

The date of Euthalius.

By F. C. Conybeare. Oxford.

Dr. Bousset in a review of Dr. Hermann von Soden's 'Die Schriften des N. T. in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt' etc. in the *Theol. Literaturztg.*, No. 11, 1903 writes thus:

Am meisten Überraschung bringt in diesem letzten Abschnitt dann die Partie, in der S. die Euthaliusfrage behandelt. Ja, es ist fast niederschmetternd, zu sehen, wie hier trotz emsiger Bemühungen die Forscher bisher alle in die Irre gegangen sind, und wie die Entdeckung einer einzigen Urkunde ganze Reihen von Hypothesen über den Haufen wirft. Durch einen von Wöbbermin auf dem Athos gemachten glücklichen Fund eines Aktenstückes, das den Titel trägt Εὐθαλίου ἐπισκόπου Σουλκῆς ὁμολογία περὶ τῆς ὁρθοδόξου πίστεως, wird die Person des rätselhaften Euthalius ein- für allemal aus dem vierten oder fünften Jahrhundert, in welchem man sie bisher suchte, verwiesen. Euthalius lebte, wie aus dem sicher echten Schriftstück mit unzweifelhafter Gewißheit hervorgeht, in der zweiten Hälfte des siebenten Jahrhunderts, zunächst als Diacon wahrscheinlich in Syrien (Antiochia), darnach als Bischof in Sulke auf Sardinien.

It must be admitted that the discovery of the 'Confession' of Euthalius of Sulkê raises a problem. No scholar hitherto has suggested a date for the author of the Euthalian prologues later than A. D. 458, the second of the two dates assigned internally to the Martyrium Pauli, which is given in conjunction with them in the Greek Mss and Versions. In the *Journal of Philology* (1895, vol. XXIII No. 46) I shewed that the second date A. D. 458 is absent from the Armenian version of the Martyrium, as it is from most of the Greek mss; and inferred that A. D. 396, the first of the two dates given in it was the true date of the activity of Euthalius.

But in his *Euthaliana*, Cambridge, 1895 Dr. Armitage Robinson carries the date further back; for he shewed that the Martyrium was written later than the prologue of the Paulines and in close imitation of it. Therefore the prologue was written before 396; but after 323, for it cites the Chronicon and history of Eusebius. The third chapter of Dr. R.'s book in which he makes these deductions is so important, and in such crucial antagonism to the inference drawn by Dr. Freiherr von

Soden from Wobbermin's newly discovered document, that I venture to cite it. For Dr. v. S. has not, I think, sufficiently considered it. Here is the most important passage:

Let us set aside by side certain sentences of the Prologue and the whole of the Martyrium, excepting the added portion which contains the later date.

PROLOGUE TO PAULINE EPISTLES.

Z. 522 Αὐτόθι οὖν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενος, ὡς φησιν αὐτός, τῷ τῶν ἱερῶν Χριστοῦ μαρτύρων στεφάνῳ κατεκομήθη. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ περικαλλέσιν οἰκοῖς καὶ βασιλείοις τοῦτου λείψανα καθείρξαντες ἐπέτειον αὐτῷ μνήμης ἡμέραν πανηγυρίζουσι τῇ πρὸ τριῶν καλανῶν Ἰουλίῳ, πέμπτῃ Πανέμου μηνός, τοῦτου τὸ μαρτύριον ἑορτάζοντες.

Z. 532 Ἐνθα δὴ συνέβη τὸν Παῦλον τριακοστῷ ἔκτῳ ἔτει τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους τρικαιδεκάτῳ δὲ Νέρωνος μαρτυρήσας, εἶπει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτηθέντα.

Z. 533 Περί δὲ τῆς δευτέρας (ἀπολογίας), ἐν ἣ καὶ τελειοῦται τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, φησίν· κ. τ. λ.

Ἔστιν οὖν ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τοῦ κηρύγματος Παύλου κ. τ. λ.

Z. 529 Ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἡγησάμεν ἐν βραχεῖ καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐπισημειώσασθαι τοῦ κηρύγματος Παύλου, ἕκ τῶν χρονικῶν κανόνων Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου τὴν ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν ποιοῦμενος.

