NOTES AND STUDIES.

OUR OLDEST MSS OF ST. CYPRIAN, II: THE TURIN AND MILAN FRAGMENTS.

IN the January number of the JOURNAL (iii 282-285) I dealt with our oldest Cyprianic MS of any size, Paris lat. 10592 (S), and after examining the lacunae more fully than was done by Hartel I was able to restore with absolute confidence the original contents of the MS¹. I now propose to follow up the account of S with similar notes upon the very ancient Cyprianic fragments from Bobbio now in the libraries of Turin and Milan, which I had an opportunity of seeing in April and May of the present year; as well as to incorporate some notice of the leaf whose text is published above, pp. 576-578.

These fragments² are all combined by Hartel under a single symbol, F, though in fact, as Hartel himself realised later, Turin G v 37 belongs to one MS, Turin F iv 27 and the guard-leaves of Ambros. D 519 inf. to another. I retain the symbol for the latter MS, and leave the other for the present nameless.

(1) TURIN G v 37.

This fragment consists of thirty leaves, forming the xiith, xiiith, xivth, and xvth gatherings of a MS, all four gatherings being complete save that between foll. 3 and 4 the two inner leaves³ of the xiith gathering have gone. Each gathering has its signature in Roman numerals on the *verso* of its last page. There are two columns of writing to a page: the present size of the page is 17 x 20.5 cmm., or measuring only from edge to edge of the writing 11.5 x 13. Quotations from Scripture are indented—a lavish waste of space like the double columns to the page,

¹ On one point on which I expressed some doubt—whether, namely, the erroneous headline ‘de zelo et liuore’ is carried right through what remains of the *de bono patientiae*—I am now able, after a second inspection of the MS, to say that the headline is, as I expected, continued to the end.

² Except of course the newly published leaf, which was not known to him.

³ Hartel wrongly says one leaf.

and like them a sign of very early date. Of the sacred names and their accompanying adjectives, spiritus and sanctus and noster are written in full: xps follows the ordinary contractions: ds and dm are contracted, but dei and deo, though they have the line of contraction over them¹, are written in full (except once at the end of the line)—in other words, the four-letter cases of deus (nom. and acc.) are contracted, while the three-letter cases are written out. For the name Iesus ihs is used as usual in the nominative, but in the only instance of an oblique case I could see (the genitive) ihm xpi appeared to be the original reading. For dominus, dms dmi dmo dme dmn (= dominum) is the regular declension: but dom is found once for the accusative and perhaps once for the genitive. This scheme of abbreviations seems to point back beyond the sixth century: my own inclination would be to place the MS in the first half of the fifth century.

Fol. 1 a begins with the first words (the title was on the previous page) of the *de opere et elemosynis* (Hartel 373. 2): and, with the exception of the lacuna already mentioned after fol. 3—it extends from p. 375. 12 to the end of the last line of p. 376 in Hartel²—this treatise is contained complete, ending on fol. 30 a: fol. 30 b contains just the opening lines of Ep. 63 'de sacramento calicis' as far as Hartel p. 702. 21. Since the *de opere* occupies all but four gatherings, and since eleven gatherings are lost before it, it is natural to conclude that three treatises of somewhat shorter average length than the *de opere* originally preceded it in the MS. This is the case both with the Cheltenham List (*ad Donatum, de habitu uirginum, de lapsis, de opere*) and with the two related MSS C R (*ad Donatum, de habitu uirginum, de zelo, de opere*): and if we were limited to these two alternatives, the former would be much the more probable, as the three treatises in C R are not long enough to fill the gap³. But since in no other known MS is the *de opere* followed by Ep. 63, it is perhaps safer to see in this Turin MS one of those smaller fortuitous collections of Cyprianic writings which no doubt existed in times when the normal size even of a parchment book was unequal to containing all the dozen or so treatises which we are accustomed to find together.

In order that the insufficiency of the collation used by Hartel may be

¹ I am under the impression that the superior line over the word was (partly at any rate) regarded as a mark of reverence or dignity, not merely of contraction: thus the Lyons Psalter (Lyons 425: saec. v¹) has deus in full, foll. 4 a, 6 a.

² The last words of fol. 3 b are dixerit aut super-, the first of fol. 4 a die mala: Hartel *ad loc.* marks the beginning of the lacuna four words too early, and does not mark the end of it at all.

