

revise the Old Latin to accord with his opinions or that he changed his mind after his revision. If, as seems likely, he adopted the punctuation given in the *Anecdota* from Chrysostom,<sup>1</sup> then the latter alternative is right. Other examples from his writings could be given.

G. D. KILPATRICK

### NEW ATTRIBUTIONS TO HIPPOLYTUS

As one who has had some hand in restoring lost property to Hippolytus, I am moved to register my opinion that certain writings which are now being assigned to him are none of his.

The writings in question are six paschal homilies, or sermons, to be found among the *Spuria* of St. Chrysostom (Migne, *P. Gr.* lix. 723-46). They are of unequal length, but each ends with a doxology, and the first five present certain repetitions which show that they are separate pieces and not parts of a continuous treatise. The sixth, which is by far the longest and most elaborate, is clearly a unity, complete in itself and with characteristics that mark it off as having no organic connexion with the rest, whether it be by the same author or not.

This being so, it is not a little surprising to find all six of these homilies quoted and assigned collectively to Hippolytus under a single title. On page xxxiii of his very serviceable edition of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus,<sup>2</sup> Dom Gregory Dix, of Nashdom Abbey, cites some words as from one of that Father's 'earlier works' with only this explanation in a footnote:—

'Hippolytus *Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα*, vi. 4. This important work by Hippolytus, supposed lost, has actually been in print for centuries among the *Spuria* of St. Chrysostom (ed. Paris, 1836, viii. 933 *sqq.*). An edition based on new MSS. is in preparation by P. Ch. Martin, S. J. of Louvain.'

Now page 933 of the Paris edition referred to is that on which the *first* of our homilies begins; so that the 'work' in question can be nothing else than the whole collection of six pieces. And in fact later in the same book Dom Dix quotes passages from Homilies iv, vi, i, and ii (pp. 74-5, 78, 85-6), and in his recent large book *The Shape of the Liturgy* (pp. 105, 138, 340) he quotes from nos. iii and vi—in every case with a reference simply to Hippolytus *Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα*.

On what grounds are these six homilies treated as the work of a single author, and that author Hippolytus? I propose here to offer

<sup>1</sup> I owe this suggestion to Dr. Souter.

<sup>2</sup> *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome* (S.P.C.K. 1937).

reasons for believing (i) that no. vi is not by the same author as nos. i-v, and (ii) that none at all of them was written by Hippolytus. But let us first see a little further.

From the above footnote of Dom Dix we gather, correctly, that this new attribution to Hippolytus is derived, at least by way of inference, from Père Charles Martin of Louvain. What we could hardly gather from it is the fact that the only item in the collection which P. Martin attributes with something like full confidence to Hippolytus is the long sixth homily, and this mainly on the ground of separate external evidence, though he shows some leaning towards the view that they may be all from the same hand.

The whole group of pieces, as a collection, is found in four manuscripts (the earliest being of the tenth century) in which they are ascribed to St. John Chrysostom. But Hom. vi had also a separate currency. It is found besides in a Grottaferrata MS. of the eighth or ninth century which contains about one-third of the text with the inscription 'Of Hippolytus, bishop of Rome and martyr, εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πᾶσχα'. It is also cited, and referred to Hippolytus, by the Lateran synod of A.D. 649<sup>1</sup>; and an extract, assigned again to Hippolytus, is found in a Syriac manuscript of date 562.

These particulars are drawn from an article by P. Martin entitled 'Hippolyte de Rome et Proclus de Constantinople εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πᾶσχα', in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, xxxiii (1937), pp. 255 ff. The article is devoted primarily to showing that our Hom. vi was used by Procius († 446); but that point being proved, the writer goes on (pp. 265 ff.) to explain the literary and manuscript tradition of all six homilies and to discuss the relation of no. vi to the other five. He had apparently conjectured as long ago as 1926 that Hippolytus was the author of Hom. vi, namely in an article entitled 'Un Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα de saint Hippolyte retrouvé?' in *Recherches de science religieuse*, xvi. 148-65<sup>2</sup>; but to that essay I have not access, nor is it likely that it would call for any modification of what I have to say here. The later article on Hippolytus and Proclus sufficiently outlines the external evidence, and it remains only to apply the test of internal criticism. And indeed at the end of that article (p. 276) P. Martin appears to grant that this test still remains to be applied before the case can be regarded as finally proved: 'Si la critique interne, l'analyse et la comparaison des textes s'avèrent à leur tour en harmonie avec les données maintenant précisées de la critique externe et de la tradition littéraire (et la chose ne nous paraît pas douteuse)'—a new document of the first importance for the history of liturgy, exegesis, and theology

<sup>1</sup> The passage there cited will be found in the Berlin *Hippolytus* i, part 2, pp. 270-1. It is from Hom. vi. 5, but with variants.

