4. Dr Mercati's suggestion that the quotation from Deut. xviii 15, 18 should be corrected in accordance with the Chronicon is fully supported by all three MSS, the text being an arbitrary alteration by the editor.

5. On the other hand, the lacuna at 232 B which Dr Mercati suggests is to be partly filled from Chron. 32. 13 sq., does not appear to be a real lacuna at all. All three MSS have after the word ὑποτάσσειν a picture of the Ark, and in V and S this is followed by the words τοῦ μεγάλου τῆς κυρίας. ἐν τῷ δὲ, continuing as in the edition. There is no reason for supposing any longer omission; this and the next sixteen lines are merely a marginal note suggested by the following passage on Noah.

It will, I think, be clear from this that the more or less considerable differences between Cosmas and the Chronicon mentioned by Dr Mercati do not exist in the better tradition of Cosmas MSS, and if, as without doubt we should, we accept V as the chief authority for the text of Cosmas, hardly any even of the small verbal differences remain, and those the least important. Practically the text is the same in both authors.

THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF ONE OF ST ANTONY’S LETTERS.

When writing the article on the original text of one of St Antony’s Letters published in the J. T. S. vii 540 (July 1906), I was unfortunately out of reach of a copy of Migne’s edition, and consequently have not mentioned that Patr. Gr. 40 contains an Arabic version of the letters, which seems to be nearer to the Coptic than the Latin version which I printed for comparison. The Arabic has the three letters which are partially preserved in the Coptic in the same order as the original, not in the order of the Latin version. Again the Arabic (p. 1009) preserves the end of the 4th (Latin 7th) letter, which the Latin omits.

I would call attention to the unfortunate misdivision of the following words in the Coptic text of my article; p. 540, l. 1 ἐπειδὴ ἔρχεται, l. 2 καὶ ἐντέρω, p. 544, l. 5 ἑλεφορτ.

The hyphen at the end of l. 8, p. 543, should be omitted.

E. O. Winstedt.
seems to me to be worth putting on record. In the first place, Father Puller has sent me from South Africa a long letter which appears to be conclusive in favour of regarding our document as a Latin original and not a translation from the Greek. Mr Puller, who is working now in Griqualand East, explains that he is writing far away from libraries; but I imagine that very few of us could manage to amass so much evidence with all the treasures of the Bodleian at our disposal, and I have ventured to take the liberty of transcribing for the J. T. S. most of what he has written. It did not seem fair to deprive the world of scholars of one of its too rare opportunities of profiting by the wealth of Father Puller’s learning. Secondly, I owe it to the kindness of Sac. Prof. Pietro Guidi of Lucca that I am able to give a specimen of the text of the Liber according to one of the earliest MSS, Lucca 490, saec. viii–ix, no. 2 in the ‘Gennadius’ group enumerated by me on p. 83. And, thirdly, I have been lucky enough myself to light upon what is, I think, an unnoticed but indubitable case of borrowing from the Liber in a document which, though its exact date is unfortunately not known, is certainly Gallic and certainly not later than about 500 A.D.—the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua. Lastly, I have a few corrections and additions to make in my list of MSS of the Liber, as well as in the text of it which I provisionally printed.

I

(Extracts from Letter written by Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E.)

'It seems clear that the author, whether he be a Greek or a Latin, was fairly well informed both about Greek and about Latin ecclesiastical literature. No doubt he may have got a good deal of his information about ante-Nicene writers from Eusebius’s History, and I have no means at present of detecting whether he read his Eusebius in the original Greek or in Rufinus’s translation. But he knows the opinions of post-Nicene Greek-speaking authors like Marcellus [of Ancyra?] (c. iii), Eunomius Aetius and Macedonius (c. iv), Didymus (c. xix), Diodorus [of Tarsus?] (c. viii), Nestorius (c. v), Eutyches (c. ii), Apollinaris (c. ii), and other Apollinarians (‘quidam Syrorum,” c. xv). On the other hand, he also knows the opinions of Latin writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, such as Lactantius (c. xxiv), Jovinian (c. xxxiv), Helvidius (c. xxxv), Vigilantius (c. xxxix), ‘Cirillus et aliqui Latinorum” (c. xiv), and the Luciferians, a Latin sect (c. xiv). The name “Arabs” in c. xvi seems to me to contain a reference to St Augustine Liber de Haeresibus c. 83 (opera ed. Bened. tom. viii col. 24, Venet. 1733).

