

ΑΝΑΦΟΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΛΕΙΩΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΙΛΑΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ  
ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΝ.

Κρατίστῳ σεβαστῷ θειοτάτῳ Καίσαρι Τιβεριῷ Αὐγούστῳ ὁ σὸς ἰκέτης Πιλάτος Πόντιος, ὁ τῷ σῷ κράτει τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπέχων, μηνύω πρὸς τὴν σὴν μεγαλειότητα διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἀναφορᾶς τάδε· οἱ ἐπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρέδωκάν μοι τινα ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν λεγόμενον ἄκαιρα ἐγκαλοῦντες αὐτὸν ὅτι τὸ Σάββατον ἔλνε, θαυματουργῶν ἐξαΐσια καὶ παράδοξα θαύματα· τυφλοὺς ἐφώτισεν, χωλοὺς ἀνώρθωσεν καὶ παραλύτους καὶ δαιμονιώντας λόγῳ ἐθεράπευσεν μόνῳ, γυναῖκα αἰμορροῦσα(ν) ἀψαμένη(ν) τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς ἰάσατο, νεκροὺς ἐπὶ τάφον ἀγομένους ἐζωοποιήσεν) καὶ ἀνέστησεν καὶ ἕτερόν τινα τετραήμερον ἐκ τάφου φωνήσας<sup>1</sup> ἐξήγειρεν καὶ ἀνέστησεν, καὶ ἕτερα πλεῖστα εἰργάσατο θαύματα. ἐν τινι δὲ πονηρῷ ἔργῳ ἢ λόγῳ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐλέγξει αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἀδίκως Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας στάσιν κινήσαντες κατ' αὐτοῦ σὺν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις καὶ Γραμματεῦσιν ἔπεισαν τὸν λαὸν<sup>2</sup> κατακρῖναι αὐτῷ θάνατον. Ὅτε δὲ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν καὶ ἐπάγησαν οἱ ἥλιοι εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας ὥστε καὶ πέτραι ἐρράγησαν καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἀπὸ 5<sup>3</sup> ὥρας ἕως 9<sup>3</sup> καὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε<sup>3</sup> καὶ λύχνους ἤψαμεν, ἀπελθόντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις ἡμῶν μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν 9<sup>3</sup> ὥραν πάλιν ἐφάνη ὁ ἥλιος<sup>4</sup> καὶ πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν ἐν τῷ ἄερι ἐφάνησαν ἐξαστράπτοντες καὶ νεκροὶ ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἐξανέστησαν οὗς<sup>5</sup> καὶ διερωτήσαντες εἶπον τελευτήσαι πρὸ 3<sup>6</sup> ἐτῶν. Ὅθεν καγὼ τρόμῳ ληφθεὶς ἔγγραφον<sup>6</sup> ἀνήγαγον τῷ σῷ κράτει ὁ σὸς ἰκέτης.

Τοῦ δὲ γράμματος φθάσαντος ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἀναγνωσθέν(τος) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Καίσαρος εὐθὺς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰδῶλα κατέπεσον εἰς γῆν καὶ συνετριβήσαν. Ὁ δὲ Καίσαρ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐθαύμασαν· ἀκούσαντες δὲ περὶ τῶν θαυμασιῶν ὧν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος κατηγόρησαν τοῦ Πιλάτου λέγοντες· Πῶς τοσαῦτα σημεῖα ἰδὼν ἐπίεσθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις θανατῶσαι αὐτόν; ὁ δὲ Καίσαρ ἐκέλευσεν ἀχθῆναι τὸν Πιλάτον δέσμιον ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Ἀχθέντα δὲ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εἰπέ μοι, κατάρτα, τίς ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος δι' οὗ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ λεχθέντος πάντες οἱ θεοὶ ἡμῶν ἄοράτως ἔπεσον πάντες; Λέγει δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ αἴτιος τοῦ κακοῦ τούτου, δέσποτα αὐτοκράτορ, ἀλλ' Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας καὶ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Καὶ ὁ Καίσαρ λέγει· Ἔδει σε, κατάρτα, ὅτε σοι<sup>7</sup> παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν ἀσφαλῆσαι καὶ πέμψαι πρὸς με καὶ μὴ πεισθῆναι αὐτοῖς καὶ σταυρῶσαι, ἀλλὰ σταυρώσας αὐτὸν ἔγραψας ἐν αὐτῷ οὕτως<sup>8</sup> (οὗτος) ἔστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς γὰρ ἐμπαίζων τὴν ἐμὴν βασιλείαν ταῦτα πεποιήκας. Οἱ δὲ παράνομοι Ἰουδαῖοι οὐκ ἤθελον αὐτὸν θεὸν ἔχειν κἂν ὡς ἱατρὸν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἤθελον ἔχειν. καὶ γὰρ διὰ τῆς τῶν ἡμετέρων θεῶν συντριβῆς ἐγνωρίσαμεν μείζονα αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπάντων θεῶν. Καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος· Καγὼ, αὐτοκράτορ, ἐπίσταμαι μείζονα εἶναι τῶν ἡμετέρων θεῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> φωνάσας    <sup>2</sup> λόγον    <sup>3</sup> ὅτι    <sup>4</sup> Sign for the sun, with accent and breathing  
<sup>5</sup> οἰς    <sup>6</sup> ἔγραψον    <sup>7</sup> σε

