

A NOTE ON COSMAS AND THE *CHRONICON PASCHALE*.

IN the April number of the JOURNAL (p. 404) Dr Mercati in a paper on the *Chronicon Paschale* has discussed the paragraphs which it shares with the *Christian Topography* of Cosmas Indicopleustes. For the text of Cosmas he naturally used the only available edition, that of Montfaucon, reprinted in Migne's *Patrology*. Unfortunately, however, Montfaucon's text was based on an inferior MS, and some of its most important errors occur in these very passages. So, though my theological ignorance prevents me from attempting to enter into the controversy as to who was the author of the paragraphs, I venture to clear the way for future investigators by shewing that the differences noticed by Mercati do not exist according to the best tradition of the text of Cosmas.

By way of preface I must state that, excluding some unimportant excerpts, the MSS of Cosmas are but three: and they fall naturally into two groups. The best tradition is represented solely by the oldest MS, number 699 of the Vatican Greek MSS (s. VIII-IX): the other two, Laurentian Plut. IX 28—the MS from which Montfaucon's edition was taken—and the Sinaitic MS numbered 1186 in Gardthausen's catalogue, both of the eleventh century, are closely related and represent a different recension, inferior to that of V. This statement fortunately need not be taken entirely on trust, as the discussion of the first of the differences mentioned by Dr Mercati affords in itself sufficient proof of V's superiority.

1. In the *Chronicon Paschale* the paragraphs on the Prophets are arranged in the Septuagint order, and so they are in V, not as in L, S, and the edition, in the order Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Here there is no doubt that V preserves the original text, while L and S shew the handiwork of a blundering reviser; because beyond the probability that Cosmas would keep the Septuagint order, there is positive proof in the text that he did. Keeping that order as it stands in V, we find paragraphs on the twelve Minor Prophets followed by a preface to the Major Prophets and paragraphs on them; in the revised order of L and S the whole sixteen Prophets are first discussed, and then comes the preface to the Major Prophets. That Cosmas could have been guilty of placing the preface to the Major Prophets after the text on them is quite impossible, and is not accounted for by Montfaucon's supposition that L and S represent a second edition by Cosmas himself. It is obviously the work of a later

editor. What that editor's object was is not clear. The Minor Prophets are arranged as in the Vulgate,—the same arrangement is found in the Egyptian version, if Tattam's edition of the Minor Prophets is reliable,—and the Major are inserted among them in a more or less chronological position.¹ Possibly the whole is an attempt to arrange them chronologically. However that may be, there is no doubt that V's order is correct, and that in this particular there is no difference between Cosmas and the *Chronicon*.

2. The paragraphs on Zacharias, Elizabeth, Mary, Simeon, and Christ, which are omitted by the *Chronicon Paschale*, are also absent from V, and as the quire is complete without them, a lacuna can hardly be assumed. They are probably interpolations by the same editor who transposed the Prophets.

3. Dr Mercati following the edition states that 'to Haggai (and also to St Matthew) the παραγραφή is wanting, while Isaiah has not one only, but two, the second being identical with the παραγραφή to Malachi'. All of these mistakes are adopted from the inferior MSS and are corrected by V. Haggai indeed, so far from being defrauded of his παραγραφή, is most liberally treated. After the text on him follows a picture of the temple, and under it the words οὗτος ὁ ναὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ὑπὸ Ζοροβάβελ κτισθεὶς μετὰ τὴν ἐπάνοδον περὶ οὗ ὁ Ζαχαρίας λέγει 'αἱ χεῖρες Ζοροβάβελ ἐθεμελίωσαν τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον' καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἐπιτελέσουσιν αὐτόν'. περὶ οὗ καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἔλεγον (-ων V) ἐν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν ὑποδομήθη (οἶκ- V) ὁ ναὸς οὗτος καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισσιν (sic!) ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν ;

ΠΑΡΑΓΡΑΦΗ. καὶ οὗτος εἰς πρόσωπον Ζοροβάβελ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Δεσπότην Χριστὸν προμηνύει δι' οὗ γίνεται πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἡ σωτηρία.

Of these the latter seems to be the actual παραγραφή to Haggai, the former a supplementary note occasioned by the mention of Zerubbabel in the text on Haggai. It is quite in Cosmas's manner to add such notes, where there is particular reason for them. Probably the greater part of the shorter notes were, as Dr Mercati suggests, and as an examination of the MSS abundantly proves, added not in the text but in the margin, though in most cases, I think, by Cosmas himself.

Matthew has the ΠΑΡΑΓΡΑΦΗ. Καὶ οὗτος οὐ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἀλλὰ τῆς νέας διαθήκης κηρυξ, ὃς συνέγραψεν ἡμῖν πῶς τε καὶ πότε ἐτέχθη καὶ ἐκ τίνος ὁ τῆς δευτέρας καταστάσεως ἀρχηγός, τούτεστιν ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστός, καὶ ὅπως ἐπολιτεύθη καὶ ἀπεκτάνθη καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀπελήλυθεν, ἔνθα ἐστὶν τῆς δευτέρας καταστάσεως ἡ πολιτεία· δόξα τῷ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐτοιμάσαντι καὶ προκαταγγέλαντι περὶ τούτων Θεῷ καὶ νῦν πληρώσαντι καὶ πληροῦντι. ἀμήν.

The second παραγραφή on Isaiah is not found in V.

¹ Almost the same order is found in Junilius Africanus *de Inst. reg. div. leg.* I 3 ff; only Isaiah and Zephaniah are differently placed. Cf. Kihn *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Afr.* p. 356; Swete *Introd. to O. T. in Greek* p. 207.

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 ὑποπίπτει a picture of the Ark, and in V and S this is followed by the words τοῦτο τὸ μῆκος τῆς κιβωτοῦ. ἔστι δέ, 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 ἐπεκρίσας, l. 2 ἀπὸ πρῶτου, p. 544, l. 5 ὑπάρχει.

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

E. O. WINSTEDT.

THE *LIBER ECCLESIASTICORUM DOGMATUM*: SUPPLENDA TO *J. T. S.* vii 78-99.

SINCE I wrote on the above subject in the number of the *JOURNAL* for October 1905, additional material has come into my hands which