

ON MS VERON. LI (49) OF THE WORKS OF MAXIM[IN]US¹1. *The reconstruction of the MS.*

WHEN I published, in the JOURNAL for July 1919, the final instalment of the documents transcribed, from the MS of which I am treating, by my regretted friend Antonio Spagnolo, I gave what account I could with the materials at my disposal of the contents and arrangement of the MS. I added that if I should ever be at Verona again I should hope to clear up the problem of the original bulk of the MS and of the extent of the lacunae that now exist in it.

In June of the present year, 1922, I was fortunate enough to get to Verona after an interval of eleven years; and so soon as the claim of the work on Canons that took me there was satisfied, I turned once more to the MS known as Maximus with results that were not without importance. The extent of the lacunae was settled, and in the early part of the MS it was smaller than might have been feared. The proceedings of the Roman editor, and of the collator who acted for him, were thrown into even clearer light than before. And I judged that it would probably be possible to decipher almost every word of the Homilies on the Gospels (foll. 2-39).

Fol. 1, as was noted in *J. T. S.* xx 290, is out of place where it stands and should immediately precede fol. 40. Fol. 2 is therefore the first surviving leaf of the MS. But it commences in the middle of a piece, and therefore something is lost before it. Similarly fol. 1 begins in the middle of a piece, of which the earlier part is not contained on the preceding leaf, fol. 39. Foll. 1, 40-132, contain the homilies and treatises which have been published in the JOURNAL, and they are continuous, so that much the larger half of the MS as it stands is happily intact. For the rest the quaternion signatures give us an absolute clue to the restoration of the original status of at least the earlier portion of the MS.

Foll. 8 a-39 b consist of four regular quaternions, signed respectively on the last page of each gathering (foll. 15 b, 23 b, 31 b, 39 b) II, III, IIII, v. Foll. 40 a-127 b consist of eleven regular quaternions, signed, save that the signature [x] is missing on fol. 71 b, on the last page of each gathering (foll. 47 b, 55 b, 63 b, 79 b, 87 b, 95 b, 103 b, 111 b, 119 b, 127 b) VII, VIII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, XIII, XV, XVI, XVII.

Thus in the first 127 leaves the only places where lacunae are possible

¹ *J. T. S.* xiii 19; xv 63; xvi 161, 314; xvii 225, 321; xx 289. I may note here that the MS, which I attributed tentatively to the later sixth century, is certainly not later than that. Chatelain *Uncialis Scriptura Codicum Latinorum* (1901) plate VII puts it in the fifth.

are (1) between foll. 39*b* and 40*a*, (2) before fol. 8*a*. As to (1), there is a whole gathering missing, the sixth, but fol. 1 belongs to that gathering, and should immediately precede fol. 40.¹ If the gathering was, like all the rest, a quaternion, seven leaves have fallen out. As to (2), fol. 8 begins the second gathering, and therefore must have been preceded by one complete gathering. Of this gathering six leaves remain, foll. 2-7 (fol. 1 being, as we have seen, wrongly placed here). These six leaves are continuous with one another, but fol. 2 opens in the middle of a homily, and fol. 7 is not continuous with fol. 8. Evidently therefore the six surviving leaves are the interior leaves of the gathering: and if we assume it to have been, like the rest, a quaternion, two leaves only are lost, the first and last.

The Roman edition of the works of St Maximus incorporated foll. 2-39, but omitted foll. 40-77, probably as being somewhat difficult of decipherment. The only lacuna that the transcriber had to deal with was therefore that between fol. 7 and fol. 8. One may presume that he was not conscious of the existence of the lacuna, and transcribed

ergo ex cuius persona propheta cum uno oculo et una manu . . .

without even indicating that 'propheta' ended one leaf and 'cum uno oculo' began another. The editor at Rome, making the best sense he could of the nonsense before him, but naturally without much success, printed

ergo ex huius persona euangelista docet melius esse cum uno oculo et una manu . . .²

As only one leaf is lost, it is not likely that more than the end of one homily and the beginning of the next has perished.

The questions raised by the last 30 leaves of the MS, foll. 128-157, are a good deal more complicated, and there was perhaps loss or mutilation at a very early period. The signature numbers of two gatherings have been altered, and an ancient (not the original) hand has added another numeration of the gatherings by letters of the alphabet on the first (instead of the last) page of each quaternion.