The passages which I have quoted from the Prologue do not practically stand so far apart as the pages of Zacagni's edition suggest; for pp. 523—528 contain brief summaries of the Pauline Epistles, and pp. 529—532 a discussion of the chronology based on Eusebius: to an epitomiser they would lie sufficiently near together.

It is almost inconceivable that a writer who has so great a wealth of expression as the author of the Prologue should repeat his own language in this slavish manner. Nor on the other hand does it seem in the least probable that the Martyrium has been used at considerable intervals (for the intervals are considerable on this view) in the composition of the Prologue.

Beside these general considerations there are three distinct points at which the Martyrium shews itself to be the later document.

1. At first where, ex hypothesi, the writer embodies a phrase of the Prologue he gives the Roman date for June 29, viz. ἡ πρὸ τριῶν καλανῶν Ἰουλίῳ; but lower down we find μηνός Ἰουνίου εἰκοστῇ ἐνάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

2. The phrase in the Martyrium τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ is, to say the least, extremely harsh; whether we refer αὐτὸν to S. Paul, or to Nero, who has not been mentioned since the first line of the piece. But in the Prologue, after quoting with

¹ Many mss add after Ἰουλίῳ in the Prologue the words μνηὶ Ἰουνίῳ.

Μαρτύριον Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.

Ἐπὶ Νέρωνος τοῦ Καίσαρος Ῥωμαίων ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτόθι Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, εἶπει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτηθεὶς ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ καὶ ἕκτῳ ἔτει τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους, τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ, πέμπτῃ ἡμέρᾳ Πανέμου μηνός, ἥτις λέγοιτο ἂν παρὰ Ῥωμαίους ἢ πρὸ τριῶν καλανῶν Ἰουλίῳ, καθ' ἣν ἐτελειώθη ὁ ἄγιος ἀπόστολος τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, ἑξηκοστῷ καὶ ἐνάτῳ ἔτει τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας.

Ἔστιν οὖν ὁ πᾶς χρόνος ἐξ οὗ ἐμαρτύρησεν τριακοκτὴν τριάκοντα ἔτη μέχρι τῆς παρουσίας ταύτης ὑπατείας, τετάρτης μὲν Ἀρκαδίου τρίτης δὲ Ὀνωρίου τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν αὐτοκρατόρων Αὐτοῦστου, ἐνάτης ἰνδικτιῶνος τῆς πεντεκαιδεκαετηρικῆς περιόδου, μηνός Ἰουνίου εἰκοστῇ ἐνάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Ἐσημειώσαμεν ἀκριβῶς τὸν χρόνον τοῦ μαρτυρίου Παύλου ἀποστόλου.

[For the additional note, see p. 47.]

reference to the first ἀπολογία, "I was delivered from the mouth of the lion," the writer continues: τοῦτον τὸν Νέρωνα εἶναι λέγων. περὶ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας (ἀπολογίας), ἐν ἧ καὶ τελειοῦται τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, φησὶν κ.τ.λ.: so that αὐτὸν here clearly refers to Nero.

3. But a more striking divergence remains to be noticed. The author of the Martyrium places the martyrdom itself on June 29. But this was a later deduction from the fact that the Roman Church kept the festival of SS. Peter and Paul on that day, which we know from the Liberian Catalogue (A. D. 354) to have been simply the day of the Deposition in A. D. 258 (see Lightfoot, Clem. Rom. 1890, vol. II. pp. 499 ff.). The mistake was common, if not universal, in later times; but it is not made by the writer of the Prologue.

The result of this investigation is somewhat surprising. Neither 458 nor 396 can any longer be considered the date of Euthalius. We must take him back earlier still. We must allow time for the recognition of the value of his work, and the modification of it by an epitomiser who desired perhaps to produce an editio minor by the abbreviation of the prefatory matter.

Other indications of date. We thus start afresh to look for the date of Euthalius's work at some period anterior to A. D. 396. An upper limit is given us by his reference to Eusebius (Z. 529). For he tells us that his Summary of the chronology of S. Paul's life is based upon that writer Accordingly the work of Euthalius must be subsequent to A. D. 323.

