

- Expl.* esse uitandos et cauendos omnibus modis.  
 (Comm.) *Inc.* 'Paulus apostolus Christi'. Praeponit et nominis . . .  
*Expl.* 'Gratia tecum. amen'. permaneat in aeternum.  
 ii Tim. Arg. *Inc.* Timotheo scribit iterum de exhortatione . . .  
*Expl.* quam dei praedicant ueritatem.  
 (Comm.) *Inc.* 'Paulus apostolus . . . per uoluntatem dei'. Con-  
 sueta ueritate et humilitate . . .  
*Expl.* qui carne mortuus est spiritaliter uiuens. Scriptae  
 ab urbe.  
 Tit. Arg. *Inc.* Titum commonefacit et instruit . . .  
*Expl.* qui in scripturis Iudaicis credunt.  
 (Comm.) *Inc.* 'Paulus seruus dei'. Seruus erat dei, non peccati . . .  
*Expl.* Vere, siue fideliter. Scripta de Nicopoli.  
 Philem. Arg. *Inc.* Philemoni familiares litteras . . .  
*Expl.* a Roma de carcere.  
 (Comm.) *Inc.* 'Paulus uinctus Iesu Christi . . . Appiae sorori karis-  
 simae'. In euangelio erat adiutor . . .  
*Expl.* 'cum spiritu uestro, amen'. Scripta ab urbe Roma<sup>1</sup>.

A. SOUTER.

## ON THE TEXT OF THE *DE SACERDOTIO* OF ST CHRYSOSTOM.

### I. THE MSS OF THE *de Sacerdotio*.

THE treatise on the Priesthood, perhaps the most famous of all Chrysostom's works, is contained in a large number of MSS in the various libraries of Europe. In view of my forthcoming edition of this treatise (in the series of Cambridge Patristic Texts under the editorship of Dr Mason), I felt it to be desirable to examine the numerous MSS contained in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris: by the kindness of the managers of the Hort Fund, who made a grant for this purpose, my project was facilitated, and was carried into effect in December 1904 and January 1905.

The MSS to which reference is made in this article are all in the Bibliothèque Nationale, with the exception of those designated by the letters *a*, *b*, *x*, *y*, *z*. A brief description of each is necessary.

*a* = Codex Augustanus: once at Augsburg (Augusta Vindelicorum), now in the Hof-und-Staats Bibliothek at Munich, where it is Cod. Graec. Monac. No. 384, Saec. xi, parch. Contains the *de sac.* in

<sup>1</sup> I omit all reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, because Pelagius did not write a commentary on that epistle.

- fol. 140-207. See Ign. Hardt *Catalogus Codd. MSS Graecorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bavaricae* vol. iv pp. 22-27. Used by Hoeschel for his edition of 1599.
- b* = Cod. Palatinus. Present whereabouts unknown. Used by Hoeschel for his edition of 1599, and our knowledge of its readings is derived entirely from him. In 1599 it was at Heidelberg.
- c* = Cod. Reg. 492. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris<sup>1</sup>. Saec. x ('copié en 910'), parch. 316 foll. The *de sac.* is contained in foll. 240-316. Also designated as Fontabl. Reg. 2290. A full collation of its readings is given at the end of vol. i of the reprint of Montfaucon's edition (Paris, 1839).
- d* = Cod. Reg. 581. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 256 foll. Contains only a fragment (part of the fifth and the whole of the sixth book) of the *de sac.* Also designated as Colbert 418.
- e* = Cod. Reg. 765 A. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xii, parch. This MS appears twice in Omont's Index; once, correctly, as 765 A, the other time incorrectly as 565 A, a number to which there is no corresponding entry in the text of Omont's work. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 1-75.
- f* = Cod. Reg. 799. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xii, parch. peint. 395 foll. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 1-87 r. A full collation is given at the end of vol. i of the reprint of Montfaucon.
- g* = Cod. Reg. 800. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 310 foll. The *de sac.* occupies foll. 1-64. It is complete: in Omont 'libri iv' should be 'libri vi'.
- h* = Cod. Reg. 801. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 427 foll. Contains *de sac.* in foll. 3-73. Also designated Colbert 974. It was used by Montfaucon.
- i* = Cod. Reg. 802. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 309 foll. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 2-68 r. Also designated Colbert 247. Used by Montfaucon.
- k* = Cod. Reg. 803. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 298 foll. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 2-72. Also styled Colbert 248. Used by Montfaucon.
- l* = Cod. Reg. 804. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 698 foll. Contains books iii-vi of the *de sac.* in foll. 1-104. Brought from Constantinople.
- m* = Cod. Reg. 805. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi (written in 1064), parch. 236 foll. Also styled Reg. 2351. The *de sac.* occupies foll. 1-66 r. Brought from Chios.
- n* = Cod. Reg. 806. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xii, parch. 321 foll. peint. Also styled Hurault. Reg. 1819. The *de sac.* occupies foll. 1-48. Used by Montfaucon.

<sup>1</sup> On this and the other MSS in the Bibl. Nat., see H. Omont *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibl. Nationale* (Paris, 1898).

