### NOTES AND STUDIES

# THE SAYINGS OF PAUL OF SAMOSATA: ADDITIONAL NOTES.

In the year 1883 Cardinal Pitra published ten extracts from the documents of the Synod of Antioch which condemned Paul of Samosata, in a Syriac rendering.¹ The first five are from the Encyclical Epistle, and are given in the order in which they appeared in it, the sixth is from the same source, the seventh, eighth, and ninth are from the Acta Disputationis, and the tenth from the Creed.² Unfortunately these extracts did not come to my notice till after my paper on the Sayings of Paul of Samosata in the October number of J. T. S. had been published. I propose now to shew the extent to which they illustrate or supplement the conclusions reached in it. I follow the order of the fragments collected in my previous paper, and occasionally refer to its pages.

### FRAGMENT I.

This fragment is referred to in Pitra no. 3, which contains two paragraphs of a passage in the Epistle in which apparently the Synod commented on various testimonies from the Old Testament. The first seems to have been based on Isa. vii 14; the second interprets Micah v I (2) as predicting that the Word whose goings forth were from everlasting should go forth from Bethlehem, and then proceeds to paraphrase a saying of Paul:—

# وماهده ومعمر مع معسم مع معبد محرا المعرب محمد عداه،

'And again, that Jesus Christ was born from Mary, but the Word from God.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> J. B. Pitra Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata vol. iv pp. 183-186: Latin rendering pp. 423-425. The extracts are preserved in the British Museum MSS Add. Syr. 12154, 12155, 14533, 14538.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Routh Rel. Sac.<sup>2</sup> iii 367.

This summary confirms the accuracy of the text of frag. i in the clause δs ἐστιν 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 τῷ ἐκ Δανὶδ γεγενημένφ is Paul's gloss—supported by some modern commentators—on the closing words of Micah v I (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 (عبود الله علام الله علام). 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 (عبود المعالم) 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:-

وهما ومع كن كرووا فلا ومعدود: وضعوعه المو لما م كهدها وكرموه هعيسا: وه ووفيا وولاد وووجي ووجعي. اهي مالمالم ودكره هدا ودكي افعه: فوم كمن هجرة كره كحدكما: ودوكره دورما ووا.

'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— $i\nu$   $\nu\alpha\hat{\varphi}$  in frag. ii l. 11. There accordingly we may insert some such words as

# ην ὁ 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:—

'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:—

τοῦτο δὲ οὖκ ἀξιοῦσιν οἱ καθολικοὶ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ κάνονες ἀλλ' ἐκείνους μὲν μετεσχηκέναι σοφίας ἐμπνεούσης ἔξωθεν, καὶ ἄλλης οὖσης παρ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν σοφίαν δι' ἑαυτῆς ἐπιδεδημηκέναι 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 τοῦτο 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) محكما إسمام معنوها الا محاد الا بعده المعنود

'The Word cannot become compounded, lest it should forsake its 1 glory.'

# (b) سعه والمؤمد والمضلي.

'God forbid that it should be compounded and mingled.'

After (a) comes Malchion's short rejoinder,

# لا المازمد: صحار هينه،

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

Syr. 'his'; probably a mistranslation of αὐτοῦ, referring to ὁ λόγος. Similarly on pp. 4, 5 the pronouns referring to Δω are masculine.

After (b) follows Malchion's remark,
مولاد (الله المالية عليه المالية المالية

'On this account you will not confess composition, lest you should say that the Son of God is essentially (οὐσιωδῶς) in His body.'

This is the second sentence of Malchion's comment on Paul's saying, as reported by Peter (p. 29). There is nothing in it corresponding to Peter's 'sed sapientia secundum participationem'. It agrees more closely, however, that Peter's rendering with the parallel passage of the Epistle (p. 30) inasmuch as it has the equivalent of  $\epsilon \nu$   $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau \nu$  instead of 'in eo'.

