

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Religion

For centuries, scripture and theology were the focus of prodigious amounts of scholarship and publishing, dominated in the English-speaking world by the work of Protestant Christians. Enlightenment philosophy and science, anthropology, ethnology and the colonial experience all brought new perspectives, lively debates and heated controversies to the study of religion and its role in the world, many of which continue to this day. This series explores the editing and interpretation of religious texts, the history of religious ideas and institutions, and not least the encounter between religion and science.

Fragments of Philo Judaeus

The scholar and philosopher Philo Judaeus, born around 25 BCE in Alexandria, blended his knowledge of Jewish law and scripture with his command of Greek philosophy in his influential works, ensuring that he became a subject of intellectual enquiry in his own right. However, James Rendel Harris (1852–1941), a biblical scholar, palaeographer and Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, thought Philo too 'slenderly prized' in Britain. Harris intended this collection, published in 1886, to bring together surviving fragments of Philo's work. In a detailed introduction, he explains the complicated tasks involved in identifying and classifying these ancient texts, and also points out that this volume is intended to provide a basis for future research on Philo. The fragments are presented in their original Greek, most of them accompanied by a Latin translation. Harris provides notes throughout, and the book continues to offer a valuable resource for biblical and philosophical scholarship.

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection brings back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03967-3 - Fragments of Philo Judaeus
Edited by J. Rendel Harris
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Fragments of Philo Judaeus

EDITED BY J. RENDEL HARRIS



Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03967-3 - Fragments of Philo Judaeus
Edited by J. Rendel Harris
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108039673

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2012

This edition first published 1886
This digitally printed version 2012

ISBN 978-1-108-03967-3 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03967-3 - Fragments of Philo Judaeus
Edited by J. Rendel Harris
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

FRAGMENTS
OF
PHILO JUDÆUS.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03967-3 - Fragments of Philo Judaeus
Edited by J. Rendel Harris
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

London: C. J. CLAY & SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.



Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

FRAGMENTS
OF
PHILO JUDÆUS

NEWLY EDITED BY

J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.

FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LANGUAGES IN HAVERFORD COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

WITH TWO FACSIMILES.

EDITED FOR THE SYNDICS OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CAMBRIDGE:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

1886

[*All Rights reserved.*]

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03967-3 - Fragments of Philo Judaeus
Edited by J. Rendel Harris
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE.

THIS little book may perhaps be described most succinctly as scaffolding for the next edition of Philo. It has often been a regret to me that, especially in England, this great writer has been so slenderly prized, and I well remember the indignation with which I first read the sentences in Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* in which he is described as "only a thoughtful, not insincere, but half-heathenized believer in the Revelation of Sinai, groping in a twilight which he has made darker by his Hellenic tastes." Nor was the feeling diminished when one found that in depreciating so great a writer the theologian too often had as companions the philosopher and the historian, and that no one has in recent times arisen to illustrate towards the indifferent or superficial student the Philonean maxim that the wise man is the ransom of the foolish. Perhaps we may yet find that we have carried bricks for some such master-builder.

With regard to the book itself, it will be noticed that it is published at the expense of the Syndics of the University Press and with the excellence of mechanical workmanship which characterises that famous establishment. But for the assistance thus

rendered it is doubtful whether the book would ever have seen the light.

Its dimensions have been carefully limited by avoiding the useless insertion of various readings in the texts employed which promised faithfully to lead nowhere, and by the removal of some matters which would have been interesting if they could have been compressed within a reasonable space. For example, my first intention was to combine the fragments of Josephus with my Philo Collection, and I had also done some work upon the problem (not wholly an unimportant one) of the genealogical relations of the various MSS. and Collections of Parallels. Upon second thoughts all of this has been removed.

Finally, whatever of excellence or accuracy is to be found in the following pages is largely due to the co-operative criticism of friends whose sympathy and encouragement I highly prize, though I have been ashamed to carve their scholarly names upon so slight a sapling.

J. R. H.

CLARE COLLEGE,
June, 1886.

INTRODUCTION.

ON COD. REG. 923 OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY AT PARIS.

THE manuscript described in the following pages drew my attention in the summer of 1884 when I was occupied in the examination of some of the treasures of the National Library at Paris. It was exposed to view in one of the upright cases (armoire XVII.) of the Galerie Mazarine, adjacent, if I remember rightly, to the celebrated Codex Ephraemi Syri, the Codex Claromontanus of S. Paul and the Coislin Octateuch. The ticket attached to it intimated that it was a volume of "Sentences des Saints Pères." As the book was in uncial Greek characters of the ninth century, and adorned with interesting marginal pictures, and was apparently unpublished, I determined to examine it carefully. The first impression upon my mind was that this was the Codex Rupefucaldinus of the Parallela Sacra of S. John Damascene, a manuscript of which Tischendorf had given a notice in the preface to the eighth edition of his New Testament, citing it under the form Dam. ^{par. cod.} If this were the case the manuscript would have been interesting not only on account of its rich collection of biblical and patristic excerpts, but as being of such antiquity that, as Scrivener remarks in his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (p. 420), it could be referred to the same century as the father whose work it contains. An examination however of the text of S. John Damascene's Parallels, as edited by Lequien, shewed that this supposition could not be verified¹. Lequien's text (which has been reproduced in Migne *Patrologia Græca* xcv. xcvi.) is based upon a MS. in the Vatican Library, to which he has appended a few readings and foot-notes from the Codex Rupefucaldinus. Finding the diversity between these two texts to be remarkable, he reprinted a portion of the additional Patristic matter of the latter MS. under the title Parallela Rupefucaldina. What was interesting

¹ It will be shewn later on that it must, however, be the MS. of which Tischendorf speaks, though he has confounded it with the

Cod. Rup. which is a totally different book. Scrivener's note must also be corrected, as far as relates to that Codex.

the MS. in the examination of Lequien's text by the side of the Paris manuscript which formed the basis of Lequien's text. I determined therefore to read the MS. through with the printed text, and especially to note any additional matter that might be found in it.

