

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]

The Journal of Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1914

DOCUMENTS

CANONS ATTRIBUTED TO THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 381, TOGETHER WITH THE NAMES OF THE BISHOPS, FROM TWO PATMOS MSS POB' POΓ'.

IN the year 1898 I was enabled, through the good offices of my colleague Mr D. G. Hogarth, at that time Director of the British School at Athens, to obtain a transcript of a good deal of the matter contained in two MSS at Patmos, POB' and POΓ'—sister MSS, each of them written somewhere about A.D. 800—which are our oldest witnesses to the text of the Greek Canon Law. So far as I know, they have never been employed by any editor; and I myself had only made occasional use of my transcript, as a check on the printed texts, when I wanted to know what was the Greek original underlying any particular passage of the Latin versions of the councils. It was only when I had it in my mind to propose to the Clarendon Press the publication of a manual edition of the early Greek canons (that is, of the fourth and fifth centuries) that I examined my material more closely.

The most obvious difference between Greek and Latin MSS of Canons, taken in the mass, is the striking resemblance of the former among themselves contrasted with the almost infinite degrees of divergence from one another which prevail in the latter. The contents of Greek canonical MSS are always more or less the same: the greater surprise was it to find in the Patmos MSS a series of canons attributed to the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) together with a list of the signatures of the bishops. These signatures, between 140 and 150 in number, are extant in Latin and in Syriac, but (so far as I am aware) they are here for the first time published in Greek. With the help of Schulthess's edition of the Syriac versions, and of my own collections for the Latin versions, I have also made the attempt in the notes to control and elucidate the Greek text—especially for the bishoprics of Asia Minor, where invaluable help is available in Sir William Ramsay's *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890).

The authenticity of the signatures is undoubted; and their genuineness goes some way to suggest the genuineness of the twenty-one

VOL. XV. M.

canons that precede them. Two further points tell obviously on the same side. The 18th canon, with its reference to the Tome published at Antioch, suits the situation of the years in the immediate neighbourhood of the Council of 381¹ and of no others. And Palladius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus, from whose *Κανονικόν* (according to the title of the piece in the MS) the canons were derived, was among the signatories at the council of Ephesus in 431, so that we are once more carried back into near chronological relation with the same historical circumstances. Against these favourable considerations we have to set firstly the uniqueness of the external testimony, and secondly the fact that of these 21 canons all but two (the 18th and 21st) are to be found in a continuous series in the Third Canonical Letter of St Basil to Amphilocheus of Iconium.

The external testimony remains solitary and unique; but internal evidence does go some way, I venture to think, in recommending both the position and the form which the Patmos MSS attribute to these canons. The canons as here printed, or at any rate the first seventeen of them, hang well together, as a sort of *Poenitentiale* of which the different parts are all constructed on the same lines; while on the other hand they do not seem to have quite the character of the other canons of St Basil, where an almost conversational tone may be detected, suitable enough to the intimate correspondence of Basil and Amphilocheus, but alien (as it seems to me) from the group here separately published. The form again of the text in the Patmos recension appears to be in some marked respects preferable to the Basilian form: where the same material has been from very early times handed down in two distinct lines of tradition, we shall of course naturally expect that either will often preserve the true reading where accident has corrupted it in the other. Thus the Basil text² enables us to correct the Patmos text in the following cases: canon v l. 2 καθ' εαυτήν for καθ' εαυτόν, canon xv l. 2 μετά inserted before τῶν διακόνων, (canon xvii l. 1 ἐπίδους for ἐπιδιδούς?), canon xix l. 3 ἀξιούμενος inserted after τοῦ ἀγιάσματος. But the Patmos recension not only enables us to supply similar improvements to the Basil recension (e.g. canon v l. 2 τοῦ ἐν τῇ μοιχείᾳ ἀμαρτήσαντος for τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς μοιχείας ἀμαρτήματος, where the parallel in vii ll. 1, 2 is decisive for the personal reference; canon vii l. 2 μετανοοῦντος for παρανομοῦντος—if the latter were the right verb, a past tense was imperative; canon viii l. 1 ἀσέλγειαν for ἀσέβειαν, canon xiii

¹ Compare the 5th canon of the ordinary Greek series of the canons of 381 *Περὶ τοῦ τόμου τῶν Δυτικῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπεδείγματα τοὺς μίαν ὁμολογοῦντας πατὴρ καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος θεότητες*.

² I print below the text (pp. 164–167) an apparatus of the Basilian readings based on three Oxford MSS—Barocci 185 (O₃), Laud gr. 39 (O₄), Barocci 26 (O₁); the symbols for the MSS are those used by Mr Rackham in his edition of the canons of Ancyra—all of them written not far from the year A. D. 1000.

I. I *γεινίασις* for *στάσις*), but reveals throughout a more rugged and original cast of text. Thus in canon i l. 5 *ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν εἰς τοὺς ἀκρωμένους δεχθήσεται* has been expanded and smoothed down in Basil into *μετὰ τὰ τέσσαρα ἔτη εἰς τοὺς ἀκρωμένους δεχθήσεται καὶ ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν κτλ.*: in canon ii l. 2 the abrupt almost unconstructed phraseology *δύο προσκλαίων, τρία δὲ ἐν ἀκρωμένοις* is developed into *δύο προσκλαύσει, τρία δὲ ἔτη ἐν ἀκρωμένοις διατελέσει*: and from time to time the article or the conjunction *δέ* is inserted to ease the business-like brevity of the Patmos text. Only in two places do the differences of reading correspond to any real difference of sense. In canon xvi the Patmos recension provides that an accessory is to be excluded from communion for a term half as long as the principal: *τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ χρόνου* becomes in Basil *τοῦ τοσοῦτου χρόνου*, and there cannot surely be any doubt that the former is the true reading, though it remains an open question whether the Basil form represents an intentional heightening of the penalty or (as I rather suppose) an unintentional corruption of *το ἥμισυ του* into *τοῦ τοσοῦτου*. And in canon xx *ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις ἀμαρτήμασιν* becomes in Basil *ἐν τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις ἀμαρτήμασιν*, which leaves open the possibility that the Patmos canons were a code proposed orally while the Basilian canons were of course a code committed from the first to writing.

The alternative explanations of the relations between the two codes would seem to be the following. (1) The Basilian recension original, and the Patmos recension derivative: for the reasons above alleged I cannot feel that this explanation would account for the facts. (2) Conversely, the Patmos recension original, and the Basilian derivative: but so long as the third letter to Amphilochius is accepted as a genuine work of St Basil, who died Jan. 1, 379, chronology makes it impossible that he could have drawn on any document that first saw the light at the Council of Constantinople. (3) There remains only the hypothesis that the document, in so far as it is common to St Basil and the Council, is older than either; that the former incorporated it in his third letter to Amphilochius, but in incorporating it edited it; that the Council accepted it as it stood, and that the reason why it does not appear elsewhere among the records of the Council's work is that, unlike the Canons, it was not the original work of the bishops there assembled. They gave to the Penitential, in fact, on this view, the same sort of authority which they gave, on Hort's theory, to the creed of Cyril of Jerusalem.

Such a view does not account for quite all the elements of the question. It is propounded as purely tentative, and in the hopes that some scholar better acquainted than I am with the history of Greek Canon Law will be attracted to devote himself to the problem and produce a better solution of it.

Text

Ἔτι κανόνες τῆς αὐτῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἀγίας συνόδου εὐρημένοι ἐν τῷ κανονικῷ Παλλαδίου τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἀμασίας καὶ κοινοσθέντες παρὰ τοῦ ἐν δόξιοις ἐπισκόπου Οὐαλεριανοῦ μετὰ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν κανόνων τῶν ἐκτεθέντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Νεκταρίου παρὰ τῶν ρν.

