

# 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 S. Augustini Opera*, Sect. III. Pars i. (Speculum), ed. Weihrich. Vienna, 1887. 15 Mk. *Priscilliani quae supersunt*, ed. Schepss, Vienna, 1889. 8 Mk. 50.**

W. Sanday

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 414 - 417

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191322, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00191322](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191322)

## How to cite this article:

W. Sanday (1890). Review of Peter Knoepfel, Corinne Larrue, Frederic Varone, and Michael Hill 'Public Policy Analysis' The Classical Review, 4, pp 414-417 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191322

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

## IV.

*S. Augustini Opera*, Sect. III. Pars i. (*Speculum*), ed. Weihrich. Vienna, 1887. 15 Mk.

*Priscilliani quae supersunt*, ed. Schepss, Vienna, 1889. 8 Mk. 50.

AN apology is due to the readers of the *Classical Review* for the long but unavoidable delay in the continuation of the notices of this series. It is seldom that such delays are quite without their compensations; and I hope to be able to show that there is a real gain in taking the two books which head this article together, as they throw unexpected light on each other.

The volume first named contains two works both of which appear in the MSS. as *S. Augustini Speculum*. Both are collections of Biblical extracts, put together for purposes of edification. But there is this difference between them: the first takes the Books of the Bible in order and selects from them sayings adapted generally for 'example of life and instruction of manners': in the second the extracts are arranged under heads each of which runs through the whole Bible.

The first, there is good reason to think, is at least so far as its framework is concerned the genuine work of St. Augustine. Possidius in his *Life* speaks of such a work as unfinished at the time of St. Augustine's death; the preface is quoted by Eugippius early in the sixth century; and there are many points of contact between the occasional summaries and comments and the extant writings of St. Augustine. There is, however, equally good reason to think that the extracts have not come down to us in the form in which they left the hand of St. Augustine. They present with very few exceptions a Vulgate text; but even if it were possible, as perhaps it is, that St. Augustine might have made use of such a text at the end of his life, there is clear evidence that he did not do so. In several places the summaries and comments spoken of above distinctly imply an Old-Latin text: for instance in the reference to Acts xv. 20, 29, xxi. 25, there is express mention of three things from which the Gentiles are to abstain, where the Vulgate, correcting the Old Latin, adds a fourth. We are shut up then to one of two conclusions: either a Vulgate text was substituted for that which St. Augustine left behind him, or else we must suppose that St. Augustine did not himself

write out, or have written out, the extracts in full, but only indicated the beginning and end, just as in the two MSS. which contain the Theodulfian recension of the second *Speculum* the entries are often abbreviated (*Honora dominum de tua substantia usque et uino torcularia redundabunt*), and that the passages were later filled in from the Vulgate. In any case the change must have been made before the work got into general circulation, as all the extant MSS. (two of the ninth century and two perhaps of the tenth) follow the Vulgate. We are reminded of the way in which the famous *Cod. Fulden-sis*, written for Victor of Capua just before the year 546, though based in the Gospels upon Tatian's Diatessaron already makes use of Jerome's version.

The other *Speculum* is published by Weihrich with the alternative title *De Divinis Scripturis*. This however rests upon the authority of a single MS. which we shall see presently is by no means above question. The other tradition gives to it too simply the title *S. Augustini Speculum*. Accordingly its genuineness was affirmed rather than established by the two Cardinals, Wiseman who referred to it in support of the *comma Johanneum* (1 St. John v. 7) and Mai by whom it was published. But there can be little doubt that they were mistaken in this contention. St. Augustine made use of a different Biblical text; he rejected the Epistle to the Laodiceans which the *Speculum* quotes as St. Paul's; and he lays stress upon our present order of the Gospels, while the *Speculum* has them in the usual Western order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. Weihrich has satisfactorily proved his case on these heads in an article in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, Band ciii. Heft 1.