'All this multifarious learning would seem to me to fit in with the idea that the author of the Liber was Gennadius of Marseilles, the author of the continuation of St Jerome’s de Viris Illustribus. Anyhow, the
author was certainly either a Latin who was unusually well informed about Greek heretics and heresies, or, what would be still rarer, a Greek well informed about Latin heresies.

'We have now to try and discover which of these two views is the most probable.

'To me, as at present advised, it seems most probable that the author was a Latin.

'In c. liii he says:—"Pascha, id est Dominicae resurrectionis solemnitas ante transgressum vernalis aequinortii et sextae decimae lunae initium non potest celebrari." Now, if I am not mistaken, the Eastern Churches of the fifth century followed the Alexandrian rules for the calculation of Easter, whereas Latins for the most part followed the Roman rules. And Duchesne tells us (Origines du culte chrétien, ed. 3, p. 238) that "les Romains n'admettaient pas que le dimanche de Pâques pût tomber, dans le mois lunaire, avant le 16 de ce mois, tandis qu'à Alexandrie on pouvait avoir Pâques dès le 15". It follows that the author of the Liber followed the Roman rule for the calculation of Easter, and was therefore presumably a Latin.

'In c. vii the author quotes from the creed the words "carnis resurrectionem", a formula which occurs in the Western creeds, but not in the Nicene creed or in the so-called Constantinopolitan creed—the two creeds which after the Council of Chalcedon would constitute for Eastern Catholics the "ecclesiae lex" in regard to articles of faith. The fact that the author used a Western creed confirms the view that he was probably a Latin.

'That view is strongly corroborated by his treatment of confirmation and of the closely connected rite for the reconciliation of heretics. In c. xi, speaking of a person who is being confirmed, he says:—"Ille manus impositione [pontificis] accipit Spiritum Sanctum." Here there is no mention of the chrism, and the receiving of the Holy Ghost is attributed solely to the laying on of hands. Now I know no post-Nicene authorities in the East for the use of the laying on of hands in Confirmation, and still less for attributing the gift imparted in Confirmation solely to the imposition of hands. In the post-Nicene East Confirmation is administered by unction with the consecrated χύτων. In the modern Eastern baptismal service, which includes the administration of Confirmation, there is no trace of the laying on of hands. References to the laying on of hands may indeed be found in the Greek commentaries on Acts viii and xix: but of course in those passages the text of Scripture compels such a reference, and it would be quite unsafe to infer that the laying on of hands was used in the Eastern Church of the fifth century. Possibly references to the post-baptismal imposition of hands might be found in post-Nicene Alexandrine writers, though
I know of none such: anyhow, a post-baptismal imposition of hands is retained in the Coptic baptismal offices. But the author of the Liber ecle. dogmatum was certainly not an Alexandrine. No Catholic of Alexandria would have called St Denys the Great ‘fons Arrii’, as our author does in chapter iv.

On the other hand, the laying on of hands is given great prominence in Western references to Confirmation during the whole of the patristic period.

I notice also that in chapter xl the word “pontificis” occurs, though it is enclosed in brackets. If the word is authentic, it supplies a fresh confirmation of the Western provenance of the Liber. At Rome and in most parts of the West the bishop has always been the ordinary minister of Confirmation. In the East the μίσθωμι is and has been usually administered by a priest.

Passing now from Confirmation proper to the rite of reconciling persons baptized in the Name of the Trinity by heretics, I notice that in chapter xxi our author, speaking of adults, requires them to confess first the orthodox faith, and then adds:—“purgati iam fidei integritate confirmetur manus inpositione.” Those words exactly describe the Roman usage, whereas the usage of the Eastern Church generally, and of the Constantinopolitan Church in the time of Gennadius of C. in particular, was to reconcile heretics, whose baptism was allowed, by chrismation. The usage of the Constantinopolitan Church in the time of Gennadius is set forth in a letter still extant addressed by a cleric of Constantinople to Martyrius of Antioch about A.D. 460: see Dr Bright’s Notes on the Canons of the first four General Councils, edition of 1882, pp. 104, 105. On the various modes of reconciling heretics see Morinus de Poenitentia ix 7–11; and for fuller details Morinus de Confirmatione may be fruitfully consulted.