Of the three reasons adduced by Dr. A. R. for regarding the Martyrium as an imitation of the prologue, No. 2 is to my mind in itself conclusive. To the weight of nos 1 and 3 Dr. von Soden himself testifies in these words p. 656:

Die Kalenderbezeichnung am Schluß (des Prologs) macht gegenüber dem Martyrium durch die umgekehrte Aufeinanderfolge der römischen und syrischen Datierung den Eindruck der Selbständigkeit.

Such an admission is destructive of Dr. von Soden's general hypothesis.

For his conclusion is the opposite of Dr. Robinson's, namely that Euthalius of Sulkê sometime between 650 and 700 wrote the prologues etc. on the Paulines, the Acts and the vii Epistles. He accounts for the resemblance of style between the prologue of the Paulines and the Martyrium by supposing that Euthalius imitated the latter, which he admits to have been written in 396. He also admits the antiquity of the fragment on the ἀποδημία of Paul and of a colophon found (as part of the Euthalian apparatus) at the end of Philemon, in which it is declared that the person who wrote and published this volume of Paul arranging the text κριτηρόν, confronted his book with the text written by Pamphilus and preserved in Caesarea. This colophon is found on one of the few leaves preserved of the fifth or sixth century Codex H of the Paulines. Such then was the stock in trade inherited by Euthalius

of Sulké about A. D. 670. Out of them he, so to speak, builded up by imitation his prologues. He also imported not a little falsehood into his work, for in his prologues he claims to be the first originator of such an edition of Paulines, Acts and vii Epistles; which he certainly was not, if he lived as late as 670, and was the author of Dr. Wobbermin's *ὁμολογία*.

But Dr. A. R. does not exhaust the objections which the Greek MSS and versions containing the Euthalian apparatus furnish against the late date now ascribed to it by Dr. von Soden and Bousset:

1. There is so close a connection between codex H of the Paulines and the Greek and Armenian codices which contain the Euthalian apparatus, as to suggest that, could we recover more of the missing leaves of this codex, we should find that it contained, in addition to the colophon mentioned, the prologue as well.

2. The prologues are given in many existing MSS of the eighth to tenth centuries. Is their diffusion at so early a date compatible with the hypothesis that they were first composed about A. D. 670?

3. Is it just to accuse the author of these prologues of direct falsehood, as we must if we accept the period 650—700 as that of his activity?

4. Dr. von Soden admits that the Martyrium was written in 396, and allows equal antiquity to the colophons which refer to the library of Pamphilus and to the lending of books.

But if these existed some three centuries before the prologues we should find them to be widely diffused in the MSS apart from the prologues. Do we so find them? In his exhaustive account of the 48 codices containing the Martyrium Dr. von Soden does not mention a single one in which it is found independently of the Prologue. It almost invariably follows the prologue, to the *κρίτοι* of which its *κρίτοι* are added to form a single sum total.

We must perforce conclude that these admittedly older elements never existed in MS tradition apart from the prologues. But if so, the prologues ascend to A. D. 396 at latest. If on the other hand the martyrion was added to the prologue in 396, we may expect to find in some codices the prologue without the martyrion. Dr. von Soden does not tell us if he knows of any such. But Mr Joseph Trotter assures me

² I only know of one Ms, viz. New College 58 in which the Martyrium is divorced from the Prologue of the Paulines. In this it follows Acts, and the Ms only contains A. K. I owe this information to Mr. Joseph Trotter.

that he has collated two such in the Bodleian alone. Codex H cannot be instanced as a case in which the said colophons survive apart from the rest of the apparatus. For we have only a few leaves of it, and can not say that it did not contain the rest of the apparatus.

Dr. P. Corsssen in the *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1899 Nr. 9, proves that the writer of the colophon in H copied the colophon which so often accompanies the prologues, and what is more made mistakes in copying it, e. g. ἐῆων ,ein offenbarer Schreibfehler für' ἡμῶν. Such a fact goes far to prove that codex H contained the apparatus in its entirety.

