Discovery and early use of the Torino manuscript of Lactantius’ Epitome divinarum institutionum

Eberhard Heck

The seven books Divinarum institutiones of Lactantius are the most extensive work of early Christian apologetics in the Latin language — in Samuel Brandt’s edition they comprise 670 pages including apparatuses —, and, as a work of apologetics, they are only surpassed by Augustine’s 22 books De ciuitate dei. They owe this scope, on the one hand, to the fact that Lactantius is the first apologist who, not only in theory, but also in practice, combines in equal proportions defence of Christianity against pagan attacks and destruction of pagan positions with protreptic introduction to Christian doctrine. On the other hand, Lactantius, in any case not fond of breuitas and often lengthy in his discussions, has equipped his work with a learned apparatus of quotations and other illustrations. If it had been written today, it is likely that the Institutiones would have devoted almost as much space to footnotes as to the main text.

Its length seems to be the reason why Lactantius wrote a short version of this work, an Epitome; perhaps he did so in order to prevent others from doing it instead; in late antiquity such abridgements of extensive works were common — the Periochae of Livy come to mind. Lactantius himself does not think this necessary; for in writing the Epitome he gives, in the Ciceronian manner, as his reason the fact that this gives him the opportunity to dedicate a book to his addressee Pentadius, who, Lactantius thinks, would be pleased by that. Lactantius (praef. 3-4) also regrets what is lost by the

1 I am indebted to the following colleagues: to Kevin Lee who was so kind as to check the English version of this article and, in many cases, to correct it; and to Peter Godman of Tübingen, who helped me when I was formulating the English title.
3 CSEL 19, Prag - Wien - Leipzig 1890, including the Epitome.
4 Edited by Brandt loc. cit., and, recently, although it is not adequate as a critical edition, by M. Perrin, Sources Chrétiennes, Paris 1987, 335; see my review, Gnomon 64, 1992, 597-600.
6 According to Lact. epit. praef. 1-4; whether Pentadius, addressed as frater, was a real brother, a brother in Christ, or simply a friend of Lactantius, we do not know.
7 For this subject, compare what Cicero says about similar desires of Varro, e.g. Att. 4,16,2; 13,18,1; 13,19,3. Lact. epit. praef.1 ext. resembles Cic. fam. 5,12,1.
abridgement, and we may suppose that he did not write the Epitome on his
own initiative, but acting on the advice of readers who found the full work too
extensive. In the course of writing the Epitome he was encouraged to change,
even to add to, the Institutiones, and afterwards he began to revise the big
work; this new edition, dedicated to Constantine, was never completed.

The Epitome, in extent about one seventh of the Institutiones, as far as
we can see, was not quoted or otherwise used in antiquity. Only Jerome
mentions it in his patrology (uir.ill. 80) in the list of the works of Lactantius: epimon eiusdem operis (the Diviniae institutiones) in libro uno akephalo.
Thus, he had in his hands a copy ‘the beginning of which is lost’. If we can
take this to mean a book of which only the last quarter is extant, while the ‘lost
beginning’ covers as much as three quarters, then even Jerome may have read
only as much of the Epitome as was extant until the beginning of the 18th
century in manuscripts and printed editions, i.e. chapters 51-68. In this
form it is carried by the two old manuscripts which contain the prose writings
of Lactantius — the seven books Divinae institutiones, the books De ira dei
and De opificio dei and just the last part of the Epitome — as a corpus of 10
books, namely B = Bologna, bibl. univ. 70l. s. V, and P = Paris, BN lat. 1662,
s. IX (here only as far as 61, 6). The same amount of the Epitome appears in
several recentiores derived from B or an apographon of B, and in the printed
editions since 1472.

