extent. Not only, and not principally, are the non-Chalcedonians in view; the aim is to show Chalcedonians what they are committed to. They were committed to the Twelve Chapters of Cyril and that meant rejection of their opponents, Theodoret and Ibas, along with Theodore, who was behind the Nestorian error in the first place. I find this convincing as I do all the main judgements of Richard Price. Not only so, but there are many amusing and clever asides which make these two volumes not only an important contribution to historical scholarship and research but a pleasure to read.
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‘In this chapter he commends charity in every respect, going so far as to assert that no virtue is of any use without it. He also defines what charity rejects, what it pursues; for though other gifts, i.e. faith and hope, are at rest in the age to come, charity alone lasts for ever; and he says it is altogether to be awaited.’ This is Cassiodorus’ summary of a celebrated chapter of 1 Corinthians. It makes no attempt to fit the chapter into its context, and leaves out the rhetoric, the passion, and the sublimity; instead, as the preface to the whole work puts it, it provides a ‘narration’ briefly ‘embracing’ (complectens) the most important points made by the apostle. It is true that Cassiodorus regularly interjects remarks of his own, some of them theological; Gatti might helpfully have signalled them by some typographical device. Characteristically, Cassiodorus points out use of the figure gradatio in Rom. 8: 30, and on 1 Corinthians 3 he compares a discussion in Augustine’s Enchiridion (Gatti, as elsewhere, does not supply the reference). But in the main he gives a bald abstract.

The Complexiones, which summarized the New Testament except for the gospels, had no fortune, and is preserved in a single Verona manuscript (V) probably contemporary with the nonagenarian author (†c.585), and possibly written at Vivarium.
with corrections in his own hand. Paolo Gatti now gives us a new edition of the part covering the Pauline epistles. Roger Gryson has already edited that covering Revelation in CCSL 107 (his prefatory remarks are well worth reading), and Maria Rosaria Cappelleri promises a text of that covering Acts.

The chapter I translated above is typical of this not very engaging work, and Gatti’s editing of it is typical of his rather casual editorial methods; he tells us (twice indeed) that V gives commendat, but that Maffei (the first and only editor of the whole book [1721], whose work is reproduced in PL 70) read commendat, as indeed Gatti does too, though we should not guess it from the apparatus. A very large part of the apparatus is devoted to pointless minutiae of this kind; Gatti even records misprints in what sounds a commendable edition produced by P. F. Donelin for an apparently unpublished American thesis (1971).

I should have preferred a text that silently normalized the spelling on some stated principle, together with extended discussion, in the introduction or elsewhere, of the principles (if they are any) that lie behind the practice of the scribe. This is the more needed because Cassiodorus was interested in orthography, and it is indeed by a mention in his De orthographia that we can date the Complexiones. It is difficult to believe that the author would have tolerated the orthographical (and other) barbarisms perpetrated by the scribe of V, though many are perpetuated here.

The text (in which it would have helped the reader if references to the Pauline text had been unobtrusively inserted throughout) is still at times unsatisfactory. I note only some instances: Rom. i (In what follows I refer to the text by the manuscript’s paragraph numbers) per quae se dicit] quem rather (Rom. 1:5). I Cor. xiii The best solution here seems to be redeat error edentium. xxii (translated above) expectandum seems odd; one would expect sectandum, comparing sectamini at the beginning of the next chapter (here as often Cassiodorus’ divisions do not coincide with modern breaks). II Cor. iii The comma after Christi should follow applicaret. xvi Maffei’s commendantur <a> Domino is ensured by the rhythm, and other conjectures by him and by Stangl should have been put in the text (e.g. the latter’s obnoxios at Rom. xxx: 7, commended by both sense and rhythm). xx gloriosius] read gloriosus (as does PL). Below, there seems no reason to follow the corrector of the Verona MS in deleting solita. Gal. ii qui falsis] read qui <a> falsis? iii praecepit] read praecepit (so too at Eph. vii). Eph. viii Tam Tychicum] PL has nam; rather, ad? Philipp. iii Add esse after aequalem (cf. Phil. 2:6). Col. v Something must be done about possit. PL has
prosit; rather, <esse> possit? II Tim. ii diei is (I suppose) a misprint for die. Hebr. v The MS has ad promissione roborati ad penetralia. Delete the first ad.

In recollating the manuscript, Gatti must (to judge from Gryson’s discussion) have had a torrid time. But the resulting edition could have been better judged.
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This stout book completes the Sources chrétiennes edition of Gregory’s homilies on the Gospels. I reviewed the first volume favourably in JTS, NS 57 (2006), pp. 756–8, but its readers should note that, as Judic now explains in his ‘Avant-Propos’, an article by J.-P. Bouhot has since reassessed the early stages of the tradition, with important implications for the dating of some of the sermons (details on pp. 13–16). I should be surprised, however, if the last word has been spoken on this matter. The crucial passages of the homilies (the prefatory letter to Secundinus and the opening of 21.1) are oddly and obscurely phrased; and it may be that they should not be taken literally but regarded as a literary device to add spice to the book. At the very least we need an answer to the problem pointed out by Judic in his introduction to the first volume (pp. 45–6): ‘On ne trouve pas de différence de style entre les deux groupes d’homélies, ce qui est étonnant.’ The second volume contains sermons that Gregory advertises as spoken by himself rather than, like the earlier ones, written for delivery by another. But there is indeed not much sign (though see below) of the ‘collo- cutionis uox’ (21.1). In particular, Hom. 34 is peculiarly long and technical for an off-the-cuff chat ad populum by an ailing pope; when at §6 there is mention of a variant manuscript reading (emundat, despite Judic’s note), we are in the world of the commentator, not the preacher.