5. If the prologues were first composed about the year 670, then most of the copies of the N. T., and also the Armenian and Syriac codices which contain it, have flowed from the single copy so equipt by Euthalius of Sulkê about A. D. 670. If this be so, there ought to be, if not identity, at least some affinity of textual tradition among the MSS of the eighth to the eleventh century which contain the Euthalian apparatus. We would expect this, even if we allow for the apparatus being occasionally transferred to alien texts, as a stolen glove passes from the hand of one man to that of another. But there is no such affinity as Dr. P. Corsssen has pointed out. Surely the fact that common equipment of two codices with this apparatus never betokens a common tradition of text shews that that equipment was devised long before A. D. 700? Had it been devised so late, we ought surely to detect in a majority of the codices fitted with it, what we may call an Euthalian type of text?

6. I have reserved to the end the most fatal objection presented by the codices to the hypothesis that the prologue of the Paulines is later, instead of earlier, than the Martyrium. The latter is found in two forms, one redacted in A. D. 396, and the other in 458. This later form differs from the earlier by the addition of the following clause:

"And from the fourth consulship of Arcadius and the third of Honorius, up to this present consulship, the first of Leo Augustus, indiction XII, Epiphi 5, year of Diocletian 174, are years 63. So that the total of the years from our Saviour's Parûsia until the current year is 462".

This clause was added in Egypt in A. D. 458. If I understand Dr. von Soden rightly this clause is appended to the Martyrium in ten codices, of which one α 7 is of s. IX and five more viz α 50, 64, 65, 70, 74 of s. X.

Now Dr. von Soden supposes that Euthalius of Sulkê picked up this martyrium in some codex or other and modelled on it his prologue

of the Paulines. So the question which he raises is reasonable: Aber in welcher Redaktion hat es Euthalius aufgenommen? For reasons I need not examine he concludes thus:

„Euthalius hat also zweifellos das μαρτυριον in der nur durch die „römische mit der ἐκμειωράμην Subskription wichtig gemachten Ergänzung der Berechnung für das Jahr 396 erweiterten Form aufgenommen. „. . . . Daß ihm die ägyptische Adoptierung desselben unbekannt blieb, „beweist sicher gegen die ihm bisher meist zugeschriebene ägyptische „Heimat.“

Here is the true τρικυμία of difficulty in the way of Dr. von Soden's hypothesis, and it makes no difference which form of the Martyrium Euthalius c. 670 knew of. If he knew only of the shorter form dated 396 and appended his prologue to that, why do we find this prologue equally appended to the longer or Egyptian form of the Martyrium. For I gather that there exists no codex in which this 'Egyptian' form occurs without the prologue preceding it.

On the other hand, if Euthalius knew only of the later or Egyptian adaptation, why do we not find a number of codices in which the shorter and earlier form of the martyrion exists apart from the prologue. But I gather from Dr. von Soden's work that the shorter form is found in 48 codices, but always as an appendix of the Prologue. As I said above I only know of one codex New college 58 in which the martyrion has been inserted independently of the prologue.

If we assume that Euthalius, about A. D. 670, or perhaps later, used the shorter form of martyrion as the model of his prologue, is it conceivable that so many ninth and tenth century codices should conjoin that prologue with the longer or Egyptian form of Martyrium unknown to Euthalius? Which ever form he used, the uniform conjunction of his prologue with the rival form becomes a miracle, and in devising textual hypotheses, we must stop short of miracles.

Before producing the adverse evidence of the Armenian sources I must draw attention to the slender character of the Greek evidence for identifying the author of the prologues with Euthalius bishop of Sulkê.

The prologue of the vii Epistles is anonymous in all MSS. Of the eleven codd. which name Euthalius in the prologue of Paulines, six qualify him as a deacon of Alexandria and only five as bishop of Sulkê, viz: δ 101, α 101, 203, α 65, 70. Yet Dr. von Soden enumerates some 60 codd as containing this prologue.

Only four codd viz. α 64, α 101 δ 101 α 203 qualify Euthalius as bishop of Sulkê in the prologue of Acts.

Thus six codices in all mention the bishop of Sulkê. Those which name Euthalius at all are barely twelve in number. In the vast mass of codd the Euthalian apparatus is anonymous. It is so in the Armenian and Syriac versions. The name Euthalius is found only in the title of the so-called Prayer of Euthalius. The Greek of the prayer has the name embedded in the text itself, but not the Armenian.

Dr. A. Robinson therefore is well within the mark when he wrote as follows in the preface of his Euthaliana:

"MSS of the Acts and Epistles are to a large extent descended ultimately from an edition of these books put out in ancient times by a modest scholar who has not revealed his personality, but to whom tradition has ascribed the name of Euthalius.