<sup>2</sup> Referred to in *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.* p. 258, note 3.

will be in our hands. But I fear the desired result will appear much more than doubtful.

Three questions present themselves for answer: I. Were Homilies i-v and vi written by the same author? II. Is Hippolytus the author of Hom. vi? III. Is Hippolytus the author of Homilies i-v? I take these questions in their order.

I. To the first question I answer emphatically in the negative, in spite of the fact that nos. i-v and no. vi appear to be in some way interrelated.

Let me begin by recognizing with P. Martin (p. 266 f.) that nos. i-v are manifestly by the same author. But no. vi is differentiated from the rest by features which render the theory of common authorship a critical impossibility.

(a) The style is appreciably different. The florid oratory of Hom. vi marks it off as an alien in the group. This is admitted in effect by P. Martin, who writes (p. 268): 'Le ton est incomparablement plus oratoire, le style plus riche et plus coloré, le contenu plus ample.' Of its distinctive character more will be said below under II.

(b) Hom. vi uses a different terminology from the rest. The Holy Spirit is regularly styled (some ten times) *τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα*, never *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*, while the other pieces employ only *ἅγιον πνεῦμα* or *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*. P. Martin has noted this on p. 268. Again, while in the first five homilies the coming of Christ upon earth is denoted, as by Justin, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus, by *παρουσία*, or *ἡ προτέρα παρουσία*, this word is never used in Hom. vi. To describe the same event, the writer employs instead (six times) *ἐπιδημία*, a word used with great frequency by Origen.

(c) The manner of referring to Scripture is completely different in nos. i-v and no. vi. In the former sacred authors are freely cited by name: Paul (frequently), 'blessed Paul', 'the Apostle', 'blessed John', David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, 'the prophet Jeremiah', as well as 'the Evangelist', 'the Gospel'. So about 24 times in all. But in Hom. vi no biblical author is ever named, nor is there a single reference in citation to psalm, prophet, apostle, evangelist, or Gospel. Instead we have such impressive formulae as *τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα βοᾷ* (thrice), *βοᾷ περὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐβόησε τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα ἐντέλλεται, ἡ θεία γραφή βοᾷ, ἡ θεία γραφή . . . προεθέσπισεν*. Is it credible that the same author, in a series of homilies on the same subject, could alter his practice in such violent fashion? The theory of a more exalted mood, induced by some specially solemn occasion, is hardly to be invoked.

(d) In vi. 5 (*init.*) we read: *τοῦτο ἦν τὸ πάσχα ὃ ἐπεθύμησεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς παθεῖν*—'the Passover which Jesus desired to suffer'. This assumes the derivation of *πάσχα* from *πάσχειν*, found in Irenaeus

and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> But four times in the preceding homilies (i, iii, iv, v) *πάσχα* is explained to mean *ὑπέρβασις*, the passing by of the Destroyer—'another interpreter' (apparently Aquila) being cited for this in iii. The derivation from *πάσχειν* seems to be implied also in vi. 2 (*med.*), where it is said that 'Egypt also suffered' (*ἔπασχε*).

Again, while all these homilies have Exodus xii. 1-15 as their starting point and give typological interpretations of the various ordinances touching the Passover, the explanations offered in Hom. vi differ largely from those found in the other five. To take but two examples: (1) In nos. i and v the period of five days (from the 10th to the 14th of the month) between the setting apart of the paschal lamb and its slaughter is said to signify the five ages of the world—from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses until the coming of Christ, and thence onward. But in vi. 3 the same intermediate period (not specified as *five* days) represents the time during which Christ, after His arrest, remained in custody with the high priest. (2) As regards the smearing of the lintel and doorposts with blood: in Hom. ii the lintel represents the reason (*λογισμός*) and the doorposts the passions (*πάθος*), which are twofold and are under the control of the reason. But in vi. 3 the lintel denotes the Church, and the doorposts 'the two peoples', i.e. the Jews and the Gentiles.