Such MSS. often contain valuable extracts from lost or important texts, and especially to note any additional matter that might be found in it. Some of the results of this collation, especially as regards the text of Philo, are contained in the following pages. An exact edition of S. John Damascene's Parallels is however not a matter of such request as to make it worth while to print variants collected from nearly 800 pages of uncial Greek; still it seems to me that although the general interest in Patristic texts is but slight in the present century, the extracts which the volume contains of sub-apostolic writings and a few of the biblical variants might be acceptable to those who are engaged in editing the Septuagint, the New Testament, and the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

It is proper to state that Lequien seems to have been perfectly aware of the existence of other copies, since he notes in the preface "In Bibliotheca etiam Medicea perinde exstat Parallelorum codex ordine alphabetico digestus, Vaticano non in totum absimilis; sed in quo Patrum sententiæ media parte truncate, non integræ nec ad longum referuntur. Adduntur insuper hinc inde e scriptoribus profanis symbolæ, contra quam sibi Ioannes Damascenus proposuerat¹." This MS. is fully described and the most important conclusions deduced from it with regard to early gnomologies in Curt Wachsmuth's *Griechische Florilegien*.

Lequien also notes that readings from a MS. of Parallels preserved at Venice were communicated to him by Banduri, and that this MS. was older than his own Vatican copy. This MS. must be the one described by Montfaucon in his Italian Diary (p. 36 Eng. Trans.). "We spent the afternoon in viewing the Grecian Archbishop of Philadelphia's MSS. I took notice among his MSS. . . . a vellum book of an excellent character and the eleventh century, St John Damascene's Parallels and other pieces of his." I suppose this copy now to be in the Nanian Library. And there must be many copies of this collection of quotations in the different European libraries, which would repay an examination².

¹ Migne 95, col. 1037.

² E.g. in M. Omont's *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs de Bruxelles*, p. 15:

"32 (11836) S. Joannis Damasceni Sententiæ . . . xiii^e siècle Bombycin, 171 feuillets, 165

sur 112 millim. . . . (Jacobins de St Honoré, de Paris)."

Several other copies will be found described in the following pages.

In the same connexion it should be added that in Cod. Coislin. 20 there are at the beginning two leaves written in sloping uncials of the ninth century which evidently belonged at one time to a Volume of Parallels. My attention was drawn to these by Dr Hort. They seem to have been first noticed by Dr Burgon, who however described them wrongly as fragments of the Septuagint. (His note is 'Bound up with it (Coislin. 20) are some leaves of the LXX. of about the VIIIth century.' *Last Twelve Verses* p. 229 n.)

The question arises here as to what has become of the Codex Rupe-^{The Codex}fucaldinus to which Tischendorf and Lequien refer^{Rupe-}^{fucaldinus}^{is now at}^{Chelten-}^{ham.}. Its name indicates that it once belonged to Cardinal Rochefoucauld; and Lequien affirms that the copy was presented by him to the library of the Jesuit fathers in Paris. It must then have disappeared at the dispersion of that library, which brought many MSS. into English collections; after some labour and enquiry, in which I had the invaluable assistance of the ever-courteous M. Omont of the National Library, I received information that the book had passed into Sir Thomas Phillips' library at Middle-Hill and was now to be found in the possession of his son-in-law, Mr Fenwick of Cheltenham. The number of this MS. in the Phillips Collection is 1450 = Meerman 94; a charge of one pound per diem is made to all persons who collate in this library, and this renders prolonged or careful study impossible for the majority of scholars; one can hardly say that it makes the books accessible to any.

This identification being made, we must remove the confusion which arises from a statement made by Pitra to the effect that the MS. was to be found at Oxford. For this MS. is the Codex Claromontanus from which Halloix edited a long passage from Justin *De Resurrectione* in his life of Justin, and a collection of fragments of Irenæus in his life of that father. Lequien expressly states, p. 730, that Halloix edited these fragments "quæ cum ejusdem S. Martyris operibus edita non sunt, sed seorsim a Petro Halloixio, cum hæc accepisset ex eodem Codice Rupefucaldino"²: while Grabe, on the other hand, *Spicilegium* II. 167, refers the passages to Cod. Claromontanus. It is, therefore, unfortunate that Pitra should speak in *Anal. Sac.* ii. XXI. as if the Codex were at Oxford "Visus est (sc. Cod. Coislin. 276)

¹ There seems to be a general opinion that it is lost: for example, in a recent number of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Oct. 31, 1885, col. 534), Neumann remarks (reviewing Zahn's *Supplementum Clementinum*) "Den wich-

H.

tigsten cod. Rupef. der *Sacr. Parall.* auf dessen Bedeutung de Lagarde mehrfach hingewiesen, hat leider auch Zahn nicht wieder aufspüren können."

