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](#)

The Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*

W. Sandy

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 5-6 / June 1887, pp 139 - 144

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183477, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183477

How to cite this article:

W. Sandy (1887). The Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. The Classical Review, 1, pp 139-144 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183477

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

just before the battles (Liv. *Epit.* 93) but were driven away by the Sertorians.

§ 6 *pietas in rem publicam*: this conjecture (for *tas* in etc. of MSS.) which I put forward in my edition, has, I am glad to see, been arrived at and adopted independently by Mueller.

§ 11 *ille ille vir*: Madvig, on the strength of inferior MSS. ejected one *ille* and Mueller follows him wrongly. The repetition is quite in Cicero's style, as is shown by Jordan on Caecin. § 14.

§ 26 *nihil magis* (Lambinus for *nihil m.*): Mueller is right in adopting this; Cicero no more said *nihil magis* than he did *multum magis*; nor, I may say, did any other Latin writer of repute; see my note on *Acad.* 2, § 58. *Nihil minus* has been generally abandoned in *Off.* 1, § 72; that passage and this are, I believe, the only two in Cicero where good MSS. give *nihil* with a comparative.

§ 39 *qui...ab omni studio sensuque Poenorum mentes suas ad nostrum imperium nomenque flexerunt*: I venture to think that these much disputed words are given correctly in the MSS. Why may not *sensus Poenorum* mean 'feeling for their fellow-Punians,' if Cicero can write, as he does, *virtutis certamen* for *certamen contra virtutem*, and *dissensio huius ordinis* for *d. ab hoc ordine*? So Justin 29, 4, 5 has *Romanorum bella* for *bella in Romanos*. For the general drift cf. Val. M. 7, 3, 7 *animum suum a Poenis ad Romanos coegit revocare*; Liv. 5, 42, 8 *abalienaverant ab sensu rerum suarum animos*.

§ 47 *si tanta bella attigisset quanta gessit et confecit* (sc. Marius): *attigisset* is an infelicitous correction of *egisset*. I have not the slightest doubt that the old em. *legisset* is correct; there is an allusion to the tradition that Marius used to pour ridicule on the generals who learned their art from books. See Sallust *Jug.* 85, and the references in my note on *Acad.* 2, § 2.

ib. *a re publica bene gerenda impediretur*: I cannot think it possible (as Mueller does), that Cic. would construct *impedire* with the simple ablative, omitting the preposition.

§ 48 *cum...quaestio venisset*: the use of *venire* 'to come about' (in other than future tenses) to which Mueller objects, is rare but well attested; cf. *Imp. Pomp.* 15 *cum venit calamitas* (left unchanged by M.). The passage given by Georges: '*haec ubi veniunt*' seems to come from *Verr.* 2, 5, 12 where the best MSS. have *eveniunt*.

ib. *ternos: trecentos* is proposed by Ihne *Hist.* V. 163 (Eng. ed.), not noticed by M. Ihne's long argument seems to me baseless.

§ 50 *Avennensem foederatum*: for the unintelligible *Avennensem* I propose *Vasiensem*, a word which occurs in inscriptions to designate a citizen of Vasio, one of the two chief towns of the Gaulish Vocontii, who were certainly *foederati*. *Vienensem*, of which I formerly thought, will not do because the Allobroges were *dediciti* not *foederati* (Liv. *epit.* 61, Strabo 4, p. 203).

J. S. REID.

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

I.

Eugippii *Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini*, ed. P. Knoell, Vienna, 1885. 22 Mk.

It is a striking proof of the immense resources of Germany that, besides all the activity expended upon the Classics in the stricter sense, there should be carried on at one and the same time three such undertakings as the *Vienna Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.*, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and the collection of materials for *Latin Lexicography* in Professor Wölfflin's *Archiv*. It is true that the last-mentioned, after being conducted for three years on a subsidy from the Munich Academy of £25 per annum, seems to be on the point of expiring;

NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

but the wonder is rather that it should have gone on so long as it has. An Englishman cannot help asking what we have at all parallel to any one of these enterprises. I am afraid that Dr. Murray's great *Dictionary* is all that we can show; and that belongs to a different sphere. Yet systematic undertakings of this kind react upon the nation that gives birth to them. Besides the positive results obtained, they serve to train and practise a whole army of collators and editors who are ready to turn their hands to anything, and who have gained their experience not at second-hand or by mere theorising, but by direct work at MSS. and texts. In saying this I do not of course mean to imply that I regard the Germans as infallible: the present article

L

will show that I do not: but they at least make the best use of their *personnel*.