ἀναγκάσαν με ἔθνος ἀδίκως αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσα. Τότε κελεύει ἐμβληθῆναι τὸν Πιλάτον ἐν τῇ φρουρᾷ.

Καὶ δόγμα γράφων λέγει οὕτως· Δικινίῳ τῷ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπέχοντι ἀρχῆν· τόλμης γενομένης ὑπὸ τῶν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων οἷτινες παρέδωκαν πρὸς Πιλάτον ἄνθρωπὸν τινα εὐλαβῆ καὶ πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐργασάμενον καὶ ἐθανάτωσαν ἀδίκως σταυρώσαντες. Πειθάρχησον<sup>1</sup> οὖν τῷ δόγματί μου καὶ παραλαβὼν πλήθη στρατιωτῶν δορυφόρων πορεύθητι καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἄνναν καὶ Καϊάφαν δεσμεύσας ἀσφαλῶς ἀνάγαγον πρὸς με, τοὺς δὲ κατοικούντας πάντας ἐκεῖ Ἰουδαίους αἰχμαλωτίσας ἐκβαλὼν καταδούλωσον διασπείρας εἰς τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν πόλεις καὶ χώρας τοῦ μηκέτι ὑποστρέψαι τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.

Τὸν δὲ Πιλάτον ἐκβαλὼν τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς φρουρᾶς ἐνέβαλεν ἐν τινι βοῶν δέρματι ὕγρῳ, ἔθηκεν ἐν ἡλίῳ ὅπως τοῦ δέρματος ξηρανθέν(τος) συσφίγξῃ<sup>2</sup> αὐτὸν καὶ σφοδρῶς<sup>3</sup> τιμωρηθεὶς τελευτήσῃ. Τοῦ δὲ δέρματος ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου θερμανθέντος φλογὸς<sup>4</sup> καὶ διαρραγέντος<sup>5</sup> ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Πιλάτος ἀβλαβῆς. Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Καῖσαρ τὸ(ν) διὰ ξίφους αὐτοῦ θάνατον ἐψηφίσατο. Λαβὼν οὖν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν φέκτωρ [sic] ὁ Σάλδιος ἐπὶ τὸν τεταγμένον ἤγαγεν τόπον. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος σταθεὶς προσηύξατο οὕτως εἰπὼν· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, μὴ συναπολέσῃς με μετὰ τῶν παρανόμων Ἰουδαίων· σὺ γὰρ οἶδας ὅτι ἀγνοῶν τολμήσας τοῦτο ἔπραξα καὶ χεῖρας οὐκ εἶχον ἐμβαλεῖν κατὰ σοῦ εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸ ἀναγκάσαν με ἔθνος· μὴ οὖν ἐν τινι ἀμάρτημα ταῦτα [sic] ἐκείνοις συναπολέσῃς με, ἀλλ' ἐν μερίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου με καταξίωσον.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ οὐρανόθεν ἠκούσθη λέγουσα· Μακάριος εἶ ὅτι τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν εἰρημένα ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐπράχθησαν καὶ ἔσει μάρτυς ἀψευδῆς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου.

Καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς ὁμοῦ καὶ φόβου κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετμήθη, σὺν αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ Πρόκλα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ.

Ἀκούσασα δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἄλλαι τοῦ Κυρίου μαθήτριαι ἀνέδραμον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πρὸς τὸν Καῖσαρα καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λεπτομερῶς, ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ ἀκούσας καὶ μεγάλως θαυμάσας εἶπεν· Ὡ πονηρὰ βουλεύματα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τοιοῦτον ἅγιον ἄνδρα καὶ μηδὲν πονηρὸν ἐργασάμενον ἀδίκως θανατῶσαι τολμησάντων.