- o* = Cod. Reg. 807. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 279 foll. Also styled Fonteb. Reg. 2354. It contains a fragment from the end of bk. vi of the *de sac.* (in foll. 1-5 r).
- p* = Cod. Reg. 812. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 249 foll. Also styled Colbert 3055. The *de sac.* occupies foll. 196 v-249. Used by Montfaucon.
- q* = Cod. Reg. 813. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 244 foll. Also styled Mazarin Reg. 1973. It contains in foll. 223-244 the first three books of the *de sac.* The end of book ii and the beginning of book iii are mutilated. Of book vi only a fragment remains. Used by Montfaucon.
- r* = Cod. Reg. 1024. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xii, parch. 304 foll. Also styled Colbert 3061. It contains the *de sac.* in foll. 2-108 r. Used by Montfaucon.
- s* = Cod. Reg. 1181. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xii-xiii, parch. 228 foll. Also styled Trichet-Dufresne-Reg. 2350. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 50-160.
- t* = Cod. Coisl. 61. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 319 foll. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 1-131 r.
- u* = Cod. Coisl. 245. Bibl. Nat. Saec. xi, parch. 218 foll. Contains in foll. 1-56 the *de sac.*, with the beginning of each book mutilated.
- w* = Cod. Coisl. 246. Bibl. Nat. Saec. x, parch. 275 foll. Contains the *de sac.* in foll. 1-79.
- x* = Cod. Passioneus. The MS breaks off at Montf. 379 A 11 (ii 7): a full collation of the part that is preserved may be found at the end of vol. i of the reprint of Montfaucon.
- y* = Cod. Collegii Corporis Christi Oxon.: in C. C. C., Oxford. Saec. xiii, parch. 140 foll. See Coxe *Catalogus codd. MSS in Collegiis Aulisque Oxon.* pars 2, p. 5, n. 21. This MS was used by Savile. I owe my collation of it to my friend Mr Vincent Benson, Scholar of New College, Oxford.
- z* = Cod. Collegii Novi, Oxon.: in New College, Oxford. Saec. xii, parch. 360 foll. Coxe, *ubi supra*, pars i, p. 23, no. 79. Used by Savile. Collated in full for me by Mr Benson.
- Berl. = Cod. Berolinensis: in the Konigliche Bibliothek, Berlin, where it is Cod. 354 Ham. See p. 232, no. 403, of the *Catalogus-Verzeichniss* (Berlin, 1897). Saec. xii, parch. 274 foll. A quaternion is missing after fol. 8. The *de sac.* occupies foll. 1 r-118 v.
- Franc. = Codex Franciscanus, so called from Francis I, king of France, to whom it once belonged. Used by Fronto Ducaeus for his edition of Chrysostom, and styled by him Fr. Present whereabouts unknown.
- Henr. = Codex Henricianus. It belonged to Henry II, king of France: and was used by Fronto, who styles it H. Present whereabouts unknown.

Marg. = Codex Margunii. This belonged to Maximus Margunius, bishop of Cythera, who corresponded with Savile. One or two of its readings are known to us from the early editions.

Oliv. = Codex Olivarii. Used by Fronto, who styles it O, and refers to it as 'membranae nobilissimi viri Fr. Olivarii'.

Sin. = Codex Sinaiticus: in the library of the monastery on Mt. Sinai. See Gardthausen *Catalogus codd. graecorum Sinaiticorum* (Oxford, 1886), where it is no. 375. Saec. ix (it is dated 893), parch. I owe my knowledge of its readings to the kindness of Archbishop Porphyrios.

These MSS fall into four groups, viz.

Group 1, containing *a, f, p*.

„ 2, „ *b, d, e, h, k, l, o, q, s, t, z, henr.*

„ 3, „ *g, i, r, w, y.*

„ 4, „ *c, m, n, u, x, berl., franc., marg., oliv., sin.*

*p* contains elements common to 1 and 2; *h* elements common to 2 and 4; and *c, x, berl., sin.*, elements common to 3 and 4.

I now propose to shew:—

(*a*) that the combination of groups 1, 2, 3 is better than group 4.

(*β*) „ „ „ „ „ 1, 2, 4 „ „ „ „ 3.

(*γ*) „ „ „ „ „ 1, 3, 4 „ „ „ „ 2.

(*δ*) „ „ „ „ „ 2, 3 „ „ „ „ 1, 4<sup>1</sup>.

From these results, if proved, we infer that 1 is the best group; and that 2, 3 is the best combination of two groups. Also, as a larger number of examples can be cited in support of (*a*) than of (*β*), and a larger number in support of (*β*) than of (*γ*), we infer that 2 is better than 3, and 3 than 4: so that the order of the groups as given above corresponds to their relative excellence.

(*a*) 1, 2, 3, are better than 4.

(*a*) *ι ι* (Montf. 362 B 6) *καὶ ἕτερα δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἡμῖν ἐφυλάττετο ἀρραγῆ (τε) καὶ βέβαια.* With the exception of *h*, which contains elements common to 4, all MSS of groups 1, 2, 3 have practically this reading (the only *vv. ll.* are *ἐφυλάττομεν* or *-τεν* for *ἐφυλάττετο*). Group 4, however, has *τὴν ὁμόνοιαν ταύτην ἐφύλαττεν* instead of *ἐφυλάττετο*. The sense of the reading of 1, 2, 3, viz. 'other things besides this (i.e. association in study) we preserved unbroken and steadfast', is somewhat difficult to catch: by *ἕτερα* is meant 'social relations', as the context shews (see my note). But *τὴν ὁμόνοιαν ταύτην ἐφύλαττεν* is clearly an attempt to explain the more difficult reading, and is therefore to be rejected.

<sup>1</sup> (*δ*) seems to me somewhat less certain than (*a*) (*β*) or (*γ*) as the number of instances on which it is based is relatively small.

(δ) i 2 (Montf. 364 B 8) καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνό γ' ἂν ἔχοις αἰτιάσασθαι ὅτι κτλ. 1, 2, 3. In 4 the words εἰπεῖν καὶ are added between ἔχοις and αἰτιάσασθαι. These additional words are not supported by later citations of this passage, in *Anonymus Scriptor Vit. S. Chrysostomi* and in *Symeon Metaphrastes*. They are most probably a gloss inserted to make the construction of ἐκεῖνο easier: ἐκεῖνο εἰπεῖν giving a common, ἐκεῖνο αἰτιάσασθαι a less common, use of the accusative.

(ε) i 4 (Montf. 366 A 11) ὅταν γὰρ ἴδωσι φανέντα που τῆς ἡμέρας μέρος (v. l. μέρει) τῆς πόλεως 1, 2, 3. For this, 4 reads ὅταν γὰρ ἴδωσι φανέντα που τῆς πόλεως. The explanation of the peculiar reading of 1, 2, 3 is uncertain. In my note I have suggested that ἡμέρας should be written Ἡμέρας, meaning some quarter of Antioch which may have been so named: 'for when they see that we appear somewhere in Hemera.' In that case μέρος τῆς πόλεως would be a marginal gloss on Ἡμέρας and μέρει τῆς πόλεως an attempt to give a construction to that gloss after it had found its way into the text. In any case the reading of 1, 2, 3 bears on it obvious marks of genuineness. That of 4, as obviously, is due to an attempt at simplification.

(δ) i 4 (Montf. 366 E 1) τοὺς νόμους . . . καθ' οὓς δεῖ ταύτην αὐτοὺς διέπειν τὴν ἀρχήν 1, 2, 3.

For διέπειν 4 reads διοικεῖν, manifestly a gloss.

(ε) i 5 (Montf. 368 C 9) ἀλλὰ φρούδα (v. l. φρούδην) τὰ αὐτοῦ θέμενον ἔτι τῶν ἡμετέρων φροντίζεν 1, 2, 3.