The *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* is to South Germany very much what the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* are to North. It was planned rather more than twenty years ago by the Vienna Academy on the most comprehensive scale. The writings which it was proposed to edit were those of the Latin Fathers down to the seventh century. Competent scholars were sent out to examine the contents of the different European libraries, so as to see what MSS. were available. The result has been a series of reports, the first of which was, I believe, that by Halm on the libraries of Switzerland in 1865, with a supplement by Morel in 1867. In 1870 and 1871 came out in two volumes Reifferscheid's elaborate account of his explorations in Italy. Compared with this the report by Zangemeister on England, which appeared in 1877, was rather slight and perfunctory. The last report, that on the Spanish libraries, has been published within the last few weeks after having previously appeared in the *Sitzungsberichte*. It is edited by Hartel from materials mainly collected by that promising scholar, whose early decease was so much to be regretted, G. Loewe. France was also included in the original programme, but no report on the French libraries has yet been issued: so much excellent work has been done of late in the way of cataloguing by the French themselves that any foreign report might well be thought unnecessary.

These reports formed a sort of chart to direct the labours of the scholars who undertook the task of collating and editing. The series of published volumes was opened with Sulpicius Severus by Halm, which appeared in 1866. It has been followed since that time by thirteen more—counting the second part of Eugippius, and the three parts of Cyprian as single works. At the end of the list comes the so-called *Speculum* of S. Augustine which is only just out.

Compared with the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* the Vienna volumes are not quite so sumptuous and exhaustive, but they have the advantage of being handier and cheaper. It may be mainly due to natural development, but it is also perhaps in part owing to a generous rivalry that in the later issues the indices and prefaces have become fuller and more complete. Many of the editors have taken occasion from time to time to give a detailed account of their critical procedure in the *Sitzungsberichte* or *Transactions* of the Vienna Academy. The series has also led

to the production of valuable essays on the language of the authors edited, as by Engelbrecht on Claudianus Mamertus in the *Sitzungsberichte* for 1885, and by Hartel on Lucifer Calaritanus in the last volume of the *Archiv f. lat. Lexikographie*.

Critics are rather in the habit of complaining that the writings which have so far been published, with the single exception of Cyprian, all belong to the second or third rank: the texts of Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Hilary, Tertullian, are still advertised as in the stage of 'preparation.' But we may well be grateful for what we have got, and leave the editors to take their own time. Many considerations determine the rate at which it is possible to issue the works of any particular author, even supposing that all the editors had the same amount of time at their disposal. For instance, it was one thing to edit Lucifer from a single MS. in a volume of some 330 pages, and another thing to edit Eugippius' *Excerpts from S. Augustine* which extend to 1,100 pages, and for which there are more MSS. than any editor was likely to collate. However, the line is now rapidly lengthening, and the volumes have of late appeared in such quick succession that we may hope to receive some of the greater works before long.

I propose in the articles of which this is the first, to notice some of the more recent volumes, not necessarily in the order in which they have appeared, and also not necessarily in any order of interest. In this respect the book which is now before me—substantial as it is—may not appear very promising. There is none which has met with so grudging a reception. Eugippius' *Excerpts from S. Augustine* are of course at best only a secondary work. Their popularity in the Middle Ages, which is evidenced by the number of MSS. that have come down to us, was naturally accounted for by the convenience of having the cream of S. Augustine's bulky tomes in a single volume. The works of S. Augustine circulated in sections, but even so it is a wonder that the endurance of the scribes was equal to the task of transmitting them to posterity. We can imagine that Eugippius must have earned a large debt of gratitude by compressing these into the equivalent of 1,100 printed pages. And yet the extracts are not such as we should make now, and they are not likely to be much used for their original purpose. Their real interest lies in the help which they afford towards reconstructing the text of S. Augustine. We

will reserve our remarks on the personality of Eugippius until we come to speak of the *Vita S. Severini*, his other extant work. Suffice it to say at present that his *Selections* were probably made within a hundred years of the death of S. Augustine; so that by bringing out a revised text of Eugippius the Vienna editors have thrown up, as it were, an advanced work from which to lay siege to the great African.