² Cf. Halloix. *Script. Eccles. Or.* ii. 299.

b

eadem continere quam Damasceni Parallela ex codice Claromontano, *nunc* Oxoniensi, pervulgata.”

The following is the description given of Cod. Rupef. in the Catal. Cod. MSS. Coll. Claromontani:

“No. 150. Codex membranaceus in fol. majori constans foliis 300, XI circiter seculo exaratus quo continentur S. Ioannis Damasceni Eclogæ seu Parallelorum excerptiones cum earum indice quæ non occurrunt in editione Michaelis le Quien (circa medium hujus codicis octo insunt folia chartacea in quibus manu recenti supplentur quæ in eo desiderabantur).”

The identity of the Claromontane and Rupefucald Parallels is suspected by Lightfoot in his recent edition of the Ignatian Letters, vol. I. p. 210 “Claromontanus, a MS. which seems closely to resemble the Rupefucaldinus.”

So much having been premised with regard to the different copies, a few remarks must be made with regard to the general subject of Parallels.

These “Parallels” are commonly referred to John of Damascus but with little show of reason.

We may I think dismiss the idea from our minds that these collections are due solely to S. John Damascene.

If no other evidence were forthcoming, the extreme unlikeliness of our finding so many early copies (some of which themselves shew traces of being taken from earlier manuscripts) of the work of an eighth century father, would be noted at once. But there is other testimony: Lequien draws attention to the Scholia in the text of the Codex Rup., which fix the date of digestion of the book in the reign of the Emperor Heraclius¹. There is one for instance (ed. Leq. p. 749) which comments on a passage in Ezekiel in the following manner:

Σχόλιον τοῦτο καὶ ἡμῖν ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων συμβέβηκεν ἀμαρτημάτων. Καύχημα γὰρ καὶ δόξασμα παντὸς γένους χριστιανῶν ὁ σωτήριος σταυρὸς καὶ ἡ ζωηφόρος ἀνάστασις ὑπῆρχον ἅτινα διὰ τὸ μεμιαμμένον

Βενετοπράσινον ὄνομα δὲ ἐπεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐβδελύχθημεν ὑπὸ χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγιάσαντος ἡμᾶς τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματι, εἰς χεῖρας μεμιαμμένων παρεδόθησαν καὶ ἐμίανθησαν.

The writer is evidently alluding to the carrying off of the Cross of Helena into Persia by Chosroes, and he writes before the time when the sacred symbol had been recovered by the successful wars of Heraclius (that is, more than a century before the time of John of Damascus); reference is

¹ Hilgenfeld seems to assume that the MS. was actually written at this time: “Cod. Rupefucaldinus vel Claromontanus imperante

Heraclio I. (610—641) conscriptus.” *Ev. sec. Hebraeos*, etc. p. 63.

also made to the blue and green factions which were then disturbing the peace and undermining the stability of the empire (*Βενετοπράσινος*). It is clear, then, that the origin of the *Sacra Parallela* is to be sought at least as far back as the third decade of the seventh century: and if this be so, the most we can infer from the preface attributed to John Damascene in Codd. Vat. and Rup. is that as far as regards the Scriptural or Patristic matter he rearranged or augmented an earlier collection, and any profane quotations may have been absorbed from existing gnomologies. If we may hazard a conjecture we should say that the original matter was arranged alphabetically under different titles, so as to include all proper subjects in an order proceeding from the creation of man to the day of death; the title of the first series of extracts being

A. *περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλάσεως καὶ κατασκευῆς.*

and the last being

Ω. *περὶ ὥρας καὶ ἡμέρας θανάτου κτέ.*

and this must have been altered by John Damascene, something on the principle of Dogberry,

“Write God first: for God forbid but that God should go before such villains”; so that the book begins with the doctrine of the Trinity.

A. *περὶ αἰδίου θεότητος τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος.*

The question then arises as to whether any traces of John Damascene are found in our book.

The margins of the book are filled with medallion portraits of persons of ecclesiastical manner and habit; these are meant to represent the different writers from whom quotations are made; and M. Bordier in his description of the Ornaments of Greek MSS. in the National Library alludes to the portrait of John Damascene as found in the volume. I have not however been able to verify his statement.

M. Bordier's observation runs as follows :

“Pour Moïse, ayant besoin d'un saint personnage investi du caractère sacerdotal, il peint un homme à barbe noire, portant sur la poitrine une étole blanchée ornée de deux croix rouges: pour un homme qui fut une partie de sa vie illustre dans le monde, Jean Damascène, il est en laïque, vêtu d'une toge et la tête ceinte d'un bandeau de perles, &c.”

But whether M. Bordier is right or wrong in this identification, it should

be noticed that there is a single passage in which he is quoted. On f. 146 we find

Ἰω Μουνζούρ ἐκ τοῦ ν' κεφ. Ἐδύνατον εὑρεθῆναι δύο τινα μὴ [δι]αφέροντα ἀλλήλων κατὰ τι.

Now this John Munzur is the celebrated John of Damascus. Cf. Suidas: Ἰωάννης ὁ Δαμασκηὸς ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μανσοῦρ and a number of other references collected by Leo Allatius in the Prolegomena prefixed to Lequien's edition of John of Damascus. The name itself is said by some to be the name of his father and by others to be an insulting cognomen attached to him by the Emperor¹. For a discussion of this point see the Prolegomena referred to. Especial attention should be paid to a quotation from Cedrenus in which he calls him Ἰωάννης μοναχὸς καὶ πρεσβύτερος ὁ χρυσορρόας ὁ τοῦ Μανσοῦρ, for this quotation seems to shew that he is also spoken of as Monk and Presbyter. For this reason one would incline to believe that a connexion exists between John of Damascus and any florilegium bearing the name of John Monachus, John Presbyter or a compound of the two. (The cases in which such a title is added by a later hand are of course more doubtful.)

