

OUR OLDEST MSS OF ST. CYPRIAN, III:
THE CONTENTS AND ORDER OF THE
MANUSCRIPTS L N P.

It is commonly recognised that the three closely-related MSS of St. Cyprian, Cod. Vindob. 962 (= L), Cod. Casinensis 204 (= N), and Cod. Parisinus lat. 1647 A (= P), represent a very excellent—on the whole, the best—textual tradition. Dr. Hartel gives them the first place among the MSS of the Epistles, and there is good ground for believing that they are still more important for the *Testimonia*.

During the past few months I have made a fresh collation of these MSS, and it is my hope that the way may thus be prepared for a more exact appreciation of them than has hitherto been possible. The present Note will be limited to a comparison of their contents and order.

1. Cod. Vindob. 962 (saec. ix) consists of 139 folios, numbered 138, the first leaf not being numbered. On the *verso* of this leaf there is a table of contents with the rubricated heading CAECILII CYPRIANI EPISTVLAE. N. XLII. As this list appears to be in the hand of the scribe who wrote the early part of the MS, it may well have been copied from the archetype. In the upper margin of the same page a later hand has written *Codex ecclē Laurissensis*. In the ancient catalogue of the Lorsch manuscripts¹ two Cyprianic MSS are mentioned. The first of these contained the treatises which in Hartel's edition bear the numbers 1, IV, VI, V, XII, XIII, VII, VIII, X, XI, IX and Ep. 58. Unfortunately this MS is no longer forthcoming, nor indeed has any MS yet been found in which the treatises are given in precisely this order. On the other hand there can be no doubt that the entry which follows next in the catalogue—*Item Caecilii Cypriani epistolae numero xliii in alio codice*—relates to the codex (L) which is now in our hands, and is based upon the heading to the table of contents in the MS². It is true that the number given in the catalogue differs by a unit from that found in the table of contents, but the discrepancy is not such as to suggest any doubt as to the identity of L with the MS noticed in the catalogue.

¹ This catalogue was first printed by Mai in the *Spicilegium Romanum*, tom. v, pp. 161–200. In G. Becker's reprint (in *Catalogi Bibliothecarum antiqui*, Bonn, 1885, pp. 82–119) the Cyprianic MSS are numbered 351 and 352.

² Students of St. Cyprian, to whom Codex L is so important, will be surprised to find that Dr. Franz Falk has not included it in the list of existing Lorsch MSS given in his *Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion der alten Bibliotheca fuldensis und Bibliotheca laureshamensis* (Leipzig, 1902). Falk's Essay, which is otherwise of great value, forms No. XXVI of the *Beihefte zum Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*.

In view of the possibility that the numeration of the documents in the table of contents may rest upon an ancient tradition and may help to illustrate or to explain the nomenclature of other early lists, I will explain how the table is related to the contents of the MS. In the table there are forty-two distinct entries, and in the MS there are forty-nine distinct documents. In this latter computation I follow the list in counting the three Books *Ad Quirinum* as one document, and the two parts of Ep. 69 as *two*. The difference between the number of entries in the table and the number of documents in the MS is accounted for as follows:— (a) Ep. 6 is not recorded in the Table; (b) the two Epp. 28 and 37 are covered by the single entry *Mosy & Maximo presbytero & ceteris confessores quibus supra*, whereas it appears from the text of the MS that *quibus supra* should be a separate entry for Ep. 37; (c) Epp. 73, 71, 70 are represented by the single entry *Ad Iuuaianum de hereticis baptizandis epistulas numero .iii.*; (d) Epp. 47, 45, 48, 44 are entered as *Ad Cornelium estulas (sic) numero .iiii.*