The MSS. which Knoell has used for his edition are these:

- A* = Cod. Ambrosianus, saec. ix., two rather long fragments.
- D* = Cod. Desnoyersii, saec. viii., about half the work.
- G* = Cod. Sangallensis, saec. ix., the whole.
- M* = Cod. Cheltenhamensis (Mediomontanus), saec. viii., all but complete.
- P* = Cod. Parisinus (Sangermanensis), saec. ix., complete as it stands, but with a few pages made up by the next MS., *Q*.
- Q* = the six last leaves of *P* which really belonged to another MS. of about the same date.
- T* = Cod. Parisinus (Tellerianus), saec. ix., like *D*, about half the work.
- V* = Cod. Vaticanus, saec. vii., the whole except a small portion at the beginning and end.
- v* = Cod. Vercellensis, saec. x., nearly the whole.

Knoell makes slight use of two other MSS. and gives an account of some more. Among these is a Bodleian MS. of the ninth century, which Knoell dismisses as *nullius in momentis*. I was anxious to test this, but unfortunately the MS. contains only the latter half of the *Extracts*, and the quaternion, which should have contained the passages from the *De Civitate* which I have used as a criterion, is missing.

Of the MSS. just enumerated several have an interest quite apart from their text. *T*, from the beauty of its execution, is one of the exhibited specimens in the Bibliothèque Nationale: *V* is also highly praised for its calligraphy. *D* was made the subject of a most instructive memoir (*Notice sur un Manuscrit Mérovingien d'Eugippius*, Paris, 1875) by the accomplished librarian M. Léopold Delisle. It is one of the best typical examples of Merovingian writing, as it contains a number of different hands—uncial, half-uncial, minuscule, and cursive. The fragment *Q* has a subscription which

has attracted much attention. This has evidently been handed on from the original from which *Q* itself was copied. We gather that the MS. to which it relates was written by Peter the notary for Redux, Bishop of Naples, in the year 581 A.D., while the Lombards were besieging the city of Naples.

What use, it will be asked, has Knoell made of these materials? The reply to this question will naturally touch upon four points: (1) the selection of MSS., (2) the collations, (3) the principles followed in the construction of the text, (4) the bearing of the text so constructed upon that of S. Augustine.

The MSS. fall into two strongly-marked groups, *MQV* on the one side, *DGPTv* on the other: *A* alone seems to stand somewhat apart, though as its text is not extant along with *T*, I have not made it the subject of close analysis. Now of these MSS. *M* is simply a direct copy of *V*, and Knoell believes that *v* was copied (apparently at one or two degrees' remove) from the same original as *G*. It is true that *M* is of use in helping to discard the corrections of *V*, which had not been made when it was written, and *v* performs a like office in regard to *G*, with the first corrector of which it is closely allied. Still I cannot but think that some of the labour (by no means slight) which has been spent on these two MSS., *M* and *v*, might have been spared. There are two ways in which the economy might have been utilised. It is part of the general plan of reducing, as much as possible, the *apparatus criticus* in the Vienna series, that the authorities are usually cited on one side only. This is, however, often unsatisfactory. It is a precarious method to leave the reader to infer readings *ex silentio*. This must of course be done in many cases, if the volumes are to be kept down to a moderate size and price, but it would have been a decided advantage if these cases had been fewer than they are. Or, on the other hand, in place of *M* and *v*, it might, perhaps, have been possible to find a MS. representing a more distinct type of text, the combination of which with the other MSS. might have been helpful. The mechanical rule of drawing a line at the tenth century is sure to lead to regrettable omissions.