It was as late as 1711 that the only manuscript containing all but the
complete Epitome was discovered: T = Torino, Archivio di stato I B II 27, s.
VI-VII. This uncial manuscript, written in Italy, during the middle-ages
was in the Benedictine monastery of Bobbio founded by Columbanus; then, it
came to the library at Torino, which in the early 18th century belonged to the
House of Savoy-Piemont. There it was discovered at the same time by two
scholars, who were staying at Torino and investigating how much of this

8 Collected, recently, by Perrin, op. cit. 25-36.
10 Taken as definite by Pfaff, ed. 1712, 14, and Maffei (below, n. 20), 456, also by
Brandt, CSEL 19, LXIX. LXXV; more cautious, rightly, is Davies, ed. 1718, preface.
If the inscriptio extant in the mss. before 51, 1 — also in T; cf. Brandt and Perrin ad
loc; — was already in Jerome’s copy, he would have called a book aképhalów which
was reduced to a quarter, but had an inscriptio. So I think it is possible that in his copy
there was less missing than in the mss. apart from T. But perhaps Jerome did not
check, by comparing the Institutiones, how much was missing, and, in spite of the
inscriptio, the mutilation is evident because epít. 51, 1 begins with nam.
11 For recentiores and early printed editions of the Epitome see Brandt, CSEL 19, XC f.;
cf. CSEL 27,1 (1893), XLVI-XLIX. LII. LIV.
12 Former signature I B VI 28. See also E.A. Lowe, Codices Latini Antiquiores IV,
Oxford 1947, 438 with photograph.
library had been saved from a fire in 1667. One of them was the Veronese Marquess Scipione Maffei (1675-1755), who, *inter alia* by means of a periodical which he himself founded, ‘Giornale de’ letterati d’Italia’, was engaged in the revival of literature and literary studies in Italy. The other was the Swabian theologian Christoph Matthaeus Pfaff (1686-1760), then tutor of Friedrich Ludwig, Hereditary Prince of Württemberg (1698-1731), who travelled with him to Torino and stayed there for a time. Afterwards (1716-1756) he was professor at Tübingen and from 1720 chancellor of the University. Towards the end of his life he became professor and chancellor at Giessen.

The discovery of the *Taurinensis* of the *Epitome* by these two scholars in 1711 is today mentioned as a fact in every edition or manual and, about 100 years ago, Brandt reported exhaustively on it and the early editions of the whole *Epitome*. But his report, too, which is to date the only one given at first hand, does not go far enough in its critical analysis of the work on the text of the *Epitome*, which since the early 18th century was dominated by a nearly unbounded confidence in Pfaff’s edition and in a careless French version of Maffei’s report. Any such critical analysis has not been helped by Michel Perrin’s edition of 1987, which, apart from strictly editorial matters, is good; his introduction and apparatus give the impression that Perrin has not examined or even seen any published study from the 18th century beyond the editions of Pfaff and his successors. Work on the *Epitome* for an edition in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana by Antonie Wlosok and myself...
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has led me to check more exactly what was published when the *Epitome* was discovered and afterwards. This has resulted on the one hand in an impressive illustration of the ‘11th commandment for classical scholars’ given — I hope, in a not too blasphemous manner — in the title of this paper; on the other hand, we have found that Maffei’s short report from 1711 deserves not only more attention than has hitherto been given to it, but also much more confidence than the work of his contemporaries, and, last but not least, our deep respect as an example of most diligent scholarly work even by today’s standards.

In 1711 Maffei published in ‘Giornale de’ letterati d’Italia’ a report — written in the form of a letter — on his discoveries at Torino. He pays special attention to the manuscript of the *Epitome*, to which he devotes half of his article. In this report he gives a transcription of the praefatio and the first five chapters of the *Epitome*. This transcription is extraordinarily exact even to the extent of rendering peculiarities of spelling. There are only two real mistakes — in 122 lines of Brandt’s edition —, i.e. 3, 1 nec loqui instead of nec eloqui and 5, 4 libros recurrendum instead of l. reuertendum; add four inaccuracies (1, 2 Epicurrus with two rs seems to be a misprint; 4, 3 by instead of hii, also the printer’s error; 4, 3 tentauerint instead of temptauerint, and 5, 1 lybissam instead of lybyssam). Errors in and damage suffered by T are noted by Maffei in footnotes: praef. 1 regionemque: ‘1. religionemque’ (so also Pfaff); 4 poterit . . . : ‘qui manca la carta’ (not noted by Pfaff); 1, 3 after esse uniuerza: ‘manca ut’ (also Pfaff; Davies 1718 put the ut after esse and comma, rightly adopted by subsequent editors afterwards); 2, 1 ambiguitas: ‘1. ambiguitatis’ (also Pfaff); 2, 7 uindicauit: ‘1. vindicabit’ (right,

