

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR.—It is always a desperate course to enter into a conflict with a reviewer. But I think I have been somewhat misrepresented in your review of my little book on 2 Corinthians.

First of all, the reviewer does not seem to be aware that the book, in common with all the others of the series which have appeared, is an adaptation of a former commentary on the English text. The passage in the Introduction in which I 'ingenuously confess' that I had 'not consulted the Bishop of Durham's note'—not 'Bishop Lightfoot's,' as the words are quoted by your reviewer—was originally published in 1879. But even so far back as this the note had only been *written*, not *published*, without consulting the Bishop's note, which, though it travelled over much the same ground and added one remarkable historical parallel, did not shake me in the conclusion to which I had come.

Next, I find myself charged with 'the habit of throwing into the lighter scale, under the name of "the great weight of patristic authority" or the like, a great unsifted mass of unspecified early fathers.'

'Among many examples' of this method are cited ii. 3 (the reviewer means iii. 3), ii. 16, and vi. 16. In only one of these three cases, vi. 16, have I done what I am accused of doing. In ii. 16 I have cited my authorities by name. In iii. 3 I have done the same, adding however that the authorities in favour of the received text are 'the earliest authorities.' In no instance whatever, save on vi. 15 and 16, have I referred to the 'great weight of patristic authority' either in those exact words or in any equivalent to them.

It should in fairness be remembered that the authors of the various portions of the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools' are not free to do as they please, but are expected to conform to general rules. They are not, for instance, at liberty to construct a text for themselves. And while they are at liberty to express their dissent from the text the rules compel them to adopt, they are, rightly or wrongly, not expected to enter much into textual criticism, nor as a matter of fact do any of them do so, beyond the simple mention of the authorities in case of a

divergence from the received text. There are no doubt some exceptions to this statement, but they only occur in cases where the determination of the text is a matter of great difficulty or importance.

I should not have ventured to join issue with your reviewer, on a question of opinion. But these are questions, not of opinion, but of fact.

J. J. LIAS.

THE RECTORY, EAST BERGHOLT. May 24.

I may perhaps be allowed to add that your reviewer seems to imply that I hold a brief for the *Textus Receptus*. But this is very far from being the case. Only in one or two instances have I thought it preferable to the reading in the text, and have therefore ventured to say so. In the vast majority of instances I have accepted without hesitation the text imposed on me by authority. But where this was the case it was not necessary for me to say anything.

[WHILE fully adhering to the substance of the notice in question, I much regret that I unintentionally overstated the frequency of what I regard as an unfortunate treatment of patristic evidence. I cited three cases: I now realise that the total number is four. This certainly hardly justifies the words 'habit' and 'many,' both of which, together with the word 'unspecified,' I accordingly withdraw. I offer my frank apology for the inadvertence, and assure Mr. Lias that, in my attempt to state honest impressions, I was actuated by no disrespectful or unkindly feeling. With the above-named exceptions, I can see nothing to recall. I am well aware of the relation of the 'Cambridge Greek Testament' to the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools,' and had no thought of criticising, directly or indirectly, anything in the plan, or textual principles, adopted by the general editors of those excellent series. If my notice gave any different impression, or the impression of a *parti pris* of any kind, I must acquiesce in the penalty which, as Horace warns us, besets the effort to be brief. A. R.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Berlin. Vol. xix. Part 1, 1893.

M. Bahrfeidt, 'Untersuchungen über die Chronologie der Münzen der Domitii Ahenobarbi aus der Zeit der römischen Republik.'—M. Bahrfeidt, 'Ueberprägte Münzen aus der Zeit der römischen Republik.' On Roman Republican coins struck on the *flans* of Romano-Campanian, Ptolemaic, Sicilian and other coins.

Numismatic Chronicle. Part 1, 1893.

Warwick Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1892' (with one plate).—F. B. Baker. 'Some rare or unpublished Greek coins.' Coins procured by Mr. Loring in his travels in Arcadia during the last three years. *Parium in*

Mysia. Bronze, *obv.* Head of Commodus, *rev.* Eros. The Eros of Praxiteles has been recognized on coins of this type (cf. P. Gardner in *J.H.S.* 1883). This specimen has now been kindly presented by Mr. Loring to the British Museum, which previously had no example of the Eros-type at Parium. The Arcadian provenance of the coin is curious. *Megalopolis*. Bronze coins of Sept. Severus commemorating the Lycaean games. *Delphi*. Bronze of Faustina I. *rev.* Temple with statue of Apollo.—B. V. Head. 'Recent numismatic publications.'

Revue numismatique. Part 1, 1893.

Th. Reinach. 'De la valeur proportionnelle de l'or et de l'argent dans l'antiquité grecque' (to be continued).—R. Mowat. 'Symboles monétaires