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](#)

Dr. Wordsworth's Edition of the Latin Vulgate *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi*. Ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem recensuit Iohannes Wordsworth, S.T.P., Episcopus Sarisburiensis, in operis societatem adsumpto Henrico Iuliano White, A.M., Societatis S. Andreae Collegii Theologici Sarisburiensis Vice-Principali. Euangelium secundum Lucam. Oxonii, e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXCIII. 12s. 6d.

T. K. Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 05 / May 1893, pp 216 - 217

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197665, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197665

How to cite this article:

T. K. Abbott (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 216-217 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197665

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

as compared with those of more recent editors, of whom—Maranus more especially—Schwartz speaks with marked severity.

The secondary MSS. then fall into four groups, headed respectively by the Modena and Paris (174 and 450) MSS. and by a lost copy of A, from a copy of which, similar or identical with Monac. 81, Gesner printed what is reputed to be the *editio princeps*. The burnt Strassburg codex was derived from that now at Modena.

Of the reason for this profound neglect by Christian antiquity of one of the very ablest of pre-Nicene writers, Mr. Schwartz can only offer a very tentative account. He was too much of a Platonist for any but the Alexandrines; too realistic in his treatment of the resurrection for the latter. He yielded little material to the historian, none to the martyrologist. These reasons, like Harnack's ingenious theory of the *Apology*, leave something to be explained. But whatever the cause of the neglect, we owe a debt of gratitude to the learned Byzantine bishop, but for whom in all probability Athenagoras would have been to us at most *nominis umbra*.

The edition comprises a preface, dealing with the materials for the text, and giving the readings of the secondary MSS.; the text of the two tracts, with the readings of A when rejected, also the corrections of Arethas, and critical notes; and lastly indices. With regard to the text, that of the *de Resurr.* is in a far more satisfactory state than that of the *Supplicatio*: for some reason it would seem to have been less frequently copied. As to the indices, the care and thoroughness with which they are

done may be partly estimated from the fact that they occupy 64 pages to 79 of text. Of the 64, 51 are taken up with the 'Index graecus' which cites every occurrence of the most important words (although the strictly theological vocabulary is incomplete: e.g. *πνεῦμα*) and adds copious illustrative quotations. This part of the work, so far as I have been able to test it, is beyond praise. The *Index Nominum et Rerum* (pp. 81–91) comprises most of the material interesting to the classical scholar; e.g. the misquotation of Pindar common to Clement Alex. and Athenagoras, probably from some one second-hand source. To the New Testament quotations I would add a reminiscence of Acts xxv. 11 (p. 3, lines 1, 2); a more obvious use of 1 Tim. ii. 8 (p. 14, l. 23); of 1 Tim. vi. 16 and Gal. iv. 9 (p. 17, ll. 7, 16); at p. 32, l. 25 the reference is to Gen. vi. 4; at p. 43, ll. 11, 12, to 1 Tim. v. 1, 2; at p. 44, l. 17 probably to Rom. i. 27. Of the very few misprints uncorrected at p. xxx., ἀπέθνησκον (p. 39, l. 21) is the only one I have observed which does not come under the head of accidents 'per typothetae culpam post plagulas correctas'—a misfortune in which Mr. Schwartz is not without companions.

In spite, therefore, of the somewhat tart criticism to which Preuschen (*uir fortis peioraque passus*) has subjected it in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1892, No. 22), this edition of *Athenagoras* may be called, with trifling deductions, an exemplary piece of work, and a worthy sequel to the same editor's *Tatian*.

A. ROBERTSON.

DR. WORDSWORTH'S EDITION OF THE LATIN VULGATE.

Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi. Ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem recensuit IOHANNES WORDSWORTH, S.T.P., Episcopus Sarisburiensis, in operis societatem adsumpto HENRICO IULIANO WHITE, A.M., Societatis S. Andreae Collegii Theologici Sarisburiensis Uice-Principali. Euangelium secundum Lucam. Oxonii, e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXCIII. 12s. 6d.

THIS new part of the Bishop of Salisbury's great edition of the Latin Vulgate well maintains the character established by its predecessors and it is with great satisfaction

that we see the steady progress made with the publication of a work of such vast labour. We shall only note the readings in a few passages.