The text of L is written in long lines, and there can be no doubt that several hands have been engaged upon it. The point at which the work of the first scribe ends is so clearly marked that the MS may almost be said to 'consist of two parts,' the first of which comprises foll. 1–65¹. After the conclusion of Ep. 76 (fol. 65 *b*) more than half a page is left blank. Ep. 73 begins on the next folio (66) in a decidedly different hand, but the new hand, by way of making some use of the blank space on fol. 65 *b*, has filled a part of it with the interesting 'Incipit,' *INCIPIIT AD IUVAIANVM DE HERETICIS BAPTIZANDIS EPISTVLAS NVMERO TRES*, written in abnormally large capitals. The writing in the second part of the MS is much less regular and consistent than that of foll. 1–65, being in fact due to several different scribes. In any case the writing of the entire MS belongs to one period, and altogether the volume has the appearance of being a (practically) continuous copy of a single archetype. If the grouping of the three Epistles 73, 71, and 70 as Epistles 'ad Iuuaianum,' occurring as it does at the precise point at which the second scribe begins his work, should raise a suspicion to the contrary, we are reassured by the testimony of the table of contents, which (as I have said) seems to have been written by the first scribe.

A word must be said with regard to an interesting feature of this MS, which is described by Hartel² in a manner that leaves the way open to misunderstanding. It is impossible to turn over the pages of the MS without being struck by the constant recurrence of the sign (·) in the outer margin. On closer inspection it is found that whenever the sign

¹ With the exception of the last half of fol. 18 *b*, which is not by the same hand.

² *Introd.* p. xxxii.

(:·) occurs in the margin, a corresponding sign (··) occurs over some word in the parallel line of the text. Now the words so marked are mostly those for which variants may be found in other types of text, and Hartel's *apparatus* generally enables us to identify the types of text to which the annotator had access for each document. To call attention to the fact that L omits words which should be in the text or which are found elsewhere, the mark above the line in the text is placed between the two words which should be divorced by an insertion, and in the margin, instead of the three dots (:·), we find (ð) or (d) which obviously stands for *deest*. We cannot be wrong in regarding these marks as the work of some post-mediaeval scholar who had access to a considerable range of critical material, and it is even conceivable that further study might lead to the identification of their author¹, but whatever interest or value these marks may have is entirely distinct from the evidential value of the MS itself. All these marks are in red, and are therefore easily distinguished from the ancient text and the ancient corrections². A few cases in which the text has been corrected in red are probably due to an occasional failure in self-restraint on the part of the critic who has marked the MS. Whether the systematic notification of the Books (and Chapters) from which the Scripture quotations are taken is due to the same hand we have no means of knowing. These Scripture references are written in black ink, sometimes above the line in the text, and sometimes in the margin.

2. Cod. Parisinus lat. 1647 (saec. ix) has been used from the early days of Cypriatic criticism by French editors, and its readings occupy a prominent place in Fell's *apparatus* as those of the 'Codex Thuani.' The MS consists of 262 folios, written in double columns, but the original (or Cypriatic) text breaks off at the end of fol. 260 *a* in the middle of a sentence of the *de Laude Martyrii* (Hartel, App. 45, 13). Foll. 86-93 are a later insertion (saec. x-xi) introduced into the MS to fill up a *lacuna* in the original text. With the exception of these leaves the entire MS appears to have been written by two contemporaneous scribes who worked alternately, and there is nothing *in its external form* to suggest that its contents are derived from more than one immediate archetype.

3. Codex Casinensis 204 (saec. x-xi) consists of 174 folios. The Cypriatic documents (foll. 1-168) are written in Lombardic characters.

¹ The following documents are not marked:—Epp. 6, 11, 39, 76, 70, 69 *b*, *de Laude Martyrii*, Ep. 48, *Quod idola*. In Test. ii the marks are intermittent, and in Test. iii only eight places are marked. The latter part of the *Sententiae Episcoporum* has also escaped the critic's attention.

² In the second part of the MS (foll. 66-138) there is no ancient rubrication. In the first part the rubrication is confined to the numbers of the chapters in the *Testimonia* and to a few of the headings.

Foll. 169-174 contain the Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas in a later (post-Lombardic) hand. It was this MS that furnished the text of the *editio princeps* of these Acts¹.