Τοῦ δὲ δόγματος φθάσαντος ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ καὶ μαθόντες Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας τὸν κατ' αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος θυμὸν νυκτὸς τῆς πόλεως ἀποδράσαντες ἀπῆλθον ἐν ὄρει τινι κρυπτόμενοι. Ὁ δὲ Δικίνιος πειθαρχήσας τῷ τοῦ Καίσαρος προστάγματι παραλαβὼν πλήθος στρατιωτῶν ὀπλοφόρων παρεγένετο τοῖς Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς ἐξῆλθε σὺν τῷ στρατῷ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἀναζητεῖν αὐτοὺς. Οἱ δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς κύνες ἀλώπεκα ἐντυχόντες κατεδίωξαν, ἡ καὶ φεύγουσα ἀπῆλθεν ἐν τινι πετραϊῶδει ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους διασωθῆναι. Τινὲς δὲ τοῦ στρατοῦ καταδιώκοντες ὀπισθεν τῶν κυνῶν ἦλθον ὅπου ἡ ἀλώπηξ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ χαλάσαντες τριόδιον<sup>6</sup> ποτὲ μὲν

<sup>1</sup> πειθάρχησε

<sup>2</sup> συσφίγξας

<sup>3</sup> σφοδρῶς

<sup>4</sup> φλόγα

<sup>5</sup> διαρραγέντα

<sup>6</sup> τριόδοτον

ἐνόησαν χεῖρα ἀνθρώπου ποτὲ δὲ πόδα εἶτα κεφαλὴν, οὓς καὶ ἀναγνωρίσαντες ἀληθῶς εἶναι Ἄνναν καὶ Καϊάφαν ἀνήγαγον ἐπὶ τὸν Καίσαρα, οὓς ἰδὼν εὐχαρίστησε χαρὰν. Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ προφήτου Δαυὶδ λέγον· παραδοθήσονται εἰς χεῖρας ῥομφαίας μερίδες ἀλωπέκων ἔσονται<sup>1</sup>, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εὐφρανθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ. Ὁ δὲ Λικίνιος ὑποστρέψας ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄρους εἰσήλθεν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐκεῖ Ἰουδαίους αἰχμαλωτίσας τῆς πόλεως ἐξήγαγε καὶ διέσπειρε καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐνέπρησεν ἐρημώσας ἅμα καὶ τῷ ναῷ ὡς προέφη ὁ Κύριος ὡς οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ἄδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθου ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται, αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἄμήν.

### AN UNCIAL FRAGMENT OF THE 'AD DONATUM' OF ST. CYPRIAN.

IN the Preface to his edition of St. Cyprian<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Hartel briefly notices a MS fragment of the *Ad Donatum*, the existence of which had been made known to him by Nolte. When writing his Preface, Hartel had no information as to the whereabouts of the fragment, but in his *Addenda* he was able to state that it formed part of Codex Aurelianensis 169. This Codex, which is now numbered 192, once belonged to the Monastery of Fleury, and contains the remnants of divers ancient MSS, most of them written in uncial characters. The Cyprian fragment, consisting of a single leaf (fol. 1 of the Codex), so far from being later in date than the other fragments, as Hartel was informed, is one of the most ancient in the collection. M. Chatelain<sup>3</sup> would place it as early as the fifth century: certainly it cannot be later than the seventh century—the date to which it is assigned in the printed Catalogue.

By the kindness of M. Delisle and of the authorities of the Library of Orléans, an opportunity was given to me of examining this fragment at Paris in the autumn of last year, and I am encouraged to believe that a transcript of it may be acceptable to those who are interested in the criticism of St. Cyprian. There can be no doubt that such fragments—which are only too rare—throw much light upon the history of the text, and help us to form a right estimate concerning the relative value of the more complete MSS of later date.

Unfortunately the Orléans fragment is in a poor state of preservation. As a rule, the concluding letters of the lines in the second column of the *recto*, and the initial letters of the lines in the first column of the *verso*, have disappeared through injury of the outer edge of the leaf.

(Continued on p. 89.)

<sup>1</sup> νεύσονται

<sup>2</sup> p. ix.

<sup>3</sup> M. Chatelain gives a photographic reproduction of the *verso* of the fragment in his 'Uncialis Scriptura Codicum Latinorum novis Exemplis illustrata' (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1901), Tabula V.