The same conclusion as to the existence of Collections of Sacred Parallels earlier than John of Damascus is drawn in a somewhat different manner in a note at the beginning of the book by some former possessor or librarian. "Codex membr. litteris uncialibus nono ad minimum sæc. scriptus quo continentur Parallela e variis Scripturæ veterumque Ecclesiæ doctorum locis collectis nempe Ignatii, Clementis Romani et Alexandrini, Dyonisii Alexandrini, Philonis, Josephi, Eusebii, Athanasii, Basilii, Gregorii, Chrysostomi, Nili, Evagrii et Maximi qui cum sæc. vi vixerit sæc. octavi revocandus videtur horumce Parallelorum scriptor, antiquior quippe Joanne Damasceno cui uberiora Parallela vulgandi noster hic auctor materiam præbuit."

A superior limit of time may of course be found in the latest author quoted: but it is doubtful whether Maximus does belong to the period assigned above, and I believe that he is rather regarded by some as a contemporary of John Damascene.

Cod. Reg.
923 quotes
the follow-
ing non-
biblical
authors.

The following is a more extended list of the authors quoted:

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Apostoli Sancti (= Ap. Const.). | Basil. |
| Athanasius. | Cassian (Abbas). |
| Athenodorus (Frater Gregorii). | Chrysostom. |

¹ Cf. Langen, *Johannes von Damaskus*, p. 20.

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Clemens Rom. (= Clem. Hom.). | Isidore Pelus. |
| Clemens Alex. | John Climacus. |
| Cyril. | Josephus. |
| Democritus (Philos.). | Justin. |
| Diadochus. | Marcus Diadochus. |
| Didymus. | Maximus. |
| Dionysius Areop. | Methodius. |
| Dionysius Alex. | Moses (Abbas). |
| Doctrina Petri. | Μουνοζούρ (Ιωάννης). |
| Epiphanius. | Nilus. |
| Ephraim. | Philo Jud. |
| Eusebius. | Pythagoras. |
| Eustathius. | Sancti Senes. |
| Evagrius. | Serapion. |
| Greg. Thaum. | Sextus Rom. (generally given as Sextrus). |
| Greg. Naz. | Synesius. |
| Greg. Nyss. | Theotimus Scythes. |
| Hippolytus. | Theophilus Ant. |
| Hesychius. | Theophilus Episc. |
| Ignatius. | |
| Irenæus. | |

We shall probably be safe in regarding John of Damascus as the latest of the writers referred to: only one passage has been inserted from his writings and that of a very trivial character. There is no necessity, however, on account of this quotation, to regard the MS. as a collection of Damascene Parallels.

We shall see presently that an important collection of Parallels in the Vatican Library bears the names of Leontius and John: and it is interesting to note that in Cod. Coislin. 294, which is a collection of Parallels, both the writers Leontius Damascenus and Joannes Mansur are quoted. It is probable, therefore, that Damascus is the real home of the Collection of Parallels from which successive editions and arrangements by different hands have been derived.

After I had finished my examination of the Paris MS., I discovered that M. l'Abbé Martin had just published an account of it in his *Description Technique des Manuscrits grecs relatifs au Nouveau Testament conservés dans les Bibliothèques de Paris*. (Maisonneuve 1884.) In this he also printed a few N. T. variants selected principally from the first 32 leaves of the Manu-
Attention had previously been drawn to this book by l'Abbé Martin.

script¹, and to the book itself he attached the name Codex Martinianus and the critical letter Ω², thus placing it among the Uncial texts of the New Testament. I see no objection to this as the book undoubtedly contains large portions of Scripture copied directly from early Uncials; but on the other hand it should be noted that Dr Hort in his Introduction to N. T. thinks it best to class collections of parallels with Patristic authorities. If we adopt the suggestion of my friend l'Abbé Martin, we may have to add at the same time several other MSS. of Parallels to the table of Uncial texts of the N.T., a process which would require a good many alterations or expansions to be made in the notation of Tischendorf's critical apparatus.

Two fragments of Justin were extracted from Cod. Reg. by the Benedictine editor of Justin, (Fragg. x, xv of Otto). The note on these passages (p. 396) added by the editor contains the important information that the MS. was brought (? in the eighteenth century) from Constantinople. "Reperitur etiam (fragmentum) in antiquissimo Codice Regio 923, paucis abhinc annis Constantinopoli allato, quo continentur Parallela, ex quibus non pauca S. Joannes Damascenus transtulit in sua."

Nor should we omit to notice that an important fragment wrongly ascribed to Clem. Rom., but in reality from the Clem. Hom., is pointed out by Nolte as existing in Cod. Reg.³

Brief description
of the MS.

Now let us proceed in order to the description of our MS, and the results derived from it in the New Testament and in Patristic literature. The MS. is a folio, with its text arranged, as will be seen from the attached facsimiles, in double columns, in lines about 36 to the column, and each line containing 13—15 letters. The size of the pages 14 inches by 9½⁴. The character is a sloping uncial of a period at least as early as the ninth century, although in some cases the script has been coarsely retraced, as in some lines of the first photograph, and deficient pages added by the hand of a later and more ignorant scribe.

