

being especially worthy of consideration. Also important is the discussion of the various names which are applied to Jesus. The author recognizes the importance of the term "Christ," and very properly finds the idea of his pre-existence deep-seated in the Pauline thought. The essay is a good illustration of present methods in biblical theology.—SHAILER MATHEWS.

Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Handschriften des Clemens Alexandrinus (1895); *Untersuchungen über die Scholien zu Clemens Alexandrinus* (1897); *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta* (1901). Von Otto Stählin. (Nürnberg: Stich; pp. 35; 48; 78; all three published as "Beilagen zu den Jahresberichten des K. Neuen Gymnasiums in Nürnberg.") The author of these three important contributions has been intrusted by the "church father commission" of the Royal Academy at Berlin with the preparation of a new edition of the writings of the great Alexandrian church father, Clement, and a study of the three "Beilagen" demonstrates beyond doubt the wisdom of the great head of the committee; for in them are treated, in a very satisfactory and scholarly way, three of the most important points which help to establish the text of Clement's extant writings, viz., the manuscript tradition, the scholia, and Clement's use of the Old Testament. A journey to Italy in 1893-94 enabled Stählin to examine the principal manuscripts. The results of these investigations he published in the first "Beilage" (pp. 1-21), where he also published (pp. 21-35) a special treatise on Clement's *Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*; To the study of the manuscripts the author has also lately contributed a short notice of eight pages to the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F., V, 4.¹—The second brochure gives most instructive notices concerning the scholia, which are, comparatively speaking, as numerous as the MSS. of Clement's writings. He discusses (1) the scholia in P (Paris), (2) those in M (Modena), and (3) those in F (Florence), pp. 8-15; pp. 15-44 are devoted to a discussion of these scholia according to their authors: (1) the Baanes scholia (pp. 16-19), whose author was a Christian grammarian of the fifth century; (2) the Arethas scholia (pp. 19-32), with a most interesting biographical sketch (p. 46) of the great archbishop Arethas of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; here Stählin proves, contrary to former views, that Arethas lived during the first half of the tenth century of our era; (3) the scholia of M¹ (pp. 33-8); (4) the scholia of M² (pp. 38-40); (5) notes in M³ (p. 40); and (6) the scholia of F. Throughout the

¹ Noticed by F. A. CHRISTIE on p. 147 of this number of the JOURNAL.

author is striving after corrections of and additions to the text of Clement. We notice here with great satisfaction the correct text of the large Arethas scholion, so faultily published by Dindorf (1869; Praef., pp. xiv ff.).²—The third contribution is devoted to a study of Clement's use of the Septuagint. This subject has attracted editors and translators of Clement's works since Gentianus Hervetus, who wrote the first translation of and commentary to the great church father's work. The later results of Sylburg (1592) and Le Nourry (1703) were carefully used by J. Potter (1715), who himself made valuable additions. Later editors, Klotz (1831) and Dindorf, copied Potter most faultily and carelessly. Stählin gives on pp. 12–74 a long list of quotations from the LXX found in Clement, and discusses many of these. The results attained are rather negative, in general. None of the extant MSS. of the LXX text can be shown to have been used by Clement in his quotations; it can only be said: (1) that Clement is familiar with all the Old Testament books found in the LXX. The fact that some minor books are not quoted proves nothing. (2) No distinction is observed between canonical and deuterocanonical books.³ (3) In many quotations, especially from the prophetic books, Clement's text agrees with that of Theodotion and the other revisers. (4) Throughout there can be seen a difference between the Bible text of Clement and the text of Codex B.—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien. Von Joseph Sickenberger. (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, N. F., VI, 1.) (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901; pp. viii + 268; M. 8.50.) This minute and laborious, yet valuable, work consists of two main parts: first, a series of text-critical studies of the commentary on Luke, which bears the name of Titus, bishop of Bostra; and, secondly, a critical edition of the genuine fragments which that commentary preserves, together with a few of the scholia on Daniel, which the editor thinks may also be accepted as genuine. Sickenberger confirms the opinion, long ago expressed, but not based upon any such

² Dindorf's edition was severely criticised by PAUL DE LAGARDE in the *Göttische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1870, pp. 801–24; republished in LAGARDE'S *Symmetica* (1877), pp. 10–24. It was this scathing review which brought about an acquaintance between Stählin and that great Semitic and Septuagint scholar, whose influence one can detect in Stählin's admirable work.

³ In his quotations from the New Testament Clement appears to have drawn a distinction between canonical and apocryphal books. This, at least, is the opinion of KUTTER, *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, Giessen, 1897.