For φρούδα (φρούδην) group 4 has παρ' οὐδέν, which gives a much commoner phrase. Once more the *difficilior lectio* is *potior*. The form φρούδην is remarkable, and possibly correct: cp. σύδην, φύρδην, ἄρδην.

(f) ii 4 (Montf. 374 D 5) εἰάν—μὴ δῶς βαθεῖαν τὴν τομὴν τῷ τουαύτης χρείαν ἔχοντι 1, 2, 3.

For τομὴν group 4 has πληγὴν, a much less suitable word in the context, which deals with the *surgical* effect of words of admonition (see ii 3 *ad fin.*).

(g) iii 3 (Montf. 382 A 9) ἀλλὰ κἀνταῦθα ἡμῖν εἰς τοῦναντίον ὁ λόγος περιτέτραπται 1, 2, 3.

For ὁ λόγος 4 has τὸ πρᾶγμα, again substituting a more obvious expression.

(h) vi 12 (Montf. 433 E 10) καταλεγέτω—καὶ βραχίονα καὶ τροχόν 1, 2, 3.

For τροχόν 4 has τράχηλον. This gives a fallacious coherence with βραχίονα. A reference to the passage will shew that the point lies in the promiscuous chaos of a battlefield after the conflict (cp. φύρδην just before the words in question): a man's arm (βραχίονα) lies next to the wheel (τροχόν) of a chariot.

These instances could easily be multiplied. They shew that the combination 1, 2, 3 is decidedly better than group 4.

(β) 1, 2, 4 are better, in combination, than 3.

(α) i 5 (Montf. 370 C 7) ἔσπασε τοῦ δοθέντος (v. l. τὸ δοθὲν) μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς προθυμίας 1, 2, 4.

Here 3 has σπουδάσαι τοῦ δοθέντος μετὰ πολλῆς τ. προθ. λαβεῖν. The infinitive σπουδάσαι is difficult. The original form of the reading of 3 seems to be that found in *c* (which contains elements common to 3 and 4), viz. ἐσπούδασε . . . λαβεῖν. The corruption seems to be due to the somewhat uncommon use of σπᾶν = 'to drink', with partitive genitive.

(δ) iii 9 (Montf. 386 C 6) ὁ τῆς κενοδοξίας σκόπελος, χαλεπώτερος ὢν ὄσπερ (v. l. ὄν) οἱ μυθοποιοὶ (v. l. μῦθοι) τερατεύονται 1, 2, 4.

For οὔπερ 3 has ὡς, which leaves the thought incomplete, with the result that the gloss τῶν Σειρήνων is introduced in 3 after τερατεύονται to fill up the deficiency: 'more grievous . . . than (the rock of) the Sirens.' Thus one corruption leads to another.

(ε) iv 2 (Montf. 407 D 8) καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχῆς (v. l. πάσῃ ψυχῇ) πρόσφορον ἐπιστάμενοι θεραπείαν 1, 2, 4.

The reading of 3 is καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχῆς ἰδέαν πρόσφορον ἐπιστάμενοι θεραπεύειν, where the very harsh use of πρόσφορον as an adverb, 'suitably', is a signal that all is not well. The cause of the interpolation of ἰδέαν and the alteration of θεραπείαν to θεραπεύειν is, no doubt, the difficulty (only, however, apparent) of πᾶσαν ψυχῆς: ψυχῆς goes with θεραπείαν, 'every suitable method of healing the soul'.

(δ) v 3 (Montf. 416 C 11) χρῆ καθάπερ ἡνίοχον . . . , εἰς ἀκρίβειαν τούτων . . . ἑλληλακέναι 1, 2, 4.

For ἑλληλακέναι, which is clearly the more appropriate word (cp. ἡνίοχον), 3 has ἤκειν (v. l. εἶκειν).

(ε) vi 8 (Montf. 428 B 8) πολλὰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τὰ δυνάμενα . . . τὸν ἐπ' εὐθείας διακόψαι δρόμον 1, 2, 4.

For the last five words ('to check the onward course') 3 has τὸν ἐπιθυμίας διακόψαι δρόμον. It cannot be doubted that this is a corruption: with ἐπ' εὐθείας cp. ἐξ εὐθείας i 5.

(f) vi 10 (Montf. 429 D 4) νῦν δέ, φησιν, οὐ δεῖ σοι πόνων, οὐδὲ φροντίδας ἔχεις 1, 2, 4.

For οὐ δεῖ σοι πόνων 3 has οὐδὲ σὺ πόνων, a manifestly inferior reading, due to the retrogressive action of ἔχεις upon πόνων which it converts into an accusative, and the ever facile corruption of σοί to σύ.

Thus the combination 1, 2, 4 has been shewn to be superior to group 3.

(γ) 1, 3, 4 are, in combination, better than group 2.

(α) iii 4 (Montf. 382 D 11) ποιούσι δὲ τοῦτο πάντες διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τότε 1, 3, 4.

For τότε 2 substitutes the words τῆς πίστews. But Chrysostom (as Harnack has shewn) agrees with Gregory of Nyssa in the assumption of an essentially corporeal effect of participation in the sacred elements. Hence the introduction of the words 'of faith' is inappropriate, especially as the actual hands of the communicant are referred to just before (ὁ μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἄνω καθήμενος . . . ταῖς ἀπάντων κατέχεται χερσί: see context). Moreover, the *vetus interpretatio*, which is based on a MS of good authority, has simply 'fitque hoc totum sub oculis humanis'.

(b) iv 2 (Montf. 405 C 3) τίνες ἡμᾶς παρατήσονται τότε; 1, 3, 4.

2 has τίνες ἡμῖν παραστήσονται τότε; clearly a corruption of the other reading. A MS of group 4 shews us the gradual course of the corruption by preserving ἡμᾶς, but changing παρατήσονται to παραστήσονται.

(c) v 4 (Montf. 417 B 9) τὸν χαίροντα . . . ἐν ταῖς τούτων (τῶν ἐπαίνων) ἀποτυχίας ἀνιᾶσθαι καὶ ἀλύειν (v. l. ἀλγεῖν) ἀνάγκη.