As the manuscript stands, foll. 128-154 are the remains of what were once four complete quaternions. Of these the two centre ones are complete (foll. 133-140, 140-147), while the first of the four has lost

¹ It ought therefore to bear the signature vi, being the last leaf of the gathering. I am afraid I omitted to look if there were any traces of this.

² Dom Capelle, p. 88 n. 1 of the article about which I am speaking later on in this note, has put his finger on exactly this point, and divined the existence of a lacuna. But when he goes on to say 'toute cette partie des expositions manifeste une grande négligence du copiste', it is hard to make either the sixth-century scribe or the eighteenth-century transcriber responsible for the loss of a leaf in the centuries which intervened between the two.

its last three leaves and the last of the four has lost the conjugate pair in the centre of the gathering.

The explanation of the lacuna between foll. 151 and 152 I gave in *J. T. S.* xv 57, xvi 524. The extant leaves pass from the middle of Apostolic Canon no. 47 to the middle of no. 52. When I published this part of the MS in *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* i pp. 32 a-32 nn (1913), I was puzzled about this lacuna, because the portion lost from the text of the Canons did not seem to correspond exactly with the contents of a leaf of the MS. But when in pursuance of my studies of the text and character of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and *Canons* I came across the long doctrinal insertion after Can. 50 which Dr Schwartz translated from Syriac and printed in his *Ueber die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (1910) p. 14, I saw that my puzzle was solved at once, if we could assume that *two* leaves, not one only, were lost. Moreover, as the doctrinal character of the insertion was Arian of an obvious and gross type, a motive would at once be offered for the disappearance of the leaves: an orthodox reader had been offended by them and had removed them. Now on re-examining the MS I found that my suspicion was correct, and that two leaves had gone: the Arian doctrinal appendix being contained entirely on the two innermost conjugate leaves of a gathering, it could be taken out without any superficial sign being left of tampering with the MS.

In assigning the reason for this last quaternion being incomplete as we have it, we have made the important discovery that theological motives have been at work on the manuscript. Let us turn back to the lacuna that we have not yet examined, namely that occurring in quaternion XVIII, foll. 128-132. Of this five leaves survive, and they are continuous in themselves and with the preceding quaternion: and in fact when the manuscript is examined it is found that the last three leaves, those that followed fol. 132, have been cut out. But we have still to ask whether the loss of three leaves at this point is the whole loss, or whether another quaternion or even more may not have fallen out or been removed before fol. 133: and here the signatures to the gatherings ought to be the decisive factor.

No gathering has been lost since the alphabetic signatures were added: they begin on fol. 8a with a and continue regularly as far as 128a q, 133a r, 140a s, 148a t. When these signatures were added, all the now existing lacunae were already present: the first gathering was imperfect, the sixth gathering had disappeared, and, whether or no an extra gathering or gatherings were originally present between foll. 132 and 133, no change has taken place since the addition of the alphabetic signatures which pass from q to r. It is of course possible,

it may even be probable, now that we have established the action of theological motives for excision, that the manuscript was intentionally renumbered with the alphabetic signatures after it had been reduced in size by the process of purgation from heresy. If reduction by purgation was the alternative to complete destruction, we ought no doubt to be grateful that the former was the alternative adopted.

Remains the problem whether any complete gathering has gone before fol. 133: and the original signatures on the last page of each quaternion ought to settle this. Unfortunately, the signatures on both fol. 140 *b* and fol. 148 *b* (I have no note of any signature on fol. 154 *b*) have been altered: the second hand has xx and XXI, and as fol. 127 *b* is xvii, and the next gathering, partially preserved, must have been xviii, it follows that one more gathering was present when the second hand altered the numbers originally written. But what of the first hand? In each case, fol. 140 *b* and fol. 148 *b*, my notes indicate that the first cypher x is unaltered, but that more cyphers went to the original than to the corrected figures. If the original cyphers had been XXI, XXII, there would have been no need to erase the second x. I conclude therefore provisionally that the original cyphers were xviii, xviii: and if that be so, the simplest explanation is that the original cyphers were a pure mistake, corrected by the original hand.

