

of the complete facsimile of cod. H, now provided in vol. i, by collating with it the printed Syriac text in the same volume. The result was the list of some twenty corrections (for the most part of no great significance) which I give on p. 82. I regret exceedingly that in drawing up that list I neglected to look up the notes appended to the translations in vol. ii. Had I done so, I should have found that a considerable number of the errors which I noted had been set right by the editors in their second volume.

(2) I have further attributed a wrong pointing to the editors at xi 12, whereas my own 'correction' is not in accordance with Jacobite practice. The editors, having adopted the Jacobite system of punctuation, rightly point the two participles there in question with short *a* (*ḡēthāḡa*) in the first syllable. I suggested that they should '(probably)' have the usual long *ā* (*zēkāpha*), because the Jacobite scribe has attached this vowel (though with the Nestorian vowel sign) to the second of the two words. But to suggest that it should be expressed by the Jacobite sign was, no doubt, an offence against Masoretic etiquette.

(3) Finally, on p. 83 I have said that 'attention seems never to have been drawn' to the fact of 'the insertion [in cod. H] of the letter *hē* at short intervals throughout the Odes' (indicating 'Hallelujah'). I failed to notice that the editors mention it at p. 132 of vol. ii, where they also point out that it extends only to Ode xxviii.

In offering my sincere apologies to the editors for the delinquencies just confessed, I take the opportunity of removing a couple of possible misunderstandings on my own account. They both concern the 'Addition', which I made on the proofs of my review and did not see again till its publication. (1) As to Ode xx 6 and its dependence on Ecclus. xxxiii 31: anxious to make my addition as brief as possible, I did not record that I had myself stumbled badly over this passage in the Odes some years ago (see *J. T. S.* xiv pp. 531-533, and xv pp. 45-47). (2) In the last line but one I intended to say 'B read no more than' &c., but it appears as 'B reads' &c. The point is, that in reality the passage is partly illegible, but the visible remains and the conditions of space make it certain that B could have read no more than 'my members in His Odes'.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

NOTES ON MR BURCH'S ARTICLE 'THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS' (July 1920).

(a) *Against the genuineness of the 'Twentieth Explanation of Cyril'.*

The genuine Lectures were written while Cyril was a presbyter, circa 347-350: this one quotes the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, published in 374.

Would Cyril of Jerusalem have said that Josephus in his *Archaeologia* (and Irenaeus) gave particulars of the birth and death of the Virgin?

On p. 627 Cyril states that he baptized Isaac, a Samaritan. This refers to a story told in the Discourse of Cyril on the Cross in the same volume: a story patently fabulous. That same Discourse (p. 789) quotes Josephus and Irenaeus and comes from the same workshop as the Twentieth Explanation.

Note that the latter part of this Explanation is already to be found in print in Forbes Robinson's *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels* pp. 24-41, corresponding to pp. 842-848 of Budge's translation.

(b) 'This fragment marks the source of like ideas in the *Gospel according to Peter*, since there is very ancient authority for finding union between these two Gospels [i.e. *Hebrews* and *Peter*]. It is commonly known that as far back as Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* iii 1 f, this union was recognized, whilst Origen *de Principiis* 1 Praef. 8 and Jerome *de Viris Illustribus* xvi are just as explicit.'

But in Ignatius l. c. Jesus appearing τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον says ψηλαφήσατέ με κτλ. No source is named.

Origen l. c. says that the phrase 'Non sum daemonium incorporeum' was in the *Doctrina Petri* (not the *Gospel*).

Jerome l. c. says that it was in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. The identification of *Doctrina Petri* (to all appearances the Preaching of Peter, κήρυγμα Πέτρον) with the *Gospel according to Peter* has yet to be made out.

(c) The old Irish homilist who says that it was the opinion of Augustine that the Star was an angel was, I think, most likely referring to the very passage in the Ps.-Aug. *de Mirabilibus Scripturae* which Mr Burch quotes: for that work is agreed to be an Irish production of the seventh century.

M. R. JAMES.

THE DATE AND PLACE OF WRITING OF THE SLAVONIC ENOCH.

NEARLY two years ago a note on *The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch* appeared in the JOURNAL (April 1919), written by Mr J. K. Fotheringham.

Mr Fotheringham's criticisms, which dealt with the date and place of writing assigned by me to the Slavonic Enoch, were not the result of independent investigation. The authority on which his criticisms are based is what he calls 'a brilliant little paper by Mrs Maunder, entitled *The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch*' (*The Observatory*, August 1918). Mrs Maunder sent me a reprint of this article. I was unable to accept her premisses or her conclusions, and I did not keep the article.

I will, therefore, simply reply to the arguments which Mr. Fotheringham reproduces from it.

1. First of all Mr Fotheringham quotes Mrs Maunder as referring

to 'the flimsy evidence on which Dr Charles has assigned this work to an Egyptian Jew of the first century of our era'. The words are lacking in courtesy, but, if they were true, I could not object to them. But I cannot believe that Mr Fotheringham has considered the evidence, which is given in my edition, pp. xvi-xxvi, and reinforced in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* vol. ii 425-429. The main conclusions as to date and authorship arrived at in these works have, so far as I am aware, been accepted by all Christian and Jewish scholars of every rank—with the exception of Mrs Maunder and Mr Fotheringham.

