

Dean Vaughan to his congregation at Doncaster. The principal object of the Archbishop was 'to give a living picture of the time of the Apostles, and the parallelism of problems of the Church at that time with those of the Church to-day,' and if this led to the 'delineation of pictures necessarily problematical' 'in a more substantive manner than criticism should allow,' and if again 'this produced a modernity of expression which is often a little startling' the gain in clearness and interest is greater than the loss caused by any such deviations from exactness—and they are few—as those to which allusion has been made.

It is impossible to do more than refer to the many apt illustrations, particularly suitable to the audience, by which the Archbishop often emphasized his points, and carried on the interest of his readers. Here a fact from nature, or from literature, here an allusion to a well-known painting or to some incident in history, here a saying or an anecdote! Nor is it possible to indicate the practical lessons for ordinary life drawn from the narrative on almost every page. In one place he finds opportunity to emphasize the duties of mothers to their children, at another the position and responsibility of country houses, at another the contrast between the religion of society-people in the country and the religion of the same class in London. Here the fashionable interest in religion is discussed, in connexion with Felix and Drusilla, and elsewhere the subject of Demetrius and the disturbance at Ephesus suggest as a subject commercial religion, which 'may be as strong in an aristocracy, in royalty, or in a Christian Clergy as in Demetrius and his craftsmen.' The book is a large and expensive one, but it is one which need not be read continuously, and may be opened for edification at almost every page. We can endorse the closing words of the preface and express the belief that many may very profitably turn to these utterances of Archbishop Benson 'who in our own times seek to reconcile the Divine and human elements in life, to mark the action of one upon the other, and above all to know of a surety that the Lord is among us in these and all the days even unto the end of the world.'

LL. J. M. BEBB.

### THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES.

*Die Oracula Sibyllina* bearbeitet im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, von Dr. Joh. Geffcken, Leipzig, 1902.

THREE great editions of the text of the Sibylline Oracles have now appeared: first that of Alexandre, 1841–1856, the second that of Rzach,

1891, and the third that of Dr. Geffcken, the most recent editor. It is true that most students of the Sibyllines have also used the text of Friedlieb (published in 1852), but this scholar cannot be classed in the same rank with the editors just mentioned. His textual contributions save in the matter of fresh collations were meagre and disappointing, and particularly so as they were subsequent to those of his great predecessor Alexandre.

The task of preparing this edition was first placed in the hands of Dr. L. Mendelssohn by the Royal Prussian Academy. In the course of some years Mendelssohn accumulated a vast amount of material for this work, but was unhappily cut off before his labours had reached a final stage. The task then devolved on Dr. Geffcken, and to him we owe the present excellent edition.

Geffcken's superiority to Rzach lies in his more critical method. The former recognized the necessity of thoroughly familiarizing himself with the various forms of literature allied to the Sibyllines and the historical background they presuppose. Rzach on the other hand is too often ignorant of this, and is too ready to emend his text on the authority of Homer and other ancient writers, whose relations with the text were remote even when actual. This can be best shown by an instance emphasized by Geffcken. Thus in viii 194 the MSS read μή ποτ' ἐγὼ ζῶην, ὅτε (ἡ) ἰλαρὰ βασιλεύσει. Alexandre retains the ἡ ἰλαρὰ and explains it as 'ipsa Roma deliciis affluens': Rzach thinks *θηλυτέρη* possible, and cites the proposals of two anonymous scholars ἡ Ἰταλή and ἡ ὀργή. But the true text is recovered from the passage quoted by Geffcken from 'The last Vision of Daniel' in Vassiliev's *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, i 46 καὶ ἐν τῷ μὴ εἶναι ἄνδρα χρήσιμον βασιλεύσει γυνή μαρὰ ἐν τῷ ἐπταλόφῳ. Thus for ἰλαρὰ we must read μαρὰ.

Another weakness in Rzach's edition arises from his use of uncritical texts of the Sibylline fragments preserved in Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus, Justin and others. This mistake has not been committed by Geffcken, though he is not indeed quite free from reproach. Thus on pp. 35, 50 he quotes Dillmann's Latin Version of the Ascension of Isaiah, where the corrupt 'Berial' is given for 'Beliar'—a corruption that is peculiar to *some* of the Ethiopic MSS, but against the Greek and Latin Versions, where these exist, as in iii 11, 13, and the universal Jewish and Christian tradition. Throughout, also, he uses Ceriani's Latin translation of the Apocalypse of Baruch, although this has been superseded by two recent translations in German and English. Does Dr. Geffcken regard Ceriani's modern Latin Version as a genuine ancient one? His use of it certainly gives that impression.

But whilst we draw attention to the undoubted superiority of Geffcken's text in certain respects, we must likewise emphasize the fact that but for

Rzach's collations, Geffcken's text would have been less excellent. Thus, whereas Rzach collated the MSS MQVHAPF at least once, and in some instances twice, for his edition, and further had R L collated for him by Kleiber, Dr. Geffcken has not done any first hand work of this kind. By means of Mendelssohn's fresh collations of H P and Violet's partial collations of ST (the latter MS discovered in Toledo by Violet) he has, it is true, made some contribution to a more exact knowledge of the MSS evidence. But it is a matter of regret that the editor did not recollate at all events the three chief MSS MQV. That the labour involved in such a task would have been fully compensated most palaeographers would readily concede. It takes many collations to ensure accuracy. Indeed the case of R—a MS of only third-rate importance—might have impressed on Dr. Geffcken the advisability of recollating some of the most important MSS. Thus he writes that Mendelssohn held that a new collation of R was necessary, although it had already been collated by Opsopoeus, Alexandre, Gildemeister and Kleiber.

Geffcken accepts the traditional division of the MSS into three classes, and agrees with Rzach as to the order of the MSS in each class in respect of worth with a single exception. Whereas Rzach assigns to A the third place in the second class, Geffcken places it in the first.

This edition, which has had the great advantage of revision by Professor Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, closes with a most valuable index of subjects, for which, as well as for the whole work, scholars will be duly grateful to Dr. Geffcken.

R. H. CHARLES.