"To whom Tradition has ascribed the name of Euthalius". Can we not suppose that after 700 A. D. this tradition, already in existence, was enlarged? An Euthalius bishop of Sulkê had gained a certain notoriety, about A. D. 670. After which date some copyist, finding the name Euthalius attached in his exemplar to the prologues, added the qualification "bishop of Sulkê". His copy was copied in turn; and so we can account for the five or six codices, in which Euthalius is qualified as bishop of Sulkê.

It is evident that Dr. von Soden's hypothesis falls to the ground, if it can be shewn that the prologues existed well before A. D. 700. I will now shew that they did so exist, and — what is more — existed in an old Armenian version as early as A. D. 685 at least. Not only so, but the old Armenian author who thus attests their existence also possessed the tradition that they were the work of an Euthalius, whose activity he dates under Arcadius and Honorius, herein influenced of course by the Martyrium. The evidence is as follows:

In the Edschmiazin library is an uncial MS which was, according to a colophon within it, repaired in A. D. 981, and must therefore have been written somewhat earlier. It contains alongwith much else, chronological tables of events arranged after the manner of the Chronicon of Eusebius, the apology and sermon of Aristides, and lastly a chronicle beginning with Adam and extending to A. D. 685, when it was compiled from the works of Eusebius and other historians. The tone of this chronicle is strongly monophysite, and its author was almost certainly

Ananias of Shirak the Armenian calendarist, whose tracts on Easter and Epiphany precede it in the volume.

In this chronicle then we find the following Notice.¹

"Arcadius and Honorius, sons of Theodosius, years 44. In their third year was Euthalius the blessed of Alexandria who in admirable constitutions (? = διατάξεις) drew up the holy prologues and chapters and particulars (or details) and testimonies and verses (= κτίχοι) of the Apostle and of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Catholic Epistles, because of the heresy of Cleobius and Carpocrates, who said that Jesus was mere man, and rejected the Old Testament, because they sought(?) the testimony of Christ."

About A. D. 1000 Stephanos Aḡolik finished his "Universal History", using among his sources the above chronicle; and from it he copies verbatim the above passage, only omitting the last clause, "because of the heresy" . . . etc.

Thus well before A. D. 700 the Armenians had the entire Euthalian System in their MSS; and — what is more — attributed it to an Euthalius of Alexandria, whose activity — no doubt by an inference from the martyrdom — they placed in the reign of Arcadius and Honorius. Stephanos Aḡolik adds the information that he was a contemporary of John Chrysostom, of Epiphanius of Cyprus and of Ammonius of Alexandria who indexed the gospels.

Lest I be accused of pressing the evidence too hard I venture to cite a passage from the valuable work of Dr. Mesrop Ter-Movsesian on the History of the translation of the Armenian bible (история перевода библии), S. Petersburg, 1902. He had not before him the chronicle of Ananias, nor the History of Stephanos, to which I appeal. He had only the evidence of similar import contained in Mkhitar of Ayrivanq and of the so called 'Book of the Caesars' adduced in the San Lazaro journal the Bazmavêp for 1877 p. 205. Yet he concludes with me that Armenian sources of the seventh century witness to the existence of the Armenian version of the Euthalian apparatus, which must have been translated at a still earlier date. He also points out how the Armenian church long ago, so to speak, canonised Euthalius. He writes p. 267:

с) Известно, что Евталій Александрійскій, человекъ съ хорошими грамматическими и литературными познаніями, вѣдая въ V вѣкѣ составить стихометрію для дѣяній и посланій апостоловъ, установить свидѣтельства В. Завета, которыя встрѣчаются въ Н. Заветѣ и снабдить каждую книгу краткимъ предисловіемъ. Точный годъ его работы неизвѣстенъ, по однимъ указаніямъ онъ ее сдѣлалъ въ началѣ (410), а по другимъ въ концѣ (490) столѣтія. Его работа цѣлкомъ переведена на арм. языкъ, но когда, въ V-ли вѣкѣ, какъ вообще принято думать, или позднѣе, неизвѣстно. На основаніи данныхъ

¹ I use a transcript made in 1836 by Father Sethean for the library of San Lazaro. He copied the codex while it still lay at Mush.