[α]¹

Ὁ ἐκουσίως φονεύσας, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο μεταμεληθείς, ἐν κ̄ ἔτεσιν ἀκοινώνητος ἔσται τῶν ἀγιασμάτων. τὰ δὲ κ̄ ἔτη οὕτως ἐπ' αὐτῷ οἰκονομηθήσεται· ἐν τέτρασιν ἔτεσιν προσκλαίετω, ἔξω τῆς θύρας ἐστὼς τοῦ εὐκτηρίου οἴκου καὶ τῶν εἰσιόντων πιστῶν δεόμενος εὐχὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, ἐξαγορεύων τὴν 5 ἑαυτοῦ παρανομίαν· καὶ ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν εἰς τοὺς ἀκρωμένους δεχθήσεται καὶ μετ' ἐκείνων ἐξελεύσεται· ἐν ἑπτὰ ἔτεσιν μετὰ τῶν ἐν ὑποπτώσει προσευχόμενος ἐξελεύσεται· καὶ ἐν τέτρασιν ἔτεσι συστήσεται μόνον τοῖς πιστοῖς, προσφορᾶς δὲ οὐ μεταλήψεται· πληρωθέντων δὲ τούτων τότε μεθέξει τῶν ἀγιασμάτων.

[β]

Ὁ ἀκουσίως φονεύσας ἐν ἰ ἔτεσιν ἀκοινώνητος ἔσται τῶν ἀγιασμάτων. οἰκονομηθήσεται δὲ οὕτως· δύο μὲν προσκλαίων, τρία δὲ ἐν ἀκρωμένοις, ἐν τέτρασιν ἐν ὑποπίπτουσιν, ἑνιαυτῷ² συσταθήσεται τοῖς πιστοῖς μόνον· καὶ τῷ ἐξῆς εἰς τὸ ἀγίασμα δεχθήσεται.

[γ]

Ὁ μοιχὸς ἐν ιε ἔτεσιν ἀκοινώνητος ἔσται τῶν ἀγιασμάτων·³ ἐν τέτρασι μὲν προσκλαίων, ἐν πέντε ἀκρωόμενος, ἐν τέτρασιν ὑποπίπτων, ἐν δυσὶ³ συνεστῶς τοῖς πιστοῖς ἄνευ κοινωρίας.

¹ The canons are not separately numbered in Patm. POG', nor by the original hand in POB'.

² ενιαυτως *codd.*

³⁻³ εν τεσσαρα . . . εν τεσσαρα . . . εν δυο *codd.*

α 1. ἐν: *om.* Bas. 2. τῶν ἀγιασμάτων: τοῖς ἀγιάσμασι Bas. *tr.* οἰκονομηθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτῷ Bas. 3. τέτρασιν: τεσσαρσιν (*εἰ ἴτα α γ β 3 γ 2 θ 2 ια 2*) Bas. προσκλαίετω: προσκλαίειν ὀφείλει Bas. 4. γενέσθαι: ποιείσθαι Bas. 5. ἑαυτοῦ: ἰδῶν Bas. καὶ ἐν πέντε . . . μετ' ἐκείνων: μετὰ δὲ τὰ (*om.* τὰ O₃) τέσσαρα ἔτη εἰς τοὺς ἀκρωμένους δεχθήσεται καὶ (*om.* καὶ O₄) ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν μετ' αὐτῶν 7. καί: *om.* Bas. ἔτεσι: *om.* Bas. 8. τότε: *om.* Bas.

β 2. οἰκονομηθήσεται δέ: + τὰ δέκα ἔτη (*om.* ἔτη O₄) ἐπ' αὐτῷ Bas. δύο μὲν: + ἔτη O₁ ἔτεσι O₄ προσκλαίων: προσκλαύσει Bas. τρία δέ: + ἔτη Bas. ἐν ἀκρωμένοις: + διατελέσει Bas. 3. ἐν ὑποπίπτουσιν: ὑποπίπτων καὶ ἐν Bas. τοῖς πιστοῖς: *om.* Bas. 4. εἰς τὸ ἀγίασμα: εἰς τὰ ἅγια Bas.

γ 1. Ὁ μοιχεύσας Bas. ἐν τέτρασι μὲν: + ἔτεσι O₃ O₄ 2. προσκλαίων: + ἔτεσι O₄ ἐστὶ O₁ ἐν πέντε: + δέ Bas. 3. τοῖς πιστοῖς: *om.* Bas.

[δ]

Ὁ πόρνος ἐν ζ̄ ἔτεσιν ἀκοινωνήτος ἔσται τῶν ἁγιασμάτων οὕτω· δύο προσκλαίων, καὶ δύο ἀκρώμενος, καὶ δύο ὑποπίπτων, ἐν ἐνὶ συνεστῶς τοῖς πιστοῖς μόνον· τῷ δὲ ὀγδόῳ δεχθήσεται εἰς κοινωνίαν.

[ε]

Ἡ παρθεναίαν ὁμολογήσασα καὶ ἐκπεσοῦσα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸν χρόνον τοῦ ἐν τῇ μοιχείᾳ ἁμαρτήσαντος ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τῆς καθ' ἑαυτὸν¹ ζωῆς ἐκπληρώσει· τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ κρατήσῃ καὶ τὸν τῶν μοναζόντων βίον ἐπαγγελλομένων καὶ ἐκπιπτόντων.

[ς]

Ὁ κλέψας, εἰ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ μεταμεληθεὶς κατηγορήσῃ, ἐνιαυτῷ² κωλυθήσεται τῆς τῶν ἁγιασμάτων κοινωνίας, εἰ δὲ ἐλεγχθήσεται, ἐν δυσὶν ἔτεσιν· μερισθήσεται δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ χρόνος εἰς ὑπόπτωσιν καὶ σύστασιν· καὶ τότε τὴν κοινωνίαν [ἔξει].³

[ζ]

Ὁ τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην ἐν ἄρρεσιν ἐπίδεικνύμενος, τὸν ἴσον χρόνον τοῦ ἐν τῇ μοιχείᾳ μετανοοῦντος οἰκονομηθήσεται.

[η]

Ὁ ἐν ἀλόγοις τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσέλγειαν ἐξαγορεύων, τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐξομολογούμενος παραφυλάξει.

[θ]

Ὁ ἐπίορκος ἐν ῑ ἔτεσιν ἀκοινωνήτος ἔσται, δύο προσκλαίων, τρισὶν ἀκρώμενος, τέτρασιν ὑποπίπτων, ἐνιαυτῷ συνεστῶς μόνον, καὶ τότε τῆς κοινωνίας ἀξιούμενος.

[ι]

Ὁ γοητεῖαν καὶ φαρμακεῖαν ἐξαγορεύων τὸν τοῦ φονέως χρόνον ἐξομολογήσεται· οὕτως οἰκονομούμενος ὡς ὁ ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἁμαρτήματι ἑαυτὸν ἐλέγξας.

¹ καθ' ἑαυτὸν: *legendum ut uideatur cum S. Basilio* καθ' ἑαυτήν.