After ἀποτυχίας 2 has the following: λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἐκκλίειν καὶ ἀνιᾶσθαι καὶ ἀλύειν ἀνάγκη. In this accumulation of verbs it is very probable that λυπεῖσθαι is a gloss on ἀνιᾶσθαι and ἐκκλίειν on ἀλύειν. Editors recognize this, and take the shorter reading with two infinitives.

(d) vi 12 (Montf. 432 D 10) σὺ δὲ ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνας τὴν ἀθυμίαν σύλλεγε μόνην (v. l. μόνον) 1, 3, 4.

Instead of this 2 has σοὶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνας ἔνεστι τὴν ἀθυμίαν συλλέγειν μόνην. The explanation of the variants here is probably that suggested by Bengel. The original reading is σὺ δὲ . . . συλλέγειν (infinitive for imperative). This appears in 1, 3, 4 slightly corrupted by the change of the infinitive to the imperative. In 2, on the other hand, the passage is more violently handled, and ἔνεστι is interpolated to explain συλλέγειν, of course mistakenly.

Thus 1, 3, 4 in combination are better than 2.

(δ) The combination 2, 3 is better than 1, 4.

The best instance where these two combinations of groups are in opposition is vi 12 (Montf. 434 B 5), ἀρα οἶε πρὸς τὴν διοίκησιν ἐκείνην ἀρκέσειν τὸν μειρακίσκον ἐκείνον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπὸ πρώτης ὄψεως εὐθέως ἀφήσει τὴν ψυχὴν;

Πρὸς τὴν διοίκησιν ἐκείνην 2, 3; πρὸς τὴν διήγησιν μόνην 1, 4.

The situation is briefly this: Chrysostom imagines the effect upon the mind of a young shepherd who is suddenly called away from feeding his flocks and shewn all the horrors of war by land and sea. After viewing two armies in battle array he is then told of all the dreadful concomitants of war (such as slavery): and is commanded to take the post of general of one of the armies. Then follows ἀρα οἶε κτλ. as above.

With the reading of 2, 3 we translate 'do you think that he will be equal to that office (of general)?' With that of 1, 4 we must translate

'do you think that he will bear up against the mere description?'<sup>1</sup> ('*vel solam horum narrationem ferre posse*,' Montf.). But (1) we should have expected, in this sense, the Greek to run *καὶ πρὸς τὴν διήγησιν*, and (2) *διήγησιν* may easily be due to the fact that the summing up of the description in question immediately precedes this passage<sup>2</sup>. On these grounds the reading of 2, 3 is preferable to that 1, 4.

In group 1, *a* seems to be better than *f* or *β*. Thus at i 4 (Montf. 366 A 11) while *a* has *μέρος τῆς πόλεως*, *f* and *β* have *μέρει τῆς πόλεως*. We have seen that *μέρει* is probably an attempt to improve upon a pre-existent *μέρος*. Again at iv 2 (Montf. 407 D 8) while *a* has *πάσαν ψυχῆς πρόσφορον κτλ*, *f* and *β* have *πάση ψυχῇ*, which is due to the apparent harshness of *πάσαν ψυχῆς* (see above (B) c).

In group 2, *β* and *henr* often agree in their readings (as Bengel saw). Another smaller group within this group is formed by *h*, *t*, *z*: for instance, these give at ii 2 (Montf. 373 B 5) the peculiar gloss (after *φροντίζει*) *ἀλλὰ πῶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας διασώσῃ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰεὶ ἐφεδρευόντων δαιμόνων*; then proceeding *ὅτι δὲ πρὸς τούτους καὶ μετὰ τούτων ἡ μάχη, ἄκουε κτλ*.

In group 3 the MSS are more homogeneous than those in the other groups, and no distinction in respect of value can be made between them.

In group 4, *u* contains some excellent readings: for instance at iii 10 (Montf. 387 D 5) it has *ἡ γὰρ κεφαλὴ, ἣν ἰσχυροτάτην εἶναι ἐχρῆν . . . ὅταν καὶ καθ' αὐτὴν ἀσθενῆς οὖσα τύχῃ, . . . τὸ λοιπὸν προσαπόλλυσι σῶμα*, where the first four words are variously corrupted in most other MSS: e.g. into *εἰ γὰρ κεφαλὴ ἦν*, with *ἐχρῆν* for main verb, and a consequent change of *ὅταν καὶ* to *ὅταν δέ*. Still more noteworthy is the fact that *u* alone of all the MSS I have seen has the true reading at iii 15 (Montf. 392 C 4) *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοῦτο ἀνείλεν, ἐπίδειξον τὸν χρησμόν*. The variants are remarkable: *ἂν εἶδεν* *c* franc, *ἐψηφίσαστο* *a f*, *ἀνήγγειλεν* all the rest<sup>3</sup>. The word *ἀνείλεν*, which I found in *u* after having conjecturally restored it, is clearly correct: as *χρησμόν* shews the reference is to scripture as the oracular utterance of God (cp. the use of *λόγια*: and for the verb *ἀνείλεν ἡ Πυθία*).

<sup>1</sup> *καὶ πάσας ἀκριβῶς διδάξας τὰς τοῦ πολέμου τραγηδίας, προστιθέτω καὶ τὰ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας δευνὰ κτλ*. It may be noted that there seems to be some confusion in Chrysostom's mind in regard to the order of events here. He first tells us that the youth listens to a long disquisition on war, and then asks whether he would not most probably faint (or expire) at the first glimpse of the armies (*ἀπὸ πρώτης ὀψεως*), i. e. before any verbal description has been given him.

<sup>2</sup> On the influence of a neighbouring word or passage as a cause of corruption in the *de Sac*, see Bengel's note on iv 2 (p. 137 of Bengel-Leo).

<sup>3</sup> For other cases where the true reading is preserved in only one or two MSS see (e.g.) critical notes in my edition on *ἐπονούμεθα* and *τὴν ἐμαντοῦ* (i 1).



II. CITATIONS FROM THE *de Sacerdotio*.

The following writers quote passages from the *de Sac*.

(a) Biographers.

Anon. = Anonymus Scriptor vitae S Chrysostomi (later than 950). See Savile's Edition viii p. 299. The passage quoted is from Anthusa's appeal to her son. It begins *καθίσασα πλησίον* (i 2), and ends at *εὐδοκίμησως ἐξ ἰσῆς ἐμοί*.