There is another point on which I cannot quite satisfy myself as to the method of collation. No doubt great allowance must be made for an editor who has collated—not everywhere but very largely—as many as nine MSS. for a text covering 1,100 pages. So long as we know what MSS. are being

collated, and what inferences may be drawn from silence, all is well. But this is not always the case. Knoell says expressly that he has collated *G* for the first twenty-nine chapters; and citations of *G* are often very frequent. But on pp. 150–155 *G* is not cited at all; on p. 154 it is cited twice; on pp. 157–164 it is again not cited, and on p. 165 it is again cited twice; yet it does not appear that there are *lacunae* in the MS. What are we to make of this? The student who wants to determine the exact relation of *G* to *DPTv* finds himself baffled.

The main question, however, of course is that as to the construction of the text. Knoell refers to his intention to explain the principles of his procedure elsewhere. I have not been able to ascertain whether this intention has been fulfilled. Knoell has based his text mainly upon *V*, which certainly has a *prima facie* case in its favour. It is by a little the oldest of the MSS.: it has preserved some spellings like *Vergilius*, and still more vernacular forms—*de non fuerit, erat de, quinta triena*—which seem to have been lost in the other MSS.: and it

gets the benefit of the subscription in *Q* which must have been taken from a MS. of the same type. And yet there is, I cannot but think, one serious difficulty to be got over—a difficulty with which I cannot feel sure that Knoell has thoroughly grappled.

In seeking to check the text of Eugippius one naturally goes first to S. Augustine, and in particular to that treatise which has had at least a preliminary critical edition, the *De Civitate* of Dombart (Leipzig, 1877). The MSS. used by Dombart are nearly as old as those of Eugippius: *V* is of cent. vii., (*C*, which is also of cent. vii., is unfortunately only extant in a passage corresponding to one short extract in Eugippius), *K* is of cent. viii., *F* of cent. ix., *AR* of cent. x. Now on comparing the text of these MSS. with the MSS. of Eugippius I find that they constantly support the group *DGPTv* against *MV* which Knoell has followed. I will give in parallel columns some of the results of this comparison, showing what MSS. of Eugippius agree with the text or leading MSS. of Augustine:

EUGIPPIUS ED. KNOELL.

- p. 52, 25, autem
53, 26, uoluptatem
54, 1, quia
3, enim *MV*
55, 22, litteras sacras
56, 14, redemptionem
18, refrigescit = Aug. cod. *V*
atque ita = Lat. Vet. cod. *f*, Matt. xxiv. 12
22, decipimus, *MV*
57, 10, temptationibus uariis
16, gloriabitur
58, 2, timorem
20, eas
24, dixit
59, 7, exspectamus
26, atque iustorum multumque sanctorum
27, quia
77, 14, est *sine addit.*
78, 2, ex mortuis
25, atque, *MV*
151, 24, requies
156, 3, maior
159, 4, fecit Deus
7, aut impossibile
10, priorum
11, Dei uerbo
172, uoluntatem aliquam
173, 20, affectos
174, 12, quia
175, 1, specie
23, pulchritudinis suauium corporum, *MV*
176, 7, deriuatur, *MVU*
23, illo, *MV*
177, 2, ille eos
178, 4, mortaliter, *MV* = Aug. cod. *A*, ed. Paris.

De Civitate ED. DOMBART.

ergo = Eugip. codd. *DGPTv*
uoluptates = *D'GPTv*
quae = *DGPTv*
autem = *DGPTv*
sacras litteras = *DGPTv*
redemptionem = *DGPTv*
refrigescet (*Domb.*) = *P²T*
atque ita = Lat. Vet. codd. *abd'c*, Matt. xxiv. 12
seducimus = *DGPTv*
temptationes uarias = *P¹PT*
glorietur = *DGPTv*
timores = *DGPTv*
om. = *DGPTv*
dixerit = *DGPTv*
speramus = *DGPTv*
multumque iustorum atque sanctorum = *DGPTv*
quoniam = *DGPTv*
ad. mediator bonus = *DGPTv*
et ex mortuis = *P²Tv*
et = *DGPTv*
et requies (Aug. cod. *V*; sed *Domb.*) = *PTv*
longe maior = *PTv*
Deus fecit = *PTv*
aut etiam impossibile = *PTv*
prios = *PTv*
uerbo Dei = *PTv*
aliquam uoluntatem = *PTv*
affectos fuisse = *PTv*
qui (Aug. codd. *VA*, *Domb.*) = *PTv*
in specie = *PTv*
pulchrorum suauiumque corporum *PTv*
deprauatur = *P²T*
ab illo = *PTv*
eos ille = *PTv*
Mutabiliter (Aug. codd. *VG*, *Domb.*) = *P(T)v*