² ἐνιαυτῷ *scripsi*: ἐν αὐτῷ *codd.*

³ ἔξει *suppleui*: *om. codd.*

δ 1. οὕτω: *om. Bas.* 2. ἐν ἐνὶ: καὶ ἐν ἐνὶ O₃ O₄ καὶ ἐνὶ O₁ τοῖς πιστοῖς: *om. Bas.* 3. δέ: *om. Bas.* εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν *Bas.*

ε 1. Ἡ παρθεναίαν (παρθεναίαν O₃ O₄): Παρθένος O₁ 2. τοῦ ἐν τῇ μοιχείᾳ ἁμαρτήσαντος: τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς μοιχείας ἁμαρτήματος *Bas.* καθ' ἑαυτήν *Bas.* 3. πληρώσει *Bas.* δὲ κρατήσῃ: *om. Bas.* τὸν . . . βίον: ἐπὶ τῶν βίων μοναζόντων O₁ O₄ ἐπὶ τῶν βίων τῶν μοναζόντων O₃ ἐπαγγελαμένων *Bas.*

ς 1. ἑαυτοῦ . . . κατηγορήσῃ: ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ . . . κατηγορήσῃ *Bas.* ἐνιαυτὸν *Bas.* κωλυθήσεται: + μόνον *Bas.* 2. ἐν τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν ἁγιασμάτων *Bas.* ἐλεγχθείη *Bas.* 3. τὴν κοινωνίαν [ἔξει]: ἀξιούσθω τῆς (*om. τῆς* O₄) κοινωνίας *Bas.*

ζ 1. ἐν τοῖς ἄρρεσιν *Bas.* ἴσον: *om. Bas.* 2. μετανοοῦντος: παρανοοῦντος *Bas.*

η 1. ἀσέλγειαν: ἀσέβειαν *Bas.* 2. παραφυλάζεται *Bas.*

θ 1. δύο: δύσιν ἔτεσι *Bas.* 2. ἐνιαυτὸν *Bas.*

ι 1. καί: ἢ *Bas.* ἐξομολογήσεται *Bas.* ὁ: *om. Bas.* ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ: ἐν ἐκείνῳ *Bas.*

[ια]

Ὁ τυμβωρύχος¹ ἐν ἰ ἔτεσιν ἀκοινωνήτος ἔσται, ἐν δυσὶ προσκλαίων, ἐν τρισὶν ἀκροώμενος, ἐν τέτρασιν ὑποπίπτων, ἐν ἐνὶ συνεστῶς· καὶ τότε δεχθήσεται.

[ιβ]

Ἀδελφομιξία τὸν τοῦ φονέως χρόνον ἐξομολογηθήσεται.

[ιγ]

Ἡ τῆς ἀπειρημένης συγγενείας εἰς γάμον ἀνθρώπων γεινίασις, εἰ φωραβείη ἐν ἀμαρτήμασι γινομένη, τὰ τῶν μοιχῶν ἐπιτίμια δέξεται.

[ιδ]

Ἀναγνώστης, εἰ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μνηστῇ πρὸ τῶν γάμων συναλλάξειεν, ἐνιαυτῷ ἀργήσας εἰς τὸ ἀναγνώσκειν δεχθήσεται, μένων ἀπρόκοπος· κλεψιγαμίας δὲ ἄνευ μνηστείας, παυθήσεται τῆς ὑπηρεσίας. τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ὑπηρέτης.

[ιε]

Διάκονος ἐν χεῖλεσι μανθεὺς καὶ μέχρι τούτου μόνον ἡμαρτηκέναι ὁμολογήσας, τῆς λειτουργίας ἐπισχεθήσεται τοῦ δὲ μετέχειν τῶν ἁγιασμάτων τῶν διακόνων² ἀξιώθησεται· τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ πρεσβύτερος. εἰ δέ τι τούτου πλείον³ φωραβείη τις ἡμαρτηκῶς, ἐν ϕ ἂν εἴη βαθμῷ καθαιρεθήσεται.

[ις]

Ὁ συνεγνωκῶς ἐκάστῳ τῶν προειρημένων ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ μὴ ὁμολογήσας ἀλλ' ἐλεγχθεὶς, τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ χρόνου εἰς ὃν ὁ ἐργάτης τῶν κακῶν ἐπιτετίμηται καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται ἐν ἐπιτιμίᾳ.

[ιζ]

Ὁ μάντεσιν ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδιδούς ἢ τισὶ τοιοῦτοις, τὸν χρόνον τῆς τῶν φονέων οἰκονομίας καὶ αὐτὸς οἰκονομηθήσεται.

¹ τυμβωρυχος *codd.* ² των διακονων *codd.* : *praemittendum* μετὰ *cum S. Basilio.*

³ πλείον τούτου *POB'*.

ια 2. ἐν ἐνί : ἐνὶ δὲ $O_1 O_4$ ἐνιαυτόν O_3 .

ιβ 1. ἐξομολογήσεται *Bas.*

ιγ 1. γεινίασις : στάσις *Bas.* 2. γινομένη : γεγεννημένη *Bas.*

ιδ 1. πρὸ τῶν γάμων : πρὸ γάμου *Bas.* ἐνιαυτόν *Bas.* 3. τὸ δὲ αὐτό *Bas.*

ιε 1. μόνον : *om.* *Bas.* 2. τῶν διακόνων : *praem.* μετὰ *Bas.* 3. τὸ δὲ αὐτό *Bas.* *in.* τούτου πλείον $O_3 O_4$ τούτου (*om.* πλείον) O_1 4. ἐν ϕ : ἐν οἴφ *Bas.* εἴη : η $O_3 O_4$; *om.* O_1

ις 2. τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ χρόνου : τοῦ τοσούτου χρόνου *Bas.* 3. ἐν ἐπιτιμίᾳ *Bas.*

ιζ 1. ἐπιδούς *Bas.* τῆς τῶν φονέων οἰκονομίας : τῶν φονέων (*om.* τῆς οἰκονομίας) *Bas.*

[ιη]

Πάντας τοὺς μὴ θεολογούντας τὴν ὁμοούσιον Τριάδα κατὰ τὸν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐκτεθέντα τόμον, Πνευματομάχους χροῖναι καλεῖν.

[ιθ]

Ὁ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρνησάμενος καὶ παραβάς τὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μυστήριον, ἐν παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ προσκλαίειν ἐξομολογεῖσθαι¹ χρεωστὲί· ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ᾧ ἐκβαίνει τοῦ βίου, τοῦ ἀγιασματος . . . πίστει² τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας.

[κ]

Ἐὰν μέντοι γε ἕκαστος τῶν ἐν τοῖς προειρημένους ἀμαρτήμασι ἔνοχος ὢν σπουδαῖος³ φαίνοιτο ἐξομολογούμενος, ὁ πιστευθεὶς παρὰ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας λύειν δεσμεῖν, εἰ φιλανθρωπότερος γένοιτο τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ὀρῶν τοῦ ἡμαρτηκότος εἰς τὸ ἐλαττώσαι τὸν χρόνον τῶν ἐπιτιμιῶν, οὐκ ἔσται καταγνώσεως ἄξιος· τῆς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ἱστορίας 5 γνωριζούσης ἡμῖν ὡς τοὺς μετὰ μείζονος πόνου ἐξομολογούμενους ταχέως τῆς τοῦ κυρίου φιλανθρωπίας καταλαμβάνουσης.