In vi. 35 we have two readings, both representing *μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες*, viz. 'nihil desperantes' and 'nihil inde sperantes.' The latter agrees with the A.V., the former with the Revised Version. The Greek word is of frequent occurrence in Polybius and Diodorus and later writers, always in the sense 'despair.' Nor does there seem any reason for giving it a different signification ('to drive to despair') in Ecclus. xxvii. 21, where we are warned not to reveal the secret of a friend, since thus we should lose

our friend, for a wound may be bound up and for reviling there may be reconciliation but he that has revealed secrets ἀπὴλπισεν (*i.e.* has lost hope of recovering his friend). The present editor judges that of the two readings 'inde sperantes' is the more likely to be Jerome's emendation, and although this is against the usage of the verb elsewhere, it is etymologically admissible as we have *e.g.* ἀπολαβεῖν = λαβεῖν ἀπό, and the necessity of the context here is all but decisive. It is however curious that in this case it is conceivable that 'nihil desperantes' might have originated by a clerical error from 'nihil inde sperantes.' Compare xi. 20 where 'praevenit,' 'pervenit' for ἐφθασε may be either a difference of translation or an instance of error of transcription.

In xv. 8 we have a notable instance of the undoubtedly true reading being lost from all the MSS. The Greek has σαποί, and almost all the Latin copies have 'everit' instead of 'everrit.' The author of the Vatican 'correctorium' (13th cent.) already conjectured that 'everrit' was the correct reading and it was accordingly adopted in the Clementine edition. The Old Latin had 'scopis mundavit.' Compare 'unoculum' in Matt. xix. 9. Is it not likely also, as Bentley conjectured, that 'tenebrarum' in xi. 36 (= σκοτεινόν) 'non habens aliquam partem tenebrarum' is a primitive error for 'tenebrosam'?

Some interest attaches to the reading of the tenses in xxii. 20, 'funditur,' 'fundetur' ('effunditur'). The former corresponds with the Greek ἐκχυννόμενον. In the three Gospels the MSS. are divided variously between the two readings. The confusion between present and future of the third conjugation is very frequent. We have it in this very verb in v. 37, where the original is ἐκχυθήσεται and some MSS. have 'effunditur.' In xi. 17 there is practically a consensus for 'cadet' (πίπτει). There indeed many MSS. have also 'desolabitur' for ἐρημοῦται. In both words the editors adopt the reading which conforms to the Greek, rightly disre-

garding the consensus for 'cadet.' In xii. 42 it is not easy to say whether 'constituit' for 'constituet' has a similar origin or represents the Greek future, which has got into some few copies from the parallel in St. Matthew. In the present case then (xxii. 20) it seems natural to suppose that the original reading was the present in agreement with the Greek. But when once a scribe found the future in one or two copies he would be very likely to prefer it (if he did not consult the Greek) as more appropriate to the occasion on which the words were spoken. The same consideration would account for its adoption in the Liturgies, which again would influence copyists. That this is the true account is certainly confirmed, if not proved, by the fact that 'datur' is universally read in v. 19. If the translator designedly wrote the future in v. 20, why not also in v. 19? But 'datur' gave no occasion for the clerical error. The Liturgies adopt 'tradetur' from 1 Cor. xi. 24 where there is a similar variety, 'tradetur,' 'traditur' as well as 'frangetur,' 'frangitur.' So also in St. Luke xxii. 22 (and parallels) a great majority of MSS. have 'tradetur,' the Greek being παραδίδοται. The present editors adopt the present tense in both verses in St. Matthew and St. Mark, but the future in St. Luke. Surely in such a case it is very much a matter of accident on which side the majority of MSS. happens to fall. A notable instance of a clerical error being adopted in a considerable majority of MSS. is 'suspiciens' for 'suscipiens' (ὑπολαβών) in x. 30. The converse error is found in a few MSS. in xix. 5 (the narrative of Zaccheus), viz. 'suscipiens' for 'suspiciens' (ἀναβλέψας).

A curious instance of a marginal gloss intruding into the text occurs in more than one MS. xxiii. 15 'in alio sic remisit eum ad uos nam remisit uos ad illum,' or as it is in another MS. 'in aliquo remisit enim eum ad nos nam remisit uos ad illum.'

T. K. ABBOTT.

ALY'S LIFE AND CHARACTER OF CICERO.

Cicero, Sein Leben u. Seine Schriften, von FRIEDRICH ALY. Berlin: 1891. R. Gärtner. Mk. 3.60.

It was perhaps inevitable that after the indiscriminating homage of generations of 'Ciceroniani' (if we may extend the meaning of the term) a Nemesis should follow;

that Middleton should make way for Mommsen. Either view is alike bound to irritate us, when we return to the facts themselves. We are tempted to say of a mixed character such as Cicero's—

Odi et amo : cur id fiat, fortasse requiris :
Nescio : sed fieri sentio, et excrucior.