probable) are interesting, a few seem to the Reviewer all but impossible: (Nothing, however, is impossible in a manuscript.) A study of the photographs which Mrs Lewis presented to the Cambridge University Library impresses the student with the greatness of the difficulty of deciphering such a palimpsest as this and with the frequent necessity of allowing a *non liquet*. But Mrs Lewis is probably right in giving ܨܐ in Matt. iii 3, and ܡܠܟܐ (in Cureton ܡܠܟܐ; Greek ὁ ὄχλος) in John vii 49. In Luke v 26 ܠܡܨܕܐ (for παράδοξα) is decidedly attractive, and so is ܠܐ ܡܠܟܐ for ܡܠܟܐ in Matt. xx 15, though the Reviewer cannot confirm (nor indeed deny) the new reading from a study of the photograph. It is difficult to believe that Dr Lewis is right in Luke i 80: ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ (‘and he fled into the desert’, A. S. L.). Professor Burkitt ends the line with ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ, and the third person who has not access to the original must feel that the letters which are so differently read must be indeed faint and ambiguous.

A few *emendanda* may conclude this notice. On page xvi, line 2 (from bottom), read ܡܠܟܐ. The reading ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (Matt. v 24) is supported by some authorities for the Peshitta; cf. page xvii. In Mark iv 1 Professor Burkitt’s ܡܠܟܐ is to be preferred; see Matt. xv 39; Luke v 3. On page 280, line 2, read ܡܠܟܐ (with ܐ prefixed). On page 5, line 14, insert between ^a and ^b the vertical stroke which marks the end of a line in the MS. The text as a whole seems to be very accurately printed. The labour spent on the book must have been very great, and Dr Lewis has earned once more the hearty thanks of students of the New Testament.

W. EMERY BARNES.

HYMNS OF SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH.

Patrologia Orientalis Tome vi: Fascicule I edited by E. W. BROOKS.
(Firmin-Didot, Paris, N. D.)

THIS volume of hymns supplies further testimony to the deep impression made by their author, Severus of Antioch (Patriarch A.D. 512–518), on the generations which succeeded him. A selection from his letters has already been published by Mr Brooks (Text and Translation Society, 1902–1904), and over a hundred of the sermons which he delivered as Patriarch are still extant, though only six have been published (*Les Homiliae cathedrales de Stèvre d'Antioche*, par R. Duval, reviewed in *J. T. S.* viii 465–467). The language of Severus was Greek, but since he was a Monophysite his works (save a few fragments) are preserved not in Greek, but in Syriac, which may be reckoned as the chief language of Monophysitism.

The hymns are taken from two Syriac MSS preserved in the British Museum, one of the seventh or eighth, the other of the ninth century. In the earlier of these the text is presented in a strangely cumbrous form. The translation was executed by Paul of Edessa, who gave some free renderings and also added some words for the sake of the rhythm. In A.D. 675 the well-known James of Edessa edited this version, and we now find literal renderings inserted above the paraphrastic translations, and added words distinguished by red paint. Mr Brooks has carefully preserved the details of this revision, without, however, using either interlinear printing or red paint. His editing is most complete and painstaking, and in particular he gives the full text of the multitude of scriptural references which are made. 'The chief value,' he remarks, 'of the work of James lies in the fact that he gives the scriptural references in full in the margin, thus supplying a new source for the criticism of the sacred text.'

Indeed Severus seems to have been no poet. A characteristic extract from a hymn on the Epiphany (even when stripped of accretions with the help of James's editing) rises no higher than this:—

'He went down into the Jordan

To crush the head of the serpent in the waters,

Whom he through Pharaoh in a figure drowned in the Red Sea.'

A curious textual fact is that in the margin of the hymns (p. 58) the text of Matt. iii 16 agrees with Syr. cur and Syr. sin (ܡܥܨܐ) not with the Peshitta (ܡܡܨܐ).

W. EMERY BARNES.

EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

Christliche Antike: Einführung in die altchristliche Kunst, von LUDWIG VON SYBEL. Zweiter Band: *Plastik, Architektur und Malerei*. Marburg, N. G. Elwertsche Buchhandlung, 1909. pp. v + 341. 4 plates (3 coloured) and 99 blocks.

THE second volume of von Sybel's introduction to Early Christian Art, which follows the first (see *J. T. S.*, 1908, p. 620) at an interval of three years, is somewhat larger, has more illustrations, and covers a wider range of topics, but will scarcely be found so interesting by the reader. The most important general problem with which the author is faced is that summed up by Strzygowski in the catchword, *Orient oder Rom?* And here von Sybel is content to hold judgement in suspense, giving us a summary of the views put forward by rival theorists. He holds—no without some justification—that too little is as yet known of the chronology and development of Christian art and monuments to permit of the