There are, however, “Zehngebote für klassische Philologen” (Decalogue for classical scholars) prescribed by Karl Lehr (in a letter to August Lobeck of March 7th 1873; now in: K. Lehr, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. by A. Ludwigh, Königsberg 1902, 476); our 11th commandment may be related to his first “Du sollst nicht nachbeten” (Thou shalt not adore blindly) and his second “Du sollst nicht stehlen” (Thou shalt not steal).

For considerable help, especially in respect of bibliography and library services, I am indebted to my student assistants Stefanie Maninger (now at Mainz) and Stephanie Seidl, and also to Wolfram Winger, doctoral candidate, and to the staff of Tübingen University library whom I consulted often and always successfully. Thanks are due also to the University of Tübingen which gave me a special grant for preparing our edition; this benefitted the preparation of this article.

Lettere del Sig. Marchese Scipione Maffei al Sig. Apostolo Zeno in data de’ 26 Giugno del corrente anno da Torino, *Giornale de’ letterati d’ Italia* 6, Torino 1711, 449-484; on our ms., which contains further texts apart from the *Epitome*, 455-473, on the *Epitome* 455-469, the transcription of the beginning 458-465. Apart from Brandt (and the ‘Anonymus Britannus’; see below, p. 176) hitherto apparently no editor of Lactantius has used this report at first hand. I thank the University library at Heidelberg for making this report at first hand. I thank the University library at Heidelberg for making a microfilm copy.

See below, p. 175.
and adopted since Heumann;²³ Pfaff and Davies do not make the change); 4.1 before monarchical: ‘manca Plato’ (also Pfaff); 4.2 totius summae: ‘totius summae’ (‘1.’ seems to be omitted by error; totius also Pfaff, but he reads in T wrongly utius — or is this a misprint?); 4.4 quia solus: ‘1. qui solus’ (the only conjecture of Maffei which, rightly, had no followers).

I report all this in such detail, because (I hope I do not seem sentimental) it is demanded by the respect due to the work of a scholar from the 18th century, which has fallen into undeserved oblivion. It had been rightly estimated by Brandt, who was the only editor to use it at first hand, though not consistently enough; Perrin, on the other hand, ignores it, apart from a bibliographical notice.²⁴ At the end of this paper, I shall treat two mistakes, which appear in the editions produced to date, but could have been avoided by consulting Maffei alongside careful checking of the manuscript, namely 4.1 the et inserted into the text as a conjecture of Le Clerc, and the wrong transition from the praefatio to chapter 1.

Whereas Maffei transcribed precisely only a part of the Epitome, Pfaff in his edition, printed in 1712 at Paris with the help of Nicholas Le Nourry, gives a text with standardized orthography, in which the peculiarities of T, like the spellings brebiare and conscribimus, disappear. Today we should do the same, and in order to abbreviate the adnotatio critica, we should report on orthographical matters in the preface or an appendix. But Pfaff does not concern himself with this in his otherwise very learned preface,²⁵ and, as for the constitution of text, he is content with what follows (p. 47): “Quae corrupta nobis videbantur loca, emendavimus, lectionemque codicis MS. semper adjecimus, ut scrupulosissimur illis hominibus satisfaceremus, qui in quavis lectione mysterium quaerunt, et ea etiam, quae nullius alias momenti sunt, accurate annotari volunt. Id quod et nos fecimus, erroremque nostrum si alii contrarium hic foveant opinionem, ingenuissime deprecamur.” It is not entirely without reason that Pfaff asks for indulgence, for while his edition, though prepared in haste, is still important as editio princeps of the complete Epitome, it is not a model of exactness.