[κα]

Περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ψυχικοῖς ἐγκλήμασι κατηγορούντων, εἴτα μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν νόσοις ἢ ἐν φόβοις ἐξομολογούμενων ὡς ψευδεῖς εἶεν εἰρηκότες ἂν κατηγορήσαν ἢ ἡμαρτύρησαν· εἰ μὲν λαϊκοὶ εἶεν (εἴτε ἄνδρες εἴτε γυναῖκες) ἔδοξεν ἐξομολογεῖσθαι μὲν αὐτοῖς τῶν μυστηρίων μεταδίδοσθαι, περιγενομένοι δὲ τῆς νόσου ἢ δια- 5 φεύγουσι τὸν ἐπιτηγμένον φόβον καὶ ἐπιβιώσασιν τὸν μέχρι τελευταίας ἡ ἀναπνοῆς ἐπαχθῆναι ἀφωρισμὸν, ὡς ἡ⁴ τὰ ψευδῆ πρότερον εἰρηκόσι καὶ αἰτίοις γενομένοις κατακρίσεως τῶν ἀνευθύνων, ἢ τότε μὲν τὰ ἀληθῆ καταθε- μένοις ὕστερον δὲ τὰ ψευδῆ λέγουσι καὶ σκανδαλίζουσι τὰς τῶν ἀπλουστέρων ψυχάς· εἰ δὲ κληρικοὶ τυγχάνοιεν, τελευτήσαντας μὲν μνημονεύσεως μετὰ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ κλήρου κεκοιμημένων,⁵ διαφεύγοντας δὲ τὸν κίνδυνον ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι 10 τοῦ προϋπάρχοντος βαθμοῦ.

¹ προσκλαίειν ἐξομολογεῖσθαι *codd.*: *legendum ut uideatur uel προσκλαίειν ἐξομολογεῖσθαι uel προσκλαίειν καὶ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι*: προσκλαίειν ὀφείλει καὶ *Bas.*

² αγιασματος πιστει *cod.* POI', αγιασματος εφεῖ πιστει *cod.* POB': *legendum ἀγιασματος ἀξιούμενος πίστει cum Bas.* ³ σπουδαῖος POI'.

⁴ ἡ *scrīpsi*: εἰ *codd.*

⁵ *Deest, ut uideatur, uerbum.*

ιθ 2. προσκλαίειν: + ὀφείλει καὶ *Bas.*
τοῦ θεοῦ: θεοῦ *Bas.*

3. τοῦ ἀγιασματος: + ἀξιούμενος *Bas.*

κ 1. προειρημένοις: προγεγραμμένοις *Bas.* ἔνοχος ὢν: γενομένων *Bas.* 2. φαί-
νοιτο: γίνηται *Bas.* 3. λύειν δεσμεῖν: λύειν καὶ δεσμεῖν *Bas.* 6, 7. ὡς τοὺς
. . . τῆς . . . φιλανθρωπίας καταλαμβάνουσης: τοὺς . . . τὴν . . . φιλανθρωπίαν καταλαμ-
βάνειν *Bas.* 7. τοῦ κυρίου: τοῦ θεοῦ *Bas.*

Νεκτάριος	Κωνσταντινουπόλεως
	Αιγύπτου
Τιμόθεος	Ἀλεξανδρείας
Δωρόθεος	πόλεως Ὁξυρύνχου ¹
	Παλαιστίνης
Κύριλλος	πόλεως Ἱεροσολύμων ²
5 Πελάγιος	πόλεως Καισαρείας ³
Μάκερ	πόλεως Ἱεριχούνητων
Διονύσιος	πόλεως Διοσπόλεως
Πρισκιανὸς	Νικοπόλεως
Νίλος	πόλεως Σεβαστῆς
10 Ῥούφος	Σκυθπόλεως
Αὐξέντιος	πόλεως Ἀσκαλῶνος
Ἡλιανὸς	πόλεως Ἰαμνίας
	Φοινικῆς
Ζήνων	πόλεως Τύρου
Παῦλος	πόλεως Σιδῶνος
15 Νεστάβος	πόλεως Πτολεμαίδος
Φί[λι]ππος ⁴	πόλεως Δαμάσκου
Βαραχὸς	πόλεως Πανιάδος
Τιμόθεος	πόλεως Βηρυτοῦ
Βασιλείδης	πόλεως Βίβλου
20 Μώκιμος	πόλεως Ἀράδου
Ἀλέξανδρος	πόλεως Ἄρκων
	διὰ Θεοδοσίου πρεσβυτέρου
	Συρίας
Μελέτιος	πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας ⁵
Πελάγιος	πόλεως Λαοδικείας ⁶
Ἀκάκιος	πόλεως Βεροίας
25 Ἰωάννης	πόλεως Ἀπαμίας
Βίζος ⁷	πόλεως Σελευκείας ⁸
Εὐσέβιος	πόλεως Ἐπιφανείας ⁹
Μαρκιανὸς	πόλεως Σελευκοβήλου ¹⁰
Πατρόφιλος	πόλεως Λαρίσης
30 Σευήρος	πόλεως Πάλτου

¹ Ὁξυρύνχου POB'.² Κοίριλλος Ἱεροσολομίαν POB'.³ Καισαρίας POG'. ⁴ Φίππος *codd.*⁵ Ἀντιοχείας POB'.⁶ Λαοδικείας POG'.⁷ Βίζος POG'.⁸ Σελευκείας POG'.⁹ Ἐπιφανίας PO¹⁰ Σελευκοβίλου

Φλαυοῦιανὸς	} πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας ¹
καὶ Ἐλπίδιος πρεσβύτεροι	
Εὐσέβιος	πόλεως Καλχίδος
Δομνῆνος	πόλεως Γαβαλῶν
Βασιλῖνος	πόλεως Ῥεφαναίων
	Ἀραβίας
Ἀγάπιος καὶ	} πόλεως Βοστρῶν
35 Βαγάλιος πρεσβύτεροι	
Ἐλπίδιος	πόλεως Διονυσιάδος
Οὐράνιος	πόλεως Ἀδραφῆς
Χίλων	πόλεως Κωνσταντιανῆς
Σενουῆρος	Νεαπόλεως
	Ὁσροηνῆς ²
40 Εὐλόγιος	πόλεως Ἐδέσσης ³
Βίτος	πόλεως Καρρῶν
Ἀβράμιος	πόλεως Βατῶν
	Μεσοποταμίας ⁴
Μάρας	πόλεως Ἐμίσης
Βατώνης	πόλεως Κωνσταντιανῆς
45 Ἰοβίνος	πόλεως Ἐμμαρίας
	Αὐγουστοεφρατησίας ⁵
Θεόδοτος	Ἱερασπόλεως
Ἀντίοχος ⁶	πόλεως Σαμοσάτων
Ἰσιδώρος	πόλεως Κύρου
Ἰοβίνος	πόλεως Πέρρης
50 Μαρίνος	πόλεως Δολιχῆς
	Κιλικίας
Διόδωρος	πόλεως Τάρσου
Κυριακὸς	πόλεως Ἀδανῶν
Ἡσύχιος	πόλεως Ἐπιφανίας
Γερμανὸς	πόλεως Κωρικοῦ
55 Ἄεριος	πόλεως Ζεφυρίου
Φιλιμόσος	Πομπιουπόλεως
Ὀλύμπιος	πόλεως Μαμψουεστίας
Θεόφιλος	πόλεως Ἀλεξανδρείας
	διὰ Ἀλνπίου πρεσβυτέρου

¹ Ἀντιοχείας POB'. ² Ὁσροηνῆς *codd.*³ Ἐδάσης POG'.⁴ Μεσοποταμίας POG'.⁵ Αὐγουστος Φρατησίας *codd.*⁶ Ἀντίοχος POB'.

