

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 1 (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:—

ܘܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܡܝܪܝܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܘܡ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܢ: ܡܠܠܐ ܘܡܢ ܥܡܘܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܝܗ.

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

¹ 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.

² See Routh *Rel. Sac.*² iii 367.

³ This is immediately preceded by the words ܘܡܠܠܐ ܕܥܡܘܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܝܗ. 'Besides these things in opposition this teacher of heresies said.' Probably a saying of Paul which followed this clause has fallen out of the text.

This summary confirms the accuracy of the text of frag. i in the clause *ὅς ἐστὶν 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 Δαυὶδ γεγενημένῳ* is Paul's gloss—supported by some modern commentators—on the closing words of Micah v 1 (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 (ܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ). 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 (ܗܘܝܢܐ ܗܘܝܘܡܐ) 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:—

ܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ
 ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ
 ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ
 ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܨܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܬܐ

'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—*ἐν ναῶ* in frag. ii l. 11. There accordingly we may insert some such words as

ἦν 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.

It may here be remarked that the foregoing investigation confirms Harnack's favourable opinion regarding the series of extracts on which it is based.¹ 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.⁵ 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.⁶ My argument therefore regarding the use of the word *ἡμοούσιον* by Paul, so far as it is based on St Hilary's statements, is considerably strengthened by Mr Puller's correction.

H. J. LAWLOR.

¹ *Die Überlieferung u. der Bestand der altch. Litt.* p. 522; *Chronologie der altch. Litt.* ii p. 135 note.

² See p. 117.

³ Pp. 115-118.

⁴ Pp. 116, 117.

⁵ Hil. *de Syn.* 77, 81, 90; Sozomen *H. E.* iv 13, 15.

⁶ Sozomen, *l. c.*