Georg. = Georgius Alexandrinus (seventh century): Savile viii p. 167. The passage quoted begins *καθίσασα πλησίον* (i 2) as above, and ends at *οὗτος ὁ δεσμός κατεχέτω σε πρὸς ἡμᾶς* (so, for *παρ' ἡμῖν*). This citation is of little value for critical purposes, being more of the nature of a paraphrase.

Sym. = Symeon Metaphrastes (tenth century): Savile viii p. 376. The passage quoted begins *ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἦσθετο* (of Anthusa) i 2, and ends *εὐδοκίμησως ἐξ ἰσῆς ἐμοί*. This citation seems to be the most valuable of the three: see below.

(b) Suidas (*s. v.* Ἰωάννης, Ἀντιοχεύς).

This lexicographer quotes from the *de Sac*. two passages which he unites to form one long quotation: viz. (1) iii 16 *ἐννοήσον οὖν ὑποῖόν τινα κτλ.*, and (2) vi 4 *ποικίλον αὐτὸν εἶναι δεῖ κτλ.*

(a) It may be of interest to give in parallel columns the text of part of Anthusa's appeal as printed in my edition, and as exhibited in the three biographers.

Present edition.	Anon.	Georg.	Sym.
Ἐγώ, φησι, παιδίον, τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ σου οὐκ ἀφείθην ἀπολαῦσαι ἐπὶ πολὺ, τῷ θεῷ τοῦτο δοκοῦν· τὰς γὰρ ἄδυνας τὰς ἐπὶ σοὶ διαδεξάμενος ὁ θάνατος ἐκείνου, σοὶ μὲν ὀρφανίαν, ἐμοὶ δὲ χηρείαν ἐπέστησεν ἄωρον καὶ τὰ τῆς χηρείας δεινά, ἃ μόναι οἱ παθοῦσαι δύναιντ' ἂν εἰδέναι καλῶς, λόγος γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐφίκοιτο τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐκείνου καὶ τοῦ κλύδωνος ὃν ὑφίσταται κόρη, ἄρτι μὲν τῆς πατρῆας οἰκίας προελθοῦσα, καὶ πραγμάτων ἄπειρος οὖσα, ἐξαίφνης δὲ	Verbally identical down to <i>εἰδέναι καλῶς</i> , for which Savile reads <i>εἰδέναι σαφῶς</i> (with <i>v. l.</i> <i>καλῶς</i> ). Anon. then proceeds:	Τοῦ σου μὲν πατρὸς τῆς ἀρετῆς οὐκ ἀήλανσα ἐπὶ πολὺ, τοῦ θεοῦ οὕτω κελεύσαντος, σοὶ μὲν ὀρφανίαν, ἐμοὶ δὲ χηρείαν προεστήσαντος τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. Several sentences are then omitted, including the remainder of the part selected for comparison. Georg. proceeds: ὅμας οὐδὲν τῶν συμβάντων μοι κακῶν ἔπεισέ με δευτέροις προσημλήσαι γάμοις κτλ.	The only variant is—Ἐξαίφνης τε πένθει ἀσχέτῳ βαλλομένη γοῦ ἐξαίφνης δὲ πένθει τε ἀσχέτῳ βαλλ. . . .
πένθει τε ἀσχέτῳ βαλλομένη, καὶ ἀναγκαζομένη φροντίδαν καὶ τῆς ἡλικίας καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἀνεχεσθαι μειζύοναν.	λόγος γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐφίκοιτο τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐκείνου καὶ τοῦ κλύδωνος, ὃν ὑφίσταται κόρη θαλαμνομένη τε καὶ πραγμάτων ἄπειρος, ἄρτι μὲν τῆς οἰκίας τῆς πατρῆας προελθοῦσα, αἰφνιδίῳ δὲ ἄωρῳ χηρεία περιπεσοῦσα, ἔνθεν μὲν ἀσχέτῳ πένθει τὴν ψυχὴν βαλλομένη, ἐκείθεν δὲ φροντίσει συνεχομένη μείζουσι ἢ κατὰ ἡλικίαν καὶ γυναικείαν φύσιν.		

(b) Suidas cites, as already stated, two passages which run on consecutively, although taken from different parts of the treatise. It will be convenient, for purposes of comparison, to place side by side his citation with the text of my edition.

My edition.

(1) vi 4

Ποικίλον αὐτὸν εἶναι δεῖ,  
ποικίλον δὲ λέγω, οὐχ ἕπουλον·  
οὐδὲ κόλακα καὶ ὑποκριτὴν, ἀλλὰ  
πολλῆς μὲν ἐλευθερίας καὶ παρρησίας  
ἀνάμεστον, εἰδὸτα δὲ καὶ συγκατιέναι  
χρησίμως, ὅταν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων  
ὑπόθεσις τοῦτο ἀπαιτῆ, καὶ χρηστὸν  
εἶναι ὁμοῦ καὶ αὐστηρόν. οὐ γὰρ  
ἔστιν ἐνὶ τρόπῳ χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀρ-  
χομένοις ἅπασιν, ἐπειδὴ μὴδὲ ἰατρῶν  
παισιν ἐνὶ νόμῳ τοῖς κάμνουσι πᾶσι  
προσφέρεσθαι καλόν, μὴδὲ κυβερνήτη  
μίαν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι τῆς πρὸς τὰ πνεύ-  
ματα μάχης.

(2) iii 16

Ἐννόησον οὖν ὁποῖόν τινα εἶναι χρῆ  
τὸν πρὸς τοσοῦτον μέλλοντα ἀνθέξειν  
χειμῶνα, καὶ τοσαῦτα κωλύματα τῶν  
κοινῆ συμφερόντων διαθήσειν καλῶς.  
καὶ γὰρ καὶ σεμνὸν καὶ ἄτυφον, καὶ  
φοβερὸν καὶ προσηγῆ, καὶ ἀρχικὸν  
καὶ κοινωνικόν, καὶ ἀδέκαστον καὶ  
θεραπευτικόν, καὶ ταπεινὸν καὶ ἀδού-  
λωτον, καὶ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἡμερον εἶναι  
δεῖ, ἵνα πρὸς ἅπαντα ταῦτα εὐκόλως  
μάχεσθαι δύνηται, καὶ τὸν ἐπιτήδειον  
μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐξουσίας, κἂν ἅπαντες  
ἀντιπίπτωσι, παράγειν, καὶ τὸν οὐ  
τοιούτον μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐξουσίας, κἂν  
ἅπαντες συμπνέωσι, μὴ προσίεσθαι,

<sup>1</sup> v. l. ἰέναι.