Our attention is caught by the coincidence of Knoell's reading *refrigescit*, p. 56, 18 with

that of the Italic text represented by *f* (Cod. Brisianus), and we at once remember

the well-known passage in which Augustine expressed a preference for that text. Too much stress, however, must not be laid upon this point. S. Augustine's Bible is a very variable quantity, and by his time the Latin texts had been much mixed. I have not as yet formulated any conclusion as to the text used in the *De Civitate*. There are certainly Italic readings, such as *glorificent* in the quotation of Matt. v. 16, *recordatus* in the quotation of Matt. v. 23. But there are also readings which are not Italic: e.g. *mundo corde* (from Matt. v. 8 = Lat. Vet. Codd. a, b), seems to have better attestation in both the places where it occurs, as against *mundi corde* of *f*. Another reading where there might seem to be a certain presumption in favour of Knoell's text is *deriuatur* in 176, 7, where the editor aptly compares the use of *deriuatio* in Victor Vitensis and Orosius: yet here too the MSS. of Augustine

unanimously present *deprauatur*, and it is equally possible that *deriuatur* may be a paraphrastic expression introduced in the process of copying. Whichever type of text is the genuine Eugippius, evidently by Eugippius himself or by a subsequent scribe such paraphrasing must have taken place to a considerable extent. In most of the other instances that are not simply ambiguous I should have thought that, even apart from the evidence of the MSS. of Augustine, the internal probabilities were rather against the text adopted by Knoell.

It is right to set down on the other side those readings in the passages previously analysed in which Codd. *PTv* &c. of Eugippius differ from the MSS., or from Dombart's text of Augustine. For a reason which I shall state presently I only give those combinations into which *T* enters.

EUGIPPII codd. *PTv*, &c.

- p. 53, 6, Virgilius, *D¹GMPTv* (cf. p. 487, 11, v, p. 538, 3, *GPTv*)
16, suscipiunt, *DGP(T)v*

- 54, 2, caliginosis, *G²Tv*
57, 14, pereant, *D¹GPTv*

[There is some confusion and mixed agreement and disagreement of the different texts here.]

- 58, 8, sui, *DGPTv*, Knoell; ei, *Mv*
16, actiones, *DG¹PTv*
59, 19, contigit, *PT*
77, 23, beatitudine, *D¹T¹*
156, 18, aereum, *PTv*
172, 26, sed si superior *PTv* = Aug. ed. Paris.
174, 27, uellet, *P²T*
32, scire, *P¹Tv*
175, 23, luxuria, *PT* (cf. *Speculum Augustini*, p. 639, 14, ex *Ep. Jac.* v. 5)

[One or two instances of the omission or insertion of final *m* have not been noted on either side.]

There will hardly, I think, be any question which of these two lists is the more important. Nor can it, I imagine, any more be doubted that on the whole the text of *PTv* and their allies is nearer to that of the MSS. of Augustine than the text of *MV*. But considering that the work of Eugippius is professedly a reproduction of Augustine's text it seems to me distinctly more probable that those MSS. of Eugippius are right which are in agreement with that text. The only other possibilities are (1) that the Augustine MSS. on their side are all corrupt—which may be practically dismissed; or (2) that the copies used by Eugippius within a hundred years of the death of S. Augustine were already corrupt or were dealt with freely by Eugippius,

De Civitate ed DOMBART.