## Recto.

a

(Hartel, p. 14, 28-15, 8)  
 ROSINREBUSHUMA  
*n*ISSUBLIMENACMAG  
*n*UMVIDETURIN(T)RASU  
*a*MIACERECONSCIEN  
 5 *ti*AMGLORIATURNIHIL  
*ad*PETEREIAMNIHILDE  
*si*DERAREDESAECULO  
*p*OTESTQUISÆCULOMA  
*io*REST QUAMSTA  
 10 *bi*LISQUAMINCONCUS  
*s*ATUTELAESTQUAMPE  
*r*ENNIBUSBONISCÆ  
*l*ESTEPRAESIDIUMIN  
*p*LICATISMUNDILAQUE  
 15 *i*SSOLVIINLUCEMIM  
 MORTALITATISAETER  
 NAEDETERRENAFÆCE  
*p*URGARIVIDERITQUE  
 INNOSPRIUSINFESTĀ  
 20 *i*SINIMICIPERNICIES  
*i*NSIDIOSAGRASSATA  
*s*ITPLUSAMARECONPEL  
 IIMURQUODFUTURISU  
 MUSDUMETSCIRECON  
 25 *c*EDITURETDAMNARE  
*quo*(DER)AMUS

3 IN(T)RA] The central letter of this word has almost entirely disappeared, but what remains fits in with T better than with F. *Intra* is the reading of SPM $\mu$  and also of W, which is wrongly quoted by Hartel in favour of *infra*.

6 IAM] The first two letters are very badly injured, but the word was certainly IAM, not CUM as Hartel says.

13 IN*p*LICATIS] So MS. There is no sign of a line above A.

18 *Vident* is the reading of S and of W as well as of P, though Hartel has omitted to say so. The reading is also supported by M (*m.* 1) and  $\mu$ .

26 The line has been almost entirely cut away, but the top of D is still visible, and the remaining traces leave no room for doubt that the second word was ERAMUS.

b

(Hartel, p. 15, 8-17)  
 NECADHOCPRÆTIISAUT  
 AMBITUAUTMAN(U)  
 OPUSESTUTHOMIN*is*  
 SUMMAVELDIGNITAS  
 5 VELPOTESTASELABo  
 RATAMOLEPARIAT(U)*r*  
 ETGRATUITUMDEDE(Ö)  
 MUNUSETFACILEEST  
 SPONTESOLRADIATDIES  
 10 LUMINATFONSRI*gat*  
 IMBERINRORATITa  
 SES*p*SCAELESTISIN*fun*  
 DITPOSTQUAMAUCTo  
 REMSUUMCÆLUMIN  
 15 TUENSANIMAC*Ogno*  
 VITSOLEALTIORE*Thac*  
 OMNITERRENA*potes*  
 TATESUBLIM*iorides*  
 SEINCI*Pitquodesse*  
 20 SECREDI*t*  
 TUTANTUM*quemiam*  
 SPIRITALI*buscastris*  
 CÆLESTISM*ilitia*  
 SIGNAVITTENEI(N)*cor*  
 25 RUPTAMTENES(OB)*riam*  
 RELIGIOSISVIRTUTI*bus*  
 (*disciplinam*)

7 DE(Ö)] The horizontal line is quite distinct, so is the preceding E. DEÖ occurs again on the *verso*, col. a, line 3.

8 It is practically certain that *ut* is never in the text of this MS at the conclusion of the line. The word is also wanting in the Lambeth MS.

27 *disciplinam*] If this word was ever in the text there must have been an extra line in this column. The parchment has been cut away immediately below l. 26.

Verso.

a

(Hartel, p. 15, 17-25)

SITTIBIVELORATIOAD  
SIDUAVELLECTIONUNC

- cum*DEŌLOQUERENUNC  
DŠ(T)ECUM·ILLETEPRAE  
5 *ce*(PT)ISSUISINSTRUAT·  
ILLEDISPONAT·QUEMILLE  
DIVITEMFECERITNEMO  
PAUPEREMFACIET·PENU  
RIANULLAESSEIAMPO  
10 *te*RITCUMSEMELPEC  
*tu*CAELESTISSAGINA  
*sa*(TU)RAUIT  
*iam*tibiAURODISTINC  
talaqueARIAETPRAE  
15 *tiosimar*MORISCRIS  
*tis*uest(ITA)DOMICILIA  
*sor*debunt*cu*MSCI  
*eriste*(esse)*exc*OLEN  
*dum*magisTEPOTIUS  
20 *ornandum*DOMUM  
*tibi*hancE~~SSE~~POTIORE  
*quam*dñsinSEditTE  
*plu*viceINQUOSPSSNCT  
(*us*)*coe*PITHABITARE  
25 *pi*NGAMUSHANCDOMŪ  
*pi*GMENTISINNOCEN

10 CUM . . . SA(TU)RAUIT] This is the reading of SPWM $\mu$ . The editors are divided between *cum* . . . *saturaverit* (Rembolt, Erasmus, Manutius, Morellius, Pamelius, Hartel) and *cui* . . . *saturavit* (Rigaltius, Fell, Baluze). Krabinger, however, follows the ancient MSS in reading *cum* . . . *saturavit*.