But our author, in the same twenty-first chapter, when speaking of the reconciliation of children baptized validly by heretics, says:—“Respondeant pro illis qui eos offerunt iuxta morem baptizandi, et sic manus inpositione et chrismate communiti eucharistiae mysterii admittantur.” Here we have both the laying on of hands and the chrism, and such was in fact the mode of reconciliation used in parts of Gaul and of Spain in the fifth and following centuries: Morinus has shewn this (see references given above).

I doubt if chrism was ever used at Rome in the rite of reconciliation.

I think, therefore, that the author of our Liber probably lived in Gaul or Spain. This again suggests the possibility of the author being Gennadius of Marseilles. He cannot be Gennadius of Constantinople: that suggestion is disproved by chapter xxi.

It was in southern Gaul and in northern Spain that Vigilantius
propagated opposition to the veneration of relics. I doubt if Vigilantianism ever took root elsewhere. Chapter xxxix supplies in consequence a new confirmation of the view which now commends itself to me.

'Chapters xx and xxv, with their vindication of free-will, seem to me to agree well with the opposition to the more extreme views of St Augustine which was characteristic of southern Gaul in the latter half of the fifth century. At Marseilles especially Cassian's influence during the first half of that century must have tended to draw men's minds away from the more extreme forms of predestinarianism.

'Chapters vi and xxiv shew that the author of the Liber was much interested in the Millenarian controversy and was a strong opponent of Millenarianism: and chapter vi in particular shews that he regarded the author of the Apocalypse as a "dreamer", and his teaching as fabulous. Now Gennadius of Marseilles in his de Viris Illustribus informs us that among the books which he had written was one entitled "De mille annis et de Apocalypse beati Ioannis". This fact seems to supply a strong corroboration of the theory that the author of the Liber was Gennadius of Marseilles.

'The author of the Liber mentions in chapter ii certain heretics whom he styles "Timothiani", presumably (as pointed out in J. T. S. vii 88) the partisans of Timothy Aelurus. Unless I am mistaken, the name "Timothiani" is a name of rare occurrence. It is therefore very noticeable that "Timothianum dogma" occurs in the 81st, and "Timothiani" in the 93rd, chapter of the de Viris Illustribus of Gennadius of Marseilles.'

II

Text of the opening chapters of the Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum according to the Lucca MS (cod. 490 fol. 233).

INCIPIT. DE DOCMATI, ECCLESIASTICI, SEDIS GENNADI, EPI, MAXILIENSIS.

Credimus unum esse deum patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum: patrem eo quod filium habeat, filium eo quod habeat patrem, spiritum sanctum eo quod sit ex patre et filio. pater est ergo principium deitatis, qui sicut numquam non fuit nisi deus, ita numquam non fuit non pater; nec factum spiritus sanctus, quia non est ex nihilo sed ex deo 5 patre et deo filio deus procedens. pater aeternus, eo quod aeternum habeat filium, cuius aeternus sit pater: filius aeternus, eo quod sit patri et spiritui sancto coaeternus: spiritus sanctus aeternus, eo quod sit patri et filio coaeternus: non confusam in unam personam trinitas, ut Sabellius dicit, neque separata aut diversa in natura diuinitas, ut Arrius blasphemat, 10 sed alter in persona pater, alter in persona filius, alter in persona spiritus

I 11. 4, 5 Between 'non pater' and 'nec factum' an omission by homosoldenton must be assumed.
sanctus, unus natura in sanctam trinitatem deus pater et filius et spiritus sanctus.

II. Non pater carnem adsumsit, neque spiritus sanctus, sed filius tantum; ut qui erat in divinitate patris filius, ipse fieret in hominem hominis matris filius, ne filii nomen alterum transiret qui non esset nativitate filii. dei ergo filius hominis factus est filius, natus secundum 5 ueritatem naturae ex deo dei filius, et secundum ueritatem naturae ex homine hominis filius, ut ueritas genitii non adoptionem non ad appellationem, sed in utraque ueritatis filii nomen nascendo haberet, et esset uerus deus et uerus homo unus filius. non est ergo duos christos neque duos filios, sed deum et hominem unum filium, quem 10 propterea et unum genitum dixerim, manentem in duabus substantiis, sicut ei naturae ueritas contulit, non confusis naturis neque immixtis, sicut Timothiani uolunt, sed societate uniti. deus ergo hominem assumpsit, homo in deum transiit, non naturae uersibilitate sicut Tertuliani Apolinaristae dicunt, sed dei dignatione; ut nec deus mutaretur in 15 humanam substantiam assumiendo hominem, nec homo in diuinan glorificatus in deo; quia mutatio uel uersibilitas naturae et deminutionem et abolitionem substantiae facit. natus ergo dei filius ex homine; non per hominem, id est ex uirgi coitu, sicut Ebion dicit; sed carne ex uirginia corpore trahens, et non de caelo secum afferens, 20 sicut Marcion Origenes et Eutyches; neque in phantasia, id est abaque carne, sicut Valentinus, neque docesi, id est putatiue imaginatum, sed corpus uerus; non tamen carnem ex carne, sicut Marcianus, sed uerus deus ex diuinitate et uerus homo ex carne. unus filius, in diuinitate uerbum patris et deus, in hominem anima et caro; anima non absque sensu et ratione, ut Apollinaris, neque caro absque anima, ut Anomeus, sed anima cum ratione sua et carne cum sensibus suis, per quo sensus ueros in passione et ante passione suae carnis dolores sustenuit.