Καπαδοκίας

	Ἐλάδιος	πόλεως Καισαρίας
60	Γρηγόριος	Νύσης
	Αιθέριος	πόλεως Τυανῶν
	Βοσπόριος	πόλεως Κολωνίας
	Ὀλύμπιος	πόλεως Παρνασοῦ
	Γρηγόριος	πόλεως Ναζιανζοῦ ¹
	Ἄρμενίας μικρᾶς	
65	Ὅτρηϊός	πόλεως Μελιτήνης ²
	Ὅτρηϊός	πόλεως Ἀραβίσου ³
	Ἰσαυρίας ⁴	
	Ὀλύμπιος	πόλεως Σελευκίας
	Μοντανός	Κλαυδιουπόλεως
	διὰ Παύλου πρεσβυτέρου	
	Φιλόθεος	Εἰρηνοπόλεως ⁵
70	Ψυστος	πόλεως Φιλαδελφίας
	Μουσώνιος	πόλεως Κελενδέρεως
	Μαρίνος	πόλεως Δαδισάνδου
	Θεοδόσιος	πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας ⁶
	Ἀρτέμιος	Τιτιουπόλεως
75	Νέων	πόλεως Σελινοῦντος ⁷
	Μοντανός	πόλεως Νεοκαισαρείας ⁸
	Εὐσέβιος	πόλεως Ὀλβίης
	Κύπρου	
	Ἰούλιος	πόλεως Πάφου
	Θεόπρεπος	πόλεως Τριμιθούντων
80	Τύχων	πόλεως Ταμασοῦ
	Μνήμιος	πόλεως Κιτιίου
	Παμφυλίας	
	Ρόηλος	πόλεως Αἰγαίων
	Γάιος	πόλεως Λύρβης
	Λογγίνος	πόλεως Κολουβράσου
85	Θεόδουλος	πόλεως Καρακισίου
	Ἡσύχιος	πόλεως Κατηρῶν
	Τουήσιος	πόλεως Κατησῶν

¹ Ναζιανζοῦ POB'.² Μελιτήνης POB'.³ Ἀραβίσου POΓ'.⁴ Ἰσαυρίας POΓ'.⁵ Εἰρηνοπόλεως POB'.⁶ Ἀντιοχείας POΓ'.⁷ Σελενοῦντος POB'.⁸ Νεοκαισαρείας POΓ'.

	Μίδος	πόλεως Πανέμου
	Ἡρακλείδης ¹	πόλεως Τίχους
90	Θεόδουλος	πόλεως Εἰαλοῦτου
	Παμμένιος	πόλεως Ἀριάσσου

Λυκαονίας

	Ἀμφιλόχιος	πόλεως Ἴκονίου
	Κύριλλος	πόλεως Οὐμαδῶν
	Ἀριστοφάνης	πόλεως Σωπατρῶν
95	Παῦλος	πόλεως Λυστρῶν
	Ἰνζους	πόλεως Κορινῶν
	Δαρείος	πόλεως Μιστιάς
	Λεόντιος	πόλεως Πετρῶν
	Θεοδόσιος	πόλεως Ὑδης
100	Εὐστράτιος	πόλεως Κάνων
	Δάφνος	πόλεως Δέρβης
	Εὐγένιος	πόλεως Ποσαλῶν
	Ἰλῦριος	πόλεως Ἰσαυρῶν
	Σευήρος	πόλεως Ἀνδαδῶν

Πισιδίας

105	Ὅπτισιος	πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας ²
	Θέμιστος	πόλεως Ἀδριανοπόλεως ³
	Ἀγγαλος	πόλεως Προστανῶν
	Ἀνιανός	πόλεως Ἀδανῶν ⁴
	Φαῦστος	πόλεως Αἰμενῶν
110	Ἰώνιος	πόλεως Σαγαλάσσου
	Καλλίνικος	πόλεως Ποιμάνδρου
	Εὐστάθιος	πόλεως Μητροπόλεως
	Πατρίκιος	πόλεως Παρλάσσου
	Λούκιος	πόλεως Νεαπόλεως
115	Λουλιανός	Σωζοπόλεως
	διὰ Συμπλικίου πρεσβυτέρου	
	⁵ Τύραννος πρεσβύτερος πόλεως Ἀμορίου	
	Αὐξανῶν ⁵ πρεσβύτερος πόλεως Ἀπαμείας ⁶	
	Ἐλαδίου πρεσβύτερος πόλεως Κονάνων	
	Θεοσέβιος πόλεως Φιλομιλίου	
	διὰ Βάπου πρεσβυτέρου	

¹ Ἡρακλείδης codd.² Ἀντιοχείας POΓ'.³ Ἀδριανοπόλεως POB'.⁴ Ἀδανῶν POB'.⁵⁻⁵ Τύραννος . . . Λυτανῶν ut uicd codd.⁶ Ἀπαμείας POΓ'.

	Λυκίας	
120	Τατιανός	πόλεως Μύρων
	Πιόνιος	πόλεως Χώματος
	Εὐδήμος	πόλεως Παταρῶν
	Πατρίκιος	πόλεως Οἰνοανδῶν ¹
	Λουπίκιος	πόλεως Λυμυρῶν
125	Μακεδῶν	πόλεως Ξάνθου
	Ῥωμανός	πόλεως Φασελιάδος
	Ἐρμαῖος	πόλεως Βουβοναίων
	Θεοαντιανός	πόλεως Ἀραξοῦ
	Φρυγίας Σαλουταρίας	
	Βίτος	πόλεως Πρυμνήσου
130	Αὐξάνικος	πόλεως Εὐκαρπίας
	Φρυγίας Πακατιανῆς ²	
	Νεκτάριος	πόλεως Ἴππιας
	Θεόδωρος	πόλεως Εὐμενίας
	διὰ Προφοντούρου πρεσβυτέρου	
	¹ Οἰνωανδῶν <i>codd.</i>	² Φρυγίας Βατιανῆς
	POB', Φρυγίας Πατιανοῖς POΓ'.	

	Καρίας	
	Ἐκδίκιος	πόλεως Ἀφροδισιάδος
	Λεόντιος	πόλεως Κιβυρῶν
	Βιθυνίας	
135	Εὐφράσιος	πόλεως Νικομηδείας
	Θεόδωρος	πόλεως Νικαίας
	Ἰολύμπιος	πόλεως Νεοκαισαρίας
	Θεόδουλος	πόλεως Χαλκηδόνος ¹
	Εὐστάθιος	πόλεως Προύσης
	Πόντου	
140	Τερέντιος	πόλεως Ἀμασίας ²
	Ἐθέριος	πόλεως Τομαίων
	Σεβαστιανός	πόλεως Χερσονήσου
	Ἀχιλεὺς	πόλεως Ἀπαμείας ³
	Ἄγριος	πόλεως Ἡμιμόντου
	Πόντου Πολεμονιακοῦ	
	Ἀτάρβιος διὰ Κύλου ἀναγνωστοῦ	
	¹ Χαλκηδῶνος <i>codd.</i>	
	² Ἀπαμείας POB'.	³ Ἀπαμίας POΓ'.

5. Πελάγιος: should be Γελάσιος, with Latt. and Thdt. *H. E.* v 8.¹
7. Διόσπολις: i. e. Lydda.
8. Νικόπολις: i. e. Emmaus.
9. Νίλος: should apparently be Saturninus (with Latt.) or Saturnilus. The Greek form of the Acts of Perpetua gives consistently Σατορνιλος (Σατορνιλος) for the Latin Saturninus. Σεβαστή, i. e. Samaria.
16. Φίππος *codd.*: read Φίλιππος.
17. Πανιάς: i. e. Caesarea Philippi.
34. Ῥεφαναίων: should be Ῥαφαναίων with Latt.
35. Βαγάλιος: should be Bagadius, compare the Acts of the Council of Constantinople in 394, where the regularity of his deposition from his see (he had become bishop of Bostra) was discussed.