¹ But what did the Abbé mean by citing the following as curious variants *χαρὰν καὶ ἐξῆς* (Acts vii. 1), *κατοικεὶ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς* (Acts xvii. 24)? We can quite understand that "De ces variantes il y en a peu qui aient pour elles l'appui des anciens manuscrits."

² I have quoted the MS. uniformly as Cod. Reg.: I should have preferred to write it Cod. Parisiensis; but it has to be quoted in a manner similar to the copies of Lequien (Par. Vat. and Par. Rup.): now we cannot very well write

Par. Par.

³ Nolte's note will be found in *Theolog. Quartalschrift* xli. p. 276 (1859). "Fragment vi. welches sich auch in cod. reg. Paris 923. f. 368 vers. sec. col. jedoch mit mannigfachen Abweichungen findet, ist aus Homil. Clem. rv. c. 11. entlehnt." Correct Nolte's reference to f. 309, and cf. Lightfoot, *Clement of Rome* p. 217 and *Appendix* p. 460.

⁴ More closely according to M. Bordier, 0,356 cm. × 0,265 cm.

In many places there are instances of missing leaves either in Cod. Reg. or its ancestry. For instance the title given in Lequien 507 as ε 13 breaks off in Reg. at the close of the quotation from Eccli. xxvii. 29 at the bottom of f. 156 b. The MS. resumes again in ε 21 (Leq. 520) in a quotation from Clement *ἀνάγκη*. Reference to the order of titles in Reg. shews that the following subjects have been omitted:

θ'. *περὶ ἐνεδρεύοντος ἐπιβουλὴν τοῦ πλησίον ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐμπειεῖται*
 (the last extract only being lost);

ι'. *περὶ ἐμπορίας καὶ ὅτι αἱ περὶ τὰ βιωτικὰ ἐνδελεχεῖς ἀσχολίαι συγχέουσιν
 ἡμῶν τὴν ζωὴν καὶ ἀποστεροῦσι τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν*

ια'. *περὶ ἐνυπνίων καὶ μαντείων*

ιβ'. *περὶ ἔκουσίων καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀμαρτημάτων*

as far as the point indicated above in the quotation from Clement.

The quaternions being numbered in the right-hand bottom corner of the first leaf, we have f. 151 marked with ιθ' and f. 158 with κ', we should be inclined to infer that a single leaf was missing in this quaternion; it is not, however, safe to draw a conclusion hastily in a MS. where the matter is so much displaced as in Reg., nor without measuring the compass of the omitted matter in Cod. Rup.

It will be observed in the photographs that the writing is placed over the lines ruled by the scribe, a custom which accords with the date deduced from other considerations.

Accents and breathings are inserted with much irregularity, apparently by the first hand; the accent in a diphthong is usually placed on the first letter. The scribe amongst other eccentricities often places a circumflex on the antepenultimate. When a preposition immediately precedes a noun, a single accent is sometimes placed upon the two words.

Itacisms occur frequently of every kind. No MS. that I know affords a better opportunity for their study: I have generally contented myself with tacitly correcting them, as well as the accents.

The abbreviations are those common to Biblical uncial MSS. of the period. Sometimes as many as three letters are built into a common symbol, e.g. the syllable *νην* on f. 339 is made of two *ν*'s with a cross-bar between. A few tachygraphic signs such as that for *την*, may be found. An apostrophus is sometimes found at the end of a proper name, as in

the Codex Sinaiticus and other early documents. Thus on fol. 2 we have $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu'$, and in our photograph (248 a. 2. 1) $\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\delta\alpha\mu'$.

The letters are remarkable for the fineness of the cross strokes, which makes many passages difficult to read rapidly: and a similar statement might perhaps have been made with regard to the exemplar from which the MS. was copied, seeing that there are frequent errors on the part of the copyist exactly similar to those into which his readers are likely to fall. The letters are well formed, the oval letters, ϵ θ \omicron ς , being much contracted horizontally, and as usual in MSS. of this class, θ Δ with pronounced hooks. ζ has its form made by two strokes of the pen, but on the first facsimile we notice that an omitted ζ has been restored in the common form made by a single ductus.

The punctuation marks are chiefly the high and low point, accompanied by a final colon at the end of passages. ι and γ have the double diacritical point. And I think that a case of interrogation mark may be found in the MS. (on fol. 15 b for instance). No cases as far as I know occur of iota subscript or ascript.

The arrangement of the matter according to the index and where the disarranged portions of the book are readjusted, is first alphabetical, the various subjects being arranged under heads according to the leading word in a sentence: thus the first title is *Περὶ ἀνθρώπου πλάσεως*, and begins the letter α . Each title is then illustrated first by extracts from the Old Testament, next from the New Testament, then from the leading Church fathers, and finally from Philo and Josephus. Occasionally sentences and gnomic sayings are introduced from the philosophers.

Thus on the photograph of fol. 248 a, the extract on the left (line 10) begins with a statement written on a gold ground that the passage which follows is from a discourse *τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλείου κατὰ πλεονεκτούντων* (*sic*). This is followed by a new title on gold,

περὶ παραχωρητικῶν καὶ εὐείκτων ὅτι εἰρηνικὸν καὶ ψυχοφελές τοῦτο.