Before proceeding to a comparison of the contents of the three MSS I must call attention to several inaccuracies in Hartel's account of the contents of N². In his list he makes no mention of the first copy of *Oratio* ii (= App. xi), though he uses it for his edition³. Moreover Ep. 32 is not omitted in this MS, nor is Ep. 49 contained in it. Lastly, if Hartel had himself made the collation of N, he would not have failed to notice that foll. 149-152 are an extraneous fragment injected into N after its completion. These leaves are obviously in a different hand, and are copied from a different original, for the section commences imperfectly with the latter part of Ep. 70, and presents a different text of it from that which is given earlier in the MS (fol. 93 sqq.)⁴. Moreover it is still possible, in spite of erasure, to discern at the bottom of fol. 148 *b* the rubricated 'Incipit' of Ep. 51. That Epistle commences on fol. 153 *a*, which, if it were not for the interpolated section, would be the next page of the MS. Thus for purposes of comparison with L and P the injected leaves, containing the latter part of Ep. 70 (not 71 as Hartel conjectures) and the whole of Epp. 7, 5 and 14, may be neglected.

These errors, which have been reproduced by other writers, are sufficiently serious to obscure the true relations of these MSS to each other and to their common archetype. The lists given by Hartel for L and P need no correction, but since the fact that he does not use L for the second part of Ep. 69 might lead others, as it had led me, to suppose that the MS does not contain that document⁵, it may be well expressly to state that both parts of the Epistle are found in L, the second part being introduced, as in P, with a separate 'Incipit.'

¹ *Passio sanctarum Martyrum Perpetuae et Felicitatis. Prodit nunc primum e MS. Codice Sacri Casinensis Monasterii, opera et studio Lucae Holstenii, 1663.*

² Introduction, pp. xxx-xxxiv.

³ The two copies of *Oratio* ii differ from each other very considerably; the one which occurs at the beginning is far superior to the other, and should have been designated by the principal sign N, the other sign *n* being reserved for the copy given on foll. 167, 168 which appears to have been thrust into the MS by way of afterthought, to fill up a spare folio.

⁴ The injected Epistles are further distinguished from the others by an entire absence of rubrication. Spaces have been left for the 'Incipits' and 'Explicits,' but they were never filled in: the text intended is, however, written vertically in the outer margins, and though partly cut away may still be deciphered. The 'Incipit' which appears in Hartel's *apparatus* to Ep. 7 as that of N *m. 2*, is taken from the Erasmian edition, and is in the writing of 'Jo. Maria Genučsis,' who filled in the beginning of the *ad Fortunatum* (fol. 5 *a*) avowedly from the same source.

⁵ In no other case does Hartel fail to use L for a document contained in it.

from which the scribe of N copied the common series. For it is certain, from the interdependence of the quires, that when the scribe of N commenced work upon the *Testimonia*, which is the first document in the common series, he must have had the earlier sections of N before him as we see them now. Now since Ep. 10 is the first document in the MS it was only natural that when the scribe came to that Epistle in the common series he should pass it over, knowing that the Epistle had already been entered in his MS, though probably by another hand and certainly from a different archetype. (b) The *Quod idola* and Ep. 66 come at the end of the common series in N—*i. e.* after Ep. 30—instead of immediately succeeding Ep. 59. If no obvious theory suggests itself to account for the displacement¹ in N, a comparison of the readings of L N P leaves little room for doubt that for the text of these documents the three MSS derive from a common source.