Such discrepancies seem to exclude all possibility of Hom. vi being by the same author as its five companions. If then Hippolytus should be the author of Hom. vi, he cannot be the author of the other five pieces. And yet Père Martin (p. 258) seems to dally with the possibility of all six coming from the same writer; and Dom Dix takes the common authorship for granted.

II. *Hippolytus and Hom. vi.*—We have seen that the attribution of this homily to Hippolytus has manuscript and other external support. But in another manuscript tradition it is ascribed to St. Chrysostom; and in early patristic literature there are plenty of writings with quite respectable attestation which have failed to survive the test of internal criticism. Hippolytus himself has a fair crop of *spuria* to his name. Our Hom. vi therefore must undergo and pass the same test before it can be received as a work of Hippolytus.

Here we cannot speak with quite the same precision as under I above. The remains of Hippolytus' writings are considerable, and without prolonged and detailed study it would usually be rash to say off-hand that he never uses this or that word or expression. Yet for his longest work, and that in which he has occasion to use the

<sup>1</sup> Iren. *Haer.* iv 20. 1 (Harvey); cf. *Apostolic Preaching* c. 25 and Armitage Robinson's note there. The same derivation is given by Melito in his recently published 'Homily on the Passion' § 46.

widest vocabulary, we have an excellent word-list which would certainly include any word of even moderate lexicographical interest; I refer to Wendland's *Wortregister* to his edition of the *Philosophumena* in the Berlin *Hippolytus*, vol. iii. It may be taken as a postulate therefore that any verb, noun, or adjective in the least degree worthy of notice which does not appear in that list is not to be found in the *Philosophumena*. But this is anticipating: let us begin by considering some of the points dealt with under I above.

(a) *Style in general*.—The baroque rhetoric of Hom. vi, with its *recherché* vocabulary, lavish use of metaphor, and other literary embroidery, stands in violent contrast to the generally austere style of Hippolytus. Regarded simply as a piece of Greek writing, no student of Hippolytus could ever have dreamed of connecting it with his name. In support of this assertion let me quote two literary appreciations, one of the real Hippolytus, the other of Hippolytus in the character of author of our homily.

(1) Photius, having read the work of Hippolytus called 'Compendium against thirty-two Heresies' (the earlier work mentioned at the beginning of the *Philosophumena*), notes as follows: 'The style is *clear, grave, and terse*, though it falls short of the Attic diction' (*Bibliotheca*, 121; and for this rendering see Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, ii, p. 414).

(2) 'Hippolytus' work strikes one as *subtle, complex, elaborate*, as compared with the naïveté of Melito'; and again: 'In spite of the very different impression produced by the *complex, tortured, often obscure* style of Hippolytus, it is evident that he knew and used Melito's sermon' (my italics).

So writes Dr. Campbell Bonner, editor of the recently recovered 'Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis', in Kirsopp and Silva Lake's *Studies and Documents*, xii (1940), pp. 57 and 60. He accepts Martin's ascription of Hom. vi to Hippolytus, thinks that it uses Melito's sermon, and appears to make it the basis of a general characterization of Hippolytus' style.<sup>1</sup> But while his words aptly, if still inadequately, describe the style of the homily, they lose all meaning when transferred to Hippolytus. Père Martin's own estimate of the homilist's style has been quoted above in a note to I (a). And here it may be added in passing that Campbell Bonner leaves open the whole question discussed under I, for he writes (p. 69 f.): 'and it is to be remembered that there is some reason to believe that not only the sixth, but also the first five, of these paschal sermons may be the work of Hippolytus'—with a reference to Martin (*ut supra*), p. 276.

(b) *Forms of reference to the Holy Spirit*.—It has been seen that the author of Hom. vi persistently uses the form τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα,

<sup>1</sup> Of which, however, he seems to disclaim 'expert knowledge' (p. 61).

never τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. We should expect therefore to find θεῖον πνεῦμα frequently in Hippolytus elsewhere, if he were the author here. But this is not his usage: he consistently writes ἅγιον πνεῦμα, or πν. ἅγ., with or without the article.