<sup>2</sup> Verba μῆτε ἀλαζονικὸν . . . καταπίπτοντα 'constituunt Ep. 379 l. 3 Isidori ad Theodorum Scholasticum'. Reines.

Suidas (Gaisford's text) vol. i

p. 1787.

(1) vi 4 ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει (αὐτὸς  
οὗτος, ὁ Χρυσόστομος λ. Cedrenus).

Διὰ τοῦτο ποικίλον εἶναι δεῖ τὸν  
ποιμένα καὶ διδάσκαλον. ποικίλον  
δὲ λέγω οὐχ ἕπουλον, οὐδὲ κόλακα  
καὶ ἕβριστὴν, ἀλλὰ πολλῆς ἐλευθε-  
ρίας καὶ παρρησίας ἀνάμεστον, εἰδὸτα  
καὶ συγκατιέναι χρησίμως, ὅταν ἀπαιτῆ  
τοῦτο ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπόθεσις, καὶ  
χρηστὸν εἶναι ὁμοῦ καὶ αὐστηρόν. οὐ  
γὰρ ἐνὶ τρόπῳ χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις  
ἅπασιν δέον· ἐπεὶ μὴδὲ ἰατρῶν παισιν  
ἐνὶ μόνῳ φαρμάκῳ πᾶσι τοῖς κάμνουσι  
προσφέρεσθαι καλόν, μὴδὲ κυβερνήτη  
μίαν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι<sup>1</sup> τῆς πρὸς τὰ πνεύ-  
ματα μάχης.

(2) iii 16 (in Suidas joined on to  
the preceding without a break).

Ἐννόησον οὖν ὁποῖόν τινα εἶναι χρῆ  
τὸν μέλλοντα πρὸς χειμῶνα ἀνθέξειν  
τοσοῦτον, καὶ τοιαύτην ζᾶλην, καὶ  
τοσαῦτα κύματα, πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι  
τοῖς πᾶσι πάντα, ἵνα πάντως κερδήσῃ.  
καὶ γὰρ σεμνὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν τοιοῦτον  
καὶ ἄτυφον, καὶ φοβερὸν καὶ προσηγῆ,  
καὶ ἀρχοντικὸν καὶ κοινωνικόν, καὶ ἀδέ-  
καστον καὶ θεραπευτικόν, καὶ ταπεινὸν  
καὶ ἀδούλωτον, καὶ φαιδρὸν καὶ ἡμερον,  
ἵνα ταῦτα εὐκόλως δύνηται μάχεσθαι.  
οὐκοῦν δεῖ τὸν ἐναργέστατον<sup>2</sup> καὶ ἐχέ-  
φρονα φεύγειν τὸ κολακεύειν καὶ κολα-  
κεύεσθαι, μῆτε ἀλαζονικὸν<sup>3</sup> εἶναι μῆτε  
κόλακα, ἀλλ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν κακῶν

<sup>2</sup> v. l. ἐνάρετον.

ἀλλ' εἰς ἓν μόνον ὄραν, τῆς ἐκκλησίας  
τὴν οἰκοδομήν, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς ἀπέ-  
χθειαν ἢ χάριν ποιεῖν.

τούτων κολάζειν τὴν ἀμετρίαν· καὶ  
ἐλεύθερον εἶναι, μήτε εἰς αὐθάδειαν  
ἀποκλίνοντα, μήτε εἰς δουλοπρέπειαν  
καταπίπτοντα.

The passage continues to deal with the subject of the different temperaments which have to be studied by the priest. The remainder of the citation, though it is apparently from the same source as the foregoing, bears no resemblance to any passage of the *de Sacerdotio*.

This quotation presents several points of difficulty. Does it, for example, point to the existence of another edition of the *de Sacerdotio* besides that which we possess: or can the nature and extent of the differences between Suidas and our text be otherwise explained?

The passage in which the quotation is embedded seems to be taken by Suidas from Cedrenus, who has written an account of Chrysostom under the thirteenth year of Arcadius. Now Cedrenus, though he expressly attributes to Chrysostom a part of the second extract (iii 16, as far as *δύνηται μάχεσθαι*) which differs only slightly from our text, quotes the following words, οὐκοῦν δεῖ . . . *καταπίπτοντα* as either from Chrysostom or from Isidore of Pelusium. It has been pointed out (see footnote 3 to the second extract) that the concluding words, at all events, of that extract occur in one of Isidore's Epistles. I have not been able to trace them in any other passage of Chrysostom's works: and Isidore—if this proves anything—uses the words in question as if they were his own.

Furthermore, in the part of the second extract which I have omitted there is introduced a quotation from Eccles. iii 1 LXX (*καιρὸς τῷ παντὶ πράγματι, φησὶ Σολομῶν*). This quotation is not in Montfaucon's Index to Chrysostom's Scriptural references: so it may be assumed that it is not from any other of his works, but must either be from a second edition of the *de Sac.* or not his at all. The latter conclusion seems to be pointed to by the words with which Cedrenus (unlike Suidas) introduces the quotation: they are (see Gaisford) *ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος δηλῶν ἔφη τὸ τοῦ σοφωτάτου Σολομῶντος, Καιρὸς τῷ παντὶ πράγματι, εἰδέναι χρὴ ὅτι καὶ ταπεινότητος . . .* (then follows the end of the second extract). This part then of the extract seems to be from a commentary by Basil the Great on Ecclesiastes, or from a sermon, perhaps, on the text Eccl. iii 1. I have not succeeded in tracing it.

