO. 180 pp. [+ 72 pp. of advertisements]. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 6s.

J. Rendel Harris

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 07 / July 1894, pp 311 - 311

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196507, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196507

How to cite this article:

J. Rendel Harris (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 311-311 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196507

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BINDLEY'S *DE PRAESCRIPTIONE HAERETICORUM*.

Tertulliani De Praescriptione Haereticorum: ad Martyras: ad Scapulam: by T. HERBERT BINDLEY. 8vo. 180 pp. [+72 pp. of advertisements]. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 6s.

THE present volume is a continuation of Mr. Bindley's studies in Tertullian, which have already given us an edition of the *Apologeticus*. It contains the famous treatise *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, to which is appended the pseudo-Tertullianic tract *Adversus omnes Haereses* on the ground that it was the custom of the earlier editors to attach it to the *De Praescriptione* (its proper place, in such arrangements of texts as are convenient for modern work, would be in a Corpus of Treatises against Heresies); Mr. Bindley has also added the two little tracts *ad Martyras* and *ad Scapulam*, which make a very good pair for study though they are not synchronous and have nothing to do with the *De Praescriptione*.

Any one who undertakes to place the text of special treatises of Tertullian before the world in an accessible form and with elucidatory notes deserves our warm thanks, even though his work may not be characterized by originality or profundity. At the same time we could wish that an admirer of Tertullian, as Mr. Bindley undoubtedly is, had selected for his criticism some tract which did not show Tertullian at his very worst, where he is only sparingly witty and almost always unfair. The tract whose arguments Mr. Bindley assiduously defends might just as well be called a tract *De Praescriptione Academiarum* as *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*: and its arguments would silence critical methods of study quite as effectively as they would break the neck of individual heresies. The most famous proverbial expression in the treatise (and Tertullian's line of thought is necessarily rich in epigrams) is the sentence 'Quid ergo Athenis

et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae?'—in connexion with which it is to be remembered that the volume before us is published at the Clarendon Press. So he chooses Athens in his riper age, or his editor chooses it for him. There is something ironical in the very title-page.

The critical apparatus, as far as we have examined it, is carefully described; most of it is taken verbatim from Oehler, as are also a great many of the notes. We say *verbatim* and do not add *literatim*, for on the first page which describes the authorities used there are not less than three bad misprints (*e.g.* l. 7. solus enim superstes nobis liber intactus a *correctione* magistrorum manu: lege *correctrice*; l. 12. *scatena* vitiis vulgaris codicum Tertulliani familiae propriis; lege *scatens*; l. 20. concordat hic *cordex*: lege *codex*): this does not speak well for the proof-reading. Another curious misprint will be found on p. 82, l. 11, where the student can exercise himself in the application of the maxim 'proclivi lectioni praestat ardua'; we are told that 'Tertullian no more meant to assert the possession of the Apostolic autographs by Apostolic churches than their possession of the very *charis* used by the Apostles.' I suppose we should read *chairs*.

These are trifling blemishes on what is really a careful and useful book. Many of the notes elucidatory of Tertullian's language and of the African Latinity are excellent. Occasionally there is a philological remark which will hardly be accepted: for example on p. 59 in discussing the form *susum* we are told that this archaic form may be equated with *subvorsum*. This derivation has been for a long time abandoned; the latest explanation is that of Stürzinger (in Wölfflin's *Archiv* for 1892, p. 598) who considers it an old participial form of *surgere*. But I do not know how far this view has met with acceptance.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

THE LANGUAGE OF CHRIST.

A REPLY.

As Professor Christie has, to some extent, misrepresented (of course, not intentionally) what I have recently written on this

subject, I beg permission to say a few words in reply.

1. He says that my argument 'ignores