(c) *Formulae of citation.*—In this matter Hippolytus differs as completely from Hom. vi as do the first five homilies. He constantly quotes biblical authors by name, and I think I may safely say that he never uses any such formula as τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα βοᾷ. There is nothing pompous or dramatic in his manner of referring to Scripture: he uses most frequently a plain λέγει or λέγων after naming his source.

(d) *Vocabulary and diction.*—Is it conceivable that Hippolytus, or any author, should have crowded into a single sermon dozens of words of which the great majority will be sought in vain in his other writings? Yet I have noted about sixty words (and there are certainly more) which do not occur in Wendland's list for the *Philosophumena*, though they are such as he could not have failed to register. Some of them are quite rare, and I hazard the prediction that not one in six will be found in the extant works of Hippolytus. It is not as though they arose in any way out of the subject of the homily; they are practically all employed by way of metaphor or other rhetorical colouring. Noteworthy among these words is ἐπιδημία, used six times in the homily to the exclusion of παρουσία (see above under I (b)). We should certainly expect this word to reappear in other writings by the same author; but I must leave it to the advocates of the new attribution to produce an instance from Hippolytus. Of the other words referred to I give in a note the forms that occur, and in the order of their occurrence.<sup>1</sup>

Another feature of the homily which may be noticed is the author's fondness for the adjective μέγας as an honorific epithet. Take the following instances:—

καὶ πολὺς (? πολὺ) μέγας ἐπανθεῖ ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς ὄλοις (§ 1); μεγάλην

<sup>1</sup> ἀμειδῆς (θάνατος) συσκιασθεῖς, γήινα, προεθέσπισεν, τελεσιουργούμενα, ἐπισιτισάμενοι, ἐρανισμὸς κοινωφελῆς, (δόγμα) ἐμπρόθεσμον, αἰνιγματώδης (ἐπιτομή), ὕλομανούσης (ψυχῆς), ἀλλακῆδόν, πανδαίδαλον (ἀγαλμα), τεκμηριούμενον, χλοηφορεῖ, ἀθηκομεί, ἄρμα μυκώμενον ('lowing wagon'?), χαροπῆς (θαλάσσης), καταθαρσύνεται, φιλοκερδέει (τεχναῖς), εὐκατέργαστος, εὐπρόσφορος, εὐκατάδεκτος, ἐρείματα, γλυκίνασσα, ἀνάμοις (σπονδαῖς), ἀναζιμωθέντες, ἰσηγορία, ἰσονομία, τυραννόμενος (pass.), ἀνυπόστροφον (ὄδόν), θολερὸν, ἀποβράσας, περιαστράψας, παστώσας, παρθενώσας, (ὡς εἰπεῖν) ἐξαγγελώσας, ἀντιρριζώσας, συνεσιτώμαι, γεωργοῦμαι, ἀτραπὸς, οὐρανόμενης, ἀταπεδύσαστο, ἐξημερῶν, ἀντέκερασε, ἐστόμασε (πλευράν, sc. Χριστοῦ), ἐμφιλοχαρεῖ (παλαιοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι), τὸν προεω(σ)φόρον (adj. as subst. from πρὸ ἑωσφόρου, Ps. cx. 3), κλονουμένων, δονουμένων, ἀδηφάγον (θῆριον), ἀναστολισάμενος, πανηγύρισμα, στεναγωγῆσαν, λαμπადουχίας, δαδουχίας, ἀγλάϊσμα.—But no mere list of words taken out of their contexts can give an adequate idea of the general style of the homily. As an outstanding example of this I recommend the perusal of a lyrical passage near the beginning of § 3, which reads like a prose version of some Ode to the Springtime.

μεγάλου βασιλέως ἐπιδημίαν (ib.); and later, ἡ μεγάλη τοῦ σώματος ἐπιδημία (§ 4); ἐπὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ (§ 3); προσιέναι τῷ μεγάλῳ σώματι<sup>1</sup> (ib.); τὸ μίμημα τοῦ μεγάλου χρίσματος (ib.); ὁ μέγας Ἰησοῦς (§ 4, and again in § 5); ὑπερέχε σου τὰς χεῖρας τὰς μεγάλας (§ 5).

