

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 𐩨𐩠, 𐩨𐩢 (41, 42) and was the first leaf of quire 𐩨. 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, (𐩨)𐩨𐩠𐩢𐩠, (π)𐩨𐩠𐩢𐩠, ἀρχιεπισκοπαι, ἀρδαι, ἀββελ, χπποϋ, ρπποϋ-(23),⁵ 𐩨𐩠𐩠- (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.

it clearly is: the phraseology is sufficient evidence of that. But whether this dialogue between John and Christ—for that line 29 seems to indicate¹—is from an Apocalypse, or from some form of *Acta* it is not easy to decide. Questions put by John to the Saviour are a conspicuous feature of the *Pistis*; the so-called *Mysteries of John the Apostle*² and the *Apocryphon of John*, in the still unpublished Berlin papyrus 8502, consist wholly of questions and answers between the same two; so does Tischendorf's *Apocalypse of John*;³ but none of these has any resemblance to our fragments, either in form of dialogue or in subjects treated of, which, in what remains of the text, are drawn from the Old Testament. 'Silence', as a primordial aeon or emanation, is conspicuous in the Valentinian cosmogony;⁴ here (4, 5) it is scarcely Eve who is to be thus renamed. The 'Five Powers' occur in the Bruce papyrus;⁵ the 'Five Trees' there⁶ and repeatedly in the *Pistis*.⁷ The 'heavenly Paradise' I have met with only in another Apocalypse, that of Paul.⁸ Neither these features, nor the biblical personages involved, suffice to identify more precisely the group of Gnostics whence the text emanated.

First in order should come our smallest fragment, since the words legible, 'the body', 'naked', presumably relate to Adam and Eve and the Fall. ϩΙϫ ϩ | πϫω[ϩϩ (?) κη] | καρηϩ | κονω | ατη (other side illegible).

The complete leaf reads as follows:

(P. 113)]τϫομ̄ π̄λοτικον̄ · εμ̄|πατσοϩωπρ̄ εβολ̄ | πεμπετρᾱν̄ αν̄πε |
 πᾱϊ̄ · αλλᾱ πετρᾱν̄[ε] | (5) ϩιγη̄ · επ̄εῑδ̄η̄ν̄ πετ̄|ρᾱμπαρᾱδ̄ιϫοϫ̄ π̄τη̄πε |
 τη̄ροϩ̄ πεϩϫοο̄ν̄ εϩ̄|τοο̄θε̄ · ϩποϩ̄κρωϩ̄ | τη̄ροϩ̄ πετ̄νᾱκ̄ῑσε̄ · | (10)
 εβολ̄ π̄ρη̄τη̄ϩ̄ · ϫαϩ̄ϫω̄π̄ε̄ π̄λοτικον̄ · εαϩ̄|ϫοϩ̄η̄ π̄τη̄ρη̄ϩ̄ · ϫαϩ̄τ̄ω̄|ω̄θε̄
 π̄ϫ̄ϫ̄ π̄ϫομ̄ ϩποϩ̄|κρωϩ̄ · ειϫ̄ ϩ̄ν̄ῑτε̄ · ᾱϊ̄|(15) ϩερ̄μ̄ν̄πεϩ̄ε̄ πᾱκ̄ ω̄ | ῑω̄
 ϩᾱν̄ν̄ιϫ̄ · ετ̄θε̄ᾱᾱ, ᾱμ̄ · μ̄ν̄π̄ῑπᾱρᾱδ̄ιϫοϫ̄ | μ̄ν̄π̄ῑϫ̄οϩ̄ η̄ϫ̄η̄ν̄ ϩποϩ̄|ϫ̄
 βο̄λον̄ πο̄ε̄ρον̄ · | (20) π̄τη̄ριϫ̄ω̄τ̄ε̄ ε̄νᾱϊ̄ ᾱ|(P. 114) πο̄κ̄ ῑω̄ϩᾱν̄ν̄ιϫ̄
 ᾱϊ̄ϫ̄ο̄ϫ̄ ϫε̄ᾱῑαρ̄χε̄ιϫ̄ο̄ᾱϊ̄ ϩη̄|ποϩ̄αρ̄χη̄ ε̄νᾱποϩ̄ϫ̄ · | [ᾱϊ̄]ϫ̄ω̄κ̄ εβολ̄
 ποϩ̄τη̄ω̄|(25)ϩ̄ιϫ̄ μ̄ποϩ̄μ̄ϩ̄τη̄ρη̄|ον̄ εϩ̄ρη̄η̄ αϩ̄ω̄ ϩη̄|ϫ̄μ̄βο̄λον̄ π̄τη̄
 τ̄ε̄ε̄ · | εαϩ̄π̄ρο̄τ̄ρη̄ε̄ · μ̄μ̄ο̄ϊ̄ | εβολ̄ ϩ̄τη̄τε̄κᾱϩ̄αν̄ · | *dividing line* |