III. Neque sic est natus ex uirgine, ut deitatis initium homo nascendo acceperit, quasi antequam nasceretur ex uirgine deus non fuerit, sicut Enathemon et Berillus docuerunt, sed aeternus deus homo ex uirgine natus est.

III. Nihil creatum aut seruiens in trinitatem credamus, ut uult Dyonisius fons Arii; nihil inaequale, ut Eunomius; nihil gratiae aequale, ut uult Aetius; nihil anterius posteriusue aut minus, ut Arrius; nihil extraneum aut officiale alteri, ut Macedonius; nihil persuasione 5 aut subreptione insertum, ut Manicheus; nihil corporeum, ut Melito et Tertullianus; nihil corporaliter effigiatum, ut Antropomorinus et Vadia- nus; nihil sibi inuisibile, ut Origines; nihil creaturis uisibile, ut Fortunatus; nihil moribus uel uoluntate diuersum, ut Marcion; nihil

II l. 13. non: added by second hand.
Tertuliani: all or part of this word added by second hand.
ex trinitatis essententia a creaturarum natura deductum, ut Plato et Tertulianus; nihil officio singulare nec alteri communicabile, ut Origines; nihil confusum, ut Sabellius: sed totum perfectum, quia totum ex uno et unum; non tamen solitariam, ut presumunt Praxeas et Silvanus, Pentapolitana doctrina dannabilis.

V. Homousion ergo in diuinitate patri filius, homousion patri et filio spiritus sanctus, homousion deo et homini unus filius, manens deus in homine suo, in gloria patris desiderabilis uideri ab angelis; sicut pater et spiritus sanctus adoratur ab angelis et ab omni creatura non homo propter deum uel Christum cum deo, sicut Nesturius blasphemat, sed homo in deum et in homine deus.

VI. Erit resurrectio mortuorum hominum, sed una et insemel; non prima iustorum et secunda peccatorum, ut fabula somniator, sed una omnium. et si id resurgere dicitur quod cadit, caro ergo nostra in ueritate resurgit, sicut in ueritate cadit; et non secundum Origenem immutatio corporum erit, id est non aliud nouum corpus pro carne sed eadem caro etc.

The Lucca MS numbers fifty-six chapters in all, but the last is the same as in my printed text. The colophon runs ‘Explicit diffinitio ecclesiasticorum docmatum. deo gratias’ (fol. 234 b). I have not thought it necessary to preserve the punctuation (such as it is) of the MS.

The extracts above printed shew that the Lucca MS, as we should expect from the appearance of the name of Gennadius in its title, belongs definitely to the group of MSS which present a secondary or revised text: its treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in chapter i, and its addition of various proper names in chapters ii and iv, are quite enough to prove this. But its age gives it a certain value in all those portions which the reviser left untouched of the original treatise: and it is almost the only MS which I have yet found to preserve the true form of the name Anomaeus (Anomeus) in chapter ii, where all MSS of the best family write Anomocus or the like.¹

III

Extract from the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua.

(Canones apostolorum et conciliorum saeculorum iv v vi vii, ed. H. T. Bruns, p. 140.)

