

*σωμεν* for פְּרַשׁ, but undoubtedly we ought to follow the reading of A κατακαινώμεν. For the equation of κατακαινώ = פְּרַשׁ, see Schleusner, s.v. The Syriac reads حَلَّهُو مَوْهِيَّةٌ حَلَّهُو مَوْهِيَّةٌ Apparently S follows G. But it is remarkable, from the point of view of the Syriac translation elsewhere that it disagrees with the Greek on the difficult מִנְיָן, but it seems to follow G<sup>B</sup> on the comparatively simple פְּרַשׁ. The writer would therefore suggest that מִנְיָן of the Syriac is a corruption of מִמְעֵד. Perhaps a scribe unconsciously rewrote מִמְעֵד as he had written it but two words before.

Incidentally, Techen queries in his Index the equation of בער=? in xxxix. 4. He thinks that the Peshitta is at variance with the Hebrew. The fact is that בער has the meaning of 'burn'.

F. ZIMMERMANN

## CASSIODORUS' LIBRARY AT VIVARIUM: SOME ADDITIONS

It is well known that in 1872 A. Franz published a considerable catalogue of writings which, from Cassiodorus' personal mention of them, were certainly in his library at Vivarium. In 1922 the present writer, as the result of his proof that the so-called Primasius on the Epistles of St. Paul is really the Cassiodorian revision of Pelagius, was able to make some additions to Franz's list. The results down to the early part of 1937 are most conveniently summarized in Mr. Mynors' edition of the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus, Index Auctorum.<sup>1</sup> A still more recent treatment is that by Miss M. Stanley in her (as yet) unpublished work, 'The Monastery of Vivarium and its Historical Importance', chaps. 7 and 8.<sup>2</sup>

One way of ascertaining what books were in the Vivarium library is to study the works of Cassiodorus and others which are known to have been written there, and to discover the sources used in them. It is this method that I have applied in the case of the Pseudo-Primasius. In the course of preparing the Vienna edition of this work I have felt it my duty to investigate the sources, especially as there is so little in the work, apart from the portion concerned with the Epistle to the Romans, that is really original. I have not been successful as yet in tracing everything, but one or two works have been discovered not hitherto known to have been in this library.

The first is Jerome against Jovinian, 2. 23 (Migne, xxiii. 318 ff.)

<sup>1</sup> pp. 184 ff.

<sup>2</sup> B.Litt. thesis of the University of Oxford (1939). Miss Stanley has favoured me with a perusal of this work.

= Ps.-Primas. (Migne, lxviii) 544, ll. 19, 37–45, which by a slip of the compiler is attributed to the ‘*Apologeticus ad Pammachium*’. The second is Augustine, *Epistle* 169. 1, § 2 (*C.S.E.L.* 44, p. 612. 22–6, 613. 4–13) = Ps.-Primas. 543, ll. 9–24.

Among the epistles of Augustine already known to have been used by Cassiodorus and his disciples are 140, 147, 187. In view of Lietzmann’s classification of the manuscripts of Augustine’s epistles,<sup>1</sup> which he made in order to discover what groups of letters existed in early times, it would have been interesting to be in a position to show that Cassiodorus possessed one of these bundles; but unfortunately neither 140 nor 169 appears in any of Lietzmann’s groups and, while 147 appears in his M 59 group,<sup>2</sup> 187 cannot be regarded as belonging to the same group. Until all the works produced at Vivarium are thoroughly examined, it is premature to express an opinion, but meanwhile it looks as if Cassiodorus had possessed no real collection of Augustine’s letters, but only a very few single letters.

A. SOUTER

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE PSEUDO-EUSEBIAN COLLECTION OF GALLICAN SERMONS

THIS collection of seventy-five homilies, arranged in forty-three chapters, was, like Beatus of Liebana’s compilation on the Apocalypse, omitted from the *Patrologia Latina* of Migne. It has not, in fact, been printed since 1677.<sup>3</sup> As no one would readily trust an edition of that date, I have gone straight to the oldest and best, though incomplete, manuscript, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1316 (1651–2), of the first quarter of the ninth century.<sup>4</sup> That this is the best manuscript I learned from an extremely valuable article by Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., in which *inter alia* he argues with the greatest probability that the author of these homilies was Faustus of Riez.<sup>5</sup>

Nobody with a right to an opinion would doubt that they belong to the fifth century. The prevailing use of the Vulgate Bible would in itself prove a date subsequent to the fourth century, but there are other proofs also. The following references are of undoubtedly signi-

<sup>1</sup> *Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 1930 (23), Berlin, 1930: see the *JOURNAL*, xxxii, 188 f.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 357.

<sup>3</sup> *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum* (Lugd.), t. vi, pp. 618 ff.

<sup>4</sup> I am greatly indebted to the managers of the Hort Fund at Cambridge for the research grant which made it possible for me to study the manuscript under perfect conditions at Brussels.

<sup>5</sup> *Z.N.T.W.*, xxxiv (1935), pp. 92–115.