At first sight P seems to deviate very considerably from the order of L and N, but on closer examination it will be found that the differences are by no means serious. The omission of Epp. 10, 37 and 38 from the series is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that these Epistles were already in the MS before the common source was drawn upon. The reversal of the order in respect of 11 66 (this MS having 66 11) need cause no uneasiness in view of the fact that in these documents the text of P is certainly related to that of L and N. Only two important differences remain, *viz.* the insertion of Ep. 58 (which is not contained in L N) after Ep. 39, and the relegation of the *de Laude Martyrii* to a later place (after Ep. 40) than that which it occupies in L N. The displacement of the *de Laude Martyrii* in this MS is exactly parallel to that of 11 66 in N. That it *is* a displacement is shown by the united witness of L N; that P rests upon the common tradition for this Book is plain from a comparison of the readings. With regard to Ep. 58, the adverse witness of L N is sufficient to assure us that, whatever may be the source from which the text of P is derived, the Epistle is certainly a foreign intrusion where P gives it.

On the whole a comparison of L N P suggests the following conclusions:—(a) that there is nothing in L which is not derived from the common archetype of the group; (b) that in L the order of the common archetype is perfectly preserved; (c) that *in respect of the common series* (from 111 to Ep. 30) the *immediate* archetypes of N and P² probably differed

¹ That it *is* a displacement is proved by the fact that P agrees with L in giving the two documents at the same point in the series.

² It is quite possible, however, that the union of the two sets of documents found in P may have been already effected in the immediate archetype of that MS, or even higher up the stream. In that case what is said in the text, here and elsewhere, concerning the composition of P, would hold good of the MS in which the union was first effected.

very little, if at all, from L and from the *common* archetype, in contents and order. Concerning this last point we have no positive evidence for P beyond Ep. 40: but the abrupt termination of the (Cyprianic) text in the middle of a Treatise—in the middle of a sentence—and precisely at the end of a page of the MS, gives the impression that the scribe ceased from work, not because there was nothing more for him to copy, but because, in some way or other, his work was interrupted.

(2) So far we have been at pains to show that presumably the entire series of documents contained in L represent a single tradition: we have next to consider whether any of the documents contained in N and P, but not in L, may be traced to that same line of tradition. At the outset it should be remarked that the agreement between N and P in order and text is strictly limited to the documents which form the series common to them and to L. The total failure of any vestige of special affinity between N and P beyond the range of that series is all the more significant when contrasted with the abundant signs of relationship which exist within its limits. Moreover it will not be forgotten that there once existed in the Library of Lorsch a companion volume to our Cod. L. That volume, as we have seen, contained the Treatises in an order which is recorded in the ancient catalogue. Presumably, therefore, if we would hope to find a text of the Treatises which has been perpetuated by the same line of tradition as that which has furnished us with the 'LNP' text of the Testimonia and Epistles, we must search for a MS which gives the Treatises in the order indicated by the Lorsch Catalogue. However, it is right that we should examine the claims of the additional documents found in N and P.

In P the common series is preceded by a group of fourteen documents (I, X, IX, 37, 38, 10, V, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, IV, VI), which is also found in cod. Paris. lat. 17350 (saec. xii), cod. Paris. lat. 1657¹ (saec. xii-xiii), Brit. Mus. Addit. 21,077² (saec. xv), and in the Siena MS. F. V. 14³ (saec. xiv-xv). It is quite possible—even likely—that this group perpetuates the tradition of an ancient archetype, for the text of P in the Treatises is, on the whole very good, but that the group cannot be the counterpart of the series common to LNP is shown by the fact that the junction of the two sets of documents in P has necessitated the mutilation of the second set by the omission of Epp. 10, 37, 38.

¹ In this MS the series is not complete, but the table of contents shows that all the documents were contained in the archetype.

² This is the 'Codex Drurianus' which was used by Dr. Routh for his edition of some of the Treatises in the *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula*.

³ The contents of this MS are enumerated by Mr. C. H. Turner, in *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii, p. 325. The order is for the most part identical with that of Brit. Mus. Addit. 21,077.

Ep. 58 follows Ep. 39 in the Siena MS and in Brit. Mus. Addit. 21,077: it is natural, therefore, to suppose that P has derived the text of the Epistle from the MS which furnished the text of the Treatises.