I. Qui episcopus ordinandus est ante examinetur . . . si in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus, et ante omnia si fidei documenta verbis simplicibus adserat, id est Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum unum deum

¹ The Verona MS, also belonging to the Gennadius group, has ‘Anomius’: the Reichenau MS Aug. cix of the same group gives ‘Eonomius’, corrected to ‘Eunomius’.
esse confirmans, totamque trinitatis\(^1\) deitate coessentialia et consub-
stantiaet et caeteraet et omnipotentem\(^2\) praedicans, si singularem
quamque in trinitate personam plenam deum\(^3\), si incarnationem divinam
non in Patre neque in Spiritu sancto factam sed in Filio tantum credat,
ut qui erat in divinitate Dei Patris Filius ipse fieret in homine hominis\(^4\)
matris filius, deus verus ex Patre, homo\(^6\) verus ex matre, carnem ex
matris visceribus habens et animam humanam rationalem; simul in eo
ambarae naturae\(^5\); id est Deus et homo, una persona, unus filius, unus
Christus, unus creator\(^7\) omnia quae sunt et auctor et dominus et
rector\(^8\) cum Patre et Spiritu sancto omnium creaturarum, qui passus sit
vera carnis passione, mortuus vera corporis sui morte, resurrexit vera
carnis suae resurrectione et vera animae resumptione, in qua veniet
iudicare vivos et mortuos.

quaerendum etiam ab eo, si novi et veteris testamenti, id est legis
et prophetarum et apostolorum, unum eundemque credat auctorem et
deum; si diabolus non per conditionem sed per arbitrium factus sit
malus.

quaerendum etiam ab eo, si credat huius quam gestamus et non
alterius carnis resurrectionem, si credat iudicium futurum et recepturos
singulos pro his quae in carne gesserunt vel poenas vel gloriaem\(^9\), si
nuptias non improbet, si secunda matrimonia non damnet, si carnium
perceptionem non culpet, si paenitentibus reconciliatis communicet, si
in baptismo omnia peccata, id est tam illud originale contractum quam
illa quae voluntarie admissa sunt, dimittantur, si extra ecclesiam
 catholicam nullus salvetur ...

Here the phrase 'in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis' in line 1 recalls the
title of the Liber. Points of contact more or less definite may be
found in line 3 (= Li. eccl. dogm. i 1), line 6 (= ii 1), line 9 (= ii
18, 25), line 14 (= ii 26), lines 21-23 (= vi 3-8), line 24 (= xxxiii
1, 2): but whatever doubt may exist in other cases, the words in
lines 8, 9 'ut qui erat in divinitate dei patris filius ipse fieret in homine
hominis matris filius' are an indubitable echo of chapter ii line 2 of
the Liber; and what is specially interesting, they represent the text
already in the form of the 'Gennadian' revision, for the words 'patris'
'matris' occur in my three Gennadius MSS—Lucca 490, Verona ix
(58), Carlsruhe Augiensis cix—but in none (so far as I know) of the
anonymous or of the Nicene group. It is clear, therefore, that Caesarius
of Arles, or whoever it was who drew up the code of the Statuta ecclesiae

\(^1\) aliter in trinitate.  \(^3\) al. coomnipotentem.
\(^2\) al. add. et totas personas unum deum.  \(^4\) al. in hominis natura.
\(^5\) al. et homo.  \(^6\) al. simul in eo ut utriusque naturae.
\(^6\) al. creator.  \(^7\) al. creaturarum.  \(^8\) al. praemia.
antiqua, knew and used the Liber not in its original but in its 'Gennadian' form. But Caesarius of Arles is very near, both in time and place, to Gennadius of Marseilles: and I am therefore completely satisfied that the 'Gennadius' group of MSS may be trusted when they claim Gennadius of Marseilles for the author of the Liber in the (revised) form in which they give it. It follows that the original form of the Liber, as restored in the text printed last year in the Journal, is earlier than Gennadius—unless indeed it was a juvenile and anonymous production of Gennadius's own pen. But it cannot be earlier than 450: and, as Father Puller shews, it was no doubt Gallic.

The only correction which I have to make in my list of MSS (J. T. S. vii 81-87) refers to two MSS of the Gennadius group which I cited doubtfully within square brackets—no. [10] Munich lat. 14468, and no. [11] Munich lat. 14461. It occurred to me afterwards that it was from these two MSS that Caspari had published (Kirchenhistorische Anecdota, Christiania, 1883, pp. xix-xxiii, 301-304) what he entitled Ein Gennadius von Massilia beigelagtes Glaubensbekenntniss. Although this tract depends on the Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, and begins with the same words, it is not identical with it; and the two MSS which contain it should, therefore, be withdrawn from my list.¹

