

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<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]

otherwise, that the bishop is the fulfilment of the O.T. priest. Evangelicals, in view of the N.T., can fairly claim that at least the *onus probandi* is upon those who assert this. But Cyprian forces the valuable question: What does the O.T., taken seriously as revelation, and as revelation given to and constituting a 'people of God', tell us about the *Christian* church and ministry?

Finally, we have seen in Clement, Ignatius, and Tertullian some of the stages by which Cyprian's position was built up, and how often and deeply he went beyond his predecessors. It is here argued that Cyprian's theory, as a whole, cannot be proved from the Bible. He failed to establish from it not merely that moniscopacy was divinely ordained, but even that the apostles appointed any specific ministers to hold *their own* office and power. But such negative criticism does not excuse us from seeking to discover how much of this development of order in the early church was guided by the Holy Spirit, how much was relative to contemporary needs, and therefore changeable, and how much was a necessary expression of, or safeguard to, the Gospel always.

S. L. GREENSLADE

COPTIC ANECDOTA

I. *A Gnostic Fragment*

THE vellum leaf, on which the following text is written, was found, with many other vellum and still more papyrus fragments,¹ at Dēr el-Balaizah—probably an ancient monastery of Apollo—west of Asiūt. It measures 16 × 12½ cm., is paged 𐩠𐩢𐩠, 𐩠𐩢𐩡 (41, 42) and was the first leaf of quire 𐩠. Two small fragments of other leaves are preserved with it. The text, like those of most early Coptic MSS., is in one column.² Initials are neither enlarged nor protuberant, but on p. 42 a *paragraphus* with *coronis*³ is used, followed by a dividing-line of a score of >. The script may be of the fifth, indeed of the fourth century.⁴ The dialect, of course Sa'idic, shows the somewhat archaic forms π-, †- (as well as π-, τ-), πτερι-, while (π)παρὰδικος, (𐩠)𐩠𐩢𐩠𐩢, (π)πιορον, ἀρχιεπισκοπαι, ἀρδαι, ἀββελ, χπποϋ, ρπποϋ-(23),⁵ 𐩠𐩢𐩢-(42) are scribal irregularities, of no dialectal significance.

To what class of composition does this remnant belong? Gnostic

¹ All now in the Bodleian. I described the collection, translating the present text (MS. Copt. d 54 P), in F. Petrie's *Gizeh and Rifeh*, 1907, p. 39.

² The *Pistis* is a rare exception.

³ Cf. the upper part of that on pl. xi of H. Thompson's *Coptic . . . Acts and Epistles*, 1932.

⁴ It recalls Budge's Deuteron., Jonah, Acts (*Bibl. Texts*, 1912) and C. Schmidt's *Erster Clemensbrief*, 1908.

⁵ In these four a line ends between the doubled letter.

(30) φῶς δὲ οὐ ἐκποικ· | χεεκερερμινπερε | παῖ ρμπεκογῶς
 ε[τ]θεκαῖν ἀπαθελ χεε|θεαυ¹ πῦτρο[ε] α[κ]αῖν | (35) ρωτῆ παθελ
 ππαῖ δὲ | ματε ἀπ ἀλλὰ ε[γ]χπ|πογ μμοσ ριτπεν² | ψαχε παμασ
 εγχω | μμοσ χεεγτων· ἀθ|(40)θελ· πεκσον· καῖν | δὲ ἀχαρνα εγχω
 μ|μοσ³ χεεμν· ἀποκπε προγ|ριτ

‘. . . the spiritual (? λογικός) power,⁴ ere it (she)⁵ had been revealed, its (her) name was not this, but (ἀλλά) its (her) name was (5) Σιγή. For (ἐπειδή) all they that (were) in the heavenly Paradise (παρ.) were sealed in silence. But such as shall partake (10) thereof⁶ will become spiritual (? λογ.), having known all; they shall seal the five Powers in silence. Lo, I (15) have explained (ἐρμηνεύειν) unto thee, O John, concerning Adam and Paradise (παρ.) and the Five Trees, in an intelligible allegory (σύμβολον, νοερόν). (20) When I, John, heard these (things), I said, ‘I have made a good beginning (ἀρχεσθαι, ἀρχή); I have completed (25) knowledge (γνώσις) and a hidden mystery (μυστ.)⁷ and allegories (σύμβ.) of truth, having been encouraged (προτρέπειν) by Thy love (ἀγάπη).’ (30) Now (δέ) I desire further to ask Thee that Thou wouldst explain (ἐρμ.) unto me in Thy love⁸ concerning Cain and Abel: according to what fashion (τύπος)⁹ did Cain (35) slay Abel? And (δέ) not this only, but (ἀλλά) he was asked by him (that) spake with him,¹⁰ saying, Where is Abel (40), thy brother? But (δέ) Cain denied (ἀρνεῖσθαι) saying, Am (μή) I the kee[per . . .]¹¹

