

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

4. Dr Mercati's suggestion that the quotation from Deut. xviii 15, 18 should be corrected in accordance with the *Chronicon* is fully supported by all three MSS, the text being an arbitrary alteration by the editor.

5. On the other hand, the lacuna at 232 B which Dr Mercati suggests is to be partly filled from *Chron.* 32. 13 sq., does not appear to be a real lacuna at all. All three MSS have after the word ὑποτίθει a picture of the Ark, and in V and S this is followed by the words τοῦτο τὸ μέγεθος τῆς κιβωτοῦ. ἔστι δέ, continuing as in the edition. There is no reason for supposing any longer omission; this and the next sixteen lines are merely a marginal note suggested by the following passage on Noah.

It will, I think, be clear from this that the more or less considerable differences between Cosmas and the *Chronicon* mentioned by Dr Mercati do not exist in the better tradition of Cosmas MSS, and if, as without doubt we should, we accept V as the chief authority for the text of Cosmas, hardly any even of the small verbal differences remain, and those the least important. Practically the text is the same in both authors.

THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF ONE OF ST ANTONY'S LETTERS.

When writing the article on the original text of one of St Antony's Letters published in the *J. T. S.* vii 540 (July 1906), I was unfortunately out of reach of a copy of Migne's edition, and consequently have not mentioned that *Patr. Gr.* 40 contains an Arabic version of the letters, which seems to be nearer to the Coptic than the Latin version which I printed for comparison. The Arabic has the three letters which are partially preserved in the Coptic in the same order as the original, not in the order of the Latin version. Again the Arabic (p. 1009) preserves the end of the 4th (Latin 7th) letter, which the Latin omits.

I would call attention to the unfortunate misdivision of the following words in the Coptic text of my article; p. 540, l. 1 επεκασρος, l. 2 εαυαχε, p. 544, l. 5 εαυακοε.

The hyphen at the end of l. 8, p. 543, should be omitted.

E. O. WINSTEDT.

THE *LIBER ECCLESIASTICORUM DOGMATUM*: SUPPLENDA TO *J. T. S.* vii 78-99.

SINCE I wrote on the above subject in the number of the *JOURNAL* for October 1905, additional material has come into my hands which

seems to me to be worth putting on record. In the first place, Father Puller has sent me from South Africa a long letter which appears to be conclusive in favour of regarding our document as a Latin original and not a translation from the Greek. Mr Puller, who is working now in Griqualand East, explains that he is writing far away from libraries; but I imagine that very few of us could manage to amass so much evidence with all the treasures of the Bodleian at our disposal, and I have ventured to take the liberty of transcribing for the *J. T. S.* most of what he has written. It did not seem fair to deprive the world of scholars of one of its too rare opportunities of profiting by the wealth of Father Puller's learning. Secondly, I owe it to the kindness of Sac. Prof. Pietro Guidi of Lucca that I am able to give a specimen of the text of the *Liber* according to one of the earliest MSS, Lucca 490, saec. viii-ix, no. 2 in the 'Gennadius' group enumerated by me on p. 83. And, thirdly, I have been lucky enough myself to light upon what is, I think, an unnoticed but indubitable case of borrowing from the *Liber* in a document which, though its exact date is unfortunately not known, is certainly Gallic and certainly not later than about 500 A. D.—the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*. Lastly, I have a few corrections and additions to make in my list of MSS of the *Liber*, as well as in the text of it which I provisionally printed.

I

(*Extracts from Letter written by Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E.*)