³ The *de zelo* of C R is barely half the length of the *de lapsis* of the Cheltenham list. I calculate that the three treatises of the list would come to exactly what is wanted.

better understood, I subjoin a rough list of 'addenda and corrigenda' for the Biblical quotations of the *de opere* :

Hartel 374.	3	elemosynis
	7	aelemosyna (<i>i. e.</i> , <i>e</i> with cedilla)
	15	intus est (<i>not</i> est intus)
	16	elemosynam
377.	1	die mala liberauit illum deus
	5	peccatua elemosynis
	9	redemisset . . . 14 elemosynis <i>om per homoeoteleuton m p, suppl ad calc pag m 2</i> [1 12 aelimosinis <i>not</i> eleemosyna, quoniam <i>not</i> quia]
378.	10	Dabitha <i>cod*</i>
	11	exsurge in nomine ihm xpi
	25	elemosynam
	26	thensauros
379.	1	thensaurizate thensauros
	3	thensaurus
	7	thensaurum
	14	praetiosam
	21	habrahae
380.	5	credit
	20	aedendum prestabit et multiplicauit
	25	dmi (<i>not</i> dni <i>as in Hartel's apparatus</i>) ¹
381.	24	et muscipula (<i>not</i> et in muscipulam)
382.	8	Daniel in lacum leonum iussu (<i>not</i> Danieli, <i>not</i> in lacu, <i>not</i> ad leonum praedam)
	15	plures illis estis
384.	8	collurio inunge
	25	gazofilacium aera minuta (<i>not</i> area)
385.	4	omnibus plus (<i>not</i> plus omnibus)
	5	de eo (<i>not</i> ex eo)
	7	<i>om sua cod*</i>
	24	matrem aut patrem <i>cod*</i>
386.	5	ser uerunt
	17, 19, 25	elias, eliae, elias
387.	25	tergeri (<i>not</i> tergi)
	27	filios vii et filias iii
388.	13	iunior
	17	in iustitiam
389.	2	elemosynas

¹ And in 380. 26 ad dom, not ad deum.

389. 4 im mente¹
 9, 12, 14 elemosynam *ter*
 16, 17 elemosyna *bis*
 16 eliberat *cod**
 391. 16 dextram (*not* dexteram)
 17 ad dextra sua (*not* ad dexteram suam)²
 18 quod uobis paratum est regnum³
 19 dedisti *cod**
 20 potas me *cod**
 22 uisitasti *cod** | *om* me 1^o
 in carcerem
 392. 3 quandiu
 5 dicet (*not* dicit)
 ad sinistra (*not* ad sinistram)
 om sunt
 7 *om* pater *cod** (*suppl. m p*)
 10 uestis *cod**, cooperuistis *in ras m p*
 infirmus et non uisitastis (uisitasti *cod**) me
 in carcerem et non uenistis ad me
 14 in carcerem
 15 qua-|diu
 17 ignem aeternam (*not* aeternum)
 393. 20 discrime-|nullum

(2) Turin F iv 27 = Ambros. D 519 inf.

Of this second and almost equally early Bobbio MS of St. Cyprian two sets of fragments, besides a single leaf, are extant.

(a) Eight continuous leaves, forming one gathering, are found as the guard-leaves of another Bobbio MS, Amb. D 519 inf., a Cassiodorus (I think), written in the tenth century: and since the page of the tenth-century MS was nearly twice the size of that of the fifth-century one, each guard-leaf is made out of a pair of conjugate leaves of the Cyprian MS, turned sideways and then trimmed at what became the lower end. Of the two guard-leaves at the beginning, the first consists of foll. 3 and 6, the second of foll. 2 and 7, of the gathering: and similarly of the two guard-leaves at the end, the first contains foll. 4 and 5, the last foll. 1 and 8, of the gathering. Unfortunately the

¹ This assimilation of the preposition is occasionally found in *k*.

² This ad dextra and the ad sinistra of 392. 5 should be added to the manuscript authority for these forms collected by me in *J. T. S.* ii 608, 609 (July, 1901).

³ With regard to this correction, and also the dicet of 392. 5, it is I think just possible that my notes may be wrong and Hartel right.

gathering is not signed. The contents of the gathering are the end of Ep. 57 (from 655: 15), the whole of Ep. 52 Ep. 47 and Ep. 45, and the beginning of Ep. 44 (as far as 598: 3¹). Of these Ep. 52 has lost its number through the trimming of the page, but Ep. 47 is numbered xxxvii, Ep. 45 xxxviii, and Ep. 44 xxxviii, in a hand which Dr. Ceriani judged to be of about the ninth century: in any case, as he pointed out to me, the numbering must have been made before the contents of the MS were dispersed and the Milan leaves put to their present use as guard-leaves in the tenth century.

