

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]



This summary confirms the accuracy of the text of frag. i in the clause  $\delta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \text{ } \text{\textit{Ἰησοῦς Χριστός}}$ , on which I have elsewhere laid stress (p. 42). The connexion in which, as we now learn, it stood in the Epistle suggests that  $\tau\tilde{\omega} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \text{ } \text{\textit{Δαυὶδ γεγενημένω}}$  is Paul's gloss—supported by some modern commentators—on the closing words of Micah v 1 (2).

It should be noted that the first paragraph of the extract betrays the hand of a later editor in two places. It states that Immanuel was of two natures, the Divinity of the Word, and the body which was endowed with a rational soul ( $\text{\textit{ܩܘܡܝܢܐܢܘܢܝܐܢܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐ}}$ ). The last phrase occurs also, as we shall see, in Pitra no. 1. But elsewhere it is said that Christ was composed of the Logos and the human body, no mention being made of the soul. See, e.g., the second paragraph of this extract, and Pitra nos. 1 (par. 2), 5, 7, 9, 10. Again, reference is made to followers of Paul who to this day ( $\text{\textit{ܠܥܠܡܝܢܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐ}}$ ) are infected with his opinions. Here at least the words 'to this day' must be a later insertion.

## FRAGMENT II.

Pitra no. 4 runs thus:—

ܩܘܡܝܢܐܢܘܢܝܐܢܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐ  
ܠܥܠܡܝܢܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐ  
ܠܥܠܡܝܢܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐ  
ܠܥܠܡܝܢܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐܘܪܝܩܝܐ

'But now it is meet for us to intimate this, that he separates as two the Word and Jesus Christ; as to whom (*sc.* Jesus Christ) he has indicated both that he was weary and that he slept and that he hungered: albeit he idly says that His whole being suffered these things, for previously he affirmed that the Word is in the whole man.'

This extract quotes two sayings of Paul, the second of which was in an earlier part of the *Acta* than the first. The second, which I have not found elsewhere, is suitably placed after—perhaps not immediately after— $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \text{ } \text{\textit{ναϥ}}$  in frag. ii l. 11. There accordingly we may insert some such words as

$\eta\tilde{\nu} \text{ } \delta \text{ } \text{\textit{λόγος ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ ἀνθρώπῳ}}$ .

The first seems to be another report of the words a paraphrase of which is placed within brackets in frag. ii ll. 11, 12. If so, it is probably, as far as it goes, a more exact representation of what Paul actually said, for the Epistle is obviously a better witness in such matters than Theodorus of Raithu.

There is also a reference to fragment ii in the first sentence of Pitra no. 1, where we are told that the Epistle says:—

ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ  
ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ

‘That not as in the prophets did the Word and Wisdom of God work, but was united in essence (*συνουσιωμένος*) to the body which was endowed with a rational soul’ (*lit.* animated rationally).

Compare frag. ii ll. 9–11. We have here again the interpolated reference to the rational soul.

The next sentence is a translation of the following, which Leontius quotes from the Epistle:—

τὸντο δὲ οὐκ ἀξιούσιν οἱ καθολικοὶ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ κανόνες· ἀλλ’ ἐκείνους μὲν μετεσχηκέναι σοφίας ἐμπνεούσης ἕξωθεν, καὶ ἄλλης οὔσης παρ’ αὐτοῖς· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν σοφίαν δι’ ἑαυτῆς ἐπιτεδμηκέναι οὐσιωδῶς ἐν τῷ ἐκ Μαρίας σώματι.

In Leontius this is a continuation of the passage quoted under frag. v (p. 28), which, like the first sentence of the present extract, refers to frag. ii. There it is obviously in its proper place, the word *τὸντο* pointing back to the statement of Paul quoted immediately before. In the extract before us there is nothing to which it can refer. It seems therefore that the two sentences of the extract are distinct passages of the Epistle.

FRAGMENT VI.

Pitra no. 9 gives from the *Acta* the exact statement of Paul represented in the second part of this fragment, which I have printed from Malchion’s paraphrase, as translated by Peter the Deacon. It runs thus:—

(a) ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ

‘The Word cannot become compounded, lest it should forsake its<sup>1</sup> glory.’

(b) ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ

‘God forbid that it should be compounded and mingled.’

After (a) comes Malchion’s short rejoinder,

ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ

‘No, there is composition—the Word and its body.’

<sup>1</sup> Syr. ‘his’; probably a mistranslation of *αὐτοῦ*, referring to *ὁ λόγος*. Similarly on pp. 4, 5 the pronouns referring to ⲛⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩ are masculine.





It may here be remarked that the foregoing investigation confirms Harnack's favourable opinion regarding the series of extracts on which it is based.<sup>1</sup> He pointed out that nos. 1, 2, 6 are in agreement with Leontius's extracts from the Epistle; we now know that no. 9 is in agreement with an extract preserved by Petrus Diaconus,<sup>2</sup> and that nos. 1, 3, 4, 8, 9 have points of contact with known sayings of Paul of Samosata.<sup>3</sup> If editorial revision must be admitted,<sup>4</sup> there is reason to suppose that it was confined within narrow limits. On the whole Pitra's extracts seem to be of high value.

I take this opportunity to thank the Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., for pointing out an error in my former paper. On pp. 31, 32 I stated that St Hilary, in the latter part of his *de Synodis* commented on a letter of some 'Gaulish bishops': I should have written 'Eastern bishops'. It is in fact clear that the letter was the document presented to the third Council of Sirmium in 358 by Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste and Eleusius of Cyzicus, who acted as delegates of the Council of Ancyra held earlier in the same year.<sup>5</sup> Their testimony as to the proceedings at Antioch is more reliable than that of any bishops of Gaul could have been; and we are expressly told by Sozomen that their letter contained the decrees against Paul and Photinus.<sup>6</sup> My argument therefore regarding the use of the word *ἡμοούσιον* by Paul, so far as it is based on St Hilary's statements, is considerably strengthened by Mr Puller's correction.

H. J. LAWLOR.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Überlieferung u. der Bestand der altch. Litt.* p. 522; *Chronologie der altch. Litt.* ii p. 135 note.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 115-118.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 116, 117.

<sup>5</sup> Hil. *de Syn.* 77, 81, 90; Sozomen *H. E.* iv 13, 15.

<sup>6</sup> Sozomen, *l. c.*