2. Mrs Maunder and Mr Fotheringham find it difficult to believe 'that a book so widely current as Dr Charles imagines, though it survived to be translated into Bulgarian . . . should have disappeared altogether in its Greek form'. A scholar acquainted with this department of learning would experience no such difficulty. The Slavonic version of 3 Baruch was first published in 1886. Of the Greek original there was no trace save in a few references in Origen, &c.—not one-tenth of the number found in reference to the Slavonic Enoch. Yet the Greek original was found in the British Museum ten years later. The Slavonic version of *The Story of Ahikar* is made from the lost Greek version. Only within the last fifteen years has the original work, written in Aramaic (420-400 B.C.), been dug up at Elephantine. The Chronicle of John of Nikin was written early in the seventh century A.D. in Greek, whence it was translated into Arabic and thence into Ethiopic in the seventeenth century. The Greek original is lost and the Arabic version. It would be almost possible to fill this page with a list of works preserved only in versions, the originals of which, whether written in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek, are for the present lost.

3. Mr Fotheringham says that lunar epacts are first met with in the third century A.D. If he studies 1 Enoch lxxii-lxxxii he will find these epacts taken account of *in the second century B.C.* See my second edition *in loc.*

4. He states that Mrs Maunder finds the Christian Eastern Calendar in the book and the 532 years cycle. There is no basis for the first statement. The words 'Thus the great circle has five hundred and thirty two years', which occur in xvi 5, are undoubtedly interpolated. *They have no connexion of any kind with their immediate context nor with any other statement or section of the book.* Yet it is on this interpolation that Mrs Maunder builds her theory.

5. Mrs Maunder maintains that the book was written by a Bogomil in Bulgarian between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries A.D.

The Bogomils were pure dualists. Over against God stood Satanail—a rebel angel with his followers. All the work of creation described in Gen. i was wrought by him and not by God. Moses was a tool of Satanail and the Law was from this satanic source. These two or three facts out of a large number are sufficient to prove that the Slavonic

Enoch, which ascribes the entire creation to God and quotes the Law as divine, could not have emanated from the Bogomils. Yet Mrs Maunder and her disciple maintain this theory. Finding that the Slavonic Enoch xxxi 4 states that Satanail's name was changed to Satan after his fall, and that this belief was current among the Bogomils, they promptly conclude that the old Jewish work—the Slavonic Enoch (which in its present form was written before A. D. 70, but parts of which go back to the first or second century B. C.)—was written by a Bogomil. But experts in this literature know that this statement occurs in works many centuries before the Bogomils existed. I will quote *Questions of St Bartholomew* (some time after A. D. 580 according to Lipsius) iv 25 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Βελίαρ λέγει Εἰ θέλεις μαθεῖν τὸ ὄνομά μου, πρῶτον ἐλεγόμεν Σατανάηλ . . . ὅτε δὲ ἀπέγγων ἀντίτυπον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομά μου Σατανᾶς. See Bonwetsch *Die Apokryphen: Fragen des Bartholomäus* (Aus den Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft . . . zu Göttingen, 1897, Heft 1), where the reader will find a discussion of the relations of this literature.

6. Jewish literature preserves in *Hebrew* a book once entitled 'the Book of Enoch' (and twice 'the Books of the Secrets of Enoch')—the actual name of the Slavonic Enoch. This book possesses a very great number of the statements recorded in the Slavonic Enoch. It claims to have been written early in the second century A. D., but probably it was later. Our book has parallels also in the Zohar and in a Hebrew apocalyptic fragment published by Jellinek *Beth-ha-Midrash* vi 19-30.

7. One more remark must be made. For some reason or other astronomers are very much at fault in the field of apocalyptic. Sir Isaac Newton, the greatest of them all, makes a poor figure in his attempt to interpret the Apocalypse. Dupuis and many others who approach it from the astronomical standpoint are much worse. But for wild extravagance in interpretation the Russian astronomer, Professor Morosow, whose work, published in 1907, was translated into German in 1912, bears the palm. Morosow claims that he has established that the Apocalypse was written in A. D. 395 (the actual day and hour being given) and that its author was John Chrysostom! Mrs Maunder seems to me to be in the same class with the Russian scholar.

R. H. CHARLES.

A SUPPOSED FRAGMENT OF THE LOST CODEX FULDENSIS OF TERTULLIAN.

It is well known that the Fulda codex of Tertullian, containing the *Apologeticus* and the *Adversus Iudaeos*, was collated by Franciscus Modius with the printed edition of De la Barre (Paris, 1580), and that the collation was published in the edition of Franciscus Junius (Franker, 1597). No trace of the manuscript has since been discovered.

D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Enoch," RB 49 (1940) 195-203; U. Fischer, Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); A. S. D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," The Observatory 41 (1918). He further suggests that it is not impossible that an oral exegesis of the Melchizedek legend in Slavonic Enoch somehow connected. Further the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood in front of the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of the altar." As shown, 2 Enoch presents Melchizedek as a continuation of the priestly line from Methuselah, son A further and more important goal of this study will be clarification of the possible date of 2 Enoch, which represent a crucial problem for the students of the Slavonic apocalypse who often lament the absence of unambiguous textual evidence that can place the pseudepigraphon in the chronological boundaries of Second Temple Judaism. These revisions take place in the midst of the debates about sacrificial practice and priestly succession. But what is the role of this denigration of the hero of the Flood and the traditions associated with his name in the larger framework of the mediatorial polemical interactions found in the Slavonic apocalypse? of the pseudepigraphon, arguing that the Slavonic Enoch does not represent an early Jewish text written in the