Speaking generally, his edition of the two documents is a careful one and such as we are accustomed to in the *Corp. Script. Eccles. Lat.* It is not however immaculate. Occasionally one desiderates a fuller statement of the evidence: e.g. on p. 140. 13 it is not clear on what grounds Weihrich reads *conuertetur*, which only has approximations in two MSS. and is easily explained by confusion of sound and association of ideas. Why not *conteretur delictum* with *P*, corresponding to the Greek συντριβήσεται ἀμαρτία? Sometimes the MSS. are deserted unnecessarily. There can be no doubt that the true reading on p. 141. 5 (also p. 477. 6) is not

*horripilationem*, but *obripilationem*, on which see Thielmann in Wölfflin's *Archiv* ii. 71. The same writer is also certainly right in correcting *acriter* to *achariter* on p. 133. 16 (*Archiv* iv. 600). These are only details, though details of some importance; but in the second *Speculum* I suspect that the editor has deferred too much to the lead of a single MS. His text is based primarily on *Cod. Sessorianus* (*S*), which is a little the oldest of the complete MSS. though not so old as the splendid but fragmentary *Cod. Floriacensis* (*F*) of which a facsimile is given by the Palaeographical Society, ser. ii. pl. 34. The Sessorian MS., so called from the library of Sta. Croce in Jerusalemme (Bibliotheca Sessoriana) at Rome, in which it is preserved, has been fully described by Reifferscheid (*Bibl. Ital.* i. 129): it contains besides the *Testimonia* of Cyprian, which is quoted as *A* in Hartel's edition. It seems to have exercised the same kind of fascination over both the editors who have dealt with it, though with less disastrous results in the case of the later of the two. It is now generally agreed that Hartel was wrong in trusting to it for the text of the *Testimonia*. In the second *Speculum* Wehrich has followed it almost as implicitly. Here however there is more to be said for it. There are in fact two divergent families of which sometimes one and sometimes the other is in the right. I should quite agree for instance with Wehrich in reading *commutauerunt* on p. 445 l. 8, *geniturae* on p. 525 l. 9, *facti* on p. 627 l. 9; but I think that he would have done well to omit *hic* on p. 305 l. 6, and to write *se esse* on p. 567 l. 6 (comp. p. 445 l. 3). The most conspicuous instance in which he seems to have gone wrong is in the quotation of Luke i. 35 on p. 322 l. 5. Here he reads (after *S*): *propter quod et qui ex te nascetur (nascitur S) sanctus uocabitur filius dei* for which the other family (*MVLC*) has *ideo et quod nascetur ex te sem uocabitur filius dei* (comp. also p. 308 l. 8). Probably Wehrich was determined by the fact that this latter text is substantially that of the Vulgate: it is however older than St Jerome, as it is found in Priscillian (p. 36 l. 22), and the importance of the corroboration thus supplied will be apparent presently. At the same time it is only fair to remember that Wehrich had not the text of Priscillian before him, and that even if he had had access to it he would have had no special reason for referring to it on this passage.

Wehrich has noted quite rightly that the first *Speculum* presents many points of con-

tact with *Cod. Amiatinus*; but he shows good critical caution in not laying too much stress upon this (p. xxi.). The fact is that the coincidences with this MS. are only so marked as they are because both represent an early and sound tradition. There are not a few places both in the Old and the New Testaments in which the *Speculum* agrees with other leading MSS. against *Cod. Amiatinus*. It would be too much to say that both belonged to the same family of Vulgate texts.

In turning to Priscillian we come to a publication of very considerable importance. The eleven treatises now edited by Dr. Schepss rank along with the *Didache* among the greatest discoveries of recent years. Dr. Schepss himself has the credit of it. He was the first to identify a volume of anonymous 'Homilies' in the University Library at Würzburg as the work of Priscillian: he gave a preliminary account of their contents in a lecture delivered in 1886 (*Priscillian, ein neu aufgefundenen Lat. Schriftsteller des 4 Jahrhunderts*, Würzburg, 1886): and he has now published the text along with the so-called 'Canons' of Priscillian and Orosius' *Commonitorium de Errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*.

The work has been excellently done. The MS., which is probably of the sixth century has been scrupulously reproduced. And all the help that could be given short of a commentary, by a full palaeographical introduction and by elaborate indices, has been given. By this publication important light is thrown on the life and character of Priscillian himself, on his teaching, on his Latinity (on this aspect of his subject Dr. Schepss wrote in Wölfflin's *Archiv* iii. 309 ff.), and last but not least on the Biblical text of which he made use.

It was already known that the unfortunate man had been put to death with several of his followers by the usurper Maximus at Trier in the year 385, as the first Christians who suffered for heresy. This was brought about mainly by intrigue, and many, including Martin of Tours, protested against their fate. The scandalous charges brought against Priscillian by Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* ii. 48, 50) are probably false; and though it would seem that he was to some extent tainted with gnosticism his error was not intentional or very deeply seated.