In other words, the original MS contained, after the three leaves lost from the end of Q. xviii, a whole gathering, Q. xviii, which had disappeared before the alphabetic signatures were added. A total loss at this point of eleven leaves: a loss of what? Fol. 132 *b* ends about two-thirds of the way through the (duplicate text of the) *contra Iudaeos*. Fol. 133 *a* begins with the 'Arian Sermon', which was the first piece I printed out of the MS (*J. T. S.* xiii pp. 19-28, Oct. 1911). The solution of the problem of this last lacuna I leave to the third part of this note, in which I give some account of a remarkable dissertation by Dom Capelle of Maredsous.¹

¹ I cannot help calling attention here by the way to another instance of mutilation of a MS which I came across on the occasion of this same visit to Verona. MS Verona LVIII (60), the collection of Theodosius the deacon, has been handled by illustrious scholars, and I myself must have seen it on eight or ten occasions: yet no one, so far as I know, had yet noticed not merely that after the canons of Serdica, on foll. 94 *b*-99 *a*, a later, say tenth-century, hand has transcribed another version of the same canons 'item eiusdem canonis secundum aliam translationem', which is obvious enough, but that this alternative version is (save for the conjugate leaves 97, 98, which are an insertion) written 'in rasura': original material has been erased to make space for the 'alia translatio'. That original material apparently consisted of the signatories to the canons of Serdica. And whereas in our other authorities the number of the signatories is 59—and several at least of their see-towns are so corrupted in transmission as to be unrecognizable—the collection of Theodosius must have had many more. The erasures extend over five full pages

Would a new study of the text of the Sermons or Homilies as given in the manuscript help to any considerable improvement of the text (or perhaps one should rather say of the lacunae) of the Roman edition? I believe it would, if I may judge from the comparative ease with which I filled up the first lacuna; col. 753 of the edition, foll. 6a 6b of the MS.

tali ardore fraclabat [*i.e.* flagrabat] et illa beata soror Martae Mariae quae sacris [fol. 6b] nutrita sermonibus a uestigiis saluatoris nullo modo recedebat, ut de fontibus doctrinae caelestis suae religiose sitis desideria saturaret. bona [*lege* bonam] ista femina sine dubio elegerat partem . . .

2. *A homily from MS LI (49), foll. 16 b-17 b, omitted in the Roman edition.*¹

ITEM DE SĀO EUANGELIO

Hodie recitatum est nobis in sĀo euangēlio quia dñs ih̄s in deserto de quinque panibus et duob. piscib. saturauerit quinque milia uirorum. ubique dñs ih̄s omnes sanat omnes saturat, ut medicus caelestis, ut lux mundi; apud eum inueniunt oculos caeci, auditum ab eo accipiunt surdi, leprosi

fol. 17a mundantur, mortui suscitantur,
 10 daemonia effugantur, paralytici resolutis membris iterum confirmantur, clodi firmatis gressibus currunt, et omnes eius muneribus gloriantur.

Ergo de quinque panibus et duob. piscib. a dño saturantur quinque milia uirorum, et colliguntur duodecim cofini fragmentorum pleni. considerare mus, fratres, mirabilia dñi ih̄u. tangit panes, et simili modo, sicut PLUUIAS

20 MULTIPLICAT SUPER TERRAM, ita cres

and part of a sixth, and there are normally 27 lines to a page in the MS. Even if the names of bishop, province, and see-town may often have overrun between them a single line, there may easily have been eighty or a hundred signatories. Only the last column of fol. 99a is clear of superposed writing: but even there the ruffian did his work of destroying history only too well, and it seems hopeless, even with modern chemical aids, to attempt decipherment.

¹ But the opening lines are employed, though in a rather incorrect transcription, as a facsimile of the handwriting of the Verona MS, in the table of specimens opposite p. cxcii.

cunt cuncta in multitudinem copio
 sam. accipit augmentum panis, et
 mirabilibus modis inter comeden
 tium turbas candida segex exori
 tur. fragmentorum fiunt omnia ple
 na, saturatur populus, colliguntur
 adhuc duodecim cofini pleni ad nu
 merum dilectorum duodecim dis
 cipulorum, ut semper abundet ecle
 30 sia de ubertate apostolorum et doc
 trinae eorum panibus saturetur.
 ipse est dñs noster, qui et aliquando
 manna in herem^o caelo famulante concessit
 fol. 17 *b* et de petra fontes exuberanti copia
 manare permisit. ipsi gloria et impe
 rium in saecula. amen.

3. *The true author of the Homilies and Tractates.*

On my return from the Continent I found awaiting me a *tirage à part* of an article by Dom B. Capelle in the *Revue Bénédictine*.¹ The *envoi* was dated June 28, 1922, the day after my departure from Verona. Had I received it earlier, I might have contributed, by the elucidation of some of the few points about the MS that still remain obscure, more than as it is I can do to the final demonstration of Dom Capelle's thesis.