Thus, in the part Maffei transcribed from the beginning to 5.4, leaving aside spelling, Pfaff is less reliable than the Italian, whom Pfaff does not

---
²³ But only because Le Clerc - see below, p.177f. - wrote unindicbit without note and Heumann regarded this as given by T, while he thought unindicavit, transmitted by T and given by Pfaff, was the latter’s error.
²⁴ Perrin, ed. 42 n. 1, perhaps from Brandt, CSEL 19, LXXVI.
²⁵ It contains interesting remarks on the theology of Lactantius, e.g. concerning the differences between his and the Manichaean dualism (24-30), and 30 years before Sabatier’s edition appeared (in 1743), a programme in regard to collecting and editing the Vetus Latina, the remains of the Latin versions of the Bible before Jerome (38-44).
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mention anywhere; Maffei, on the other hand, refers to his co-scholar, then only 25 years of age, quite respectfully, and gives notice of his edition which was soon to appear. Pfaff's errors cannot be wholly attributed to the printer. Praef. 1 *aliquid* is omitted; ibid. 4, instead of *poterit* — after which, because a corner of the leaf (fol. 2r, right side, below) has been torn off, apart from one letter, (perhaps to be interpreted as *u*), text is missing to the extent of about four letters — Pfaff, without any note pointing out the damage to the text, described by Maffei (see above), prints *potest utile*, not marked as his own conjecture. Again without comment, against Maffei and T, Pfaff divides the *praefatio* from chapter 1 after *protrahenda est* and before *prima incidit quaestio*, and he divides chapter 1 from 2 after *quoniam certum est esse prouidentiam* and before *sequitur alia quaestio*, and thus arbitrarily produces two parallel beginnings of chapters. The words *et ab eo solo regi mundum adfirm aucrint* are omitted (by misprint?). He gives the same emendations as Maffei on praef. 1; 1,3; 2,1: 4,1; 4,2; further 2,8 ext. after *qui potest totum* instead of *quam* he prints a schoolmasterly *non* which has found no support. Moreover, he corrects 5.1 *samaiam* to *Samiam*, rightly, and *cimmeam* to *Cumaeam* (Davies was the first to suggest *Cimmeriam*, rightly), and 5,2 *cumanae* to *Cumaeae* (an odd change), and 5,3 *cymaeam* into *Cumaeam*.

Three other examples from the part of the *Epitome* not transcribed by Maffei may be given, namely from 51,1 ff.; there Pfaff compares the extant printed editions with T, but inaccurately: he is not aware that 63,2 *tanta* between *igitur* and *mala*, which is not in B nor in *recentiores* and earlier printed texts, but was inserted first by Egnatius (1515), also does not occur in T. 54,4 Pfaff gives *deum agnoscere ut parentem* without note; but *ut*...
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*parentem* is not in T nor in P — it was interpolated in B and from there came into recentiores and early printed editions. Wrong, too, at 54.9 is Pfaff’s note concerning *itaque quae ante palam fiebant, clam fieri coeperunt, circumscribi eqs.* (so Pfaff as all other editors): “ed. quae ante palam coeperunt circumscribi”; instead of “ed.”, “MS.” would be right, as fiebant clam fieri has dropped out in T, where, however, instead of *itaque quae*, a conjecture which is only in recentiores, there is only *itaq* i.e. *itaque*, while B and P (where a is expunged) have *ita quae*.

Thus, Pfaff’s edition though not free from errors, was the foundation for the editions by Johann Georg Walch 1715, who, apart from his doubts about Lactantius’ authorship, did not contribute to the text of the *Epitome*, and John Davies 1718, to whom we owe some emendations. Neither went back to the Taurinensis. The first who appeared to have done so was Christoph August Heumann 1736; several times he cites readings in the ms. against Pfaff, and changes accordingly the text in the *praefatio* and in chapters 1-5. But what he uses for this is neither T nor Maffei, but primarily an ‘Anonymus Clerici’, whose ghost still hovers about modern editions.

