











It may here be remarked that the foregoing investigation confirms Harnack's favourable opinion regarding the series of extracts on which it is based.<sup>1</sup> He pointed out that nos. 1, 2, 6 are in agreement with Leontius's extracts from the Epistle; we now know that no. 9 is in agreement with an extract preserved by Petrus Diaconus,<sup>2</sup> and that nos. 1, 3, 4, 8, 9 have points of contact with known sayings of Paul of Samosata.<sup>3</sup> If editorial revision must be admitted,<sup>4</sup> there is reason to suppose that it was confined within narrow limits. On the whole Pitra's extracts seem to be of high value.

I take this opportunity to thank the Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., for pointing out an error in my former paper. On pp. 31, 32 I stated that St Hilary, in the latter part of his *de Synodis* commented on a letter of some 'Gaulish bishops': I should have written 'Eastern bishops'. It is in fact clear that the letter was the document presented to the third Council of Sirmium in 358 by Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste and Eleusius of Cyzicus, who acted as delegates of the Council of Ancyra held earlier in the same year.<sup>5</sup> Their testimony as to the proceedings at Antioch is more reliable than that of any bishops of Gaul could have been; and we are expressly told by Sozomen that their letter contained the decrees against Paul and Photinus.<sup>6</sup> My argument therefore regarding the use of the word *ἡμοούσιον* by Paul, so far as it is based on St Hilary's statements, is considerably strengthened by Mr Puller's correction.

H. J. LAWLOR.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Überlieferung u. der Bestand der altch. Litt.* p. 522; *Chronologie der altch. Litt.* ii p. 135 note.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 115-118.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 116, 117.

<sup>5</sup> Hil. *de Syn.* 77, 81, 90; Sozomen *H. E.* iv 13, 15.

<sup>6</sup> Sozomen, *l. c.*