When Dr Spagnolo and I commenced the publication of the unprinted portion of the codex, we treated the contents as anonymous. It was quite clear that the 'Arian Sermon' (*J. T. S.* xiii 19-28: Oct. 1911) was not by any orthodox writer. So also our first publication of the Homilies bore the title 'An ancient homiliary' (*ib.* xvi 161-176, 314-322: Jan.-Apr. 1915). But in the course of the publication the direct indications of a fifth-century date became so clear (and the evidence of the Biblical citations was so entirely concordant) that I thought there was no longer sufficient reason to reject the 'traditional' ascription. My primary purpose was to produce an adequate and accurate text of documents that were either unprinted or very inadequately printed. Perhaps before I attached the name of Maximus I ought to have studied the admitted works of that author. But one has not leisure for everything, and I have at least left the gap open for Dom Capelle's startling discovery.

In the first place Dom Capelle demonstrates the truth of the conclusion which I adopted as to the unity of authorship of both Sermons

¹ *Rev. Bén.* xxxiv (April 1922) pp. 81-108.

(or Homilies) and Treatises by a series of illuminating and convincing parallelisms of style and expression (pp. 83-88). But further he makes it at least probable, by the use of the same argument (pp. 94, 95), that the 'Arian Sermon' should be attributed to the same authorship: and since St Maximus was naturally not an Arian, it would follow that none of the material of our MS belongs to him. And if we turn (p. 89) to the certain writings of Maximus, we find that they are marked by quite other characteristics, of style, expression, and substance, from the documents under discussion. Maximus is therefore put out of court. If the argument for community of authorship with the 'Arian Sermon' holds good, we must look in a very different direction. And in fact the whole of the material, when carefully probed, reveals (pp. 91-94) a doctrinal attitude which in a Latin writer of the fifth century can be nothing but Arian. It is not 'arianisme brutal', but it is Arianism. The doxologies are exclusively of the type 'gloria Patri per Filium in Spiritu sancto'. Emphasis is laid on the 'invisible' and 'ingenerate' Father, while the Son made Himself visible in the Theophanies of the Old Testament, obeyed the Father's commands, and is 'humilior Patre'. The Holy Spirit had His beginning after the Son.

The author, then, was an Arian. But there are not many Latin Arian writers whom we know to have had literary activity about this period. If he is to be identified with any writer already known, the field of choice is small. With one of them, however, that Maximin with whom St Augustine held at Hippo, in the year 427 or 428, a discussion, reported in full by notaries, the parallels are astonishingly close and complete (pp. 97-104). If Maximin was the real author, we can understand the origin of the variant ascription to Maximus, one of the two most celebrated preachers of the North Italian Church. And in fact, so late as 1742, Maffei in his *Istoria teologica* catalogued the MS under the name not of Maximus but of Maximinus (p. 108). [I cannot find this anywhere in Maffei's book myself.]

Such is in brief Dom Capelle's brilliant presentation of his thesis. Even on first reading I realized how much there was to be said for it: but I made reserves on certain points, principally on two.

(1) I thought, and I still think, that Dom Capelle treats as indications of Arianism some things which in the East one would be entirely prepared to expect in orthodox fathers, and perhaps even in some Westerns like St Hilary. St Basil of course defended the orthodoxy of the doxology *διὰ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι*, and if it were a necessary sign of Arianism there would be few ante-Nicenes who were not Arian. Still more would this be the case with the exegesis of the Theophanies: the identification of the supernatural visitant with the Son is almost universal, in Nicenes and ante-Nicenes alike, before Augustine.

(2) I found it difficult to believe that the writer of the 'Arian Sermon', so naked in its expression of Arian doctrine, could be the same as the writer of the Homilies and Treatises with their admittedly watered Arianism, and that to treat the brief 'Sermon' as a *contra hereticos*, the third of a trilogy with the *contra Iudaeos* and *contra paganos*, was to compare disparate things with one another.

But Dom Capelle himself suggested (p. 95, n. 1) that the Sermon, which as it stands covers three leaves only, was not a complete whole, but merely a fragment, 'une fin de traité'. It is here that the investigations carried out above, as to the loss which the MS has suffered before fol. 133, come into significant connexion with Dom Capelle's results. At least eleven leaves have been removed: and as we may assume that they have been removed for cause, and that the cause was the unorthodoxy of their contents, it becomes more than likely that they constituted in fact the beginning and principal part of the 'Arian Sermon'. If we could suppose that a second complete gathering had been lost—nineteen leaves in all, instead of eleven—then with the three surviving leaves the total would almost precisely correspond to the twenty-one leaves of the *contra Iudaeos* and the twenty of the *contra paganos*. But the evidence did not seem to point to the absence of more than one complete gathering at this point, and even fourteen leaves is a sufficiently respectable figure to bring into some comparison with the two other treatises.