Of additions, on the other hand, I have one to make to the Nicene group, and one to the anonymous group, of MSS. To Mr Ommanney's Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed pp. 145-148 I owe the reference to Paris lat. 2341, saec. ix, a bulky volume of creeds and doctrinal treatises,² among which the Liber is included under the title 'Dogma

¹ Caspari was of opinion that the tract was not a genuine work of Gennadius, but the composition of some Frankish theologian during the Adoptionist controversy in the later decades of the eighth century. His view is contested in the just published work of Father Brewer of Feldkirch Kommodian von Gnae, ein Anlaiischischer Laiendichter aus der Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte vi 1, 2 : Paderborn, 1906) pp. 217-236. Brewer has, I am given to understand, completely demonstrated his main thesis about the late date of Commodian, nor am I prepared to say that he is wrong in defending the Gennadian authorship of Caspari's tract: but he is over-hasty in his assertions about the Liber ecc. dogm.—he has not seen my paper in the Journal—and in particular in impugning Caspari's statement that the Liber in its original form taught the doctrine of the Single Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. When Caspari appealed to the uralte Cod. Bob. Ambros,' he meant by that, not, as Brewer supposes, Ambros. G 58 sup. saec. ix-x, but Ambros. O 212 sup. saec. vii-viii.

² Mr Souter informs me that, in the opinion of Dr Holder of Carlsruhe—to the appearance of whose magnificent catalogue of the Reichenau MSS at Carlsruhe I should like to call attention—the MS came from Reichenau.
sanctorum patrum trecentorum decem et octo congregatis apud Nicean
Bithiniae': the form of the title of our treatise resembles that in Paris
lat. 2076, no. 1 in my 'Nicene' list. A still earlier text of the Liber,
but unfortunately only a fragment, I came across in the library at
Metz, in cod. 134, of the eighth (perhaps the end of the eighth) century.
After the gathering signed E three gatherings are unfortunately lost:
the next (signed I) commences in chap. 46 of the Liber with the words
'salviur quod perierat', and ends, as my text does, with chap. 54, the
colophon being simply EXPL. DOGMA. I should conclude from this
colophon that the MS belonged to the anonymous group: cf. no. 13
of that group, St Gall 230, EXPLIC. DOGMA.

Of MSS contained in my list I have since had an opportunity of
examining Laon 113 fol. 43 b (no. 15 of the anonymous group), which
should be dated, I think, rather saec. x or ix-x than with the catalogue
saec. ix. The MS is one of unusual interest, and contains an
apparently unpublished treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity: but
its text of the Liber is bad, or at any rate is far removed from that of
the best MSS. It contains fifty-five chapters in all, the last two of my
text being run into one.

Two of the manuscripts which I have collated of the anonymous
group contain additional matter at the end of the treatise, which for
completeness' sake I add at this point.

(a) Cod. Berolinensis Phillipps lat. 84 gives the last chapter of the
Liber in the following enlarged form (I correct its orthography and its
obvious blunders):—

'Propter nouellos legislatores, qui ideo animam tantum ad imaginem
Dei creatam dicunt et, quia Deus incorporeus recte creditur, etiam
anima incorporea esse credatur, libere confitemur iuxta diuinae scripturae
relationem integrum hominem qui ex anima constat et carne ad imaginem
Dei factum—illam imaginem qua postea homo factus est Deus, dicente
apostolo et regnavit mors ab Adam vsqve ad Moyseu etiam in
eos qvi non peccaverunt in similitudinem praevacionis adae qvi est forma fvtvri, id est Christi nouissimi Adam, qui in forma
qua erat quandoque hominem adsuempturus praeformuit primum
Adam; confirmante hoc ipsum apostolo ubi dicit vir qvident non
debet velare capvd svvm, qvia gloria et imago dei est, mvlier
avtem gloria viri est. in animis sexuum diversitas non est, si una in
masculo et femina anima est, +icut et uir est +. quomodo uir dicetur
imago esse de, femina imago viri, nisi quod Christus Deus creator
hominis, qui hominis formam adsuempturus postea erat, uirum ad
imaginem suam praefiguravit, femina uero ex uiro sumpta uiri

1 I have conjecturally added the words 'qui hominis' which seem necessary to
complete the sense: they might have been omitted by homosoteleuton.
imaginem expressit? ambo tamen IMAGO DEI, quia unus ex altero, dicente scriptura CREAUIT DEVSP HOMINEM, AD IMAGINEM DEI CREAUIT ILVM (id est Deus ad Dei) MASCULVM ET FEMINAM CREAUIT EOS.'