Thus in view of the possibility, not to say probability, that the quotation in Suidas, although headed by a reference to Chrysostom (*ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει*), is really a *cento* from various writers, including, besides Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium and Basil of Caesarea, it cannot be held that that citation demonstrates the existence of another edition of the *de Sac.* in ancient times. And the second extract bears signs that it did not originally follow immediately after the first, but has been dislodged from its own proper context: for if we examine the end of iii 15 we find a metaphorical description at some length of the storms and tempests to which the peace of the Church is exposed: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀγρίων ἀνέμων ἐξ ἐναντίας προσπεισόντων τὸ τέως ἡσύχαζον πέλαγος μαίνεται ἐξαίφνης καὶ κορυφούται, καὶ τοὺς ἐμπλέοντας ἀπόλλυσιν' οὕτω καὶ ἡ τῆς ἐκκλησίας γαλήνη, δεξαμένη φθορέας ἀνθρώπων, ζάλης καὶ ναυαγίων πληροῦται πολλῶν.* Now the second extract, which begins with references to 'so great a storm' (*τοσοῦτον χεῖμῶνα*), follows much more naturally after an elaborate description such as that just given than after a mere incidental allusion to the dangers of the sea such as that at the end of the first extract (*μήτε κυβερνήτη [καλὸν] μίαν ὁδὸν εἶδέναι τῆς πρὸς τὰ πνεύματα μάχης*). If then the second extract did not originally follow after the first, but came from another context, this proves a dislocation due not to Chrysostom, but to a later writer making selections from his writings: and the inference is natural that such an anthologist would add passages from other authors also, so that gradually a *cento* would be formed. Cedrenus perceived that part of the second extract (not quoted) was from Basil. But Suidas apparently assumed that the whole was by Chrysostom.

Some investigation of this question seemed desirable in view of the fact that neither Gaisford nor Bernhardt, two of the most recent editors of Suidas, seems to be aware that the two extracts given above are from the *de Sac.*, or to doubt that the whole citation is by one author, viz. Chrysostom.

### III. ANCIENT TRANSLATIONS OF THE *de Sac.* INTO OTHER LANGUAGES.

#### (a) Syriac.

The following Syriac MSS in the British Museum contain versions of portions of the *de Sac.* I have quoted the references according to the numeration of Montfaucon.

1. Add. 14,612 = Catal. 753. i. e. Saec. vi or vii. Contains the first book, which begins on fol. 53 v. of the MS (Montf. 362 A 1 to 371 B 2).
2. Add. 14,612 = Catal. 753. i. k. Saec. vi or vii. Contains discontinuous extracts from book iii, beginning on fol. 73 v. (Montf. 382 C 13 to 394 E 1).

3. Add. 17,173 = Catal. 762. 18. Saec. vii ('ut videtur'). Contains an extract from book iii, beginning on fol. 145 v. (Montf. 390 A 2 to 390 C 1).
4. Add. 17,191 = Catal. 864. 30. b. Saec. ix-x. A palimpsest: contains on fol. 43 v. sqq. an extract from book iv (Montf. 403 D 5 to 404 A 1).
5. Add. 17,193 = Catal. 861. 13, 14. Saec. ix (it is dated 874). Contains on fol. 5 v. sqq. an extract from book vi (Montf. 430 B 8 to 430 C 4).
6. Add. 18,187 = Catal. 801. 3. b. Saec. ix. Contains on fol. 71 r. sqq. an extract from book vi (Montf. 434 C 11 to 434 D 4).
7. Add. 14,611 = Catal. 813. 16 (2). Saec. x. Contains on fol. 1 r. sqq. an extract from book vi (Montf. 428 B 7 sqq.).
8. Add. 12,164. Saec. vi. On fol. 131 r. there is a quotation from the *de sac.* in a treatise by Philoxenos of Hierapolis (Montf. 394 B 4 sqq.). Also, on fol. 139 v. (from the same treatise) we have Montf. 376 A 9 sqq.
9. Add. 14,612 = One of the citations under 8 (Montf. 394 B 4), with one verbal difference.

I derive all my knowledge of these Syriac MSS from information kindly placed at my disposal by Mr E. W. Brooks. I learn from him that the Syriac version is a very loose translation, so that to make a complete collation would have amounted to writing out the whole. The variants which his translation suggests are in no case important. Occasionally words are omitted in the Syriac version which are supported by all other MS evidence<sup>1</sup>.

(b) Latin.

The only version in Latin which is of importance to the textual critic of the *de Sac.* is the *vetus interpretatio*. This ancient version, which seems to be derived from a Greek MS of fairly good quality<sup>2</sup>, was known to Bengel in an edition published soon after the discovery of printing; neither the date nor the place of printing was mentioned on the title-page. In 1504 another edition of this version was published at Basle, but with various alterations: and a third in 1524 at Paris *apud Petrum Gromorsum*.

The translator (*vetus interpres*) has not been identified with certainty. Some hold that he was Anianus the Deacon, of Celeda, who defended Pelagianism. See Jerome *Epp.* cxliii 2.

<sup>1</sup> I have said nothing of Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, or Slavonic versions. The Arabic versions would probably come—I am informed—from the Syriac or the Coptic, and thus be comparatively late. Ethiopic versions also (if any exist) would almost certainly be as late as the fifteenth or sixteenth century. For versions in the other languages see Bardenhewer *Patrologie* 2 pp. 328-9.

<sup>2</sup> Probably akin to the MSS of group 3.

In conclusion, it seems advisable to mention that, of the many editions<sup>1</sup> which have been published of the *de Sacerdotio* alone, those of Hoeschel (1599), Hughes (1710: 2nd edition by Thirlby, 1712), Bengel (1725: new edition by Leo, 1834), and Dubner (1861) are of importance on the critical side. The best critical edition of the whole of Chrysostom is still Savile's: and although that great scholar did not add as much to our knowledge of the text of the *de Sac.* as he did in the case of other treatises, nevertheless his knowledge of patristic Greek and his sound judgement give his text a value which is beyond that to be attached to any other edition of the complete works of Chrysostom. Montfaucon's edition, although in many respects useful and convenient, is deficient from the point of view of textual criticism. This fact is widely recognized in regard to the other works of Chrysostom, especially the Homilies on St Matthew and on the Pauline Epistles, since the labours of Dr Field<sup>2</sup>, whose text, based on a thorough examination of the MS evidence, has supplanted that of Montfaucon in the Chrysostom of Migne's *Patrologie grecque*. So far as concerns the *de Sacerdotio* Montfaucon's critical notes are obviously open to the same charges of vagueness and lack of scientific method which Field brought against his critical notes on the Homilies just mentioned: the MSS referred to are not specified by name or designation, but are simply quoted as 'two', 'three', 'others', 'many', so that they are simply counted and not weighed: and while relatively insignificant readings are mentioned (e.g. on points of spelling), those of real importance are often omitted. To these allegations must, I fear, be added that of inaccuracy. Of the ten MSS which Montfaucon mentions as consulted by him for his text of the *de Sac.* I have consulted seven on all the passages of importance to the textual critic, with the result that I found even the vague 'two', 'three', 'many' cannot be trusted as representing the facts.

The following examples (out of a much larger number) will substantiate what has been said. I give first Montfaucon's critical notes (all bearing on the *de Sac.*), and then append my own remarks.

