

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

cannot altogether forget the lessons of their past history, or believe on any ground of experience in the safeguards he has provided, the very existence of which is a silent proof of his distrust of those who need their restraints. Let us hope that some plan of extended local self-government may succeed this crude and disintegrating scheme, and that the unity of this glorious empire may be secured while the self-government of its component parts is practically and effectually guaranteed.

R. C. JENKINS.



ART. IV.—THE NEWLY-DISCOVERED LATIN VERSION
OF THE EPISTLE OF S. CLEMENT OF ROME.

TWENTY years ago the genuine Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians was known to us from one manuscript only, the famous uncial Codex Alexandrinus of the fifth century, where it appears as a sort of appendix to the New Testament Canon, but mutilated at the close, as well as illegible in many passages. Then, almost simultaneously, two other authorities for the text were discovered and given to the world. Bryennios in 1875 first printed the Epistle in full from an eleventh-century Greek cursive belonging to the library of the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem at his chief residence in Constantinople, the manuscript from which he subsequently published the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." A few months later a twelfth-century Syriac manuscript was purchased by Cambridge University, and found to contain the Epistle entire embedded in the canonical writings of the New Testament, then first of all discovered complete in the Harkelean recension of the Philoxenian Version. All three authorities contained, side by side with the genuine Epistle, the so-called Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which is now generally admitted not to be the work of S. Clement, but an ancient homily by an unknown writer. It did not escape the observation of commentators as a remarkable fact that no Latin version of the genuine Epistle was known to exist. In the case of all the other Apostolic Fathers, one Latin version (at least) was extant; and in this particular instance the phenomenon, though an excellent testimony to the Greek character of the early Roman Church, was all the more noticeable from the circumstance that the writer was one of the earliest Bishops of Rome, and the letter exhibited the Church of Rome in the rôle of peacemaker allaying the factions in the Church of Corinth. Yet hitherto the closest search had failed to discover any trace of such a version, and in his larger edition of this

father, which represents his latest work, Dr. Lightfoot is still compelled to confess, "I cannot find any indications that it (*i.e.*, the genuine Epistle) was ever translated into Latin before the seventeenth century; and if so, it must have been a sealed book to the Western Church" ("Apostolic Fathers," Part I., vol. i., p. 146).

But the experience of the last few years has taught students never to despair of the recovery of any lost Christian document, and the recent announcement made in the *Revue Benedictine*, 1893, p. 402, of the discovery of an early Latin translation of this Epistle has been followed with commendable promptitude by the publication of the Latin text in full in the second number of *Anecdota Maredsolana*,¹ edited by Dom. G. Morin, of the Order of S. Benedict, who is to be sincerely congratulated no less upon the discovery of so valuable a document than upon the scholarly way in which he has produced the *editio princeps*. The manuscript which contains the Latin version is at present in the possession of the Benedictine monastery of Namur; but it came originally, as its title-page tells us, from the monastic library of Florennes, a neighbouring town in the province of Namur, where a monastery was founded in the beginning of the eleventh century by Gerard, a canon of the Church of Rheims. To judge from the handwriting (of which a page is given in facsimile by M. Morin), the document, of which it forms part, must have been written shortly after the foundation of the monastery. It commences with the Clementine Recognitions in full, prefaced by Rufinus's letter to Gaudentius. Our Epistle begins on fol. 104 (*verso*), and is inserted between Rufinus's translation of the spurious Epistle of Clement to James (Migne, P.G. ii., p. 31) and the treatise of Bede *de locis sanctis* (Migne, P.L. xciv., p. 1190), which follows on fol. 117 (*recto*). It thus occupies twenty-six pages. To it is prefixed the heading, INCIPIT EPISTOLA CLEMENTIS AD CORINTIOS, and we notice at the outset that, unlike its predecessors, our new authority appears to distinguish between the genuine and the spurious Epistle to the Corinthians, the latter being deliberately excluded, though there was plenty of room to insert it, had the architype contained it and the scribe so wished.