Vergilius = Knoell

suspiunt = Knoell (despiciunt Verg. edd. [despiciunt codd. opt.; respiciunt codd.])

caliginosi = Knoell

pereunt = Knoell

om.

affectiones = Eugip. codd. *G²v*, Knoell

contingit = Knoell

beatitudini = Knoell

aerium = Knoell

sed superior = Knoell

uelit = Knoell

sciri = Knoell

luxuria = Knoell

and that a later copy—the parent MS. of *DGPTv* which may well have been as old as the ancestor of *MV*—was systematically corrected into agreement with the Augustine MSS. The first half of this second alternative is possible enough in either of its forms: the history of the text of the New Testament shows that a hundred years is quite long enough to let in a great amount of corruption; and an editor like Eugippius would be, perhaps, more likely to resort to paraphrase than a scribe who was trained to copy mechanically what he had before him. But the further assumption which is necessary to complete this alternative, that the text of Eugippius was deliberately harmonised with that of Augustine, seems to me by no means probable. So far as I have

been able to judge, the phenomena are the same all through Eugippius; but if so, the corrector must have had access to a complete collection of the works of S. Augustine, which must have been in itself an exceptional thing; and then we must remember that he would have no such convenient indices and cross references as those with which Knoell has supplied us. It may, of course, have been done for all that, as Knoell assures us that it has been done by

the third corrector of *G*, but one hesitates to assume such a hypothesis without strong reason, and the instances in which *PT* &c. do not agree with the Augustine text all tell against it.

A further argument to the same effect would be supplied by those instances—not a few—in which Knoell himself has had to abandon his chosen guides, *MV*. I have noted the following in the passages analysed:

Codd *MV*.

p.	52, 27, corrumpere et
	56, 25, sicut ipse
	58, 8, ei
	59, 20, aphantia, <i>GMVv</i>
	78, 20, peruentionibus grados
	148, 2, quidquid
	149, 8, uocationis, <i>MVv</i>
	150, 26, die <i>gen. cf. Cypr. ed. Hartel ind.</i>
	171, 20, initium
	25, uoluntate
174,	4, quas
	8, consentit
176, 21,	noluissent

KNOELL.

corpore
sicuti se <i>DGPTv</i>
sui, <i>DGPTv</i>
ἀπάθεια <i>spathia, PT</i>
peruentionis gradus
quid
uocationis
diei, <i>PTv</i>
uitium
uoluntatem
quae
consensit, <i>PTv</i>
uoluissent

I do not like to speak at all confidently without a more prolonged study than I have been able to give. All that I have done has been to sink a few shafts into the text here and there, and set the results before the reader. If Knoell has not yet published his promised essay, he would perhaps himself take account of the considerations here put forward. It is true that in several places he refers to the text of Augustine, and in some makes use of it to support his own text, but I cannot be sure that he has formed a clear, well-reasoned conception of the relation of the two texts to each other. It seems to me that such a conception was essential to the formation of a trustworthy text.

I will venture to throw out a single suggestion for what it is worth. In the course of the above analysis I have been led to suspect that the most constant element in the preferable readings was *T*, and that combinations of *T* with another MS. had special claims to consideration. Against this it may be urged that *T* has interpolations—that is, it continues the extracts a little further—in caps. xxv., lxxxvi., clxi., and adds a new heading in clvi. In the first two places *T* stands alone; in the greater part of the third it is combined with *GP*, and in the fourth with *GPv*. But I do not wish to lay stress on the singular readings of *T*, which do not appear to have any special value, so much as on *T* in combination with other MSS.: where, as is

frequently the case in some parts, it goes over to *MV*, it seems to me to carry with it the preponderance to the other side. This is only a *prima facie* view, but it might perhaps be worth testing.

In regard to our last point, the reflex influence which this edition of Eugippius may be expected to have on the text of S. Augustine, it is clear that this influence will be considerable, and that for fixing the text of S. Augustine, Knoell's digest of the readings of the MSS. of Eugippius will be of high importance. A few instances strike me at once where we may correct Dombar's text: we must remove the brackets from *absit* in p. 524, l. 16; we must restore *singula* for *singuli*, p. 620, 15, and read *facturas* for *victuras*, p. 621, 4. Whatever may be the true reading in S. Augustine—I have little doubt that in Eugippius, p. 58, 16 we ought to read *actiones*, and I am not at all sure that this is not what S. Augustine himself wrote. Outside the *De Civitate* the Vienna Eugippius is the nearest approach which we possess to a critical edition of S. Augustine.

Fortunately a good *apparatus criticus* is independent of the text which stands above it, and though I have freely expressed my doubts on the subject of Knoell's text, I am none the less grateful to him for the long, and I fear dreary, toil which this edition must have cost him.

W. SANDAY.