Of the latter passage there is a translation in Pitra no. 6:— ما المعامدة على المعامدة المعا

This agrees exactly with the Greek of Leontius except that it omits μάθησιν καί and οὖσιωμένην ἐν σώματι.¹

#### FRAGMENT VIII.

This fragment, as I have printed it, consists of no more than four words taken from Leontius's sixth extract from the Epistle, and it is obviously a mere paraphrase. In Pitra no. 8 the full text of the saying is translated from the *Acta*:—

معه صعب من بعد حديم المنعه كسعه الدين المدون عديد وحلين حدا وصعبه المدون المدون حديد وحلين حدا وصعبه المدون المدون والمدون وا

'Jesus Christ who was of Mary was joined to Wisdom and became one with it, and by means of it became Son and Christ.<sup>2</sup> For he [Malchion?] said that Jesus Christ was the Son of God who suffered, who endured buffeting on the cheeks and stripes, who was buried and

<sup>1</sup> Pitra conceals the resemblance by translating leaded by amicitiam. The word leader is the regular equivalent of συνάφεια in Nestorian theology.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Pitra, no doubt following the MS, punctuates 'became one, with it and by means of it, he became', &c.

descended to Sheol, who rose from the dead. For it is not fitting to divide that one who (was) before the ages from this who was born in the end of days. For I tremble to speak of two sons; I tremble to speak of two Christs.'

It will be observed that there is here a distinct pronouncement that Jesus Christ was Son. For the importance of this see p. 34.

The parallel passage of the Epistle (quoted from Leontius, p. 34) is translated in Pitra no. 2, the first clause being omitted and an insignificant clause added at the end.

I have now to ask attention to a new saying of Paul, which I may designate as

### FRAGMENT XIX.

(مدلما حسوبا عبد لا صفح عدد عدم دول حلا دوسا عبد ولسط معدها دول)

('The Word when alone, while it was not incarnate, had need of the Holy Spirit; and was passing under law.')

The evidence for this saying is in the following speech of Malchion, translated from the *Acta* (Pitra no. 7):—

all aroare seroes well is a compace. sack consider and array of aroad aroal array of and are are incomed that aroad form of some well some form from the same well some since the serve are accepted aroas same and some are accept ones to some same are same and same are accept ones to some same are same are accepted to a some same are same and same are same are same are same and same are sa

'Concerning the *qnuma* of our Saviour it is right to think thus: that the Word when alone, while it was not incarnate, had not need of the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit received of it; and it was not passing under law. But because it was united essentially (οὐσιωδῶs) to its human body, as for the things which were happening to Him, it is as though He himself suffered them because of the composition and essential union (of the body) with Him.'

Assuming that Malchion is here combating a doctrine of his opponent, it seems clear that he would have regarded the words printed above as a sufficient statement of it. But it cannot be claimed that they approximate in the form of expression to any single utterance of Paul; they may represent a whole group of his sayings in summary fashion, and possibly not with absolute fairness. We may reasonably infer, however, from Malchion's argument that Paul held the Logos to be distinct from, and in some measure subordinate to, the Holy Spirit. But it must be remembered that another saying has led us to believe that he made the Holy Spirit inferior to the Logos (p. 41).

#### THE JOURNAL OF \*THEOLOGICAL STUDIES T20

It may here be remarked that the foregoing investigation confirms Harnack's favourable opinion regarding the series of extracts on which it is based. 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,2 and that nos. 1, 3, 4, 8, 9 have points of contact with known sayings of Paul of Samosata.3 If editorial revision must be admitted,4 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 δμοούσιον 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>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Die Überlieferung u. der Bestand der altch. Litt. p. 522; Chronologie der altch. Litt. ii p. 135 note. 4 Pp. 116, 117.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Pp. 115-118. <sup>2</sup> See p. 117. <sup>5</sup> Hil. de Syn. 77, 81, 90; Sozomen H. E. iv 13, 15.

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