¹ Though *ἀγάπη* in Coptic often means 'kindness', and so might imply, not Christ, but an angel or prophet.

² Budge, *Copt. Apocr.* 59 ff.

³ *Apocal. Apocr.* 70 ff.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, *Ketzerg.* 307, &c., Bousset, *Hauptprobl.* 340.

⁵ C. Schmidt, *Gnost. Schr.* (1892) 245 = 293. Cf. Bousset, op. cit. 236 n.

⁶ V. *Griech. Chr. Schriftst.* (C. Schmidt, 1905), 386 *inf.*

⁷ V. loc. cit. These and other 'pentads' are common to Gnostic and Manichaean literature. Cf. *Manifund* 35 n., *Psalmbook* (Allberry) 161, *Kephalaia* (Böhlig) 30, *Le Muséon* 38. 1 (Bang).

⁸ Budge, *Misc. Copt. Texts* 569, 571. Other versions of this do not use it; cf. M. R. James, *Apocr. N. Test.* 526 ff.

(30) φρωψ δε οη εκποηκ · | χεεκερερμινπερε | παϊ ρμπεκογωψ
 ε[τ]θεκαϊη ακαβελ χεε|θεαψ¹ π̄τγπο[ε] α[κ]αιη | (35) ρωτη παβελ
 π̄παϊ δε | ματε αν αλλα ε[γ]χη|πογ μ̄μοσ ριτηπεν² | ψαχε παμσα
 εγχω | μ̄μοσ χεεγτων · αη|(40)βελ · πεκσοη · καϊη | δε αχαρνα εγχω
 μ̄μοσ³ χεεμ̄η · αποκπε 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 (ἄρχεσθαι, 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[|]μ̄αγ χ[|]τογ ε[|]εστο[| (5)]μοσ · αγ[|]
 εροηη · επ[|]ε μ̄πελη[ρωμ̄α] | εγχηκ¹³ εβολ ει[ε ρηη]|τε · αἰρερ-

¹ αψ added above.

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

³ μ̄μοσ added in margin.

⁴ Σομ̄ 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 ριτη- would give a passive. I assume πενταε-. 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·ϊωραππι[с ε]|τθενωρε μιν[εφ|κ]ιθωτος·
| | [. . .] π[τ] . . .

Verso . . . εκε]ερμιν[πευε παϊ ετ]θεμε[λχ]ισεκεκ μ]н дгжω
[μμος ετθινт] θεου[(5)ατειωτ . . .] μμδδγ [?] εδφ[1½ lines lost
ραν π[ωπρ] ?π[τ] .ονεπρω[? (10) μπ]οуτε εφ . ε . . . [? ποу]ιηη·
шабоλ· дг[ж]о[с о]и εтθинт] θε[τ]μπεμ[. . .

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 (μῆ) 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 ccxlviii, 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–с, 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.

A line has 13-15 letters. Approximate numbers of lost letters (beyond those here tentatively supplied) are in brackets. Corresponding gaps in the translation are not precisely calculated. Page-numbers are lost and I am uncertain as to the sequence of *recto* and *verso*.