'It seems clear that the author, whether he be a Greek or a Latin, was fairly well informed both about Greek and about Latin ecclesiastical literature. No doubt he may have got a good deal of his information about ante-Nicene writers from Eusebius's History, and I have no means at present of detecting whether he read his Eusebius in the original Greek or in Rufinus's translation. But he knows the opinions of post-Nicene Greek-speaking authors like Marcellus [of Ancyra?] (c. iii), Eunomius Aetius and Macedonius (c. iv), Didymus (c. xix), Diodorus [of Tarsus?] (c. viii), Nestorius (c. v), Eutyches (c. ii), Apollinaris (c. ii), and other Apollinarians ("quidam Syrorum," c. xv). On the other hand, he also knows the opinions of Latin writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, such as Lactantius (c. xxiv), Jovinian (c. xxxiv), Helvidius (c. xxxv), Vigilantius (c. xxxix), "Cirillus et aliqui Latinorum" (c. xiv), and the Luciferians, a Latin sect (c. xiv). The name "Arabs" in c. xvi seems to me to contain a reference to St Augustine *Liber de Haeresibus* c. 83 (*opera* ed. Bened. tom. viii col. 24, Venet. 1733).

'All this multifarious learning would seem to me to fit in with the idea that the author of the *Liber* was Gennadius of Marseilles, the author of the continuation of St Jerome's *de Viris Illustribus*. Anyhow, the

author was certainly either a Latin who was unusually well informed about Greek heretics and heresies, or, what would be still rarer, a Greek well informed about Latin heresies.

'We have now to try and discover which of these two views is the most probable.

'To me, as at present advised, it seems most probable that the author was a Latin.

'In c. liii he says:—"Pascha, id est Dominicæ resurrectionis sollemnitas ante transgressum vernalis æquinoctii et *sextadecimæ lunæ initium* non potest celebrari." Now, if I am not mistaken, the Eastern Churches of the fifth century followed the Alexandrian rules for the calculation of Easter, whereas Latins for the most part followed the Roman rules. And Duchesne tells us (*Origines du culte chrétien*, ed. 3, p. 238) that "les Romains n'admettaient pas que le dimanche de Pâques pût tomber, dans le mois lunaire, avant le 16 de ce mois, tandis qu'à Alexandrie on pouvait avoir Pâques dès le 15". It follows that the author of the *Liber* followed the Roman rule for the calculation of Easter, and was therefore presumably a Latin.

'In c. vii the author quotes from the creed the words "carnis resurrectionem", a formula which occurs in the Western creeds, but not in the Nicene creed or in the so-called Constantinopolitan creed—the two creeds which after the Council of Chalcedon would constitute for Eastern Catholics the "ecclesiae lex" in regard to articles of faith. The fact that the author used a Western creed confirms the view that he was probably a Latin.

'That view is strongly corroborated by his treatment of confirmation and of the closely connected rite for the reconciliation of heretics. In c. xi, speaking of a person who is being confirmed, he says:—"Ille manus impositione [pontificis] accipit Spiritum Sanctum." Here there is no mention of the chrism, and the receiving of the Holy Ghost is attributed solely to the laying on of hands. Now I know no post-Nicene authorities in the East for the use of the laying on of hands in Confirmation, and still less for attributing the gift imparted in Confirmation solely to the imposition of hands. In the post-Nicene East Confirmation is administered by unction with the consecrated *μύρον*. In the modern Eastern baptismal service, which includes the administration of Confirmation, there is no trace of the laying on of hands. References to the laying on of hands may indeed be found in the Greek commentaries on Acts viii and xix: but of course in those passages the text of Scripture compels such a reference, and it would be quite unsafe to infer that the laying on of hands was used in the Eastern Church of the fifth century. Possibly references to the post-baptismal imposition of hands might be found in post-Nicene Alexandrine writers, though

I know of none such : anyhow, a post-baptismal imposition of hands is retained in the Coptic baptismal offices. But the author of the *Liber eccl. dogmatum* was certainly not an Alexandrine. No Catholic of Alexandria would have called St Denys the Great 'fons Arrii', as our author does in chapter iv.

'On the other hand, the laying on of hands is given great prominence in Western references to Confirmation during the whole of the patristic period.

'I notice also that in chapter xl the word "pontificis" occurs, though it is enclosed in brackets. If the word is authentic, it supplies a fresh confirmation of the Western *provenance* of the *Liber*. At Rome and in most parts of the West the bishop has always been the ordinary minister of Confirmation. In the East the *μύρον* is and has been usually administered by a priest.