¹ Theodoret, in the passage referred to, gives a summary list of the more noteworthy participants in the council—Helladius, successor of Basil, Gregory and Peter, brothers of Basil, Amphilocheus, metropolitan of Lycaonia, Optimus of Pisidia, Diodore of Cilicia: and besides them Pelagius of Laodicea, Eulogius of Edessa, Acacius [no doubt the bishop of the Syrian Beroea, No. 24], 'our own Isidore' [i. e. the bishop of Cyrrhus, No. 48], Cyril of Jerusalem, Gelasius of Palestinian Caesarea. All these can be easily identified in the list, with the single exception of Peter: it is noteworthy that neither in v 8 nor in iv 30 does Theodoret connect his name with any see, and when we further find that his name does not appear in the Constantinopolitan list, the doubt which Venables expresses in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (iv 346 a) as to the value of the evidence which connects him with the see of Sebaste seems amply justified. Either he was not a bishop at all, or, if he was, he was a bishop unattached.

36. Διονυσιάς : i. e. Soada, between Bostra and Canatha.
37. Ἀδραφή : Latt. Adradensis and Adarensis, Syr. Adrados. The atlases give the name of the town as Adraha or Adra.
40. Eulogius of Edessa is named by Thdt. *H. E.* v 8.
43. Ἐμίση : read Ἀμίδη with Latt. Amida.
44. Κωνσταντιανή (perhaps better Κωνσταντινή with lat.-Prisc.) : i. e. Tela, as the Syriac actually gives it. Βατώνης with Batenis lat.-Prisc. : Batthes lat.-Dion., and the Syriac implies some similar form.
45. Ἐμμαρία : Latt. Aemarensis and Emarias, and the Syriac is similar. Ptolemy speaks of a Βεθαμμαρία, and Procopius *de aedif.* II ix 10 (I owe the reference to Mr Hogarth) says that Chosroes pulled down the walls τοῦ καλουμένου Ἡμερίου.
48. Isidore ὁ ἡμέτερος is named by Theodoret, himself bishop of Cyrrhus, *H. E.* v 8.
50. Μαρίνος : Latt. and Syr. agree on the form Maris.

Cilicia.

51-58. Here first we have the advantage of the aid to be derived from Sir William Ramsay's invaluable *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (1890). For the Cilician cities, about which there is no difficulty, see the lists in Ramsay, p. 383 : but it must be remembered that Cilicia was not divided into Prima and Secunda till the fifth century, so that at both Nicaea and Constantinople it is still given as a single unit, while Ramsay only treats of it as divided.

Cappadocia.

59-64. The six cities in Cappadocia are all easily identifiable in Ramsay's table, p. 282 : Colonia is the earlier Archelais. But with respect to one name among the bishops, and three among the cities, there is some doubt on the evidence as to the correct orthography, and a brief statement on this head may be worth making.

59. Ἐλάδιος is the form of name given in the Patmos MSS to St Basil's successor at Caesarea, as also to the presbyter of Conana, No. 118 *infra*. With regard to the single l it has the support on this occasion of one family of the MSS of lat.-Prisc., but no support at No. 118, and it seems clear that the Patmos MSS are prone to avoid the double ll, as in 103 Ἰλίριος and 115 Λουλιανός. On the other hand the absence of the aspirate agrees on this occasion (not at 118) with the Syriac evidence, and on both occasions with lat.-Dion., while the MSS of lat.-Prisc. are again divided, with some preponderance both times for Elladius (Eladius). Thdt. *H. E.* v 8 calls the bishop of Caesarea Ἐλλάδιος.

60. Νύσση. The single s has the united testimony of the Patmos MSS and the versions : yet the traditional spelling of Nyssa with

double s seems to reappear in all Ramsay's authorities, pp. 282, 287. Compare 63 Παρνασοῦ, 80 Ταμασοῦ, 129 Πρυμνήσον.

63. Παρνασοῦ is supported by lat.-Prisc., and of Ramsay's authorities by Hierocles: double s lat.-Dion., with the rest of Ramsay's evidence.

64. The strange native-sounding name Ναζιανζός was bound to experience changes at the hands of Greek and Latin scribes: assimilation of one syllable to the other prompted either the insertion of a second n (Νανζιανζός one Patmos MS, Nanzanzenus one family of lat.-Prisc.) or the omission of the one n (Nazazus the rest of the Latin witnesses).

Armenia Minor.

That the correct name of this province in the fourth century was not Armenia Secunda but Armenia Minor, Ἀρμενία μικρά, is proved by the consentient testimony of the Laterculi of Verona and Polemius (Bury's *Gibbon* ii 551), and the lists of the Councils of Nicaea (*Eccl. Occid. Mon. Jur. Ant.* i pp. 60, 61) and Constantinople. That both the bishops who came from the province to the latter council should bear the unusual name Otreius would be otherwise so strange that the most natural explanation is that, like the two Gregories of Nazianzus and Sasima, they were father and son: the bishop of Melitene is mentioned as far back as the Council of Tyana in 367, the bishop of Arabissus as far on as the episcopate of Chrysostom.

Isauria.

67-77. The Patmos MSS give the correct names of the bishops, save in the case of the metropolitan of Seleucia, No. 67, where for Ὀλύμπιος—which has perhaps crept into the text by reminiscence from No. 63 *supra*—we must read with all the versions Συμπόσιος. For the cities see the table in Ramsay opposite p. 362: most of them offer no difficulty at all; for Nos. 69, 70, Εἰρηνόπολις and Φιλαδέλφεια, see p. 365, for No. 73 Ἀντιόχεια—probably Antiochia 'ad Cragum'—p. 380, for No. 74 Τιτιούπολις p. 370. In only the three following cases is the form given by the Patmos MSS incorrect.

72. Δαδισανδοῦ becomes Dalisandus in lat.-Prisc. and Syr., Dasidandus in lat.-Dion.; the evidence given in Ramsay (pp. 362 b, 366) shews that Dalisandus is right. Whether the error was one of eye (Δ for λ) or ear we cannot tell.

76. Νεοκαισαρεία is wrong, though it has confirmatory support in an inferior Syriac MS. All the Latin evidence, and the best Syriac MS, is for Διοκαισαρεία, and this is right: Ramsay, pp. 362 b, 364.

77. Ὀλβίης should be Ὀλβης: compare the reading of the best MS of lat.-Prisc., Olbis, and Ramsay, pp. 362 b, 364. The other reading has arisen by confusion with Olbia in Pamphylia; the Isaurian city is Olba.

Pamphylia.

82-91. The Pamphylia group presents more difficulties perhaps than any other. Coracesium, Catenna or Cotenna, and Ariassos can be identified at once: Colybrassus is in the larger Kiepert: for the rest we must go to Ramsay *Historical Geography of Asia Minor (ut supra)* and especially to the map facing p. 330. Lyrbe and Casai represent Nos. 83 and 87. No. 90 *Εἰαλοῦον* has S for E in all Latin and Syriac authorities, and the confusion of C with E is an easy one for scribe or transcriber to make: *Εἰάλουον* is then no doubt Ramsay's Sillyon,¹ cf. p. 416. Nos. 88 and 89 *Πανέμου* and *Τίχου*s (which forms the versions faithfully reproduce) must certainly, as Ramsay points out, p. 409, be run into one place-name *Πανεμοντείχος*, a bishop from which was present at Nicaea (No. 178 in my *Eccl. Occid. Mon. Tur. Ant.* i 76, 77). But the documents do not seem to me to give any support to his further conjecture that the bishop of No. 88, Midus, should be assigned the see-town Petnelissus: the problem of finding a second see-town must be left unsolved, and perhaps the corruption may extend to the neighbouring numbers, for the bishop of No. 87, *Τουήσιος*, has a name which looks much more like part of a place than a personal name.