In regard to the events which led to the execution there are considerable discrepancies between Sulpicius Severus and Priscillian's own treatises. The first of these is a defence

of himself at the earliest stages of the controversy; the second is a *libellus* handed in to Pope Damasus when he went to Rome with that object, appealing at the same time to St. Ambrose at Milan; the third is a reply to a charge of using apocryphal books; the remaining treatises are not controversial but homiletical. The second is most important in its historical bearings; and when allowance is made for the fact that it proceeds from the accused person himself it enables us to correct Sulpicius Severus in several respects. On this historical side reference may be made to the lecture by Schepss mentioned above, to Möller's *Kirchengeschichte* i. 463 ff., and to an elaborate review by Loofs in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1890, col. 7 ff.

The Canons of Priscillian are based upon a system of division into numbered sections applied to the Epistles of St. Paul in a manner similar to the Ammonian or Eusebian sections in the Gospels. Having thus mapped out the whole of St. Paul's Epistles, Priscillian proceeded to draw up a series of ninety heads, doctrinal and practical, and under each he ranged the numbers of the sections by which it was illustrated. Schepss has given (in the index) a list of the numbered sections from a copy of the famous *Cod. Cavensis* of the Vulgate; and he has also printed the Canons, with the numbers of the illustrative sections attached to them, from a group of Vulgate MSS. mainly Spanish. A preliminary note which goes with these shows that the Canons had undergone a certain amount of orthodox

revision from a bishop who calls himself 'Peregrinus.' Schepss, following Arevalo, seems to think that this may be a pseudonym. He points out that Vincentius Lerinensis wrote under the name 'Peregrinus,' and he seems to think that Bacchiarius, author of a work *De Fide* which presents affinities to Priscillian, might also be considered. The editing of this section shows the same scrupulous care as the rest.

The *Commonitorium* of Orosius, a short tract addressed to St. Augustine, is printed from two MSS. compared with the Benedictine edition.

It only remains to explain the relation between Priscillian and the *Speculum*. It is, I believe, an important fact, and one which as far as I am aware has not yet been noticed, that there is a close relation between them, and that in fact the second *Speculum*, wrongly attributed to St. Augustine, was put together somewhere in the circle in which Priscillian moved and from a copy of the Bible which if not exactly his was yet closely related to it. I was first made aware of this by observing the marked resemblance of the two texts in a quotation from the Epistle of St. James. This will appear distinctly if the four extant texts are set side by side. Advantage may also be taken of this opportunity to show how the MSS. of the *Speculum* divide, the right reading being sometimes on the side of *MV* and sometimes on the side of *S*. Coincidences between Prisc and Spec. against Vulg. and ff are marked by italics, those between Vulg. and ff against Prisc. and Spec. by small capitals.

## ST. JAMES, V. 1—3.

PRISCILLIAN.	SPECULUM.	VULGATE. (Cod. Amiatinus)	CORBIE MS. (ff)
Age nunc, diuites, <i>plangite</i> ululantes <i>super</i> miseras vestras quae <i>superueniunt</i> diuitiis vestris : putruerunt et tini- auerunt uestes vestrae : aurum [uestrum] et argentum vestrum, <i>quod reposu-</i> <i>istis in nouissimis diebus</i> eruginabit et erugo eorum in testimonium vobis erit et <i>comedet</i> carnes vestras sicut ignis.	Age nunc, diuites, <i>plangite</i> [uos] ululantes <i>super</i> miseras vestras, quae <i>superueniunt</i> diuitiis vestris : putruerunt et tini- auerunt uestes vestrae : aurum et argentum vestrum, <i>quod reposu-</i> <i>istis in nouissimis diebus</i> eruginabit et erugo eorum in testimonium vobis erit et <i>comedet</i> carnes vestras sicut ignis. age <i>MV</i> <sup>1</sup> : agite <i>SV</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>LC</i> . ululantes <i>om. MVLC</i> . putruerunt <i>MV</i> . uestimenta uestra ( <i>om. uestra</i> <i>C</i> ) <i>MVLC</i> . eruginavit (-bit <i>L</i> ) et erugo <i>SMVLC</i> (acr- bis Wehrich). comedit <i>S</i> .	Agite nunc, diuites, PLORATE ululantes IN miseris quae ADuenient vobis : diuitiae uestrae putraefactae sunt et uestimenta uestra a tineis comesta sunt : aurum et argentum vestrum  eruginavit, et erugo eorum in testimonium vobis erit : t MANDUCABIT carnes vestras sicut ignis.	Iam nunc locupletes PLORATE ululantes in miseris vestris ADuenientibus : diuitiae uestrae putri- erunt res uestrae tiniauerunt :  aurum uestrum et argentum  eruginavit et erugo ipsorum erit vobis in testi- monium et MANDUCABIT carnes vestras tanquam ignis.