'Passing now from Confirmation proper to the rite of reconciling persons baptized in the Name of the Trinity by heretics, I notice that in chapter xxi our author, speaking of adults, requires them to confess first the orthodox faith, and then adds :—"purgati iam fidei integritate confirmentur manus inpositione." Those words exactly describe the Roman usage, whereas the usage of the Eastern Church generally, and of the Constantinopolitan Church in the time of Gennadius of C. in particular, was to reconcile heretics, whose baptism was allowed, by chrismation. The usage of the Constantinopolitan Church in the time of Gennadius is set forth in a letter still extant addressed by a cleric of Constantinople to Martyrius of Antioch about A. D. 460 : see Dr Bright's *Notes on the Canons of the first four General Councils*, edition of 1882, pp. 104, 105. On the various modes of reconciling heretics see Morinus *de Poenitentia* ix 7-11 ; and for fuller details Morinus *de Confirmatione* may be fruitfully consulted.

'But our author, in the same twenty-first chapter, when speaking of the reconciliation of children baptized validly by heretics, says :—"Respondeant pro illis qui eos offerunt iuxta morem baptizandi, et sic manus inpositione et chrismate communiti eucharistiae mysteriis admittantur." Here we have both the laying on of hands and the chrism, and such was in fact the mode of reconciliation used in parts of Gaul and of Spain in the fifth and following centuries : Morinus has shewn this (see references given above).

'I doubt if chrism was ever used at Rome in the rite of reconciliation.

'I think, therefore, that the author of our *Liber* probably lived in Gaul or Spain. This again suggests the possibility of the author being Gennadius of Marseilles. He cannot be Gennadius of Constantinople : that suggestion is disproved by chapter xxi.

'It was in southern Gaul and in northern Spain that Vigilantius

propagated opposition to the veneration of relics. I doubt if Vigilantianism ever took root elsewhere. Chapter xxxix supplies in consequence a new confirmation of the view which now commends itself to me.

'Chapters xx and xxv, with their vindication of free-will, seem to me to agree well with the opposition to the more extreme views of St Augustine which was characteristic of southern Gaul in the latter half of the fifth century. At Marseilles especially Cassian's influence during the first half of that century must have tended to draw men's minds away from the more extreme forms of predestinarianism.

'Chapters vi and xxiv shew that the author of the *Liber* was much interested in the Millenarian controversy and was a strong opponent of Millenarianism: and chapter vi in particular shews that he regarded the author of the Apocalypse as a "dreamer", and his teaching as fabulous. Now Gennadius of Marseilles in his *de Viris Illustribus* informs us that among the books which he had written was one entitled "*De mille annis et de Apocalypsi beati Ioannis*". This fact seems to supply a strong corroboration of the theory that the author of the *Liber* was Gennadius of Marseilles.

'The author of the *Liber* mentions in chapter ii certain heretics whom he styles "Timothiani", presumably (as pointed out in *J. T. S.* vii 88) the partisans of Timothy Aelurus. Unless I am mistaken, the name "Timothiani" is a name of rare occurrence. It is therefore very noticeable that "Timothianum dogma" occurs in the 81st, and "Timothiani" in the 93rd, chapter of the *de Viris Illustribus* of Gennadius of Marseilles.'

II

Text of the opening chapters of the *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum* according to the Lucca MS (cod. 490 fol. 233).

INCĪ . DE DOCMATI . ECCLESIASTICI . SEDIS GENNADI . EPĪ . MAXILIENSIS.

Credimus unum esse deum patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum :
 patrem eo quod filium habeat, filium eo quod habeat patrem, spiritum
 sanctum eo quod sit ex patre et filio. pater est ergo principium deitatis,
 qui sicut numquam non fuit nisi deus, ita numquam non fuit non
 pater ; nec factum spiritus sanctus, quia non est ex nihilo sed ex deo 5
 patre et deo filio deus procedens. pater aeternus, eo quod aeternum
 habeat filium, cuius aeternus sit pater : filius aeternus, eo quod sit patri
 et spiritui sancto coaeternus : spiritus sanctus aeternus, eo quod sit patri
 et filio coaeternus : non confusam in unam personam trinitas, ut Sabellius
 dicit, neque separata aut diuersa in natura diuinitas, ut Arrius blasphematur, 10
 sed alter in persona pater, alter in persona filius, alter in persona spiritus

I ll. 4, 5 Between 'non pater' and 'nec factum' an omission by *homosoidenton* must be assumed.

sanctus, unus natura in sanctam trinitatem deus pater et filius et spiritus sanctus.