In N the common series is preceded by Ep. 10, App. XI (*Oratio ii*), and the *ad Fortunatum*; it is followed by the *Caena* and by a second version of App. XI. (a) Ep. 10 is introduced with the extraordinary, and as it would seem the unique, title INCIPIT EPLA CIPRIANI AD SILVANVM ET REGIANVM MARTYRES IN METALLO CONSTITVTOS. The text of the Epistle is also peculiar and certainly has no affinity whatever with that given in L, which may safely be taken as the standard of the common series for this document. (b) If we may regard L as continuous with the MS of the treatises mentioned in the Lorsch Catalogue, the *ad Fortunatum* would be separated from the *Testimonia* only by Ep. 58, and since there is in N no objective contrast between the *ad Fortunatum* and the *Testimonia*, we might have hoped to find in N a text of the *ad Fortunatum* related to that of the lost MS. But a detailed examination of the text of N would lead us to connect it rather with the tradition represented by R. In any case we do not find in the *ad Fortunatum* as given in N the readings which are peculiar to L N P in the *Testimonia*. (c) If the two documents 10 and IX are to be denied to the tradition of the common series, it is probable that the first version of *Oratio ii* which occupies a position between them should be dismissed in their company. (d) The second version of *Oratio ii* which concludes the collection is in a different and probably later hand. It has obviously been forcibly crushed into what was once the last page of the MS in order to fill a vacant space. (e) On the other hand the *Caena* may possibly have been written continuously with the documents which precede it, but I take it that this highly interesting but grotesque work cannot be of sufficient antiquity to merit serious consideration in connexion with the ancient line of tradition that we are investigating.

To sum up. It would appear, from a general examination and comparison of the three MSS, that their agreements and their differences are best explained on the supposition (i) that in respect of contents, order, and arrangement, the Lorsch collection of Cyprianic documents in two volumes must be taken as the adequate standard of the tradition to which L N P owe their common element; (ii) that N P derive nothing from that line of tradition but what is proper to the second part of the collection, i. e. what is actually contained in L.

(3) It only remains to determine the *character* of the relationship existing between L N P. If these MSS in their order and their text betray unmistakable signs of special relationship, they witness no less clearly to the fact that their relationship is collateral and not that of direct descent. A glance at the *apparatus criticus* is sufficient to show

that the textual differences between the three MSS are as striking as their coincidences. Here I can call attention only to some of the more obvious differences. In the *Testimonia* N is the only MS of the group which retains the Greek numerals for the chapters¹, while in P only do we find the form *cata lucanum*² instead of *cata lucan* or *cata lucam*. L is characterised by the grouping of Epp. 73, 71, 70 as Epistles 'ad Iuuaiianum,' N by the unification of the two parts of Ep. 69. In some of these cases we cannot be sure that the differences noticeable in the three MSS existed also in their immediate archetypes. Far more significant, therefore, are the *lacunae* which occur in our MSS.

In L there is a curious displacement whereby a part of Ep. 60 has found its way into the middle of Ep. 76.

In P the scribe passes from 482. 10 *anima et cor*. to 636. 8 *sacrificatis*, thus omitting the latter part of Ep. 6 and the first half of Ep. 55³: he also omits several pages of the *de Laude Martyrii* (App. 26. 10 *ingenii* . . . : 30. 6 *suppeditat*).

In N there is a *lacuna* in Ep. 55 which deprives us of the long passage 628. 12 *non tantum* . . . 639. 3 *ruperunt ut*.