The larger of the fragments should be from the leaf next, or next but one, to the above, since it deals with Noah and Melchizedek.¹² It is not possible to say from what position in the leaf it was detached. Word-division and gap-filling are quite uncertain.

Recto . . .]αγ ερο[|]μααγ ς[|]τογ ε[|]εστο[| (5)]μοσ· αγ[|]
 ερογπ· επ[|]ς μπεπλη[ρωμα] | εγχνκ¹³ εβολ ει[ς ρην]|τε· ἀίρερ-

¹ αψ added above.

² Perhaps something above η, but not ταε, which seems to be required.

³ μμοσ added in margin.

⁴ Σοα is the usual translation of δύναμις; e.g. Lu. i. 35, Ac. viii. 10.

⁵ The fem. suffix serves equally for neuter.

⁶ Paradise, or the tree of knowledge? Either would be masculine.

⁷ Cf. Rom. xv. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

⁸ More literally ‘in Thy will’, i.e. if Thou wilt; but it can be taken as equivalent to the phrase in 29.

⁹ Lit. ‘Concerning, because of, what τύπος’. I am not certain of the meaning.

¹⁰ εγ- and ριτπ- would give a passive. I assume πεπταε-. Is this pronoun, in place of ‘the Lord’, of any significance?

¹¹ The Sa’idic of Gen. iv. 9 is not preserved. ‘Denied’ not found in any version.

¹² His occurrence here is of course unconnected with the use of his name in the *Pistis* (*Griech. Chr. Schr.*, ut sup. 397). It is clearly drawn from Heb. vii.

¹³ From here to end the left-hand margin is visible.

μινπευ[ε] | (10) πακ·ω·ϊωραππ[ε] | τθενωρε μιν[ε]κ[η]κ[η]ωτος·
| | [. . .] π[η]τ[η] . . .

Verso . . . εκε]ερμ[ιν]πευε παϊ ετ]θεμε[λ]αχ[ι]σεκεκ μ]η δ[υ]ζω
[μ]μ[ο]ς ετ[η]νιτ[η]] θεου[(5)ατειωτ . . .] μ[μ]ααυ [?] εαυ[] 1½ lines lost
ραν π[ω]π[η]ρ[η]] π[η]τ . οπερ[ω]] ? (10) μ[π]π[ο]υτε ε[] ε . . . [?] πο[υ]] ηη·
шабо[л]· д[у] [χ]ο[с] о]η εт[η]ниτ[η]] х[ε]р[η]] μ[μ]εμ[. . .]

Recto. 7 πλήρωμα (if not πλήθος?) presumably the biblical 'fullness', rather than the gnostic abode of the aeons. 'Lo, I have explained (έρμ.) unto thee, O John, concerning Noah and his (?) ark (κιβ.) . . . *Verso*. [But I desire further to ask Thee that Thou wouldst] explain (έρμ.) [unto me] concerning Me[lchizedek.] Is it not (μ[η]) said [concerning him] that [he was] a (5) [fatherless . . .] mother[less] end of [life a] priest for ever. It was said [also] of him that . . .'

II. Severus and the Heretics

Albeit for catholic orthodoxy a pernicious heretic himself, Severus of Antioch was tireless in his reprobation of the earlier 'heresies' and of none more than of that of the Manichaeans, to whose refutation indeed he devoted a long homily.¹ Whether the fragments of another, here published (Cairo 8010a), had that religion for their principal theme, or whether the tenets and iniquities condemned are—in part at least—those of other communities it is difficult to say. One name occurs (*Recto* col. 2) which should help to decide this, but it is fragmentary and I cannot complete it.

