

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]

2 Cor. iii 18 'we all with unveiled face beholding the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image' *a claritate in claritatem*. 'The Apostle asserts both that there was a glory before the Passion of Christ and that it could not be extracted, that is produced, by the Law, so that it must clearly have been by faith'. 'We have passed into glory from the same glory, and this original glory was not from the Law' or from works, but by faith and the grace of God. The 'gloriatio' of Rom. iii 27 is thus identical with the 'gloria' or 'claritas' of 2 Cor. iii 18: it was something desirable, and it came not from works but from faith.

This complete inversion of the turn of the particular phrase may however, I suspect, be due rather to Tyconius himself than to the translator of his Latin Bible. The Latin translation would be as innocent of punctuation as its Greek original; and Tyconius blundered because he read 'ubi ergo gloriatio exclusa est' as one clause instead of two.

3. Rom. vii 13 b.

ὡνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς.

St Augustine in numerous passages quotes this verse in the rendering 'ut fiat supra modum peccator aut peccatum per mandatum'. Sabatier adduces at least a dozen references: it may suffice to cite particularly *ep.* lxxxii § 20 and *contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* i 14—the first because we have of the letters a critical text by A. Goldbacher in the Vienna Corpus (vol. xxxiv p. 372. 5), the second because I found in the Bibliothèque Nationale an early fragment of two guard leaves (*nouv. acq.* 2199), from a MS of the *contra duas epist. Pelag.* which contains the quotation. The explanation of 'peccator aut peccatum' is of course that the translator was rendering not ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία, but ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία.

C. H. TURNER.

OSSIUS (HOSIUS) OF CORDOVA.

It is a curious coincidence that neither for bishop Hosius himself, nor for the council of Sardica at which he presided, do we use the form of name familiar to the Latins of the fourth century. The Greeks spelt the two words Σαρδική and Ὅσιος, and it is I suppose ultimately from Greek influence that Latins came to say Sardica and Hosius: but the bishop's contemporaries called him Ossius, and the council (and the town where it was held) Serdica. The latter fact is well enough known,

and I need not labour the proof: but, if I may judge by my own ignorance until lately on the subject, the former is sufficiently unfamiliar to justify an enumeration of the evidence in some detail.

So many proper names among Christians, Greek and Roman, were of moral or specifically Christian significance that in transliterating the name of the bishop of Cordova it was an obvious course to take advantage of so near-lying a word as ὄσιος: Ὀσιος took his place by the side of Εὐσέβιος and Μακάριος and Γρηγόριος and Ἀθανάσιος. And so St Athanasius plays on the word: Hosius is ἀληθῶς Ὀσιος, 'worthy of his name': cf. *Apol. de fuga* 5 περὶ γὰρ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ εὐηροτάτου καὶ ὁμολογητοῦ ἀληθῶς Ὀσιού περιπτόν ἐστιν ἐμὲ καὶ λέγειν, *Hist. Arian.* 45 ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἀβραμιαῖος γέρων ὁ ἀληθῶς Ὀσιος ἐφρόνησέ τε καὶ ἔγραψε . . . πᾶσι γὰρ γνώριμος ἦν ὁ ἀληθῶς Ὀσιος καὶ ὁ τούτου βίος ἀνεπίληπτος. But just because the assimilation was so obvious in Greek, we cannot argue back from Ὀσιος to a Latin Hosius.

No doubt there is a certain amount of Latin evidence for Hosius. But there is much more for Osius than for Hosius: in the lists of signatures to the Nicene council in *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* i pp. 36, 37 I printed Osius in the text of each of the five groups, and among all the MSS there used I have only recorded one instance of Hosius.¹ And just as Osius becomes more common, as we get further back, than Hosius, so in the same way there is evidence, as we get further still, pointing behind Osius to Ossius. In the fourth and fifth columns of my Nicene lists, I ought certainly to have printed Ossius, following in the one case the original hand of the oldest MS, and in the other the reading of the oldest and original reading of the next oldest MS. For the canons of Sardica the two MSS which give the purest and least adulterated text are Vat. Reg. 1997 (I) and the small collection prefixed to the main body of canonical matter in Monac. 6243 (F₂): the original hand of the former has Ossius quite regularly, in the latter it varies with the curious alternative Dyssius, for which I have no explanation to offer. On the strength of their authority I had begun to print Ossius in the text of the canons before I lighted upon the other evidence which seems to me to demonstrate that it and nothing else was the original form of the name.

For (1) in St Hilary of Poitiers 'Ossius' is the true form. Maffei, although in the *de synodis* and the *contra Constantium* he prints Osius

¹ Paris 12097, saec. vi, from Corbie (C). Possibly Hosius was a Gallic variant: in the canons of Sardica I find that no Italian MS uses the aspirate; two early MSS from Gaul, Toulouse 364, saec. vii, from Albi (T) and Cologne ccxii, saec. vi-vii, from Provence (K), vary between Hosius and Osius, Husius and Usius, while three eighth-century transalpine MSS, Brussels 2493 (bb), Munich 6243 (F), Berlin Phillipps lat. 84 (R), give Hosius only.

in the text (e.g. *de syn.* 3, 11, 63, 87: *contra Const.* 23), yet reveals in a note that the older MSS were faithful throughout to the form Ossius: ii 460 c 'in antiquis libris Osi inomen cum duplici ss constanter pingitur, puta Ossii'. In the *fragmenta ex opere historico* he regularly gives Ossius in the text.

(2) In the *libellus de confessione verae fidei* which the Roman presbyters Marcellinus and Faustinus presented to the emperor Theodosius about the year 383, the editor of the *Collectio Avellana*, vol. xxxv of the Vienna Corpus p. 15 l. 1, notes of the unique MS of the collection 'Ossius V, et sic semper per duplicem s'.

(3) Of St Augustine's treatise *contra epistolam Parmeniani* we have now Petschenig's edition in vol. li of the Vienna Corpus: and on the authority of the best MS—Casinensis 163, saec. xi, 'ex archetypo saeculi sexti uel septimi diligenter descriptum'¹—'Ossius' is regularly printed in the text (26. 9, 17; 29. 5; 33. 19, 21).

(4) In Isidore of Seville's supplement to the *de viris illustribus* of Jerome-Gennadius Arevalo's edition gives, it is true, Osius; but a Hereford Cathedral MS of the tenth century, O 3. 2, spells it Ossius, and so do two twelfth-century MSS in the Bodleian, Bodl. 391 from St Augustine's Canterbury, and Bodl. e Mus. 31 from Bury St Edmunds. But I imagine that these three MSS are not independent of one another.

Perhaps it is worth adding that place-names beginning with Oss- are not quite uncommon in the Spanish provinces: the *Corpus Inscriptionum* gives Ossonoba, Osset, and Ossigi.

C. H. TURNER.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE FLEURY PALIMPSEST (*h*).

THE publication of H. von Soden's *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig 1909) has led me to another revision of the text of the Fleury Palimpsest. Von Soden has published a study of the text of *h* for which all students of the New Testament will be grateful, and I have followed his reduction of the text to its corrected form with the greatest interest.

He has left little for any future pen to add, but nevertheless in a few

¹ I should like, in passing, to call attention to its orthography of the name Ezechiel, which is invariably written Iezech-, while in two cases out of five the accusative is Iezechielum: see *J. T. S.* ix (Oct. 1907) pp. 62 ff.