

- uicina desiderant.
- v. 6 nam prudentia carnis mors est.
 prudentia autem $\overline{\text{sps}}$. uita et pax.
 ipse alibi dicit. prudentiam huma
 10 nam esse malo uicem referre.
 talis ergo prudentia mortem pa
 rit. transgrediendo praeceptum.
 $\overline{\text{sps}}$. uero prudentiae et in praese
 ti pacem habet. et non reddendo
 15 uicem et uitam in futuro perci
 piet. prudentia uero. a provide
 do est appellata.
- v. 7 quoniam sapientia carnis inimica
 est dō. legi enim dī. non est subiecta
 20 non ipsa caro ut manichei dicunt.
 sed sensus carnalis. inimicus est dō.
 omne enim non subiectum ini
 micum est. et quicumque se uo
luerit
10. esse. 11. prudentia. 13. prudentiae. 15. uicem. et *deleuit m. 2*
 22. subiectum.

G. MERCATI.

THE RELATION OF THE ROMAN FRAGMENTS TO THE COMMENTARY
 IN THE KARLSRUHE MS (AUGIENSIS CXIX).

IN my lecture before the British Academy on December 12, 1906,¹ I argued that the commentary contained in the Karlsruhe MS, Augiensis cxix (saec. ix), is the original, unaltered commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St Paul. I also contended from internal evidence that the MS is a copy of a fifth or sixth-century original. The Roman fragments which Dr Mercati has discovered are portions of another copy of the same commentary. Scholars, therefore, are free to dispute that this commentary is the original Pelagius; they cannot dispute that it already existed in the sixth century, the century after Pelagius wrote his commentary. By good fortune the fragments provide the severest possible test of the character of the Karlsruhe MS. For it is on the longer Epistles, especially on the Epistle to the Romans, that the Pseudo-Jerome form is so much longer than the Karlsruhe form. Pseudo-Jerome is characterized, in my view, by numerous explanations added to the original Pelagius, and generally introduced by the word *Item*. All the passages which Dr Mercati has noted above as absent from his Roman

¹ Published in vol. ii of the Proceedings of the Academy, under the title 'The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: the Problem of its Restoration'.

fragments are absent also from the Karlsruhe MS. The remainder of this note is devoted to a statement of the few and unimportant discrepancies in text between the two MSS.

Romans MS (I a)

- l. 1 *naturalem*
 l. 4 qui sci—
 l. 7 in uita
 in *morte*

 l. 12 me
 ll. 16-17 *scā* et bona
 l. 20 ueteri
 l. 22 *marcionistas *****

(I b)

- l. 5 super
 peccatum *delinquens*
 l. 6 legis
 l. 10 autem quoniam
 l. 18 propositus
 l. 21 ipsum

(II a)

- l. 1 quod hostem
 l. 12 possit
 uelit
 l. 13 nobis

(II b)

- l. 5 *singulae*
 l. 13 *prudētia*
 l. 14 et
 l. 19 est *subiecta*

Karlsruhe MS

- naturalem* et
 quia iam sci—
 ad uitam
 ad mortem (Then follows the part
 of Scripture which the Roman
 MS introduces after *duxit ad*
mortem)
om.
 bona et *scā*
 uetere
 marcionitas (very likely the reading
 of Roman MS) hic locus facit

- supra
 peccans peccatum
om.
 enim quod
 uenundatus quasi propositus
 ipse

- quo hominem
 posset
 uellet
 nobis (Then follows the part of
 Scripture which the Roman MS
 introduces after 'mortificauimus
 carnem')

- singulae substantiae*
 prudentia
om.
 subicitur

While it is premature to discuss the relative value of the texts of the two MSS in these passages, it may be meantime remarked that, while the Roman MS appears to give the better arrangement of text and commentary, the actual readings of the Karlsruhe seem generally preferable.

ALEX. SOUTER.