рукописей трудно определенно что набудь сказать, потому что самая древняя изъ нихъ 1220 года. Выше были приведены ссылки изъ «книги Цезарей», *liber Causarum* и цѣлкомъ былъ напечатанъ текстъ второй версии предисловія къ апостольскимъ посланіямъ. На основаніи всего того мы можемъ заключить, что въ седьмомъ столѣтіи армяне были знакомы съ работою Евталія, а для того, чтобы ее отнести къ болѣе раннему времени пока никакого прямого указанія не имеемъ. Потому мы знаемъ, что общее предисловіе Евталія ко всей работѣ, такъ называемое наставленіе Евталія, получило каноническое значеніе въ армянской церкви и читается въ день Вознесенія.

Безъ сомнѣнія поздняго происхожденія слѣдующія добавленія въ разныхъ рукописяхъ:

а) вторыя предисловія къ Дьяніямъ апостоловъ и посланіямъ Павла, которыя мнѣ случилось видѣть въ рук. St^r, Sk², Ja, б) «Имена первыхъ діаконѣвъ апостоловъ и творимыя ими чудеса» въ тѣхъ же самыхъ рукописяхъ и с) «Путешествіе апостола Павла».

Whence did the Armenians of the seventh century obtain the tradition that the prologues etc. were the work of Euthalius of Alexandria?

To this question I have no very satisfactory answer. The codices of the Mechitarist library in Vienna which contain the epistles and acts only mention Euthalius in the heading of the so-called prayer. The same is true of two early codices in the British Museum, of Lord Zouche's Armenian bible and of the more valuable copy belonging to the British and Foreign Bible Society. The latter adds between the Prologues etc. and the text of the Paulines an old colophon stating that 'this book was written carefully from an exemplar of the translation of the ancients, and accords therewith'. But whether this notice applies to the Prologue as well as to the text is not clear. The editors of the bible printed at San Lázaro in 1860, profess to follow the oldest codices. If so, these codices omit the name of Euthalius before the prologues. Thus it would seem as if in all Armenian codices the prologues were anonymous, and as if the name Euthalius was affixed to the 'Prayer' alone. This 'Prayer' in B. M. cod. add 19, 730, written in S. XIII, follows after the epistle of Jude. So also in the Mechitarist Bible codex in Vienna, No. 55, written 1375. In another bible codex No. 71 of the same collection written s. XIII—XIV the 'Prayer' is not given, but on f. 468a the 'chapters' of Euthalius are eo nomine alluded to in a note written by the scribe. I now turn to another Armenian source of knowledge about Euthalius.

A certain presbyter Matthew in A. D. 1411 wrote a commentary on Acts which is preserved in the Mechitarist library in Vienna cod. 34, (Dashean catal. p. 187). In it he raises the question: "Who composed the 'prologue of acts'?" "It seems to me, he answers, that Euthalius composed this as well as that of the Paulines. He was a teacher and 'bishop in Alexandria. For whom then did he compose it? Some say

"for one Athanasius an ascetic in the desert of the Thebaïd. But it seems to me that they were different people who asked respectively for the works on the apostle (Paul) and on the acts. For that (? on Paul) was composed for Alexander patriarch of Alexandria, whom he calls 'honorable Father' (= πᾶτερ τιμώτατε) and at whose humility and condescension he is surprised, that he should ask for the discourse from a pupil, and whom he fears to disobey lest he be given over to perdition. But this work (? on Acts) he wrote for Athanasius a 'pupil of the same patriarch, who corrected (? = κατώρθωσεν) the 'we believe', whom he here calls 'Brother Athanasius'."

This Matthew was pupil of the learned doctors John Orotnetzi and Gregory of Dathev. His commentary on acts is compiled from John Chrysostom and Ephrem, Michael the Syrian historian and other foreign writers. The commentary is followed at Fol. 223 by a moral treatise written by the same Matthew and based on Evagrius of Pontus.