(b) The Turin fragments consist of twenty-four leaves, now bound up together as an independent MS, and are made up as follows: (i) two leaves—the first (I think) and the last—of a gathering signed xvii on fol. 2 b; (ii) foll. 3–8 are the six interior leaves of the next gathering; (iii) foll. 9–24 are the two next gatherings (19th and 20th), both being complete quaternions but without any signature now visible. Fol. 1 has the headlines ‘ad Pomponium’ (fol. 1 b) ‘de uirginibus’ (fol. 1 a), and contains the end of Ep. 4—Hartel 476. 19–478. 7. Fol. 2 commences with ‘ad Stephanum expl²’, showing that one of the two letters to Pope Stephen (Ep. 68 or 72) was contained on the lost leaves, and goes on with Ep. 61 numbered xliii. The leaf lost between foll. 2 and 3 contained from 696. 9 ‘de camino ignis’ to 697. 11 ‘ceteris ipsi’³. Ep. 61 is followed by Epp. 1 (numbered xliiii), 46 (numbered xlv), 56 (numbered xlvi⁴). The leaf lost between foll. 8 and 9 is that lately acquired by Mr. Grissell (see above, pp. 576–578): it contains the salutation of Ep. 54 (numbered xlvii) and the beginning of the text, Hartel 621. 4–622. 12 ‘uestri nominis.’ The succeeding words ‘dignitas uidebatur’ are the first words of Turin fol. 9. Foll. 9–24 contain the rest of Ep. 54, and the whole of Epp. 20 (xlvi), 30 (xlviii), 31 (l). Fol. 24 b ends with the title of a new letter (li) ‘in cp ppr et diaconibus fratribus’⁵.

The two doubtful letters, to Pope Stephen and to the presbyters and deacons, can be identified by the help of two MSS which give substantially the same order of letters as F—H (cod. Paris. lat. 15242) and β (cod. Trecensis 442)—as Ep. 72 and Ep. 12⁶. The same MSS

¹ The words ‘probationis aduer’ in Hartel’s introduction, p. xxviii, are a slip for ‘probatione partis aduer.’ That Hartel enumerates Ep. xli among the letters given by F is a pure blunder on his part.

² Hartel on p. 478 gives this as the colophon to Ep. iv. He had apparently no idea of the existence of a lacuna between foll. 1, 2.

³ Hartel gives both the beginning and the end of the lacuna wrongly.

⁴ Not, as Hartel wrongly says, xlviii.

⁵ The numbering of the letters, whether in the Milan or in the Turin fragments, is all by the same early hand. Hartel sometimes calls it ‘m. rec.’, ‘recenti saec. xv manu,’ sometimes gives it as part of the original scribe’s title.

⁶ I owe these identifications to Dom John Chapman.

enable us also to fill up the lacuna of probably six leaves which we have seen to exist between foll. 1 and 2 of the Turin fragments. They contained, we now know, the whole of Ep. 72, seventy-eight lines in Hartel; and as each leaf of F contains matter equivalent roughly to twenty-seven lines of Hartel, six leaves ought to contain 162, and therefore another letter of some eighty lines intervened between the end of Ep. 4 and the beginning of Ep. 72. If now we turn to codd. H β, we find that their order is Epp. 4, 3, 72: and as Ep. 3 amounts to eighty-two lines in Hartel, we may confidently conclude that it was also contained in the lost leaves of F.

By combining then the Milan and Turin fragments, and the leaf belonging to Mr. Grissell, the following order results:

[xxxv]	Ep. 57	xliviii	Ep. 1
[xxxvi]	52	xlvi	46
xxxvii	47	xlvi	56
xxxviii	45	xlvi	54
xxxviii	44	xlvi	20
[xl]	4	xlvi	30
[xli]	[3]	l	31
[xlii]	72	[li]	12
.xlvi	61		

Between the Milan and Turin fragments there was therefore apparently no gap when the (ninth century?) corrector numbered the letters. But the MSS H β insert between Epp. 44 and 4 the four letters 13, 43, 65, 66; and the end of Ep. 44 (twenty-eight lines) and beginning of Ep. 4 (ninety-three lines) could not anyhow form a complete quaternion. It seems probable, in consequence, that the MS had undergone loss at this point anterior to the date of the numerator.

These fragments display some of the same marks of extreme antiquity as those described at the beginning of the present paper. There is the same waste of space in double columns and in indentations for quotations. The page, though not so small, covers only 28.5 × 23.5 cm.; the writing only 16.5 × 15.5. One peculiarity of special interest palaeographically is that the scribe employs for the salutation at the end of each letter a much smaller and quite different handwriting. The usual abbreviations *dns*, *ds*, *xps*, occur throughout: but it is to be noted that the abbreviating line is carried over the whole of the word in each case.

Dr. Ceriani ascribes the MS to the fifth century. My own inclination would be to date the fragments of the MS first described in the first half of the fifth century, and these in the second half. But I have no special claim to speak in such matters.

C. H. TURNER.