Anyhow the conclusion seems justified that an orthodox reader, at some quite early date, removed from the codex all that was most obviously heretical. We cannot tell whether the loss of the sixth gathering was due to this cause or was purely accidental. But I have little doubt that the same hand removed the two leaves from the Apostolic Canons and the eleven or more leaves from the 'Arian Sermon' (or as Dom Capelle prefers to call it the *contra hereticos*), and for the same reason. It was probably by an unintentional oversight that the three final leaves of the 'Sermon' escaped the knife.

Just what an orthodox reader, somewhere about the seventh century, left undisturbed was exactly in fact what an intelligent layman in the twentieth century ascribed, with whatever hesitation, to a Catholic writer. I have no doubt that Dom Capelle's theological acumen has divined the truth, and that, however little there is that is necessarily Arian, the sum total of doctrinal phraseology, as collected by him, points, for that time and place (that is to say, the West and the fifth century), necessarily to an Arian. One may, I hope, justifiably welcome two thoughts: the one that the controversy against heathen and Jews would be carried on by Catholic and Arian with substantially the same arguments and in substantially the same language; the other that an

Arian bishop could impart to his flock—even though, as Dom Capelle points out, he preached much more theology than ethics—a great deal of instruction with comparatively little error.

Dom Capelle's admirable study is an earnest of what we may hope from the revival of the *Revue Bénédictine*. 'In the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom': and perhaps he and I between us have carried the criticism of the documents concerned further than either of us alone would be likely to have done. But if the spade-work was mine, the decisive word has been his.

C. H. TURNER.

THE ARAMAIC EQUIVALENT OF ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας IN JN. VII 38.

PROF. EMERY BARNES, in reviewing my *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, criticizes my proposal to regard ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας in Jn. vii 38 as a misinterpretation of Aramaic מַעַין מִן מַאֲיָן *min māyan* 'out of the fountain' as *min m'in* 'out of the belly', on grounds which he states thus: 'But is κοιλία the most natural translation of מַעַין? If any particular Aramaic word lies behind κοιλία, would it not rather be כַּרְסָא (כַּרְשָׁא)? For מַעַין one would expect σπλάγχνα.'

Had he looked at the concordance he would hardly have expressed this opinion. In the one passage in which מַעַין 'belly' (properly 'bowels') occurs in Biblical Aramaic, viz. Dan. ii 32 (a passage to which I refer in my discussion), the rendering is κοιλία both in LXX and Theodotion. There are thirty-three occurrences of the cognate Hebrew מַעַיִם in the Hebrew Bible, and this is rendered κοιλία by LXX twenty-seven times.¹ In the remaining six cases we find καρδία twice, Ps xl 9, Lam. ii 11 (in both cases Field gives *al. exempl. κοιλία*); Gen. xv 4 ἐκ σου (i. e. probably מַמְעֵיךָ for מַמְעֵיךָ); Isa. xlvi 19 ὡς ὁ χούς τῆς γῆς for the questionable מַמְעֵיךָ; Isa. lxiii 15 paraph. τὸ πλήθος τοῦ ἐλέους σου for מַמְעֵיךָ; Jer. xxxi 20 paraph. ἔσπευσα ἐπ' αὐτῷ for לִי הָמוּ מַעֵי לִי (Aquila ἤχησεν ἡ κοιλία μου αὐτῷ). The only other renderings of מַעַיִם which we find in the fragments of the later Greek versions are in Symmachus, ἔντερα three times (a rendering which Field gives as occurring three times in *al. exempl. of LXX*), ἔγκατα twice, ἐνδόσθια once, τὸ ἐντός μου once; while σπλάγχνα (the rendering which Dr Barnes rather strangely

¹ It should be noted that the Hatch-Redpath Concordance wrongly gives κοιλία in Ezek. iii 3 as representing מַמְעֵיךָ. τὸ στόμα σου φάγεται, καὶ ἡ κοιλία σου πλησθήσεται = כָּמֵן וּמַעַיִן תִּמְלֵא, so that στόμα renders כָּמֵן, while κοιλία is to be added to the cases in which this word represents מַעַיִם. To the Biblical examples may be added ἡ κοιλία μου = מַעֵי in Ecclus. li 21.