It would be too much to say that this degree of resemblance is kept up all through the Bible; still there is a very preponderating

resemblance, so far as I have observed, throughout the Old Testament as well as in the New. When once this is brought home

to us a number of other phenomena occur to the mind, confirming the conclusion that there is some intimate local connexion between the two texts. We remember that whereas hitherto the *Speculum* had been the oldest authority for the *comma Johanneum*, this is now found in Priscillian (p. 6 l. 5). We remember that both Priscillian and the *Speculum* recognise the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which is also found in Spanish MSS. of the Vulgate. We remember further that most of the MSS. of the *Speculum* are French, coming up as it were from the South and West—Limoges, Fleury sur Loire, Mont St. Michel, St. Victor (Paris). We remember lastly that there is a special connexion between the *Speculum* and the Spaniard, Theodulf bishop of Orleans. It will, I believe, be found that there are interesting relations between Priscillian and

the two Theodulfian MSS. For instance in Deut. xxxii. 8 there is a closer resemblance between Prisc. and  $\mu$  than with other MSS. of the *Speculum*: the same holds good of Hos. ii. 18: on the other hand Prisc. = Spec. against  $\alpha$  and still more  $\mu$  in Job xl. 9; Prisc. =  $\alpha$  Spec. against  $\mu$  in Isa. xxx. 15; Prisc. = Spec. against  $\mu$  (*vacat a*) in Isa. xl. 6—8: Prisc. = Spec. Codd. *MVLC* against Spec. cod. *S* as well as  $\alpha \mu$  in Amos v. 8. It would seem as if the Theodulfian MSS., especially  $\mu$ , had a fundamental affinity to Prisc. but (as we might expect) were more largely corrupted from the Vulgate. It will be seen however that a number of interesting problems are raised which will need more fully working out than I can profess to have done at present.

W. SANDAY.

#### TEUFFEL'S STUDIES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE.

*Studien und Charakteristiken zur griechischen und römischen Literaturgeschichte*, von W. S. TEUFFEL. 2te veränderte Auflage. (Teubner 1889.) 5s. 6d.

THE present collection of Teuffel's papers differs from the previous edition, published in 1871, seven years before the author's death, by the addition of some papers, the abridgment of others and the omission of one or two. The whole has been edited by the author's son from his father's papers. An interesting sketch of Teuffel's life is also supplied.

The material in the present volume has all, with the exception of a short introduction to Cicero's speech *pro Quinctio*, been already published in some form, and by far the largest part of it appears in print now for the third time. It is therefore not necessary to treat the work as a new contribution to scholarship. It derives its importance rather from the personality of its author. To English students Teuffel's name is well-known from the translation of his *History of Roman Literature*, which has gone through four editions in Germany. His editions of the *Clouds* of Aristophanes and of the *Persae* of Aeschylus are deservedly popular. In the

useful and responsible work of translation he was most active. To a collection of German translations of classical authors he contributed the metrical versions of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Horace's *Ars Poetica*, Persius and Tibullus, besides being joint author of those of Catullus and Juvenal; from him too came the prose translations of Plato's *Republic*, Lucian, Cicero's *Orator* and *Brutus*, Livy and Tacitus's *Dialogue on Orators*. To this sum of work must be added articles written for Pauly's *Real-encyclopädie*, some of the volumes of which he edited, several 'Programs' etc., and a large number of contributions to German periodicals. Some of the papers published were preliminary studies for a *History of Grecian Literature*, which he had planned but did not live to execute.

The papers in the present volume are of various origin. The first three—on 'The Position of Women in Grecian Poetry,' 'The Comparison of Ancient and Modern Lyric Poetry' and 'Aristophanes's Relation to his Time'—are lectures delivered before popular audiences, and present little that is original. Of the rest some belong to the class of 'Programs,' etc., others were published with volumes of translations (as the paper on Cicero's life, and that on Tibullus); some