(b) Cod. Bernensis 89 has lost a leaf after fol. 16b, that is, after the end of chap. 51 of my text. The list of capitula prefixed to the treatise shews that there were no additional chapters, and the words that conclude the treatise at the beginning of the present fol. 17a must therefore be the end of another variant form of the last chapter:—

'nostrum spirare uiuere est, ita et Dei spirare uiuificare est. substantia itaque animae quadri moderatione subsistit, sensu, voluntate, cogitatione, sapientia. sensus pertinet aduitam: consilium adcogitationem: sapientia ad intellectum: voluntas ad definitionem. haec substantia veluti pelle creatoris sui dispositione uestitur.'

Finally, I subjoin a list of the more important changes which I should now wish to make in the tentative text printed last year. My present results are based on the collation of the following MSS of the 'anonymous' group: Milan Ambros. O 212 sup., saec. vii–viii; Cologne cxxii, saec vii (perhaps vii ineunt.); Berlin Phillipps Cat. 84, saec. viii; St Gall 238 saec. viii, 911 saec. viii, 230 saec. ix; Vatic. Reg. 1127, saec. ix; Berne 89, saec. ix. I do not think that any of the three ninth-century MSS used are later than the middle of the century.

c. i l. 4 for 'principium deitatis' read 'principale nomen deitatis'.
c. ii l. 25 for 'corpus cum sensibus suis' read 'caro cum sensibus suis'.
c. iii l. 2 for 'gratiae inaequale' read 'gratia aequale'.
l. 4 for 'persusione' read 'perusione'.
c. vi l. 7 for 'poenam' read 'penas'.
c. vii l. 5 for 'suscepimus' read 'suscipimus'.
c. viii l. 2 for 'quam' read 'qua'.
l. 6 for 'iudici omnium et retributori iusto' read 'iudici omnium, illi retributori iusto'.
c. x l. 4 after 'bonitatem' add 'suam'.
c. xiii l. 3 place 'necessaria' within square brackets.
c. xv l. 1 omit '[uno]'.
c. xvi b omit the lines printed in small type altogether.
c. xx l. 10 after 'elegit' add 'uel quod sequitur'.
l. 11 for 'Deo largiente' read 'Deo miserante'.
l. 14 for 'ab adepto' read 'indepto'.
c. xxv l. 2 for 'creatam . . . inuentam' read 'creata . . . inuenta'.
l. 5 omit 'est' (and remove the full stop after 'mali').
c. xxviii l. 2 omit 'bonum' (and remove the brackets, so as to make 'ut non mutarentur cum ceteris' the object of the verb 'possident').
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A SUPPOSED HOMILY OF EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA.

The Coptic papyrus of the British Museum, Or. 5001, contains on fol. ρ. "Eusebius of Caesarea, On the Canaanitish Woman ... Begins 'Great is the storm (χείμων) but it has not been able to prevent (μαλών) the joy of those who have come. The Church overcomes all her trials. As the furnace the gold, so affliction benefits the soul that is fitted for it. Yesterday Paul prepared his table for us, to-day Matthew,'" &c. See the analysis in Crum Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum (1905) pp. 63, 64.

The commencement and the contents agree exactly with the homily of St John Chrysostom, in dimissionem Chanaeae (Migne P. G. lii 449-460), Πολίν ή χείμων, ἀλλὰ τὴν προθυμίαν τῶν παραγενομένων οὔ διεκάλων ... χθες τούτων ὁ Παύλος τὴν τράπεζαν ἢμᾶν παρέθηκε, σήμερον ὁ Ματθαῖος, κ.τ.λ.

Thus this supposed sermon of Eusebius of Caesarea 'in Cappadocia' according to the Coptic title is simply a Sahidic version of Chrysostom's homily, just as the liber de muliere chanaeae of Bishop Lawrence the mellifluous of Novara (Migne P. L. lxvi 116-124) is really the ancient Latin version of the same homily; cf. Haidacher in Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie xxx (1906) p. 183. Other writings of Chrysostom exist in a Coptic translation; cf. Fr. Rossi in Memorie della R. Accademia di Torino Series II xxxix, part 2, pp. 100 sqq. and xl, pp. 116 sqq., and Crum op. cit. nos. 171, 1; 177; 981; 982.

G. Mercati.