

Traube's position, viz. that the text of which the Oxford MS is the chief representative, is secondary and corrupt, interpolated, as Traube calls it. On the other hand, in regard to the question whether the Monte Cassino 'autograph' really was St Benedict's autograph, I find myself compelled to maintain the slightly sceptical attitude of 'not proven' which I took up against Traube and the eminent critics who follow him. The matter is not one of great practical importance; for I am satisfied that the text of this 'autograph' was so much the best of those known to us, that my endeavour as an editor will be to reproduce it.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

NOTES ON APOCRYPHA.

I

REVELATIO THOMAE.

IN a recent number of the *Zeitschrift f. Neutestamentl. Wissenschaft* (1908, p. 172) Dr C. Frick calls attention to an interesting note in the Berlin-Phillipps MS of Jerome's Chronicle. The MS is of cent. viii-ix, and contains a series of additions to the text, which are printed (from a collation by Rühl) in Appendix V to Schoene's edition.

At the eighteenth year of Tiberius the MS has this note:

In libro quodam apocrifo qui dicitur Thomae apostoli scriptum est dominum Iesum ad eum dixisse ab ascensu suo ad celum usque in secundum aduentum eius nouem iobeleos contineri.

Frick identifies this as a quotation from the lost 'Revelatio Thomae Apostoli', which is named in the 'Gelasian' list of books condemned as heretical.

This passage, embodying the first trace which has ever been thought to have been discovered of the Revelation of Thomas, recalled to my memory a statement of Scipio Maffei's (*Opera*, Venice, 1790, tom. x p. 92) who, in describing the famous Graeco-Latin ancient Psalter of cent. vi in the Chapter Library at Verona, says, that after the apocryphal Psalm cli (*Pusillus eram*), 'In pagella quam librarius vacuam reliquerat, celeriscriptione, papyrosque veteres apprime referente, *Epistola Domini ad Thomam* subnotatur, quae inter apocrypha monumenta nondum est visa'. I accordingly wrote to the Rev. D. Antonio Spagnolo, the Chapter Librarian at Verona, who with great kindness supplied me with a transcript of the *Epistola*, and also informed me that it had in fact been

printed by G. G. Dionisi in an appendix to his *Apologetiche Riflessioni*, published in 1755. I have hitherto been unable to procure access to a copy of this book, which is probably not easily to be met with outside Italy. It seems clearly worth while to reproduce the text of this short fragment (for it is no more), since the absence of any mention of it by recent students of apocryphal literature indicates that Dionisi's publication has escaped their notice as well as my own. It runs as follows: the punctuation is added by me:—

†_ω Incipit epistula domini ad Thomam.

Audi, Thoma, quae oportet fieri in novissimis temporibus. erunt
fames et bellum et terremotus per varia loca, nix, glacies, et siccitas
magna erit. plurimae dissensiones in populis erit, blasphemia,
5 iniquitas, zelus et iniquitas, ocium, superbia et intemperantia. item
unusquisque quod illi placet loquatur.¹ Sacerdotes mei pacem
inter se non habebunt. fincto animo mihi sacrificabunt, propterea
non haspiciam super eos.² tunc videbunt sacerdotes populum de
domo domini recedentem, quos iam in seculum . . . ³ sunt terminos
10 in domo dei. sic erunt et uindicabunt sibi plurima et loca perdita
et erunt sub . . . ⁴ sicut et ante fuerunt, dantes capitularia ciuitates
auri et argenti, et condemnabuntur priores urbium.

The text is obscure and corrupt, or ill translated, especially in lines 10–12. Is it possible that the last sentence could mean 'selling the headships (or head-offices) of the city (or, of cities) for gold and silver, and the just men of the cities shall be condemned'? This rendering presupposes an incorrect rendering of *capitularia*, which would more properly mean the poll-tax books of the city. I assume that *ciuitates* is a mistake for *ciuitatis* or *ciuitatum*.

D. Spagnolo tells me that the writing is of the eighth century and resembles generally the hand employed in the *papyri* (of Ravenna and elsewhere).

It is not easy to assign a date to so short a piece, but a period is indicated when church organization is mature, and (if the concluding sentences refer to the priesthood), wealth and temporal power have been attained; in other words, not an early date. This constitutes no bar to the supposition that the fragment may be a part of the *Revelatio Thomae*. We have plenty of apocalypses of late date, e.g. those of Paul and John; and it must be remembered that the only mention of the Revelation of Thomas is of the fifth century.

Our fragment does not permit us to form any guess as to the dimensions of the document from which it was taken. But I may be permitted to

¹ Dionisi: placitum est loquetur.