I await parallels from Hippolytus, which should certainly be forthcoming if he is the author of our homily.

The author also indulges in word-play and assonance of a kind that seems foreign to the gravity of Hippolytus, e.g. :—

καθαροὶ καθαροῦ πνεύματος ἀνατέλλουσι φωστῆρες (§ 1); καὶ ἀνατολαὶ ἀνατολῶν ἐπέχουσι τὸ πᾶν (ib.); μεγάλην μεγάλου βασιλέως ἐπιδημίαν (ib.); ἡ ἀθάνατος ζωὴ θανάτου θανατηφόρος (ib.); ἡ ἀθάνατος τροφή καὶ τρυφή (§ 2; and τροφή καὶ τρυφή again in § 5); τὸ γὰρ ἔργον τῆς θηλείας λῦσαι θελήσας (§ 5); τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἐπιμόνης (? or ἐπιμονῆς) ἐθαμβήθη τὸ πᾶν (ib.); κλονομένων γὰρ τῶν ὄλων καὶ δονομένων (ib.); ὦ μόναι μόνον ἀληθῶς δι' ὄλων ὄλαι (? meaning : ib.); καινῆς λαμπραδουχίας φώτισμα, παρθενικῆς δαδουχίας ἀγλαίσμα.

These few samples will convey some idea of the general character of the homily. It cannot with any show of probability be identified with the *περὶ τοῦ πάσχα* of Hippolytus mentioned by Eusebius and St. Jerome, and to treat it as such can only serve to propagate false history.

III. *Homilies i-v and Hippolytus.*—As no serious claim has been advanced for Hippolytus' authorship of these five pieces, their case may be dealt with more briefly. I will call attention to only one point, which should be decisive.

The author clearly employs the Epistle to the Hebrews as canonical Scripture, and almost certainly ascribes it to St. Paul. There are two verbal citations which admit of no question. Though they are not directly referred to St. Paul, they each have an inserted *φησί*, by which this writer regularly indicates a scriptural quotation, whether the source be indicated or not; and they are each linked by a *καὶ* to other N.T. texts. In Hom. iii (*post med.*) we read: *καθὰ φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος· εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Rom. v. 1). Then: *καὶ· δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμέν, φησι, τὸν προκειμένον ἡμῖν ἀθλον* (*sic*: Heb. xii. 1). Then: *καὶ· οὕτω τρέχω, ἵνα καταλάβω* (*sic*: 1 Cor. ix. 25-6). Here there is a strong presumption that the words from Hebrews are ascribed to 'the Apostle' with the

<sup>1</sup> The phrase is eucharistic; but it is not the kind of terminology we expect to meet with before at least the middle of the third century. Further on in § 3 we find the equivalent expression *τῷ μυστηρίῳ προσελεύσεται*. But again, by what date had *μυστήριον* come into use as a term for the Eucharist? It is not found in that sense in Hippolytus, nor I believe in any earlier or contemporary writer.

other two texts, especially as the third text follows in the first person.—In Hom. v (*init.*) Heb. x. 1, in the form *σκιὰν γάρ, φησιν, ὁ νόμος εἶχε τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*,<sup>1</sup> is immediately followed by John i. 17. The words therefore are cited as Scripture, though no source is indicated.

But further, in Hom. ii (*circa med.*) we read: *ἡ πίστις, φησί, χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά ἐστὶ* (James ii. 26). *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοῖς ἀργῶς διακειμένοις ἐπιφέρονται θλίψεις πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος φησιν*. Here the words *πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον*, attributed to St. Paul, might be referred to 1 Cor. xii. 7, were it not that the context there has nothing to do with our writer's argument, viz. that tribulations befall slothful persons 'for their profit'. He undoubtedly has in mind Heb. xii. 5-10, on the divine correction which we receive *ἐπι τὸ συμφέρον*. He is thinking of that passage, and thinking of it as written by St. Paul. As we have seen, he quotes from the same chapter in Hom. iii.