II. Non pater carnem adsumsit, neque spiritus sanctus, sed filius tantum; ut qui erat in diuinitate patris filius, ipse fieret in hominem hominis matris filius, ne filii nomen alterum transiret qui non esset natiuitate filius. dei ergo filius hominis factus est filius, natus secundum
 5 ueritatem naturae ex deo dei filius, et secundum ueritatem naturae ex homine hominis filius, ut ueritas geniti non adoptionem non ad appellationem, sed in utraque natiuitate filii nomen nascendo haberet, et esset uerus deus et uerus homo unus filius. non est ergo duos christos neque duos filios, sed deum et hominem unum filium, quem
 10 propterea et unum genitum dicimus, manentem in duabus substantiis, sicut ei naturae ueritas contulit, non confusis naturis neque immixtis, sicut Timothiani uolunt, sed societate uniti. deus ergo hominem adsumpsit, homo in deum transiuit, non naturae uersibilitate sicut Tertuliani Apollinaristae dicunt, sed dei dignatione; ut nec deus mutaretur in
 15 humanam substantiam assumendo hominem, nec homo in diuinam glorificatus in deo; quia mutatio uel uersibilitas naturae et deminutionem et abolitionem substantiae facit. natus ergo dei filius ex homine; non per hominem, id est ex uiri coitu, sicut Ebion dicit; sed carne ex uirginis corpore trahens, et non de caelo secum afferens,
 20 sicut Marcion Origenes et Eutyches; neque in phantasia, id est absque carne, sicut Valentinus, neque docesi, id est putatiue imaginatum, sed corpus uerum; non tamen carnem ex carne, sicut Marcianus, sed uerus deus ex diuinitate et uerus homo ex carne. unus filius, in diuinitate uerbum patris et deus, in hominem anima et caro: anima non absque
 25 sensu et ratione, ut Apollinaris, neque caro absque anima, ut Anomeus, sed anima cum ratione sua et carne cum sensibus suis, per quos sensus ueros in passione et ante passione suae carnis dolores sustenuit.

III. Neque sic est natus ex uirgine, ut deitatis initium homo nascendo acceperit, quasi antequam nasceretur ex uirgine deus non fuerit, sicut Enathemon et Berillus docuerunt, sed aeternus deus homo ex uirgine natus est.

IIII. Nihil creatum aut seruiens in trinitatem credamus, ut uult Dyonisius fons Aarii; nihil inaequale, ut Eunomius; nihil gratiae aequale, ut uult Aetius; nihil anterius posteriusue aut minus, ut Arrius; nihil extraneum aut officiale alteri, ut Machedonius; nihil persuasione
 5 aut subreptione insertum, ut Manicheus; nihil corporeum, ut Melito et Tertullianus; nihil corporaliter effigiatum, ut Antropomorfus et Vadianus; nihil sibi inuisibile, ut Origenes; nihil creaturis uisibile, ut Fortunatus; nihil moribus uel uoluntate diuersum, ut Marcion; nihil

II l. 13. non: added by second hand.

Tertuliani: all or part of this word added by second hand.

ex trinitatis essentia a creaturarum natura deductum, ut Plato et Tertulianus; nihil officio singulare nec alteri communicabile, ut Origines; nihil confusum, ut Sabellius: sed totum perfectum, quia totum ex uno et unum; non tamen solitarium, ut presumunt Praxeas et Siluanus, Pentapolitana doctrina damnabilis.