There can be little doubt that these defects are reproductions of corresponding defects in the respective archetypes of the three MSS—defects of which the copyists were not conscious. Certain irregularities in the text of the *Testimonia* as given in N tell a different tale. In that MS three several portions of the text (corresponding to 81. 11–93. 8; 105. 18–127. 22; 174. 2–175. 22 in Hartel's edition) are in a different hand from the rest of the Treatise; they are also differentiated by an absence of rubrication and by a disuse of the Greek numerals⁴. It further appears, on examination of the MS, that these portions of the text must have been inserted in spaces left blank by the original scribe. Thus in the third passage the later scribe has obviously spread out his concluding lines in order to make them reach to the continuation of the text which had been already written. Similarly at the end of the second insertion there is a blank space of six lines between the concluding words of the second hand and the continuation by the original hand. In the case of the first insertion the junction between the new and the old has been more successfully effected, but here also there are sufficient indications that the passage is subsequent to the rest of the text. Hence it follows (a) that the MS from which the first scribe of N copied the *Testimonia* must have had three *lacunae*—two of them of considerable

¹ In N the use of the Greek numerals commences with Book ii.

² P has this form consistently.

³ The *lacuna* on fol. 85 b of P whereby the scribe passes from the middle of *de Zelo* to the middle of *de Habitu Virginum* belongs to a different line of tradition.

⁴ In N the rubrication begins with Test. ii 3. From Test ii 7 to the end of the third Book, it is regularly employed except in the interpolated passages.

extent; (*b*) that the first scribe of N was not only aware of the defects of his archetype, but must also have had the means of calculating how much of the text was missing¹.

The existence of these defects in the three MSS—each MS possessing its own unshared by the others—seems to place the relative independence of L N P beyond question; and since the defects evidently come to our MSS by inheritance, perhaps it is not altogether unjustifiable to infer that the MSS in whose mutilation the defects originated were probably already ancient at the time when the copies were made from them². In that case it is obvious that the *common* archetype of L N P must have been of very early date, and the recovery of its text would be a matter of corresponding importance.

I make no attempt to arrange L N P in 'order of merit.' Such comparisons are more often misleading than useful, and in the present case our chief concern should be to secure a recognition of the fact that for the reconstruction of the common archetype the three MSS must be regarded as so many independent and therefore indispensable witnesses.

H. L. RAMSAY.

ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑ—ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΝ.

A MS note by F. J. A. H. Passages in [] added by J. O. F. M.

Philo is fond of the words *εὐχαριστία*, *εὐχαριστεῖν* (*εὐχαριστικὸς ὕμνος*, &c.): but see especially *de victimis* §§ 1–9. He evidently uses them in place of the LXX [περὶ] *αἰνέσεως*, *θυσία αἰνέσεως* (cf. § 9 ἡ λεγομένη τῆς αἰνέσεως), and speaks of *εὐχαριστία* as including 'hymns, eudaemonisms, prayers, sacrifices, &c.' (§ 9 ὕμνοις τε καὶ εὐδαιμονισμοῖς τε καὶ εὐχαῖς θυσίαις τε καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις εὐχαριστίας εὐαγῶς ἀμείβεσθαι, ἃ δὴ πάντ' ἀθρόα συλλήβδην ἐν ὄνομα τὸ αἰνέσεως ἔλαχε). In § 3 he speaks of the morning and evening oblation as *ὑπὲρ εὐχαριστίας*, and the victims themselves (*τὰ μὲν ἔναυμα* as distinguished from the incense) as *εὐχαριστίαν*. Cf. also § 4 *Εἰ γὰρ βούλοιτό τις ἐξετάζειν ἀκριβῶς τὰς αἰτίας ὧν ἕνεκα τοῖς πρώτοις ἔδουεν ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ τὰς διὰ θυσιῶν εὐχαριστίας ὁμοῦ καὶ λιτὰς ἐλθεῖν, εὐρήσει δύο τὰς ἀνωτάτω. [The references to the subjects to be included in the thanksgiving according to § 6 are interesting. If the subject is *περὶ γενέσεως κόσμου*, the thanksgiving is to go into detail, taking note of the heaven with sun, moon and stars, the earth with its living creatures and plants, the seas and rivers, the air and the various seasons—quite in the spirit of the*

¹ For critical purposes these insertions must be clearly distinguished from the rest of the text. The type of text contained in them is very similar to that of the Codex Bambergensis (B).

² This remark applies with special force to the ancestor of N.