Before I treat him, let me say something in brief about an ‘Anonymus Britannus’, who, unlike the ‘Anonymus Clerici’, remains really anonymous; he, too, has been mentioned since Heumann and, rightly, is still named by Brandt, but undeservedly no longer figures in Perrin.31 It is an article published anonymously in 1734 in a collection of miscellaneous papers by British scholars in several volumes:32 For *praefatio* and chapters 1-5 (he discusses other passages too) the author uses Maffei directly, and following him he corrects Pfaff’s mistakes: praef.1 *aliqvid*; transition praef.4/1,1; 4,3 *et ab eo . . . adfirmauerint*; 5,4 however, he replaces Pfaff’s right reading *reuertendum* with Maffei’s wrong *recurrendum*. But this is the only case where the use of Maffei had undesired consequences, the effect of the ‘Anonymus Clerici’ on the other hand was fatal, and it is to him we now turn.

In 1727 Jean Le Clerc33 (latinized to ‘Clericus’ by the German editors) published an ‘abstract from a report on the Torino library’, the author of

---

31 Thus Perrin does not attribute the deletions of 36,2 [*quae*] and 37,2 [*et*] to the anonymous Britannus p. 420ff., but to Brandt, and does not give his reasons.


33 J. Le Clerc, ‘Extrait d’une Relation de la Belle Bibliotheque de Turin, apartenante a S.M. le Roi de Sardagne, Prince de Piedmont, Duc de Savoye etc. etc.’, in: Id., Bibliotheque ancienne et moderne 27, La Haye 1727, 325-354 (available at Tübinger University library); ibid. vol. 3, 1712, 444, Le Clerc had already briefly reviewed Pfaff’s edition, ibid. II, 1719, 190-201, and in more detail, Davies’ edition.
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which he strangely concealed (p. 325): “Ayant eu l’occasion d’écrire à Turin
a un homme de qualite et de savoir, j’ai cru pouvoir le prier de m’instruire de
l’état de la Bibliothèque de S.M. le Roi de Sardagne.\textsuperscript{34} Il m’a fait le grace de
m’envoyer une Relation Italienne de cette Bibliothèque, faite pour un homme
de condition. J’ai cru en pouvoir donner ici un Extrait ...” Le Clerc himself
partly unveils the secret about the author and addressee of the report from
Torino in the second title, which then follows: “Lettre de l’état de la
Bibliothèque de Turin, a Mr. Apostolo Zeno, Noble Venetien, traduite de
l’Italien”; the addressee, previously called ‘man of status’, Apostolo Zeno,\textsuperscript{35}
leads us to Scipione Maffei, curiously never mentioned by Le Clerc. Whether
the sender of the ‘relation italienne’, to whom Le Clerc had written, was
Maffei himself or somebody else, there is in any case no doubt that it is
Maffei’s report Le Clerc translates into French nearly at full length —
certainly far from ‘un Extrait’ —, adding in bold print commenting remarks
of his own. A comparison with Maffei’s original soon makes this clear. It was
Heumann\textsuperscript{36} who, by conjecture, had already identified the ‘Anonymus
Clerici’, as the author of the report is called in the editions of Lactantius since
Heumann, with Maffei. But this identification is anything but a guarantee for
the reliability of what Le Clerc reports.