V. Homousion ergo in diuinitate patri filius, homousion patri et filio spiritus sanctus, homousion deo et homini unus filius, manens deus in homine suo, in gloria patris desiderabilis uideri ab angelis; sicut pater et spiritus sanctus adoratur ab angelis et ab omni creatura non homo propter deum uel Christus cum deo, sicut Nestorius blasphematur, sed homo in deum et in homine deus.

VI. Erit resurrectio mortuorum hominum, sed una et in semel; non prima iustorum et secunda peccatorum, ut fabula somnatorum, sed una omnium. et si id resurgere dicitur quod cadit, caro ergo nostra in ueritate resurgit, sicut in ueritate cadit; et non secundum Origenem inmutatio corporum erit, id est non aliud nouum corpus pro carne sed eadem caro etc.

The Lucca MS numbers fifty-six chapters in all, but the last is the same as in my printed text. The colophon runs 'Explicit definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum. deo gratias' (fol. 234 b). I have not thought it necessary to preserve the punctuation (such as it is) of the MS.

The extracts above printed shew that the Lucca MS, as we should expect from the appearance of the name of Gennadius in its title, belongs definitely to the group of MSS which present a secondary or revised text: its treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in chapter i, and its addition of various proper names in chapters ii and iv, are quite enough to prove this. But its age gives it a certain value in all those portions which the reviser left untouched of the original treatise: and it is almost the only MS which I have yet found to preserve the true form of the name Anomaeus (Anomeus) in chapter ii, where all MSS of the best family write Anomocus or the like.¹

III

Extract from the STATUTA ECCLESIAE ANTIQUA.

(*Canones apostolorum et conciliorum saeculorum iv v vi vii*,
ed. H. T. Bruns, p. 140.)

I. Qui episcopus ordinandus est antea examinatur . . . si in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus, et ante omnia si fidei documenta uerbis simplicibus adserat, id est Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum unum deum

¹ The Verona MS, also belonging to the Gennadius group, has 'Anomius'; the Reichenau MS Aug. cix of the same group gives 'Eonomius', corrected to 'Eunomius'.

esse confirmans, totamque trinitatis¹ deitatem coessentialem et consubstantialem et coaeternalem et omnipotentem² praedicans, si singularem quamque in trinitate personam plenam deum³, si incarnationem divinam non in Patre neque in Spiritu sancto factam sed in Filio tantum credat, ut qui erat in divinitate Dei Patris Filius ipse fieret in homine hominis⁴ matris filius, deus verus ex Patre, homo⁵ verus ex matre, carnem ex matris visceribus habens et animam humanam rationalem; simul in eo ambae naturae⁶, id est Deus et homo, una persona, unus filius, unus Christus, unus creator⁷ omnium quae sunt et auctor et dominus et rector⁸ cum Patre et Spiritu sancto omnium creaturarum, qui passus sit vera carnis passione, mortuus vera corporis sui morte, resurrexit vera¹⁵ carnis suae resurrectione et vera animae resumptione, in qua veniet iudicare vivos et mortuos.

quaerendum etiam ab eo, si novi et veteris testamenti, id est legis et prophetarum et apostolorum, unum eundemque credat auctorem et deum; si diabolus non per conditionem sed per arbitrium factus sit²⁰ malus.

quaerendum etiam ab eo, si credat huius quam gestamus et non alterius carnis resurrectionem, si credat iudicium futurum et recepturos singulos pro his quae in carne gesserunt vel poenas vel gloriam⁹, si nuptias non improbet, si secunda matrimonia non damnet, si carni-²⁵um perceptionem non culpet, si paenitentibus reconciliatis communicet, si in baptismo omnia peccata, id est tam illud originale contractum quam illa quae voluntarie admissa sunt, dimittantur, si extra ecclesiam catholicam nullus salvetur . . .