The above notice calls for consideration on several grounds. We do not know to what sources an Armenian scholar of the year 1400 may not have had access, but the following points are important:

1. His information is not obtained from the prologues, and yet admirably agree with and explains them.

2. He does not repeat the chronicler of A. D. 685, but at once knows more than he does and implicitly contradicts him, for he places Euthalius not as late as 396, but under Alexander who died six months after the council of Nice, say early in 326. Every writer earlier than Dr. A. Robinson has jumped to the conclusion that the writer of 396 or 458 was Euthalius.

3. He knows that the πατήρ τιμώτατος of the prologue to the Paulines was this Alexander.

4. He knows that the 'brother' Athenasius was a monk of the Thebaïd and not the great Athanasius. If we allow for the tendency to ascribe everything to the great leader of orthodoxy, we must admit that Matthew here displays very special knowledge, and appears to be very reliable.

5. He knows that the Athanasius in question was the one who drew up or corrected the creed which from time immemorial has been in use in the Armenian church, and is not identical with the Nicene. It begins 'we believe' *hawatamq*. Of course the *Quincunqve vult* is not in question, for that was only translated into Armenian about 1650, begins as in the Latin, and has never been used as a creed until recently

by a few Uniats. In Alexander's time the name of Athanasius was common in Egypt.

The information of Matthew the elder of 1400 is so weighty, that we are inclined to discount his lateness of date, and admit the probability of his account of Euthalius. Only there here meets us a difficulty. How could the author of the prologue to the Paulines, writing for Alexander the patriarch and therefore before 326, cite from works of Eusebius which were written about 323. Hence Dr. A. Robinson fixt 323 as the terminus a quo of Euthalius, just as 396, the year in which the Martyrium Pauli was imitated from and compiled out of the prologue, supplied him with a terminus ad quem.

But the difficulty vanishes if we can suppose that the author of this prologue visited Caesarea and there had access to the writings which Eusebius had just completed.

And this is just what we do learn from the colophon which in Armenian MSS of the Paulines, as also in codex H of Paul, follows the Epistle to Philemon:

"I have written out and arranged as far as I could verse by verse "the writings of Paul the apostle, disposing them also in easily understood lections for our brethren . . . This book was copied after an "exemplar of Caesarea, which lies there in the chest of books, and "which was written with his own hand by the holy Pamphilus."

In the *Journal of Philology* Vol. 23 in an article "on the codex Pamphili and date of Eusebius" I argued that this colophon must be of the same writer, Euthalius or not, who wrote the prologues, because it agrees with them in style and contents. There is a similar colophon at the end of the Catholic epistles. These two colophons are first rate evidence that the author of the argumenta did visit Caesarea. But if so why should he not have seen there the very works of Eusebius which he cites? He would hardly have omitted to enquire of the great historian about the chronology of Paul. The use of the month Panemus in the prologue of the Paulines also points to Caesarea, as Dr. Robinson has remarked. It is quite likely that Euthalius repaired to Caesarea, the great home of study of the Sacred text, in order to fulfil the command laid on him by Alexander. There is no reason, as Dr. P. Corssen has shewn, why Dr. A. Robinson should ascribe these colophons to the writer of A. D. 396 rather than to the Author of the prologues.

The question next arises: How long before A. D. 685 were the

prologues, martyrium, colophons relating to Pamphilus etc. translated into Armenian? In translating dates fixed in the Julian calendar the Armenians were wont to add the name of the month which in their vague calendar answered at the time of translation to the Julian month mentioned.

For the moment I set aside the passage of the Prologue in which the Feast of S. Paul is dated. I do so, because in evidence of the original Armenian text of this passage I have only the printed Armenian bible and MSS of the thirteenth century. I will begin by considering the dates in the Martyrium, for the Armenian text of which I have indefinitely older testimony.

Now in this Martyrium the date of Paul's death is fixt on June 29 twice, viz *ή πρό τριών Καλανδών 'Ιουλίων μηνι 'Ιουνίω*, and lower down *μηνός 'Ιουνίου είκοστή έννάτη ήμέρα*.

The Armenian translator of the Euthalian apparatus adds the name of the Armenian month corresponding to the month of June.

In 1892 I found in a binding at Edschmiazin a very ancient uncial text of parts of the Euthalian prologue to the epistles of Paul and also of the Martyrium Pauli; and in this text the above dates are rendered thus: *յառաջ քան զերիսն կաղանդացն յունիս ամսոյ որ է մարգոց ամիս*, and: *ի հինգետասաներորդում շրջանակի ամացն յամսեանն յունի, որ է մարգոց որ աբ քսան և ինն էր ամսոյն*.