Montf. 363 A 13 (i 1) 'προείνας abest a tribus MSS'. Seven of his ten MSS omit the word.

Montf. 365 A 3 (i 3 *init.*) 'maxima pars MSS τὸ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, quatuor MSS τὸ τῆς ἱερωσύνης'. Seven of his ten MSS read τὸ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, not to mention a large number of other MSS in the

<sup>1</sup> For a list of these see my forthcoming edition (Introduction § 6): or Lomler *Ioh. Chrysostomi opera praestantissima* (Rudolstadt, 1837), Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> See Field's edition of the *Homm. in Matt.* (Cambridge, 1839), *Praefatio* pp. xiii sqq.: 'codices non modo non contulit bonus monachus, sed interdum, . . . ne inspexit quidem . . . ne unum quidem (codicem) nominatum appellat, sed "unum", "duo", "alios", hoc vel illud legere monens umbris ac simulacris lectorem ludit', &c.

- Bibl. Nationale. I have not found τὸ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς in any single MS.
- Montf. 365 B 6 (i 3) 'non pauci MSS εἰ νέον οὕτως ἀγαθὸν . . . ἐπιγῆδιον, quae lectio corrupta est'. All MSS consulted by me, including seven of Montfaucon's, read εἰ νέον κτλ. (as above).
- Montf. 366 C 8 (i 4) 'quatuor MSS τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν, quae lectio non spernenda'. I find no trace of another reading in any MS.
- Montf. 369 A 11 (i 5) 'ἦρτον deest in tribus MSS'. The fact is that ἦρτον has no authority at all except as a marginal reading in one MS of the worst class.
- Montf. 370 C 7 (i 5) 'quatuor MSS ἔσπασε τοῦ δοθέντος'. Seven of Montfaucon's ten MSS have this reading. Nothing is said of the remarkable variant σπουδάσαι τοῦ δοθέντος . . . λαβεῖν, although that is in at least two MSS of his list.
- Montf. 386 D 2 (iii 9) 'alii ἐπιβουλαί, εὐχαὶ κατὰ'. Every MS consulted by me gives this reading. For Montfaucon's reading, which was ὀργαί or εὐχαί, I can find no MS authority.
- Montf. 392 C 4 (iii 14) 'aliqui εἰ . . . θεὸς τοῦτο ἀγγέλει'. A very large number of MSS (fifteen out of twenty) gives this reading. I can find no authority for Montfaucon's ἐγνώρισε, which he prints in the text.

His omissions are also noteworthy: e.g. 363 A 6 (i 1) where he says nothing of ψυχῆν, 364 B 8 (i 2) where he is silent with regard to εἰπεῖν καὶ omitted by nearly all MSS. Matters of personal judgement I have reserved to the end: but it is not unreasonable to say that in his treatment both of the passages already given, where he prefers an inferior reading, and also of others, for instance Montf. 378 A 4 (ii 5) where he fails to see that τῆς λήθης is imperatively required by the context, and that τῆς ἀληθείας (his reading) is due to the preceding τὸ ἀληθές—in all these instances he shews himself deficient in critical instinct and insight.

The reprint of Montfaucon's edition (Paris, Gaume Frères, 1839) gives a somewhat better text, due to the editor Theobald Fix, who, as he has told us in a noteworthy passage, saw with increasing clearness, as the reprint proceeded, the value of Savile's edition, and used it more and more freely to correct the text of Montfaucon<sup>1</sup>. Thus so far

<sup>1</sup> See vol. xiii of the reprint, *Epilogus Novae Editionis* p. iii 'is (usus editionis Savili) per universa volumina duodecim Montfauconiano operi increduliter profuit. Sed quominus ab ipso statim initio et ubique penitus omnia ex Saviliana transumerentur quibus emendari potuit, obstitit primo disertum testimonium Benedictinorum de melioribus et copiosioribus subsidiis ex quibus se . . . orationem Chrysostomicam constituisse profitentur . . . Maiorem ei (i.e. Savile) procedente opere auctoritatem, evidentibus documentis tandem cedentes, debebamus tribuere. The *de sac.*, which has gained less than other parts of Chrysostom from this revision, is in vol. i, and thus was reprinted before the superiority of Savile had been recognized by the editor.

as the text of Chrysostom is concerned we have the authority of one of Montfaucon's own countrymen, himself a scholar of no mean repute, for regarding the best complete edition to be that of an Englishman, Sir Henry Savile.

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

## ADVERSARIA PATRISTICA.

### I. 'WHO IS MY NEIGHBOUR?'

IN all three Synoptic Gospels (Matt. xix 19, xxii 39: Marc. xii 31: Luc. x 27) and in St Paul's Epistle to the Romans (xiii 9) the precept 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' is repeated from the Old Testament (Lev. xix 18). In St Paul and in the first passage in St Matthew's Gospel, it is only introduced as a summary of those commandments of the Decalogue which deal with different aspects of man's duty to his neighbour. In the other three gospel passages it is the antithesis and the complement of the commandment 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God'.

'And who is my neighbour?' was the further question put by the lawyer in the story as recorded by St Luke: and our Lord's answer to this further question was given in the form of the parable of the Good Samaritan. It did not need to be wedded to any theory of allegorical exegesis, to see in Christ Himself the Good Samaritan who healed the wounds of bruised and battered humanity: no Christian expositor could fail to find on these lines the primary application of the parable. But if so, it followed, when the language of the gospel was pressed, that Christ, ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος, was the 'neighbour' to him that fell among the thieves, and therefore 'neighbour' also to all who, with the lawyer, ask the question what they must do to inherit eternal life and hear the answer that eternal life follows on the love of God and one's 'neighbour', —that is, on this interpretation, of God and Christ; as it is said elsewhere, 'This is eternal life, that they may know Thee the only God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent'.

Such we may suppose to have been the genesis of the curious and at first sight purely trivial exegesis of ὁ πλησίον which the examples that I proceed to cite will shew to have been normal among Latin writers down to the end of the fourth century.

1. Cyprian *Ad Fortunatum* §2 'Quod Deus solus colendus sit' (Hartel i 322, 323). Under this head St Cyprian quotes Matt. iv 10 (= Luc. iv 8), Exod. xx 3, Deut. xxxii 39, Apoc. xiv 6, 7, and then continues 'sic et Dominus in euangelio commemorationem facit primi