



= Ps.-Primas. (Migne, lxxviii) 544, ll. 19, 37-45, which by a slip of the compiler is attributed to the 'Apologeticus ad Pammachium'. The second is Augustine, *Epistle* 169. 1, § 2 (C.S.E.L. 44, p. 612. 22-6, 613. 4-13) = Ps.-Primas. 543, ll. 9-24.

Among the epistles of Augustine already known to have been used by Cassiodorus and his disciples are 140, 147, 187. In view of Lietzmann's classification of the manuscripts of Augustine's epistles,<sup>1</sup> which he made in order to discover what groups of letters existed in early times, it would have been interesting to be in a position to show that Cassiodorus possessed one of these bundles; but unfortunately neither 140 nor 169 appears in any of Lietzmann's groups and, while 147 appears in his M 59 group,<sup>2</sup> 187 cannot be regarded as belonging to the same group. Until all the works produced at Vivarium are thoroughly examined, it is premature to express an opinion, but meanwhile it looks as if Cassiodorus had possessed no real collection of Augustine's letters, but only a very few single letters.

A. SOUTER

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE PSEUDO-EUSEBIAN COLLECTION OF GALLICAN SERMONS

THIS collection of seventy-five homilies, arranged in forty-three chapters, was, like Beatus of Liebana's compilation on the Apocalypse, omitted from the *Patrologia Latina* of Migne. It has not, in fact, been printed since 1677.<sup>3</sup> As no one would readily trust an edition of that date, I have gone straight to the oldest and best, though incomplete, manuscript, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1316 (1651-2), of the first quarter of the ninth century.<sup>4</sup> That this is the best manuscript I learned from an extremely valuable article by Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., in which *inter alia* he argues with the greatest probability that the author of these homilies was Faustus of Riez.<sup>5</sup>

Nobody with a right to an opinion would doubt that they belong to the fifth century. The prevailing use of the Vulgate Bible would in itself prove a date subsequent to the fourth century, but there are other proofs also. The following references are of undoubted signi-

<sup>1</sup> *Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 1930 (23), Berlin, 1930: see the JOURNAL, xxxii, 188 f.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 357.

<sup>3</sup> *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum* (Lugd.), t. vi, pp. 618 ff.

<sup>4</sup> I am greatly indebted to the managers of the Hort Fund at Cambridge for the research grant which made it possible for me to study the manuscript under perfect conditions at Brussels.

<sup>5</sup> *Z.N.T.W.*, xxxiv (1935), pp. 92-115.