I will love anything or anybody. This is the true root of Augustinianism, both in its sweetness and in its bitterness. Mr Tennant has done his work very well, so far as one to whom the Rabbinical writers are known only at second hand can judge of it. But the scheme which he planned for himself, and to which he has adhered with scholarly concentration of purpose, obliged him to deal exclusively with the less important, less agreeable, less scriptural, and less philosophical of the sources of Augustinianism.

C. BIGG.

THE LIFE OF SEVERUS.

Vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scholastique, texte syriaque publié, traduit et annoté par M. A. KUGENER (Patrologia Orientalis tom. 2 fasc. 1). (Paris, 1903.)

THE life of Severus was published by Dr Spanuth in 1893, and has been translated into French from his text by M. Nau in the *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 1899, 1900; but, as Spanuth's text is so printed that one can hardly read it without injury to the eyesight or find any desired passage in it, the editors of the *Patrologia* have done well in publishing M. Kugener's work, which he intends to follow up by an edition of the unpublished life of Severus by John the archimandrite (parts of which have been translated by M. Nau¹), and by an introduction and commentary. Moreover, M. Kugener has been able in several places to correct Spanuth's text from the MS, and has done much more towards removing corruptions than was attempted by Spanuth. At 37. 4 and 86. 12 however, and perhaps also at 106. 11, his corrections are unnecessary, and at 91. 6 the emendation spoils the sentence, where we should supply *محله* from the previous clause, and render 'or how can any one who is a Christian give any attention to such words?'. On the other hand at 66. 5 an emendation seems to be required, for the extraordinary statement that Leontius the law-student 'was at that time *μάγιστρος*' cannot be right, unless M. Kugener has some explanation which he is reserving for the commentary. Many passages however defy emendation, and M. Kugener has here wisely given the text as it stands with an approximate translation instead of making wild conjectures. The printing is clear and misprints few (I have noted such at 18. 12 translation, 66. 3, 70. note 6, and 104. 16 translation); but an unfortunate system has been adopted of using vowel-points in place of diacritic marks, which, being unusual, is sometimes puzzling.

The Syriac is a literal translation from the Greek; and M. Kugener,

¹ *Rev. de l'O. C.* v 293.

who has made a special study of Graeco-Syriac, has done very good service by giving the Greek originals of words and phrases in notes. This he has done with great thoroughness, and his restorations will command general acceptance; but at 33. 14 κτήτορες should be given as the original of **ܩܬܪܐ**, and at 47. 6 I cannot think that **ܐܘܨܒܐ** can represent ἐγκράτεια: M. Kugener by so rendering this word and by apparently taking no account of **ܡܬܬܝܢ** has made shipwreck of this passage, where I would read **ܡܬܬܝܢ** for **ܡܬܬܝܢ** and render 'but such things as excite laughter only in the spectators, and display temporary power' (so M. Nau) 'over those at whom they are laughing'. There is a less important error at 86. 13, where **ܕܢܐܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ** must mean 'John should be set apart for the altar', not 'de reserver l'autel à Jean'. Again at 41. 3 'les soi-disant dieux' hardly renders **ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ**, and at 36. 17 and 39. 13, 14 the renderings 'le σχολαστικός', 'le σοφιστής' make it appear as if there could only be one barrister or professor in a town or district. The text of the life is however very difficult; and M. Kugener has been able not only to grapple successfully with its complications and obscurities, but to produce a clear and fluent translation. The two remaining parts of his work, in which new matter will be touched, will be awaited with interest.

E. W. BROOKS.

MISCELLANEA.

IN the Rev. W. B. Trevelyan's *Sunday*, a contribution to the *Oxford Library of Practical Theology*, we have a good example of the way in which one standing need of the English Church should be met. She has no standard writer in the field of moral theology, who covers, in his progress, subject by subject as it arises. But here is a beginning with the observance of Sunday: and a beginning on sound lines. After an introductory chapter of his own, the author entrusts to the Rev. G. W. Hockley two chapters on the history of Sunday, which trace it, in general, down to the Reformation; and, in England, to the Restoration. Their drift is to show that the history of Sunday observance is a history of reactions, in which Old Testament analogy was pressed into service as well by the legalism of Councils and Canonists from the sixth century onwards as by the disciplinarianism of English Puritans. The fourth chapter, historical also, wisely draws upon the late Canon Overton's unique knowledge of the later seventeenth and of the eighteenth century for a sketch of Sunday in that age; and for the nineteenth, Mr Trevelyan, if he naturally has at his disposal the records of the Macaulay family, is as fortunate in intimacy with the friends of Mr Gladstone. For thus he is able to reproduce the best traditions, in regard to Sunday