Turning to the text, we can decide without hesitation that the translation was made not from any intermediate version, but from the Greek direct. It abounds in Greek constructions,

¹ *Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. ii. *Sancti Clementis Romani ad Corinthios Epistula versio latina antiquissima*, edidit D. Germanus Morin, presbyter et monachus, Ord. S. Benedicti. *Maredsolæ*, apud editorem, Oxoniæ apud J. Parker et Soc., 1894.

such as the genitive absolute (§§ 43, 48), the genitive after the comparative ("maior angelorum," § 36), etc., and in Greek words reproduced, e.g., "in eodem scemate (? scammate) sumus," ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἔσμῆν σκάμματι, § 7; "melotes," μηλωταῖς, § 17; "in lacu leonum," εἰς λάκκον λέοντων, § 45. Occasionally the translator forgets the construction in his literal rendering of Greek cases—e.g., "per pietatem aut operum," διὰ εὐσεβείας ἢ ἔργων, § 32; "pro pontifice et illorum predictorum ministrorum," διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν, § 41. Again, the order of the Latin follows that of the Greek so literally as to make it quite possible that originally the version was interlinear with the original. One example out of many will suffice: "Videamus enim quia quosdam vos reprobatis bene operantes ex illo sine querela facto (? functo) ministerio," ὁρῶμεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐνίοις ὑμεῖς μετηγάγετε καλῶς πολιτευομένους ἐκ τῆς ἀμέμπτως αὐτοῖς τετιμημένης λειτουργίας, § 44, where "illo" as frequently represents the Greek article. But if this was so, the exemplar from which our manuscript was copied was not interlinear, for some of the omissions by homoioteleuton with which it abounds have no counterpart in the Greek (e.g., "mentiri," ψεύδασθαι . . . "mentiri," ψεύσασθαι, § 27). At what date, then, was this version composed? The editor points out that as regards his Scriptural quotations, the translator was "either unaware of or entirely neglected Jerome's version"; and to this we may add that, on the other hand, these quotations appear to exhibit traces of just such a correspondence with some old Latin version as would be natural to one quoting from memory and rearranging the Latin words so as to follow the Greek order exactly. Unfortunately, our acquaintance with pre-Hieronymian versions of the Old Testament is very scanty; but where we can check the quotations, as by means of the Lyons Pentateuch or the Codex Sangermanensis of the Psalms, this deduction seems tenable. Thus in § 4 the quotation from Exod. ii. 14, "Quis te constituit principem aut (Lyons P., "et") iudicem super nos; aut (Lyons P., "numquid") occidere tu me eis quemadmodum occidisti hesternam die Ægyptium," fairly represents the Lyons Pentateuch with the order of words changed to coincide with Clement's Greek, and our translator's memory of the familiar version has betrayed him into forgetting that the Greek which he was rendering read κριτὴν, not ἀρχοντα, as the first of the pair of substantives. To take one other example, the final sentence in the fifty-first Psalm (§ 18) coincides verbatim with the Psalt. Sangerm., "Cor contribulatum" (Vulg. "contritum") "et humiliatum Deus non spernet" (Vulg. "non despicias"). On the other hand, such a mistranslation as "remitterit autem inhabitantium domos luteas," εἶα δὲ οἱ

κατοικοῦντες οἰκίας πηλίνας, § 39, where *ἕα* has been confused with *ἕφ*, may be an original blunder.¹ This independence of the Vulgate will place our version in the sixth century at the latest (unless the translator be an African; see Westcott, *Vulgate*, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," iii., p. 1702). But other considerations arising from certain archaisms employed, which cannot be gone into here, incline us to date it perhaps as much as three centuries earlier than this. It would be interesting to discover in what part of Christendom the translation took its rise; but our data are very scanty. M. Morin draws attention (p. xi.) to certain Hebraisms introduced by the translator ("verbo sanctitatis illius," τοῖς ἀγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ, § 13; "in voluntate patientiæ illius," εἰς τὸ μακρόθυμον αὐτοῦ βούλημα, § 19), which might guide us; and we should be glad to learn why, when speaking of the flight of the Phoenix to Heliopolis, he calls the place "a colony," "in colonia quæ vocatur Solis civitas," § 25; whether, that is to say, he confused Heliopolis Ægypti with Heliopolis Syriæ (Baalbec), which was made a colony by Julius Cæsar, and further honoured by subsequent emperors, and if so, what deductions are legitimate as to his nationality.