Recto, col. 1. To judge by col. 2, the first 15 ll. are lost. L. 16 (10) ροι εϋ | (5) πωρ|ϫ μπποϋ|τε (12) | (10) | ψωπε | (8) π|ϫι ππε|[τοϋααβ διο]πνισιος | [παρχιεν]ισκοπος¹ | [πτετιππο]λις παι π|[ταϋκο]σμει μπει|[ερωκος] ετοϋααβ ρη|[πνϫη]² μπαιωτμοc | [πδεν]ιοc μπφιλιπ|[ποc πρρωϋ] πρρωμн | (11) ροϋ | (11) παϋ | (9)]ρηπνεϋ | (10) π|τοϋ | (10) | πσωϋ | Col. 2, l. 1 (12)]ωϋ | (10) | αϋει|πε ε[ροϋη πρεπϫω]ωμε | πτα[(6)]ηc πετ|[. .]ηδ[. . . τ]αμμοϋϋ | αϋωψ ρητοϋ δημμο|cια ρητμντε πтка|θολικη πταπιοϋχια | αϋω πεψα-ϋσω³ πϋ|ϫρε μπκωτε μπε|θνcιαcтиpиoп μп|пшнpe шнм етcооϋ | μпшшeere шнм ет|ραпсаpоϋ αϋω ρμ|πтpεϋλιθε ρημπ|ϫρε μпнpш шϫαϋρε | εpραι ευποpηια μп|пcωc тμптpεϋпкoтн|μппpооϋт μпpот | εβολ μпθнcиaстн|pиoп αλλα μπεпеп|таϋшep текκλнcиa | ρηтμпeϋ-спoϋ μμнп | μμμοϋ πтаϋπαpтϋ | εβολ ρapoϋϫαι μпκoc|μoc тнpϋ пeϫϫē ιϫ θω|ποϋеш πр pραп птeϋ|шeлeет μппeϋλαoc | εβολ жeпaшe п[ε]пта|пρωμe етμμμμδ ηc[ε] | cпo[ϋ] oϋ]oтϋoϋ ρηтeс|μ[η]тe | ρμпт-pеϋϫп|oϋ ε[ϫ]п[пeтeϋe]pе μ|μoоϋ птeϋпoϋ αϋт | *margin*

Verso, col. 1. μμнп [μμμο⁴ (7) | πпκϋпнтiоп μп|пpиπпикoс⁵ εαϋκω πσωϋ πпϫω|ωμe птeтpαφн | πпн[ε] птe ппoϋтe | αϋωψ ρηппeтaп|pеϋϫe шнω ϫoоϋ | етeпaтeϋpαpеcиc | етcооϋпe eшшaϫe | εμμнп μпoωμaс | пeϋμaθηтнc | μппeтaϋϫoоϋ π|ϫι pαpиpетикoс тн|pоϋ εαϋκω π|cωϋ oп птапoкa⁶ | λϋμμψиc πтапшн|pе μпepoϋϫн-θαι ω|ραпннc παϋ epoc | epειϫ пμeсiтнc μ|пeиoт o пcϋптpα|φeϋc epoc eϋcтϋϫeи epoc кaтa лeϋиc | [αϋ]тнтeн ρeпϫωω|μe ρωωϋ [αϋμ]oϋтe⁷ | [ep]oоϋ жeп[oк]αλϋ | Col. 2 [μψиc (10)]етpеϋ (5) тпic]тiс μ[μe (8) | пшн[(11) | μпп[(11) | птаϋ (10) | eшшa[ϫe e (7) | пaтμ|oc⁸ (8) | μпpαп μ[(6)⁹ пa]пoстoлoс (6) | eтe[.]ϫт (6) п] pεпψαλμ|oc μп] pεп (11) | η[(13)]пт (12) | тca|θo (9) | ρe[п

Recto. . . me, whilst he divide(? -ing). God, namely the [saintly Dio]nysius, [the arch]bishop [of your] city

¹ Or πποϫ πепи. 'the great bishop'.

² ποϋοειш would be more usual, but then ρμ- would be expected.

³ My copy пeпшaϋ-.

⁴ Might be μμμнп[ε пμμ 'of every kind'.

⁵ 'Иптiкoс, not -oν, seems to be normal in Coptic: Budge *Misc.* 118, Hyvernat *Actes* 209, 321.

⁶ My copy птапaпo-.

⁷ Or eϋμμoϋтe 'calling', or eϋμμ. 'that are called'.

⁸ Might be quite otherwise completed.

⁹ пμμптcпoоϋc is too much, πποϫ too little for the space.

(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)μανηχαῖος.

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 (αἱρετικοί) 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᾽ ἡμῶν ποθοεῖν), 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.