The MS. to which this double leaf belonged is well known; its scribe wrote a volume of Severus's Homilies in their Sa'idic translation, to which presumably our leaf belonged, and at least one of his Epistles.² To him is due likewise the fragment of Ignatius, printed by Lightfoot.³ He wrote perhaps in the tenth or eleventh century, perhaps later.⁴ The text is in two columns of 33–36 lines apiece.

¹ Ed. Kugener in Cumont's *Recherches*. Severus had himself to submit to be abused as a Manichee (J. Maspero, *Hist. des Patr.* 68, Alfarcic i, 117).

² Homilies: Paris 131¹, 68–73 + 129¹⁴, 127 = pp. α–12 (all but last ed. Porcher, *ROC.* xix). Epistles: Zoega cclxviii, pp. μγ–η, πα–ζ η and 3 unpagcd foll., (partly = Brooks, *Sel. Let.*) + Paris 129¹³, 77 pp. ζτ–λ (ed. *Miss.* iv, 827), 131¹, 75 pp. ζε–ε, 131⁸, 78 p. ?, and probably BM, 191 p. ?. Other MSS. of the Homilies existed at the White Monastery, e.g. Paris 131¹, 67 (ed. *ROC.* xx), Cairo 9276 (ed. Munier, text partly = last), BM. 190 and related leaves. BM. 185 also may safely be classed among the Epistles. In Vienna are many Severian leaves, which I know thanks to Prof. Till's copies.

³ Zoega, loc. cit., pp. ε–η. Not from the Severian volumes; cf. pagination—unless each author was pagcd independently.

⁴ Facsimile in Cairo, *Cat. Gén.*, ad loc.

(πόλις),¹ he that adorned (κοσμεῖν) this holy [throne (θ.)] in [the times] of the persecution (διωγ.) [of Deci]us and Philip,² [the kings] of Rome ('Ρώμη) Col. 2, . . . and he introduced books that [. . . .]ἔς,³ the [. . . .]fabricated and he read therein publicly (δημοσίᾳ), in the midst of the Catholic (καθ.) (Church)⁴ of Antioch. And he used to drink and to be drunken round about the sanctuary (θυσιαστήριον) with polluted youths and accursed⁵ maidens. And whilst they raved with drunkenness of wine, they would fall into fornication (πορνεία) (and) thereafter paederasty, in face of the sanctuary (θ.). Howbeit (ἀλλά) He that did buy the church (ἐκ.) with His own blood, which was shed for the salvation of all the world (κόσ.), Christ Jesus, remained not (long) without doing justice for His bride and His people (λα.). For many were the things (or men) that that bloodthirsty (?) man had transferred from (?) her (sc. church's) [midst],⁶ in upbraiding him for what he did. Forthwith he (*perf. pref.*) . . .

Verso. . . . himself (? his own)⁷ circus-games (κυνήγιον) and horse-races (ἵππικός), and having forsaken the God-inspired Scriptures (γρ.), he read from what the fabulists have said, those, that is, of his foul heresy (αἵρ.), I mean Manē⁸ and Thomas, his disciple (μαθ.)⁹

¹ Assuming the Homily to be addressed to the Alexandrines (though that is not so with any of the homilies published). The following 'this' suggests that it was spoken in Egypt, if not in Alexandria, after his exile.

² The persecution in the last year of Philip's reign (Eus., *HE.* vi, 41), to which S. perhaps alludes elsewhere (*Sel. Let.*, tr. 170), accounts for his name here. Preceding it I see no alternative to Decius.

³ Who is this writer? Completion of the next word—presumably a Greek verbal form as epithet—should identify him.

⁴ 'Catholic' thus is equivalent to 'great' church, cathedral, in which the patriarch was enthroned (Tuki, *Euch.* i, 146). The principal church in the Monastery of Macarius is so called (Evelyn-White, *New Texts* 128, *Codd. Copt. Vat.* i, 521). In the Canons of Basil (Riedel 274) contrasted with μαρτύριον. Cf. *Mon. of Epiph.* i, 116 n.

⁵ Translates ἐπάρατος Jo. vii. 49. One is reminded of Paul of Samosata.