Here the phrase 'in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis' in line 1 recalls the title of the *Liber*. Points of contact more or less definite may be found in line 3 (= *Lib. eccl. dogm. i 1*), line 6 (= ii 1), line 9 (= ii 18, 25), line 14 (= ii 26), lines 21-23 (= vi 3-8), line 24 (= xxxiii 1, 2): but whatever doubt may exist in other cases, the words in lines 8, 9 'ut qui erat in diuinitate dei patris filius ipse fieret in homine hominis matris filius' are an indubitable echo of chapter ii line 2 of the *Liber*; and what is specially interesting, they represent the text already in the form of the 'Gennadian' revision, for the words 'patris' 'matris' occur in my three Gennadius MSS—Lucca 490, Verona lx (58), Carlsruhe Augiensis cix—but in none (so far as I know) of the anonymous or of the Nicene group. It is clear, therefore, that Caesarius of Arles, or whoever it was who drew up the code of the *Statuta ecclesiat*

¹ *aliter* in trinitate.

² *al. add.* et totas tres personas unum deum.

³ *al.* et homo.

⁷ *al.* creaturarum.

² *al.* coomnipotentem.

⁴ *al.* in hominis natura.

⁶ *al.* simul in eo ut utriusque naturae.

⁸ *al.* creator.

⁹ *al.* praemia.

antiqua, knew and used the *Liber* not in its original but in its 'Gennadian' form. But Caesarius of Arles is very near, both in time and place, to Gennadius of Marseilles: and I am therefore completely satisfied that the 'Gennadius' group of MSS may be trusted when they claim Gennadius of Marseilles for the author of the *Liber* in the (revised) form in which they give it. It follows that the original form of the *Liber*, as restored in the text printed last year in the JOURNAL, is earlier than Gennadius—unless indeed it was a juvenile and anonymous production of Gennadius's own pen. But it cannot be earlier than 450: and, as Father Puller shews, it was no doubt Gallic.

IV

The only correction which I have to make in my list of MSS (*J. T. S.* vii 81-87) refers to two MSS of the Gennadius group which I cited doubtfully within square brackets—no. [10] Munich lat. 14468, and no. [11] Munich lat. 14461. It occurred to me afterwards that it was from these two MSS that Caspari had published (*Kirchenhistorische Anekdota*, Christiania, 1883, pp. xix-xxiii, 301-304) what he entitled *Ein Gennadius von Massilia beigelegtes Glaubensbekenntniss*. Although this tract depends on the *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*, and begins with the same words, it is not identical with it; and the two MSS which contain it should, therefore, be withdrawn from my list.¹

Of additions, on the other hand, I have one to make to the Nicene group, and one to the anonymous group, of MSS. To Mr Ommanney's *Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed* pp. 145-148 I owe the reference to Paris lat. 2341, saec. ix, a bulky volume of creeds and doctrinal treatises,² among which the *Liber* is included under the title 'Dogma

¹ Caspari was of opinion that the tract was not a genuine work of Gennadius, but the composition of some Frankish theologian during the Adoptionist controversy in the later decades of the eighth century. His view is contested in the just published work of Father Brewer of Feldkirch *Kommodian von Gana, ein Arelatensischer Laiendichter aus der Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte vi 1, 2: Paderborn, 1906) pp. 217-226. Brewer has, I am given to understand, completely demonstrated his main thesis about the late date of Commodian, nor am I prepared to say that he is wrong in defending the Gennadian authorship of Caspari's tract: but he is over-hasty in his assertions about the *Liber eccl. dogm.*—he has not seen my paper in the JOURNAL—and in particular in impugning Caspari's statement that the *Liber* in its original form taught the doctrine of the Single Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. When Caspari appealed to the 'uralte Cod. Bob. Ambros.' he meant by that, not, as Brewer supposes, Ambros. G 58 sup. saec. ix-x, but Ambros. O 212 sup. saec. vii-viii.

² Mr Souter informs me that, in the opinion of Dr Holder of Carlsruhe—to the appearance of whose magnificent catalogue of the Reichenau MSS at Carlsruhe I should like to call attention—the MS came from Reichenau.

sanctorum patrum trecentorum decem et octo congregatis apud Niceam Bithiniae': the form of the title of our treatise resembles that in Paris lat. 2076, no. 1 in my 'Nicene' list. A still earlier text of the *Liber*, but unfortunately only a fragment, I came across in the library at Metz, in cod. 134, of the eighth (perhaps the end of the eighth) century. After the gathering signed E three gatherings are unfortunately lost: the next (signed I) commences in chap. 46 of the *Liber* with the words 'saluari quod perierat', and ends, as my text does, with chap. 54, the colophon being simply EXPL. DOGMA. I should conclude from this colophon that the MS belonged to the anonymous group: cf. no. 13 of that group, St Gall 230, EXPLIC. DOGOMA.