That is: "On the third day before the calends <of the month July> in the month of June which is the month margotz".

And: "In the 15th cycle of years, in the month of June, which is Margotz, on the 29th day".

In the first passage I add in brackets "of July", which must have once stood in the Armenian text, for the later MSS have it, but omit the words "in the month of June". As in many Greek MSS, so in the Armenian, mention was made of both months; but the equation with Margotz only applies to June as the second passage shews.

Now in A. D. 388, June 15th = Margotz 1st.

" " 448, " 1st = " "

" " 508, May 15th = " "

Therefore the martyrium was translated into Armenian between 388 and 508, and the middle date 448 best suits the translator's text, since the whole of June then covered the whole of Margotz.

But, it may be said, the martyrium was translated before the prologue. I answer that there is not proof that it was; and that the iden-

tity of style and of phrases used to render in the Martyrium phrases which recur in the prologue proves that the same translator translated both. The uncial fragment contains part of the prologue to the Paulines as well as the martyrrium; but, unfortunately, not the passage which gives the date of S. Paul's feast in Rome.

The equations with Armenian months as given in the printed Armenian bibles are impossible. They are these:

In the prologue of Paulines: Nōomon (? Lous) = Mareri.

In the Martyrium: July = Margatz.

" " " : June = Mareri.

Perhaps in the prologue the Armenian means that the third day before the Kalends of July, viz: June 29, fell in Mareri. But Mareri answered to June in A. D. 324, and to July in A. D. 200. Lous 8—30 covered July 1—22. It is evident that the Armenian version was not made before A. D. 396 when Mareri 1 fell on May 14 or 15. Therefore any equation in the prologues with Mareri must be wrong.

The equations therefore furnished in the Martyrium by the printed text only suit the sixty years following A. D. 332, and must be rejected as confusions of a copyist. The text of the uncial alone accords with the facts and the probabilities, and it shews that the prologues, Martyrium and the rest were translated in the middle of the fifth century, to which age linguistically the translation belongs. The equations of the printed text would imply that the translation was made about A. D. 350, which is absurd.

The Greek text of the Prologues used by the Armenian translator was already old enough to contain corruptions, and the existence in it of the word noomon as name of the month enables us to recognise its Greek congeners. These are enumerated by Dr. A. Robinson p. 44 of his Euthaliana:

Vat Reg 29 (Boecler) s. XI.

Par Gr 105 s. X (Fragm.).

BM Add 28, 816. A. D. 1111 (τοῦ παν.).

Oxf Ch Ch Wake 38 s. XI (τοῦ παν.).

Ibid Wake 12 s. XI (τοῦ παν . . . νομων).

For these codices (except for the variants given above in brackets) agree in reading in the Prologue of the Paulines the following: πέμπτη πανέμου μηνός, ἕκτω τῶν νόμων μηνί.

This word νόμων — whatever its origin — must have stood in the Greek text used by the Armenian, who renders:

որ որ լից է նամոն ամսոյ որ է մարերի "which day is sixth of the Noomon month, which is Mareri".

I suspect that τῶν νόμων is a corruption of τῶν δλων, and that this in turn is a corruption of τῷ λῶψ. Dr. A. Robinson enumerates three codices which read τῷ δλων, one of the XIth and two of the XIIth century; and two of the tenth and eleventh which read τῷ λῶψ, which, as he rightly suggests, must have come into the text as a marginal gloss somewhere in Asia Minor, where Lous 6 = Panemus 5 in Syria = June 29.

I hope I have given reasons why we should suspend our judgement about the date of the Euthalius who was author of the prologues.

1. The evidence of the Armenian sources is cogent, and proves that these argumenta etc. were already known in Armenian before 700 A. D. and were then attributed to an Euthalius.

2. Both the language and internal dating of the Armenian compel us to set the translation back in the fifth century.

3. Lastly the evidence of Matthew the Elder is very difficult to explain away, and has a genuine and authentic ring. If we accept it, we must put back the composition of these Argumenta to before 326 and after 320 A. D.