⁶ A broken sentence, uncertain in reading and in meaning. 'Bloodthirsty' seems inappropriate, while οὔωρῆ, if 'transfer, remove', needs more context to explain it. ⁷ Could be otherwise read.

⁸ More often Manēs in Coptic (Shenoute); Manē, Budge, *Apoc.* xxx; in the Mani papyri (π)μανηχαιος.

⁹ Mani's missionary to Egypt (*Manifund* 15). Beyond the ascription of the Gospel of Thomas to a Manichaean source (loc. cit., note 3), I do not find M.'s disciple credited with literary work, unless we accept, with Allberry, the 20 'Psalms of Thōm(as)' (*Psalm Book*, pp. 203-27) as his. It may here be observed that an undeniable similarity of style and phraseology, as well as of subject-matter, exists between (the first half of) that group of 'psalms' and the 'Hymn (ψαλμός) of the Soul' (*Acta Thomae*, Bonnet, 219 ff.): adventures of a king's son, the glittering robe which he awaits, his return, passing by the Euphrates, to his father's house, the land of peace. Comparison might be pursued in detail, did space permit. If a connexion could be demonstrated,

and what all the heretics (αἱρετικός) have said. Having forsaken moreover the Apocalypse (ἀπ.) that the Son of Thunder, John, beheld Jesus, the mediator (μεσίτης) of the Father, being its author (συγγραφεύς), and consenting thereunto, verse by verse (στοιχεῖν κατὰ λέξιν),¹ [he] himself contrived books and called them Apocalypse[s?]² the [true] faith (πίσ.), I mean Patm[os?] the name[s?] of apostle[s?] (ἀπ.) he . . . psalms (ψ.)³ [and] teach (? taught) . . .

The Cairo fragments of this manuscript comprise another leaf (8010b), which has likewise lost its paging and so may be from a different part of the volume and unconnected with that here published. It deals with 'those of that evil heresy' who taught that frequent communion (συνάγειν) and oblation (προσφορά)⁴ ensure forgiveness of sins and that stale bread, if moistened with water, might lawfully be used, relying on Mt. xxvi. 26 (ἀφ᾽ ἑὸς ποτοεῖν), and asking 'Did bakers, then, follow the Lord, to bake for Him, whenever He had need?' Further, 'If the apostle said, Be not drunken (Eph. v. 18), how then should he give command (saying,) Communicate (συνάγ.) many times, till ye be drunk and vomit?' The text breaks off with a reference to Zeph. i. 8, a verse quoted more than once by Severus.⁵

W. E. CRUM

THE MOZARABIC POST PRIDIE

[ABBREVIATIONS: PL = Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. LS = *Liber mozarabicus sacramentorum*, ed. Férotin. LO = *Liber ordinum*, ed. Férotin. MX = *Missale mixtum* of Ximenes (PL lxxxv). OV = *Orationale* of Verona. AL = *Antiphonarium* of León, ed. by the Benedictines of Silos, 1928.]

EVER since Dr. Neale surmised⁶ that a certain Mozarabic *Post pridie* prayer showed signs of being 'doctored' in the interests of Roman

the Manichaean origin of the Hymn (v. Bornkamm, *Mythos u. Legende* 115 ff.) would be strongly supported and its presence in the Acts of Thomas explicable. Mani's Thomas appears indeed to be confused eventually with the apostle of India (PO. vii, 533 Agapius, iv, 227 *Hist. Nestor.*), of whose mission Mani himself was perhaps aware (Schaefer, *Gnomon* ix, 350); the *Psalm Book* (194) certainly is.

¹ Severus evidently accepts the Apocalypse (cf. also *TU*. 43, 728), but, judging by his published works (accessible to me), never quotes it.

² As if the writer, whoever he be, had so designated more than one of his books. On apocalypses produced by various heretical sects v. H. C. Puech in *Mélanges Cumont*, vol. ii. On the ever-growing number of such works v. Lietzmann, *Gesch. d. alten Kirche* ii, 87.

³ Heretical psalms perhaps, such as the Manichaean *Psalm Book*.

⁴ How often we are not told. S. himself exhorts to daily communion (PO. iv, 65). As to stale bread, cf. *Can. Athanas.* 129, § 64.

V. *Sel. Let.*, tr. 474.

⁶ *Essays in Liturgy*, 2nd ed., p. 164.