But the most serious difficulty raised by the Pamphylian names concerns the very first of the list, No. 82. The versions indeed shew that an initial T has dropped out from the bishop's name: read *Τρόηλος* (*Τρώιλος*) for *΄Ρόηλος*. What, however, was his see-town? The Greek has *Αιγαίων*: the Latin *Geonensis* (adj.) or *Egeon* (genitive of noun): the Syriac something like *Egenon*. Ramsay, p. 418, identifies with *Έρενά*, which I cannot think quite satisfactory.

Lycaonia.

92-104. The Lycaonian names present far less difficulties than the Pamphylian. The names of the bishops are warranted throughout by the Latin: even the strange 'Inzus' (No. 96) reappears in lat.-Dion., though lat.-Prisc. (with some support in Syriac) gives *Ininius*. There is not one of the thirteen that cannot be satisfactorily identified by the help of Ramsay's table of Lycaonian cities *op. cit.* p. 331: the only name there omitted is that of *Derbe*, but as the city is given a place both in the map (facing p. 330) and in the detailed enumeration (p. 336), it is to be presumed that the omission in the table is an oversight. The names of *Iconium*, *Lystra*, *Misthia*, *Derbe*, and *Isaura* (Nos. 92, 95, 97, 101, 103) present no difficulty; but on each of the rest a word or two may be necessary.

¹ The resemblance of α and λ in Greek uncials would perhaps justify us in conjecturing *Σαλλούον* in our list: but in this case both Latin versions have the α, and at least one Syriac MS.

93. Οὔμαδά should be Οὔμαναδά: lat.-Dion. implies Umanada, lat.-Prisc. Cumanada, and the latter form of the name is borne out by most of the Latin versions of the Nicene list (*Eccl. Occid. Mon. Jur. Ant.* i 78, 79, No. 182). But the Syriac version here represents Οὔμαναδά, and that is no doubt the correct form.

94. Σωπαρά is supported by lat.-Prisc. and by the Syriac, and is nearer to what appears to be the true name, Sabatra or Sauatra, than the Sopara of lat.-Dion.

95. Κορνά is the reading of the Patmos MSS. Ramsay's authorities (p. 330) give Κορνά: but both Latin versions and the Syriac text agree with the Patmos MSS in inserting i between r and n, and Κορνά maintains therefore a claim for consideration.

98. Περά has no support anywhere, and must be altered to Περτά with lat.-Prisc., Syriac (and in effect lat.-Dion., which implies Perga): Perta is the form in nearly all Ramsay's authorities.

99. Ὕδη of our MSS and of lat.-Dion. is correct. Ramsay has adopted Udisenus in the column representing the Council of Constantinople, but he has been misled, as in some other cases, by the printed texts: most MSS of lat.-Prisc. have, it is true, Ydisenus, but the best MS has Sydis, and no doubt Ydis was the original form even in lat.-Prisc.

100. Κάνα has the support, for the single n, of one of the *Notitiae*: but the rest of Ramsay's witnesses agree with lat.-Prisc. (and in effect lat.-Dion.) in doubling the n, Κάννα.

102. Πασαλά is supported as far as the first vowel goes by lat.-Prisc. and Syriac, as far as the λ is concerned by lat.-Dion. and Syriac. But the true reading for our Council would appear to be Πασαδά: most of Ramsay's authorities give Οὔασαδά.

104. Ἄνδαδά would seem at first sight a blunder of our MSS, for the Latin and Syriac evidence is clear for Ἄμβλαδά, and this is the form in Ptolemy, Hierocles, and some of the *Notitiae*: but other *Notitiae* have Ἄμδαδά, which is sufficiently close to the Patmos MSS.

Pisidia.

105-119. Fifteen sees are represented under the province Pisidia in the Constantinopolitan signatures: Ramsay, following I do not know what Latin list, gives sixteen in the table facing p. 388, but his Eugenius Paspanensis is absent alike from the Patmos MSS, from lat.-Prisc. and lat.-Dion., and from the Syriac. It is to be noted further that three cities allotted to Pisidia in the Conciliar list will be found in other connexions in Ramsay's work: Philomelium and its neighbour Hadrianopolis (the earlier Thymbriion) under Phrygia, p. 140, and Amorion under Galatia Salutaris—a new province founded soon after

the date of the Council of Constantinople—p. 230. The other twelve cities are dealt with under the heading Pisidia, pp. 387 ff.

No difference worth noting exists in the tradition of the names of Antioch, Metropolis, Neapolis, Sozopolis, Apamea, Conana (Nos. 105, 112, 114, 115, 117, 118; Ramsay *op. cit.* pp. 396, 400, 402, 403, 407): there remain six names of which not so much can be said, though, as in the case of the Lycaonian cities, in no case is the identification at all really doubtful.

107. Προστανά, with which form agree lat.-Dion. and some of the Syriac evidence, is no doubt more correct than either the Prostada of lat.-Prisc. or the Prostama which Ramsay cites as the Conciliar form: the coins give Προστανένων. Ramsay, p. 407.

108. Ἀδανά of one Patmos MS and Ἀνδανά of the other are both wrong: Ἀδαδά is supported alike by the Latin and Syriac versions, and by all of Ramsay's authorities.

109. Αἰμενά must be corrected into Λιμενά on the testimony of both versions and of the parallels in the *Notitiae* and in the Councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon. The form of the name is so constant in all authorities that I hesitate to accept Ramsay's transformation (p. 414) into Λίμναι, 'the Lakes'.

110. Σαγάλασσος of the Patmos MSS is right, for it agrees both with the coins Σαγαλασσέων and with our other Greek evidence: the two versions combine to invert γ and λ, 'Salagassus'.

111. Ποίμανδρος has the entire support of lat.-Dion., and the partial support of the Syriac 'Pumandun'. But Thymandun of lat.-Prisc. points to the true form Θύμανδος, from which our Greek MS has rather definitely deviated: Ramsay, p. 402.

113. Πάρλασος, with which compare Parlaxu of lat.-Prisc. and probably the archetype of the Syriac MS, seems to have no authority outside the Constantinople list; but it appears to be a genuine variant on the ordinary Parlais. The town was a colony, and calls itself IVL. AVG. COL. PARLAIS on its coins.

Of the Pisidian episcopal names Ὀπτίσιος (105) should be Ὀπτιμος (so Latt. and Syr. as well as Thdt. *H. E.* v 8); Θέμιστος (106) should be Θεμιστίος; Ἀγγαλος (107) should be Ἀτταλος; Ἀνανός (108) is unobjectionable in itself, but the remaining authorities all point to Ἀνάσιος; Ἰώνσιος (110) is on the same evidence to be altered to Ἰωνίσιος. The presbyter Βάπος, who subscribes for Theosebius of Philomelium, ought clearly, as the versions shew, to become Βάσσιος.

Lycia.

120-128. For the province of Lycia we get less help than before from Ramsay, whose work on the Lycian cities is practically confined to the

table facing p. 424.¹ But fortunately no serious problems are raised by the list, and it is possible without difficulty to identify each of our nine cities with names appearing in the table. Myra, Choma, Patara, Limyra are certain enough; and such variations as affect the other names are relatively unimportant.

123. The form *Οἰωανδά* (*Οἰωανδά*) of the Patmos MSS is supported against Ramsay's *Οἰιανδά* by both Latin versions (the Prisca corruptly inserts the letter m, Ynomandun) and by the Syriac text, though the editor in his apparatus cites a variant which may represent iota rather than omega.