For, while Maffei’s transcription of the first part of the \textit{Epitome} up to
5.4 is quite exact,\textsuperscript{37} Le Clerc’s copy of this transcription (pp.341-350),\textsuperscript{38}
which is enlarged by inserted remarks, partly referring to Pfaff, is
extraordinarily careless. Brandt\textsuperscript{39} says there were more than 70 errors made
by Le Clerc in this passage. If we leave aside the orthography, which as
against Maffei is standardized with spellings like \textit{coelum} for \textit{caelum}, or
rendered inexacty, then, if my counting is right, 32 mistakes (to which must
be added, of course, the two made by Maffei) remain which really falsify the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Since 1720 the Dukes of Savoy-Piemont were also Kings of Sardinia.
\item \textsuperscript{35} On him, see Turri (above, n.12) 394.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Heumann, Ed. fol.b3-b4. That the author of the report is Maffei, Heumann discovered
with the help of J.A. Fabricius, Bibliotheca Latina \ldots IV (I have used the 3rd ed.
Florence 1858; first published 1735), 510; here, as in the case of Davies’ edition which
was not available to him, Heumann indicates his ‘intermediate sources’, a practice
which must be appreciated in contrast with that of modern scholars quoting silently at
second hand; for this, see my reviews, \textit{Gnomon} 52, 1980, 573 f. (Ogilvie); 57, 1985,
651 (Bender); 60, 1989, 687 f. (Büchner).
\item \textsuperscript{37} See above, p. 173.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Thus, we can decode Perrin’s note to epit. 4,1 (see below, p.129), which is sibylline in
the absence of any corresponding indication either in his introduction or in his
bibliography: “et \textit{uir doctus apud Cleric.} XXVII pag. 348”. Brandt notes the same,
but gives us all we need in the list of sigla referring to p.LXXVIII f. Does Perrin
perhaps quote Le Clerc at second hand?
\item \textsuperscript{39} Brandt, CSEL 19, LXXVIII.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
text, i.e. omissions, miscopyings, insertions. So we find, e.g. in the praefatio: (1) quosdam instead of quos iam; informent omitted; (3) in angustum omitted: ut instead of et before brebitate; et omitted between cum and argumenta. And so on.

This would not have been disastrous, if nobody had paid attention to Le Clerc’s negligent transcription with his inserted remarks which at times sound witty in a schoolmasterly fashion. But this is precisely what happened: Heumann, to whom neither T nor Maffei was available, trusted Le Clerc as witness of what seemed to be extant in T; he was not in the position to know that he only had to rely on the ‘Anonymus Britannus’, to whom he also referred. It is true, that Heumann, like the British anonymous, who followed Maffei directly, was able to correct Pfaff’s mistakes praef. 1 and 4,3, and to mark the right transition from praef. 4 to l.l, but at 3,2 the ‘Anonymus Clerici’ induces him to declare the text transmitted by T as Pfaff’s conjecture: Heumann believes that the words et uates were not in T, because Le Clerc had omitted them, and he notes: “Iure tamen ea inseruit Pfaffius ex cap. V l”.

But in the most cases the authority of the ‘Anonymus Clerici’ misled him to the detriment of his text. Let me give some examples: praef.1. Heumann omits informent contrary to Pfaff with the note “testis est Anonymus Clerici p.341 in MS sic legi”, and also deletes the preceding ita; 2,3 before summa he ejects rerum omitted by Le Clerc, as well as 2,5 omnis before haec moles and omnino before potuisset; 2,8 Heumann writes deus habendus and notes: “habendus) Male Pfaffius edidit putandus est. Prius enim in MS vidit Anonymus Cleric, p.347” — Pfaff was right; Le Clerc’s copy was wrong. However, 5,4 Heumann would have found recurrendum instead of reuertendum also in Maffei. In the cases quoted above Heumann, the acute conjectural critic, was followed by his compatriot and contemporary Johann Ludolf Bünemann (1739), who elsewhere was remarkably careful in respect of the text of Lactantius and was rightly praised by Brandt as his best predecessor;
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sometimes, it is true, Büinemann used his sense for stylistics as a criterion, but like Heumann, he was led into error by the 'testis' Le Clerc.44