15 CRISTIS] So MS. Cf. 'cristae sunt montium' in *De Spectaculis*, cap. 9 (Hartel, App., p. 12, l. 4).

18 (esse)] This word is not found in SWM $\mu$ , but P has it, though Hartel does not record the reading. Fell quotes *Voss*. 2 and *Lin.* in its favour. It was admitted into the text by Rembolt, Erasmus, and Morellius, and was probably in this MS, as the line would otherwise be unduly short.

23 QUO] So MS.

b

(Hartel, p. 15, 25-p. 16, 6)

TIAELUMINEMUSL(U)*ce*  
IUSTITIAENONHÆCUMq-  
(*uam*)

- P(ROC)UMBETINLAPSum  
SENIOVETUSTATIS*Nec*  
5 PIGMENTOPARIETIS(*aut*)  
AUROEXOLESCENTEF*oe*  
DABITU(R)CADUCASUnT  
QUÆCUMQ·FUCATASunT  
NECFIDUCIAMPRÆ*Bent*  
10 POSSIDENTIBUS*Tabi*  
LEMQUAEPOSSESSIONis  
NONHABENTVERIT(A)*tem*  
HOCMANETCULTUIUGiter  
VIVIDOHONOREIN(TE)  
15 GROSPLENDOREDIIUTur  
NOABOLERINONPOTEst  
NEEXTINGUIPOTEST  
TANTUMINMELIUSCOR  
POREREDUNTEFORM*Mari*  
20 HAECINTERIMBREVibus  
DONATECARISSIME  
NAMETFACILEMBONi  
TATEM·PATIENTIAM  
MENTEM·INDMSOLI(D)*am*  
25 FIDEMTUAMSALU*ta*  
RISAUDITUSOBL(E)*ctat*

5 *Aut* is omitted in the Lambeth MS, but was probably in this MS.

12 HABENT] So P and W, though here again Hartel has overlooked the reading. *Habent* is also the reading of M $\mu$ , and, I believe, of all the editions except that of Hartel.

24 DM] So WM $\mu$  and the Lambeth MS, and the editions of Erasmus, Morellius, Manutius, and Pamelius. P and the ed. of Rembolt have *dm*. Rigaltius, Fell, and Baluze read simply *mentem solidam*.

25 TUAM] So P.

Similarly the initial letters of the lines in the first column of the *recto*, and the concluding letters of the lines in the second column of the *verso* are, for the most part, lost to us owing to the manner in which the leaf has been bound into the Codex. Furthermore, the bottom of the leaf has been cut off, causing the loss of the last line of both columns on the *recto*, and of the second column on the *verso*. Nevertheless in spite of these and other injuries, it is possible, by making the most of what remains, to obtain a fairly exact notion of the original text. The writing on the *recto* appears to have been freshened up by retracing, but there is no indication of any departure from the original impressions. The *verso* has not been dealt with in this way. The leaf now measures 21.6 × 16.5 cmm.

As the representation of the fragment on pp. 87–88 is drawn up for critical as distinct from antiquarian ends, letters which are imperfect in the MS are printed without qualification if the traces that remain, however slight, place the identity of the letter beyond doubt. Letters which are in any degree doubtful, or which can only be certainly determined by inference, are enclosed in brackets. Letters of which no trace remains in the MS are printed in small italic type. When there is some *positive reason* for questioning the correctness of letters thus supplied, they are enclosed in brackets.

The readings quoted in the notes from S (Codex Seguerianus), P (Codex Parisinus 1647 A), W (Codex theol. Wirceburgensis 145), M (Codex Monacensis lat. 208),  $\mu$  (Codex Monacensis lat. 18203), and the Lambeth MS are based upon my own examination of those MSS.

H. L. RAMSAY.

## THE GENUINE PROLOGUE TO AMBROSIASTER ON SECOND CORINTHIANS.

EVEN from the critical notes of the Benedictine editors one can see that the manuscript tradition of the Ambrosiaster commentaries is confused to a greater extent than usual at two points. These are, first, the end of the commentary on Romans and the beginning of that on First Corinthians, and, second, the end of the commentary on First Corinthians and the beginning of that on Second Corinthians.

Thus the following colourless production poses in the printed editions as the prologue to the commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians:—

‘Secundam epistulam apostolus scribit Corinthiis, cuius haec principalis est causa: quoniam in prima pro quorundam peccatis doctores