125. *Ξάνθος* of our text is supported by Ramsay's witnesses against the versions: lat.-Dion. has Xandulensis, lat.-Prisc. and the Syriac agree on the form Xandun or Sandun—an agreement in apparent error which raises the question whether these two versions descend from a common archetype, though it is probably enough to say that in both versions the name follows three towns with the termination -un (-on): the Prisca continues the process, and turns the next town as well from a singular to a plural.

126. The Patmos MSS seem to be the only authority for the presence of an alpha in the name *Φασελιάς*: most of Ramsay's authorities combine with our versions on *Φασελίς* or *Φασηλίς*.

127. *Βουβοναίων* of our MSS agrees well enough with the versions—after we have corrected Bubuteun of the Prisca to Bubuneun—but seems by exception to represent an adjective formed from the name of the town, 'the Bubunaeans': *Βούβων* or *Βούβου* is apparently the proper genitive of the name of the town itself.

128. **Αραξα*, genitive **Αράξης*, is so consistently given by all Ramsay's authorities that it must presumably be right, and the masculine form implied in the Patmos text **Αραξοῦ* (and lat.-Prisc. Araxu) must presumably be wrong. Lat.-Dion. gives no help; the Syriac Araxus may perhaps represent a feminine genitive as easily as a masculine nominative.

Of the names of the bishops, the only cases where the versions modify the text of the Patmos MSS are 124, where Lupicinus (so both Latin and Syriac) must be read for Lupicius, and 128, where, though Thoantianus has some Latin support, we ought probably to read Thoantinus with lat.-Dion., the best MS of lat.-Prisc., and the Syriac—if we may treat the absence of more than a single vowel between t and the second n in the Syriac as a fair indication of the Greek form meant to be represented.

¹ Neither the list of the Council of Nicaea nor that of the Council of Constantinople is on this occasion cited with the rest of the evidence by Ramsay.

Phrygia Salutaris and Phrygia Pacatiana.

129-132. The province of Phrygia was divided at, or not long after, the reorganization of the empire under Diocletian: if the Nicene list may be trusted, Phrygia was still a single unit in 325. Before the Council of Laodicea—though of that council the exact date is uncertain—the province had not only been divided, but the names Pacatiana (metropolis Laodicea) and Salutaris (metropolis Synnada) had ousted the proper names of Prima and Secunda. Prymnessus should apparently be Prymnessus (Ramsay, p. 139), though the Latin versions agree with the Patmos MSS on the single s: compare above Nos. 59, 60, 63. Neither about the identification of this name, nor of Eucarpia and Eumenia, is there room for doubt: but No. 131 Ἰππία is wrong, and must be corrected by the help of the Latin texts to Ἀππία, cf. Ramsay, p. 146. So too of the bishops' names three are certain, one, No. 130, is doubtful: for Ἀὐξάνικος lat.-Dion. gives Auxanianus, lat.-Prisc. Eusanius, while one Syriac MS apparently represents Auxaninus and the other Ausaninus. The choice must lie between Auxaninus and Auxaninus.

Caria.

133, 134. The only point that arises is the difference over the bishop's name, No. 133, where the Patmos MSS with lat.-Prisc. give—rightly, as I suppose—Ecdicius, lat.-Dion., and Syr. Eudocius.

Bithynia.

135-139. Only one bishop's name is doubtful: for No. 136 the versions combine to substitute Dorotheus for the Θεόδωρος of the Patmos MSS. For the city Neocaesarea see Ramsay, p. 181.

Pontus Amasia and Pontus Polemoniacus.

The name of Pontus Amasia—which appears to be in the *Laterculus* of Polemius the equivalent of the older Diospontus of the Verona list and the Council of Nicaea, and of the later Helenopontus of the *Notitiae* and the Council of Chalcedon—puzzled the scribe of the archetype of the Patmos MSS, so that Amasia became the name of a city, and at the same time an omission of several lines must have taken place. With the help of the versions we may restore the lost passage as follows: Πόντου Ἀμασίας Πανσόφιος πόλεως Ἰβάρων¹ Μυσίας Μαρτύριος Μαρκιανουπόλεως Σκυθίας. Then, as Ἀμασία has been wrongly taken down into the line below its proper place, the bishops and their sees no longer correspond in the Greek: the bishop of No. 140 Τερέντιος belongs to the see of No. 141, Tomi, the bishop of No. 141 Ἐθέριος belongs to the locality or city of No. 142, Chersonesus, and the bishop of No. 142 Σεβαστιανός belongs to Anchialus, which the versions give correctly as a town, while the Greek has made it into the name of No. 143 Ἀχλιεύς. But Anchialus belongs to the province Haemimontus, and it is clear

¹ Ramsay, pp. 326-328.

therefore that the Ἡμμόντου which all our authorities, Latin and Syriac as well as Greek, make into the see-town of bishop Agrius, No. 144, ought to be moved higher up, so that the text should run Ἡμμόντου Σεβαστιανὸς Ἀγχιάλου. We have then, so far, the provinces in succession of Pontus Amasia, Moesia, Scythia, and Haemimontus, and the list is closed by a single name from Pontus Polemoniachus, namely, Atarbius. This bishop's see is not given, but the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* s.v. shews good reason for placing him at Neocaesarea, and Neocaesarea was the metropolis of Pontus Polemoniachus. Possibly we ought to transfer this province with its single representative to a position immediately after Pontus Amasia with its single bishop, and the three provinces Bithynia, Pontus Amasia, Pontus Polemoniachus would then follow one another in proper geographical order from west to east along the northern coast of Asia Minor: but it is also possible that the one prelate whose signature was attached by a member of the lower clergy was considered to be in his proper place at the end of the list.

The above analysis accounts for all the elements in the last section with the exception of the name Agrius, and of a city or province in near connexion with him. The Greek has πόλεως Ἀπαμείας (or Ἀπαμίας) Ἀγριος, the Latin and Syriac (Prouintiae) Spaniae Agrius. Obviously Ἀπαμίας and Σπανίας are not independent of one another; they differ by not more than two letters, and the only question to ask is which has been developed out of which. The presence of a Spanish bishop has caused much perplexity, and the novel suggestion of the Patmos MSS may therefore find the more ready welcome. But for myself I do not think that Agrius of Apamea is correct, and believe rather that the Σπανία of the Latin and Syriac evidence is prior to the Patmos reading Ἀπαμία. Spania itself, however, may be only an earlier stage of corruption: I do not know whether it would be a plausible conjecture to suggest 'Pannonia' as the ultimate original.

C. H. TURNER.

[NOTE 1. Perhaps I may take advantage of this opportunity to say that Ramsay's *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, so often cited in the above paper, enables me to make a correction in the list of Nicene names in my *Ecl. Occid. Mon. Iur. Ant.*: p. 365 he mentions that Neronias and the Cilician Irenopolis are one and the same city, so that my No. 86 Narcissus of Neronias is identical with my No. 94 Narcissus of Irenopolis: 94 should therefore have been 86 *b*, and the credit of my fifth column (the only one which does not repeat the name), is proportionately increased.]

[NOTE 2. I have found myself in some difficulty in regard to the accentuation of the cities in the Constantinopolitan list. A considerable number of these are accented on the last syllable in the transcription of the Patmos MSS, where other authorities shew the accent thrown back: and conversely, one or two are oxytone elsewhere but throw back the accent in my list, such as 65 Μελιτήνης and 110 Σαγαλάσου. After some hesitation, I have determined to follow the transcription throughout.]