But now, we have direct evidence that Hippolytus denied the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. That he did so in his 'Compendium' against the heresies (as under II (*a*)) is expressly stated by Photius (*Bibliotheca*, 121). And this is only what we might expect from the general evidence as to the tardy acceptance of the Epistle in the West. It finds no mention in the, doubtless Roman, Muratorian Canon; it was not received as a writing of St. Paul by Hippolytus' Roman contemporary, the presbyter Gaius (Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 20); it was known to Tertullian as the 'Epistle of Barnabas'. And from the denial of its Pauline authorship must be inferred also its exclusion from the Canon of the N.T. St. Jerome says in one place that the tradition of the Latins did not receive the Epistle among the canonical writings (*Ep.* 129, 3, *ad Dardanum*). No doubt it was generally known and read by early western writers, who might take an idea or a phrase from it here and there in passing; but anything like a connected quotation of its words, and much more any reference to the Epistle itself—even with a vague *φησί*—is still to seek in the writings of Hippolytus; and the same is true of his master Irenaeus.<sup>2</sup> I believe also that this will be found to hold good in regard to the Epistle of St. James, quoted in Hom. ii.

<sup>1</sup> It seems to me that this text must also have been in the mind of the author of Hom. vi when he wrote (§ 1): *ταῦτα πάντα τῶν μελλόντων σκιά· ἐν ἡμῶν δὲ τῶν εἰκόνων τὰ μορφώματα*. We must consider the possibility therefore that he also used Hebrews as Scripture.

<sup>2</sup> On Irenaeus see C. H. Turner in *Nov. Test. S. Irenaei*, p. 226 f. He says 'it is certain' that Irenaeus neither ascribed the Epistle to St. Paul nor reckoned it among the canonical books of the N.T. In the Berlin edition of Hippolytus, vols. i and iii, a number of provisional references to Hebrews will be found, as also in Harvey's edition of Irenaeus; but none of these will bear examination considered as conscious citations. We may safely say of Hippolytus what Turner has said of Irenaeus. A real echo of Heb. v. 14, not observed by



The conclusion cannot be doubtful: these five paschal homilies are not the work of Hippolytus, or of any western writer of about his time.

Here I must end, leaving it to others to discuss when, where, and by whom (Rome and Hippolytus excepted) these six paschal homilies may have been written, and what may be the precise relation of Homily vi to the other five. But I fear that when robbed of the name of Hippolytus they will lose much of their interest.

R. H. CONNOLLY

### EULADIUS OF ARLES

THE history of the see of Arles during the years 426-30 is a subject upon which the conclusions of students have been almost unanimous. The accepted chronology provides us with a list of Bishops, as follows:

#### 1. PATROCLUS

Murdered in 426 (Prosper ad ann., *P.L.* li, 594).

#### 2. ST. HONORATUS, 426-January 429

Died soon after Epiphany (Hilary *Sermo de vita Honorati P.L.* 1, 1265): the life of Hilary (*Vita*, vi, 9, *P.L.* 1, 1227) implies a two years' episcopate approximately.

#### 3. ST. HILARY

In a letter from Prosper (ap. Augustine, Ep. ccxxv. 9) informing Augustine of the opposition of the semi-Pelagians to his doctrines, Hilary Bishop of Arles is mentioned as a leader among those who wish to ask for an explanation of predestinarian doctrine. Since Hilary was therefore already bishop of Arles some time before Augustine died, and since his panegyric on the death of Honoratus shows that Honoratus was his predecessor, Hilary must have been elected to the see soon after January 429.

So runs the accepted argument. This article attempts to show that the accuracy of this history may with good reason be questioned. The evidence is centred upon the chronology of the writings of John Cassian, in particular of his *Conferences*. To these we must now turn.

#### A. *The accepted view*

The *Conferences* were published in three groups (i-x, xi-xvii, xviii-xxiv), each issued separately with a preface. The last two groups can be dated fairly accurately, if the above account of the Bishops of Arles is taken as correct. For *Conferences* xi-xvii is dedicated to

Turner, is I think to be found in Iren. *Haer.* iv. 63. 1, where the Greek is extant. The coincidence with Heb. in the words ἀγύμναστα ἔχειν τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθητήρια can hardly be accidental; but it is no more than an echo.