As an authority for the text of the Epistle, the Latin version stands second only to the Codex Alexandrinus. Out of a hundred disputed readings, taken at random where all our authorities are available, I find the Alexandrian manuscript wrong in eleven instances, the Latin version in thirty-four, the Constantinopolitan in fifty, and the Syriac in sixty-eight. It does not, however, necessitate any alterations in Dr. Lightfoot's text. It gives us fresh evidence for ἀνεκδήγητα κρίματα, § 20, and for the perplexing reading, Δαναῖδες καὶ Δίρκαι, § 6, and we are thus still left to wonder what form of torture could be designed by the refined cruelty of a Nero or a Domitian under the scenic representation of the Danaids. Of the new readings which it suggests, the most tempting are τίνα τρόπον ("quemadmodum") for τί πρῶτον, § 47, οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ("nostri" for ἡμῶν), § 42, and ἐπήρθη ("receptus est") for ἐπορεύθη, § 5, the last supported by the Syriac; but they are unimportant. Others, as φυλλσφυεῖ ("folia mittit") for φυλλοροεῖ, § 23, and ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ("a fratribus") for ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, § 4, do not commend themselves on mature consideration.

One of the most interesting results of this discovery is the fresh light thrown by it upon Latin forms and constructions.

¹ It shows affinity to Cod. Alex. (LXX.), which, in the passage quoted (Job iv. 19), reads, as our translator must have read, *εα* δε τους κατοικουντας; but the verb there is probably an imperative, not an indicative as he renders it.

Students of Rönisch ("Itala und Vulgata") learn not to be surprised at eccentricities of late Latin; but one who came upon our manuscript direct from the study of Cicero or Livy would be somewhat bewildered to find "in" with the accusative and ablative freely interchanged, the dative after "iubere," "exsequi," "venire," "latere," such irregularities as "magis hominibus offendamus quam deum," and the forms "adferet" for "adfert," "audientur" for "audiuntur," "postulavimus" for "postulabimus," with the confusion of tenses necessarily occasioned thereby. This last phenomenon—the interchange of *b*, *v*, and *p*, so characteristic of Latin scribes—is not unfrequent—*e.g.*, "in imbidia" for "in invidia," "labia mea" for "lava me," and might help us to locate our manuscript, were we more certain as to the geographical limits of this usage.

In every way the new discovery is most interesting, and M. Morin's edition leaves nothing to be desired as to arrangement and form. I have only noticed one misprint ("quidusdam" for "quibusdam," p. 41, c. 18). His emendations of the text commend themselves at once; those given above are all taken from his edition. The notes on constructions are scholarly and the indices full. We shall look forward with pleasure to other numbers of the *Anecdota Maredsolana*, which are announced as shortly to be expected.

J. R. HARMER.

ART. V.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

PART I. THE PRESENT "STATUS CONTROVERSÆ."

I WASTE no time in prefatory words.¹ I am to deal briefly with a most important subject in view of present difficulties and dangers and consequent duties.

I must begin with submitting for consideration four observations which demand, I am sure, most careful attention, and which will endure, as I believe, the strictest investigation.

I. The first observation is that the main line of demarcation, or (I would rather say) THE GREAT CHASM OF CLEAVAGE, DEEP AND BROAD, IN THE MATTER OF EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE, AS WE HAVE NOW TO DO WITH IT, IS THAT WHICH SEPARATES BETWEEN THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL ABSENCE AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN OR UNDER THE FORM OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS CONSIDERED IN THEMSELVES.

This does not mean that there are not shades of difference of view on what I may call the other side of the chasm; still less that there may not be variations of teaching and certain

¹ This paper was read at the Islington Clerical Meeting, January 16, 1894.