Of MSS contained in my list I have since had an opportunity of examining Laon 113 fol. 43 b (no. 15 of the anonymous group), which should be dated, I think, rather saec. x or ix-x than with the catalogue saec. ix. The MS is one of unusual interest, and contains an apparently unpublished treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity: but its text of the *Liber* is bad, or at any rate is far removed from that of the best MSS. It contains fifty-five chapters in all, the last two of my text being run into one.

Two of the manuscripts which I have collated of the anonymous group contain additional matter at the end of the treatise, which for completeness' sake I add at this point.

(a) Cod. Berolinensis Phillipps lat. 84 gives the last chapter of the *Liber* in the following enlarged form (I correct its orthography and its obvious blunders):—

'Propter nouellos legislatores, qui ideo animam tantum ad imaginem Dei creatam dicunt et, quia Deus incorporeus recte creditur, etiam anima incorporea esse credatur, libere confitemur iuxta diuinæ scripturæ relationem integrum hominem qui ex anima constat et carne ad imaginem
5 Dei factum—illam imaginem qua postea homo factus est Deus, dicente apostolo ET REGNAVIT MORS AB ADAM VSQVE AD MOYSE ETIAM IN EOS QVI NON PECCAVERVNT IN SIMILITVDINEM PRAEVARICATIONIS ADAE QVI EST FORMA FVTVRI, id est Christi nouissimi Adam, qui in forma
10 qua erat quandoque hominem adsumpturus praeformauit primum Adam; confirmante hoc ipsum apostolo ubi dicit VIR QVIDEM NON
DEBET VELARE CAPVD SVVM, QVIA GLORIA ET IMAGO DEI EST, MVLIER AVTEM GLORIA VIRI EST. in animis sexuum diuersitas non est, si una in
masculo et femina anima est, † sicut et uir est †. quomodo uir dicitur
IMAGO ESSE DEI, femina IMAGO VIRI, nisi quod Christus Deus creator
15 hominis, qui hominis¹ formam adsumpturus postea erat, uirum ad imaginem suam praefigurauit, femina uero ex uiro sumpta uiri

¹ I have conjecturally added the words 'qui hominis' which seem necessary to complete the sense: they might have been omitted by *homoeoteleuton*.

imaginem expressit? ambo tamen IMAGO DEI, quia unus ex altero, dicente scriptura CREAVIT DEVS HOMINEM, AD IMAGINEM DEI CREAVIT ILLVM (id est Deus ad Dei) MASCVLVM ET FEMINAM CREAVIT EOS.'

(b) Cod. Bernensis 89 has lost a leaf after fol. 16*b*, that is, after the end of chap. 51 of my text. The list of *capitula* prefixed to the treatise shews that there were no additional chapters, and the words that conclude the treatise at the beginning of the present fol. 17*a* must therefore be the end of another variant form of the last chapter:—

'nostrum spirare uiuere est, ita et Dei spirare uiuificare est. substantia itaque animae quadri moderatione subsistit, sensu, uoluntate, cogitatione, sapientia. sensus pertinet ad uitam: consilium ad cogitationem: sapientia ad intellectum: uoluntas ad difinitionem. haec substantia ueluti pelle creatoris sui dispositione uestitur.'

Finally, I subjoin a list of the more important changes which I should now wish to make in the tentative text printed last year. My present results are based on the collation of the following MSS of the 'anonymous' group: Milan Ambros. O 212 sup., saec. vii–viii; Cologne ccxii, saec. vii (perhaps vii ineunt.); Berlin Phillipps Cat. 84, saec. viii; St Gall 238 saec. viii, 911 saec. viii, 230 saec. ix; Vatic. Reg. 1127, saec. ix; Berne 89, saec. ix. I do not think that any of the three ninth-century MSS used are later than the middle of the century.