And the first extract under the new title is indicated by the word *Γενέσεως*, and so on throughout the book, with few variations.

The illuminations are the most striking feature of the whole book. The facsimile of fol. 248 a shews us first an ordinary ecclesiastical portrait hundreds of which occur, and which serve to represent the fathers quoted. This one, accordingly, must be Basil.

The picture on the margin of the right-hand column represents the

battle between the herdsmen of Lot and Abraham, with plenty of sheep in the foreground. This is followed by a picture representing the conference between Abraham and Lot, and another shewing Abraham in the act of intercession for Sodom.

The book must have been written first and illuminated after, for in our other facsimile over against a passage from S. John's Gospel concerning the true Vine, the artist has by oversight introduced an illustration of a totally different passage, namely the one in which the gardener appeals to his master to spare the unfruitful fig-tree yet another year. Unless indeed it should be that the tree represented is really a vine, in which case the scribe has fused the passages together in his mind. The attitude of the petitioning gardener is very pathetic!

The whole series of illustrations is interesting, and some require no small skill in the interpretation.

At the beginning of the book is a leaf of cursive writing of a considerably later date: it is written in two columns of 30 lines each, and bears something of the appearance of having been copied from an early bicolunar uncial text¹. The two columns of the verso are subjoined:

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>ἔργων ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ ἡ τοῦ σαββά- του προσηγορί- α κατὰ παυσιν ἔβραικῶς σημαί- νουσα· εἰ δέ τις καὶ ὑψηλότερος πε- ρὶ ταῦτα λόγος ἄλλοι φιλοσοφεί- τωσαν. ἡ τιμὴ δὲ αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐ- ν ἡμέραις μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυ- τοὺς φθάνουσα. ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἡ- μετέρων τὸ σάβ- βατον τοῦτο δὴ τὸ συνεχῶς πα- ρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμε- νον. καθ' ὃ καὶ ἡ</p> | <p>καὶ ἔτεσιν· αἱ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἑβδομάδες γεν- νῶσι τὴν πεντηκο- στὴν, κλήτην [ἀγί-] [1. κλήτην] αν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡ- μέραν· αἱ δὲ τῶν ἐτῶν τὸν ἰωβελαι- ον παρ' αὐτοῖς ὀ- νομαζόμενον, ὁμοίως γῆς τε ἄ- φεσιν ἔχοντα καὶ δουλῶν ἐλευθερί- [1. δούλων] αν καὶ κτήσεων ὠνητῶν ἀναχώ- ρησιν καθιερού- σι γὰρ, οὐ γεννημά- των μόνον οὐδὲ πρωτοτόκων ἀλ- λ' ἤδη καὶ ἡμερῶν</p> |
|---|--|

¹ Dr Hort identifies this passage as coming from Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xli. § 2 in Pentecosten.

τῆς ζύμης ἄρσις
 ἰσάριθμος· ἢ δὲ
 τῶν ἐτῶν ἐβδο- (l. ἐτῶν ὁ)
 ματικὸς ἐνιαυτὸς
 τῆς ἀφέσεως.
 καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἐβδομά-
 σι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ
 ἐν ἐβδομάσιν ἐ-
 βδομάδων, ὁμοί-
 ως ἔν τε ἡμέραις

καὶ ἐτῶν ἀπαρχὰς
 τῷ θεῷ τοῦτο τὸ γέ-
 νος· οὕτως ὁ ἐ-
 πτὰ τιμώμενος
 ἀριθμὸς τὴν τι-
 μὴν τῆς πεντηκο-
 στῆς συνήγαγεν·
 ὁ γὰρ ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ ἐ-
 αὐτὸν συντιθέμενος
 γεννᾷ τὸν πενήκοντα.

Tischen-
 dorf's use
 of "Paral-
 lels."

We have already alluded to the readings which Tischendorf extracted from the *Parallela Sacra*. He seems to have seen the importance of these quotations in the seventh edition of the New Testament (1859).

In the prolegomena to this text (p. xxiii) he remarks as follows:

"Item Johannis Damasceni perlustravi plura, maxime commentarios in Pauli epistulas et quae in parallelis sacris ad easdem spectant." And on p. cclxv. in referring to patristic authorities of the eighth century, he observes:

"Prae multis vero eminent Johannes Damascenus, cuius commentarium in epp. Pauli pertractavimus in ed. Mich. Lequien; item permulta ex sacris eius parallelis adscripsimus."

These quotations in the seventh edition are usually cited without a reference, as they could easily be found in a continuous exposition, but the passages from the parallels have references given.

Thus on Heb. xi. 13 we have as follows:

λαβοντες c. DEKL al longe pl Thdrt Dam (et par 371) al.

where the authority of John Damascene is twice appealed to, first in the ordinary text and commentary of the Hebrews, the latter of which is sometimes distinguished as Dam^{com} as in Heb. i. 3, and secondly in a passage found on the 371st page of Lequien's edition of the *Parallels*. These references to the *Parallels* are not however very complete. The seventh edition refers only to three passages for the text of the Hebrews, viz. to p. 371 of Lequien, where Heb. xi. 13—16, 32, 33 are quoted,

To p. 673 Heb. xii. 5—11,

And to p. 358 Heb. xiii. 17.

From these passages Tisch. extracts six variants, but it must not be supposed that these references imply anything like an exhaustive treatment.

