

- uicina desiderant.
- v. 6 nam prudentia carnis mors est.
prudentia autem sps. uita et pax.
ipse alibi dicit. prudentiam huma-
nam esse malo uicem referre.
10 talis ergo prudentia mortem pa-
rit. transgrediendo paeceptum.
sps. uero prudentiae et in praese-
ti pacem habet. et non reddendo
15 uicem et uitam in futuro percipi-
piet. prudentia uero. a prouide-
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 sc̄a 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 prudentiae
- 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 sc̄a
- 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.