- c. i l. 4 *for* 'principium deitatis' *read* 'principale nomen deitatis'.
- c. ii l. 25 *for* 'corpus cum sensibus suis' *read* 'caro cum sensibus suis'.
- c. iii l. 2 *for* 'gratiae inaequale' *read* 'gratia aequale'.
- l. 4 *for* 'persuasione' *read* 'peruasione'.
- c. vi l. 7 *for* 'poenam' *read* 'poenas'.
- c. vii l. 5 *for* 'suscepimus' *read* 'suscipimus'.
- c. viii l. 2 *for* 'quam' *read* 'qua'.
- l. 6 *for* 'iudici omnium et retributori iusto' *read* 'iudici omnium, illi retributori iusto'.
- c. x l. 4 *after* 'bonitatem' *add* 'suam'.
- c. xiii l. 3 *place* 'necessaria' *within square brackets*.
- c. xv l. 1 *omit* '[uno]'.
- c. xvii b *omit the lines printed in small type altogether*.
- c. xx l. 10 *after* 'elegit' *add* 'uel quod sequitur'.
- l. 11 *for* 'Deo largiente' *read* 'Deo miserante'.
- l. 14 *for* 'ab adepto' *read* 'indepto'.
- c. xxvii ll 1, 2 *for* 'creatam . . . inuentam' *read* 'creata . . . inuenta'.
- l. 5 *omit* 'est' (*and remove the full stop after* 'mali').
- c. xxviii l. 2 *omit* 'bonum' (*and remove the brackets, so as to make* 'ut non mutarentur cum ceteris' *the object of the verb* 'possident').

- c. xxx l. 2 *for* 'retinetur' *read* 'retentetur'.
 l. 3 *omit the clause printed within square brackets* 'alioquin . . . castitas'.
 c. xliii l. 3 *for* 'uitae conditione' *read* 'uita conditionis'.
 c. xlvi l. 3 *for* 'qui decreuit' *read* 'quo decreuit'.
 c. lii l. 6 *after* 'mobilitate' *add* 'et mutabilitate'.

C. H. TURNER.

A SUPPOSED HOMILY OF EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA.

THE Coptic papyrus of the British Museum, *Or.* 5001, contains on fol. ρζ. "Eusebius of Caesarea, *On the Canaanitish Woman* . . . Begins 'Great is the storm (χειμών) but it has not been able to prevent (κωλύειν) the joy of those who have come. The Church overcomes all her trials. As the furnace the gold, so affliction benefits the soul that is fitted for it. Yesterday Paul prepared his table for us, to-day Matthew,'" &c. See the analysis in *Crum Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum* (1905) pp. 63, 64.

The commencement and the contents agree exactly with the homily of St John Chrysostom, in *dimissionem Chananaeae* (Migne *P. G.* lii 449-460), Πολλὸς ὁ χειμών, ἀλλὰ τὴν προθυμίαν τῶν παραγενομένων οὐ διεκάλυψε . . . χθὲς τοίνυν ὁ Παῦλος τὴν τράπεζαν ἡμῖν παρέθηκε, σήμερον ὁ Ματθαῖος, κ.τ.λ.

Thus this supposed sermon of Eusebius of Caesarea 'in Cappadocia' according to the Coptic title is simply a Sahidic version of Chrysostom's homily, just as the *liber de muliere chananaeae* of Bishop Lawrence the mellifluous of Novara (Migne *P. L.* lxvi 116-124) is really the ancient Latin version of the same homily; cf. Haidacher in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* xxx (1906) p. 183. Other writings of Chrysostom exist in a Coptic translation; cf. Fr. Rossi in *Memorie della R. Accademia di Torino* Series II xxxix, part 2, pp. 100 sqq. and xl, pp. 116 sqq., and *Crum op. cit.* nos. 171, 1; 177; 981; 982.

G. MERCATI.