In the eighth edition much more use is made of the collection, which is cited as Dam^{par.} and Dam^{par. cod.} as intimated above¹, and I do not think it need be pointed out that a very large further use may be made, by future New Testament collators, of Parallels to be found in the large European libraries.

An important question arises with regard to the MS. from which Mangey published fragments of Philo under the name of Johannes Monachus Ineditus. He obtained these extracts, I believe, from Thomas Carte, and writes concerning them as follows:

‘Sunt haec fragmenta ex Cod. MS. Collegii Ludovici Magni Soc. Jes. Qui cod. sic inscribitur Ἰωάννου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ ἐκλογῶν βιβλίον Α' καὶ Β'. Titulorum vero discrepantia tum inversa ordinis ratio liquido sunt argumento excerptorem hunc alium esse a Damasceno illo Sacrorum Parallelorum auctore. Cui sententiae suffragatur Michael le Quien, Johannis Damasceni operum praeclarus editor, qui docet codicem istum noni esse saeculi.’

A collection of Parallels is also used by Mangey, the editor of Philo

What has become of this Codex? At first sight the description seems not unlike Coislin. 276, described by Montfaucon as of the tenth century, diverse from the edited Parallels, and its title being *Joannis Monachi et Presbyteri Eclogae*. But the order of titles given by Montfaucon does not seem to agree with Mangey's description. Is it possible that in editing fragments from John Monachus Mangey is really going over the ground again with the Codex Rupefucaldinus? For certainly the title printed by Lequien from this MS. agrees precisely with that given by Mangey. And does not this supposition also explain why Lequien is quoted as an authority for the date of the Codex (though I cannot verify the passage referred to)? I believe that this supposition is the correct one, and will be verified by an examination of the MS. at Cheltenham.

which seems the same as Cod. Rup.

We must also draw attention to the following important copies of Parallels, of which use has been made by collectors.

Mai in his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, Vol. I. et VII. has pointed out and used the Cod. Vat. 1553 (olim Cryptoferratensis) which bears the title *Res Sacrae Leontii et Joannis*.

Pitra in *Analecta Sacra*, II. xxi. and elsewhere has quoted largely from Cod. Coislin. 276, already referred to, and wonders that so little attention has been paid to it. “Codicem Parisiensem, quem miror a nemine, ni

¹ But see further on this point on p. xx.

fallor, collatum, comminisci juvat. Coislinianus est sub num. 276¹, olim fortasse neglectus vel a Maurinis quia visus est eadem continere quam Damasceni Parallela.”

And many other copies yet uncollated might easily be pointed out.

From a similar collection, as I suppose, in the Library of the Patriarch of Alexandria at Cairo, Tischendorf extracted in 1853 a number of valuable passages, which he printed at the end of his *Philonea*.

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE CODEX RUPEFUCALDI.

The whole of the preceding and almost all of the succeeding matter was written out for the press before I was able to undertake the expedition necessary to the verification of the suppositions thus made with regard to Cod. Rup., and even now a complete study of the recovered codex remains to be made, four days being all the time that I have been able to bestow upon it. The results thus arrived at are as follows:

The Codex Rupefucaldi is a magnificently written volume of 285 leaves (in addition a few blank leaves at the beginning and end), the numbered leaves being 284, and one number repeated (=f. 218 bis). To my surprise, it is not an uncial MS. at all, but an early cursive with a few rubricated uncials at the beginning, middle and end; and dating, as near as I can judge, and in accordance with the tradition of the library, from the eleventh century.

The rubricated uncials at the beginning are as follows:

Ἰωάννου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ μοναχοῦ τοῦ δαμασκηνοῦ τῶν ἐκλογῶν βιβλίον α' καὶ β'.

And in the middle, f. 177 b, at the close of *στοιχείον ε*, where perhaps from weariness the scribe was constrained to obtrude his personality more definitely upon his work, are the abbreviated words,

χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, σῶσόν με

At the end stands the subscription,

τέλος τῶν ἐκλογῶν τοῦ ὁσίου πρὸς ἡμῶν μοναχοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ + δόξα σοι, χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πάντων ἕνεκεν.

¹ Wrongly given by Pitra as 279.

ON THE CODEX RUPEFUCALDI.

xxi

The preface and titles to the Parallels are written in a bicolunar form with about 40 lines to the column: the rest of the MS. is written in the ordinary manner, the initials and titles and authors' names being rubricated subsequently to the writing of the rest of the matter, but with such care that I have thus far only detected a single dropped initial, and the whole book is a marvel of exact calligraphy.

On f. 1 stands the superscription:

“Collegii Claromontani Parisiensis Societat. Jesu ex dono eminentiss. Cardinal. Rupifucaldi.”

Between ff. 161 and 162 are eight leaves on paper in a modern hand, in which an attempt has been made to restore a missing quaternion or quaternions from the printed Vatican Parallels (beginning Par. Vat. 432 D *ἐὰν ὀμνύης* and ending with Par. Vat. 462 B *σπηλαῖον | ληστῶν*).

The identity of the MS. with the missing book is evident not only from the headings and subscription but from a comparison with the Par. Rup. of Lequien, the John Monachus of Mangey, and the extracts from it in Halloix and other patristic writers. So valuable and complete (with the exception noted) is this MS. that if it had crossed my path earlier I should have made it the basis of almost all the subsequent work, and printed from it the greater part of the Philonea collected by Mai, Pitra, and Tischendorf, as well as those quotations which are current in the *Melissa* of Antony.