Just as if he, like the two Germans who followed Le Clerc, wanted to verify the proverb that prophets have no authority in their own countries, Nicholas Lenglet-Dufresnoy in the edition he completed after the death of Jean-Baptiste le Brun (1748, at Paris) firmly remained on Pfaff's side, whom he addressed with respect as 'Tubingensis Academiae cancellarius', the position Pfaff then held.45 So, without any qualms praef. 4 he writes potest utile and does not indicate the lacuna. When he corrects Pfaff's errors in the passages Maffei had transcribed, he either cites an 'apographon' of T Pfaff had sent him,46 where what is wrong 'in editis' is given correctly, (e.g. on praef. 1 aliquid; 3 in angustum,) or, (e.g. 4,3 on ab eo . . . adfirmauerint) he cites an 'on-dit': “Septem haec verba, quae desunt a Pfaffio, dicuntur inesse in MS". That this 'on-dit' means also Le Clerc, whom Lenglet does not mention by name, cannot be seen from his note on 5.4 reuertendum (so Pfaff according to T): “In MS. dicit Anonymus legi reuertendum est", because this may also mean the British 'anonymus', but it is clear from those on 2.5 omnis and on 3,2 et uates, as here the words in question are omitted only by Le Clerc.47 In most of these cases Lenglet, referring in his notes to a different 'on-dit', follows Pfaff,48 and thus, on balance, he fares better than his German predecessors.

From that date to the time of Brandt virtually no critical edition was produced.49 Brandt, as we have already said,50 has detailed thoroughly with full documentation the history of editorial work since Maffei and Pfaff. But, apart from the fact that the manuscript readings are not always given correctly by Brandt as well as Perrin (granted that no edition, including the one we are preparing, is fully proof against error), even Brandt's studies call for revision at least in respect of two passages, and with a discussion of these I shall conclude this voyage into the editorial past.

44 His sceptical words “si fides Anonymo Clerici . . .” concerning praef.3 in angustum, which is bracketed by Büinemann and wrongly omitted by Heumann following Le Clerc, are an exception.
45 Ed. I p. XVII; I have not yet been able to check his statement that Pfaff had sent him an 'apographon' of the ms., i.e. the transcription he had made for his edition; cf. Brandt, CSEL 19, LXIX, and above, n.28.
46 See previous note.
47 See also below p.180 for 4,1 et.
48 For the one exception, the et 4,1, see below p.180.
49 The uncertainty appears in the editio minor by O.F. Fritzsche, Leipzig 1842, who has e.g. praef.1 informent, 3,2 et uates missing in T and gives 5,4 reuertendum without a note.
50 See above, p.172.
4,1 <Plato> monarchian adserit unum deum dicens, a quo sit mundus instructus <et> mirabili ratione perfectus. This is printed by all editors from Heumann to Perrin. *Plato* was rightly inserted by Maffei and Pfaff with reference to inst. 1,5,23. But *et* after *instructus* is neither necessary (not even a comma is needed) nor is it a silent conjecture of Le Clerc, but simply a transcriptional error. For Le Clerc was good enough to point out, beside the conjectures of Maffei which he records, *expressis verbis* two of his own: 5,1 *Cymaeam* instead of *cinmeam* with the note "(c' est comme il faut lire) ", and 5,3 *Cumanae* (sic) instead of *cymaeam* with the note "(il faut lire ainsi) ". He does not, however, mention the inclusion of *et* as a conjecture, but it has simply 'slipped past' him. 52 Yet Heumann and Bünnemann put it into the text 'teste Clerico'. Lenglet, too, by way of exception fails us here: "Et) Deest apud Pfaffium, sed restituit anonymus ex ipso MS". Brandt does not claim that it was in T, but still inserts it into the text; finally, Perrin, who was not even in this case prompted to investigate the matter further, does the same.53 In the end, we remove the *et* and restore the text.