² Dion.: superbos.

³ Dion.: transgressi.

⁴ Dion.: subvertitores.

call attention to another apocryphal writing recently brought to light which has some slight points of resemblance to this. In the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte* (Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1908) Herr Bick has published the contents of an important Vienna palimpsest from Bobbio (Cod. 16) in which such diverse books as a Lucan, a Dioscorides, and a copy of the Acts and Catholic Epistles have been used. Two leaves of this volume contain, in fifth-century uncials, scanty fragments of a Latin apocryphon, of which the head-line is *Epistula*, and which contains revelations made by our Lord to the Apostles, or some of them. Herr Bick has shewn that a portion of the text also occurs in a Coptic book as yet unpublished, of which Dr C. Schmidt gave some account in the Berlin Academy's *Sitzungsberichte* for 1895 (p. 705). The headline of the Latin document is *Epistula*, and the first of the two leaves, the one not corresponding to the Coptic text, contains apocalyptic matter not unlike that of our fragment, e.g. 'εργο audi a me signa quae futura sunt in finem saeculi huius ut transeat antequam exiant electi de saeculo. dicam tibi . . .' In the second column are the words 'famis magna et pestilentiae magna et necessitates magna . . . et captivi labuntur per universas gentes et cadunt in mucronae gladii'. Hardly anything is legible on the verso. A single auditor is evidently addressed here ('audi, tibi'): on the other leaf the Apostles are the narrators ('Nos enim temptantes . . . dicimus illi'): yet the head-line of both leaves is the same, and it would be rash to assume that both do not belong to the same document. The possibility, however, seems to be still open that the Verona fragment may be ultimately related to the Vienna *Epistula*.

II

SYRIAC APOCRYPHA IN IRELAND.

IRISH scholars will perhaps be interested by the following note on a point in the Vision of Adamnán, which has recently been translated and published with an interesting introduction and notes by Mr C. S. Boswell (*An Irish Precursor of Dante*: Grimm Library, No. 18. Nutt, 1908).

In the Introduction to the Vision (§ 2, p. 29) is the following passage:—

'Moreover, on the day of Mary's death, all the Apostles were brought to look upon the pains and miserable punishments of the unblest; for the Lord commanded the angels of the West to open up the earth before the face of the apostles, that they might see and consider Hell with all its torments, even as Himself had told them, long time before His Passion.'

Mr Boswell, rightly suspecting this episode to belong to a form of the *Transitus Mariae* fuller than any he had seen, has not been able to point to its occurrence in any text. So far as I can see, it only occurs in that remarkable Syriac form of the legend which is to be found in Wright's *Syriac Apocrypha* under the name of the *Obsequies of the Holy Virgin*. On p. 47 is this passage:—

'The dreadful place of torment which the Disciples begged of our Lord that they might see.

'And when these things were said by the blessed Apostles, our Lord made a sign with His eyes, and a cloud snatched away the Apostles and Mary and Michael, and our Lord along with them, and carried them to where the sun sets, and left them there. And our Lord spake with the angels of the pit, and the earth sprang upwards, and the pit was revealed in the midst of the earth. And our Lord gave place to the Apostles, that they might look, as they were wishing.' Then follows a scene of intercession for those in torment, of which the conclusion is wanting.

The question whether Oriental literature was indeed known in Ireland in early times has never been properly worked out. It is stated by Dr G. T. Stokes that the *Saltair na Rann* contains passages from the *Oriental Book of Adam and Eve*. As the text of the *Saltair* has never been translated, it is impossible for me to say whether the Oriental book or the Latin *Vita Adae* is really the source of the passages in question. At present, the quotation from the *Obsequies* given above is the clearest instance that I have encountered of obligation on the part of an Irish writer to an Oriental text.

M. R. JAMES.

TWO MORE MANUSCRIPTS WRITTEN BY THE SCRIBE OF THE LEICESTER CODEX.

IN the JOURNAL for April 1904, p. 445, I was able to point out on the evidence of a manuscript at Leiden that the scribe of the Leicester Codex was a man named Emmanuel of Constantinople, and that he worked for George Neville, Archbishop of York (d. 1476). I am now able to add two more to the five volumes known to have been written by him. They are at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. The first is a copy of the Lexicon of Suidas (nos. 76, 77) on paper and vellum, bound in two volumes. The first volume and perhaps a third of the second are in Emmanuel's hand: the remainder is in the hand of Joannes Serbopoulos of Constantinople, who was working at Reading in the last years of the fifteenth century (cf. MSS C.C.C. 23, 24 of 1499,