As it is, I have contented myself with noting the references and a few readings, and reserve a fuller account of the Patristic excerpts for a future tract on Ante-Nicene Patristic Fragments. But now, what are we to say about Tischendorf's description of this MS.? The prolegomena to the VIIIth edition of the New Testament, or rather the fragmentary notice which stands in the place of prolegomena, says (p. xvi):

Dam^{par. cod.} i.e. Joh. Damasceni parallela sacra ex Cod. Rupefuc. Saeculi fere 8.

It is needless to say that by no reasoning can we identify this book with Cod. Rup. Tischendorf is evidently quoting from an uncial MS. Can it be that after all he is referring to Cod. Reg., and has made the hasty identification to which our own first thoughts were led under his influence? Let us see some of the readings which he quotes from the book.

In general, as intimated previously, the references are given as follows: Matt. xxii. 8 *ἐστὶν* Dam^{par. 382} om.; Mark xii. 44 *περισσευοντος αὐτοῖς* (et Or. Dam^{par. cod.}); UΓΔ et mu Dam^{par. ed.} *περισσευματος αὐτῶν*. In the last

passage the references clearly refer to the printed parallels and to the edited text of Lequien. If we turn, however, to the critical apparatus of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we are astonished to find a new notation: e.g. Heb. xii. 1 *Dam^{paris} τρεχομεν* Heb. xii. 3 *ὑμων* *Dam^{paris} om.* xii. 4 *Dam^{paris} αυτεκατεστητε*, &c., all of which readings may be found in Reg. f. 341 b. While on xii. 7 we have *εις παιδειαν* supported by *Dam. ad h. l. et^{parall 673} (et^{paris})*. The first of these references is, of course, to the commentary on the Pauline Epistles; the second to the printed text of parallels; while the third is from f. 260 of Cod. Reg. We have no doubt then that Tischendorf is really referring in these readings to our Paris MS., seeing that there is no other to which we can attach the mark of place (Parisiensis) nor of date (viii. sæc. fere) so as to agree both with his descriptions and citations.

FURTHER REMARKS ON COD. COISLIN. 20.

We have alluded to the uncial fragments of a MS. of parallels which are found at the beginning of Cod. Coislin. 20. A few more notes are added with regard to them in order to shew the close connection that subsists between them and the Cod. Reg.

The MS. from which they are taken is bicolumnar, and contained (as a little restoration of the damaged parts will shew) 36 lines to the column and about 16 letters to the line. The first leaf contains as follows: after four lines of a sentence whose beginning is wanting, *μηδὲ γογγύσης ὡς ὀλίγον βραδύνων ἵνα μηδὲ ὀλίγον τοῦ ὕλου ζημίαν ὑπομείνης*, the text follows as in Lequien 621, in the middle of a passage attributed to Chrysostom, *ὅσον γὰρ νηστεία κτέ...ἔπιεν*. It then continues with the fragment of the same homily (Lequien 622) beginning *νηστεία καὶ δέησις...μόνον πρὸς μόνῳ*. It then adds from Basil *περὶ νηστείας* the fragment on 622, as far as *ἀντλεῖς*: and so concludes the titles under N at the foot of the first column of the verso. In all this it is strictly following the order in Cod. Reg., with the single exception that it has avoided the transposition of the passage from Basil over the last of the extracts attributed to Chrysostom.

Letter ξ then begins, precisely as in Cod. Reg., as follows:

ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΝ Ξ.

ἔ
 π ξένων καὶ φιλοξενίας καὶ ὅτι
 ἀπαρρησίαστος ὁ ξένος πάντοτε.

The extracts then follow the order in Cod. Reg., viz. :

Gen. Ἀναβλέψας Ἀβραὰμ κτέ. followed by a *Scholium* which is given completely in Reg., but only indicated by an abbreviation in Coislin, the bottom of the leaf where it probably was written being cut away.

Exod. Προσήλυτον κτέ.

Levit. εἰάν τις προσέλθῃ κτέ.

with which the first leaf ends.

The second leaf begins with οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι κτέ. from the Gospel of John c. xiii.

This is followed by Matt. xiv. 6, 7

and a sentence τοῦ ἁγίου βασιλείου ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὸν α΄ ψαλμὸν Μὴ ἐναπομείνης τοῖς κακῶς βουλευθείσιν.

These passages belong under the title, περὶ ὄρκου.

Then comes

περὶ ὀρφανῶν καὶ χηρῶν

The passages are given in the order, Exodus xxii., Proverbs xxiii., Prov. i., Sirach iv., Sirach xxxv., i Tim. v. 5, i Tim. v. 11, i Cor., Jac. i., Philo, Tob., Ps. xciii., Zacharias. It will be seen that this order is confused; but the matter contained is almost exactly the same as that in Cod. Reg.

The next title is

περὶ οἴνου καὶ χρήσεως αὐτοῦ

the extracts being from Psalm ciii. and Proverbs as in Reg., and so the leaf ends.

On the whole it will be found that there is a much closer agreement between Coislin and Reg. than between Coislin and Vat. or Coislin and Rup.: the latter codex for instance has three additional titles thrust in between περὶ ὄρκων and περὶ ὀρφανῶν. The Coislin fragment is, therefore, though not a part of the Cod. Reg., so like to it that there is either a relationship between them or they both are derived without much change from the primitive collection of parallels.