Finally, there is the question as to where the *praefatio* of the *Epitome* ends: Pfaff, his successors except Heumann, as well as Brandt and Perrin give the following transition: (praef.4) *enitar ... prolixa breuiare, sic tamen, ut neque res ad copiam neque claritas ad intellegentiam deesse uideatur in hoc opere, quo in lucem ueritas protrahenda est*. (1,1) Prima incidit quaestio, sitne aliqua prouidentia eqs. Whereas Perrin is silent, Brandt says in his apparatus: "ueeba in hoc opere relitto spatio initium proximi capitis facit Maffeius in apographo (et cum secutus uir doctus ap. Cleric. XXVII 343 et cum hoc rursus Heum), sed scriptura continuatur in T." Brandt did not see T himself, but used the collations of Studemund and Holder, and asked for verification at Torino, in this case not precisely enough. It is true, the text continues after *uideatur* on the same line, but only after a space of about 1.5 cm, i.e. 3-4 letters, and the *l* in *in* is emphasised by form and size; besides, there is some sort of punctuation mark which seems to be from the first hand.

Maffei describes the evidence correctly in conjunction with the also differently edited transition from 1,4 to 2,1.55 He says, 465f., after having

---

51 Miscopyings of Le Clerc are also 5,1 *Albuneae* instead of *albunea* and 2,6 *non* instead of *nec* before *audebir*; in both cases Bünnemann and Heumann follow him; even Brandt still notes these pseudo-conjectures of Le Clerc; Perrin no longer does so.
52 A further instance of a wrong word added by Le Clerc is 3,1 a second *est* between *deus est* and *perfectus*.
53 4,1 does not even appear among the 37 passages he discusses as ambiguous in his introduction (44-51).
54 Just as, in spite of Heumann, Bünnemann, who elsewhere is so thorough.
55 See above, p. 173, and below, n.57.
noted that T elsewhere gives scriptura continua, but sometimes has small spaces in order to divide cola: “Nel pezzo, ch’io v’ho trascritto, si vede lasciato assai spazio dopo il rideatur (sic; read videatur), ch’è come il termine del proemio, dov’io son ito a capo: e parimente dopo il coepisse, dove finisce il compendio del II capo (i.e. of inst. 1,2). Per altro, questa buona regola non si serva sempre, anzi non bisogna fidare di questi spazi . . .”

Heumann did well here to trust the ‘Anonymus Britannus’ (411), as he used Maffei correctly. Le Clerc, also cited by Heumann, but only at the second place, gives (343) Maffei’s division, but thinks Pfaff’s to be equally good.

But as Maffei already saw, the evidence of these spaces is not beyond question, and in spite of the clear evidence in T we would have to follow Pfaff, if there were good reasons for doing so. But a comparison with the Institutiones is in favour of T: There, after the prologus, 1,2,1 starts: Suscepto igitur inlustrandae veritatis officio non putavi adeo necessarium ab illa quaestione principium sumere, quae uidetur prima esse natura, sitne prouidentia eqs. The correspondence between suscepto . . . inlustrandae veritatis officio and in hoc opere, quo in lucem ueritas protrahenda est is evident; in both cases we see before us the very beginning of the treatise. So, we make the praefatio end with uideatur, following the Taurinensis and in the light of the evidence rightly described by Scipione Maffei.
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---

56 Heumann’s further note, that already Davies had punctuated after uideatur against Pfaff “solo usus ingenio”, is due to a confusion: Here, Davies follows Pfaff without a note, but 1,4 he postulates end of chapter after coepisse against Pfaff, but Heumann, here following Pfaff, does not note this.

57 Pfaff does not give any reason for his division 1,1 and 1,2; it seems to be due simply to the wish for similar beginnings of chapters; see above, p.175.

58 Add the point that Lactantius, who does not think that his work is too long and is not pleased with the idea of abridging it, concludes with an assertion that he will not abbreviate at the expense of copia and claritas, and ends the whole praefatio with deesse uideatur, a clausula which takes up with a slight variation the famous esse videatur, considered as a Ciceronian ‘trade mark’ by imperial orators (Quint. inst. 10,2,18; Tac. dial. 23,1) and used by Lactantius himself 18 times in all (cf. the similar inesse uideatur epit. 63,9).