

50P = 130, 13B:—*ιτέον οὖν ὡς ἐνὶ μάλιστα ἐγγυτάτω τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, ὧν οἰκεία ἢ πλάνη κακὴ τῆς προσόψεως ἐλέγχεται. ὧν* : ὡς. — ἐλέγχεται Potter, vulg.*

51P = 132, 5B:—*δραστήριος μὲν ἢ δημιουργική, ἀλλ' οὐχ οἷα τε ἀπατῆσαι (τὸ) λογικὸν οὐδὲ μὴν τοὺς κατὰ λόγον βεβιωκότας. (τὸ)*.*

At 874P fin. read *ἡ γνώσις οἶον [δ] λογικὸς θάνατος*: at 160P, *ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια λογικῆ (* : λογικῆς) κατὰ κρίσιν ἀστείαν.*

Ib. *ζωγραφίας μὲν γὰρ δι' ὁμοίότητα σκιαγραφία περιστερᾶς προσέπτησαν πελειάδες καὶ ἵπποις καλῶς γεγραμμέναις προσεχερέμισαν ἵπποι. σκιαγραφία περιστερᾶς* : σκιαγραφίας περιστερᾶ.*

A plurality of doves is dearly bought at the price of such conjectures as *σκιαγραφῆταις* (an unheard-of form) *περιστεραῖς* or *ἔσκιαγραφημέναις περιστεραῖς*. — At 322P, it may be said in passing, *σκιΟγραφία* should be changed into Clement's only form *σκιΑγραφία**.

Ib. (132, 16B):—*ἐπὶ τὸ ἐρᾶν προάγουσα (* : προσάγουσα).*

At 204P, the sense demands:—*ποππυσμὸς δὲ καὶ συριγμὸς καὶ οἱ διὰ τῶν δακτύλων ψόφοι, τῶν οἰκετῶν οἱ προσκλητικοί* (προκλητικοί cod., edd.).*

J. JACKSON.

(To be continued.)

THE RAINER FRAGMENT OF THE APOCALYPSE OF PETER

I

I GRATEFULLY acknowledge that I owe my first inkling of the existence of this to a footnote in M. Vaganay's *Évangile de Pierre* (p. 189). It was first printed by Wessely in *Patrol. Orient.* xviii 482 (1924); more recently Father K. Prümm S.J. has written on it an interesting essay *de genuino Apoc. Petri textu* in *Biblica* x 62–80 (1929), and it is from this that I draw my text. The source is a parchment double leaf of the third or fourth century in the Rainer collection at Vienna.

It preserves the original Greek of a paragraph which is otherwise known only from the Ethiopic version, wherein it is largely unintelligible. An English rendering of the Ethiopic will be found in my *Apocr. N.T.* p. 518, and a German one (Weinel's) in Hennecke's *N.T. Apocr.*, p. 325, both issued before the publication by Wessely (who, by the way, wrongly identified the fragment as part of the *Acts of Peter*).

The situation or context of the passage is this: at the end of the description of hell-torments we read in the Ethiopic:

'Thereafter shall the angels bring mine elect and righteous . . . and bear them in their hands and clothe them with the raiment of the life that is above (*or* of everlasting life). They shall see their desire on them that hated them', &c. Those who are in torment acknowledge the justice of their punishment. The angel Tartaruchos chastises them yet more severely and tells them that the time of repentance is past. They again acknowledge that God is righteous and they are justly punished.

The Ethiopic proceeds:

'Then will I give' . . . and here begins our Greek fragment, which I will set out side by side with an English rendering. Emendations by me are underlined:

(παρ)έξομαι τοῖς κλητοῖς μου καὶ
ἐκλέκτοις μου ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται με
ἐκ τῆς κολάσεως, καὶ δώσω αὐτοῖς
καλὸν βάπτισμα ἐν σωτηρίᾳ Ἀχερου-
σίας λίμνης ἣν καλοῦσιν ἐν τῷ Ἑλυ-
σιῶ πεδίῳ, μέρος δικαιοσύνης μετὰ
τῶν ἁγίων μου. καὶ ἀπελεύσομαι
ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ μου ἀγαλλῶντες
μετὰ τῶν πατριάρχων εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν
μου βασιλείαν, καὶ ποιήσω μετ' αὐτῶν
τὰς ἐπαγγελίας μου ἃς ἐπηγγειλάμην
αὐτοῖς ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς.

ἰδὸν ἐδήλωσά σοι, Πέτρε, καὶ ἐξ-
εθέμην πάντα' καὶ πορεύου εἰς πόλιν
ἄρχουσαν δύσεως, καὶ πίε τὸ ποτήριον
ὃ ἐπηγγειλάμην σοι ἐν χειροῖν (? χερ-
σίν) τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἄιδου, ἵνα ἀρχὴν
λάβῃ αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀφάνεια καὶ σὺ δεκτὸς †
τῆς ἐπαγγελίας . . .

Then will I give unto my called
and my chosen whomsoever they
shall ask me for, out of torment,
and will give them a fair baptism in
(*or* unto) salvation from the Acheru-
sian lake which *men so* call in the
Elysian field, *even* a portion of
righteousness with my holy ones.
And I will depart, I and my chosen,
rejoicing, with the patriarchs, unto
mine eternal kingdom, and I will
perform for them the promises
which I promised them, I and my
Father which is in heaven.

Lo, I have manifested unto thee,
Peter, and have expounded all *this*.
And go thou into a city that ruleth
over the west, and drink the cup
which I promised thee, at the hands
of the son of him that is in Hades,
that his destruction may have a
beginning; and (*lit.*) thou accept-
able of the promise. . . . (*perhaps*
(become) a receiver of the promise).

ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται. The MS has θεον εαν στεσωνται: θῆ has been read for ὃν and στησωνται for ἐτήσ.

δύσεως. MS οπυσεως.

δεκτός has always the passive sense of acceptable. If 'receiver' is the needed meaning, δεκτήρ is possible; the forms δέκτησ and δέκτωρ seem to be poetical.

The best attainable equivalent of the Ethiopic must next be given. The sources are: Grébaut, quoted by me in full in *J. T. S.* 1910 (xii 52); Weinel ap. Hennecke l.c., and Duensing in *ZNTW* 1913, p. 73 (but he omits several lines as unintelligible). What I give here is essentially that of my *Apocr. N.T.* l.c.:

'Then will I give to mine elect and to my righteous the baptism and the salvation for which they have besought me in the field of Akrosja which men call Anēslaslejā. They (shall) adorn with flowers the portion of the righteous (*or* A portion of the righteous adorneth itself with flowers) and I shall go . . . I shall rejoice with them. I will cause the peoples to enter into mine eternal kingdom, and will give (*or* show) them the everlasting good things whereon I have made them to set their hope, even I and my Father which is in heaven.

'I have spoken this unto thee, Peter, and declared it unto thee. Go forth therefore and journey unto the city (*or* land) of the west, into the vineyard which I shall tell thee of. (*Two renderings of the next sentence are possible.* (a) That by the sufferings of the son who is without sin the deeds of corruption may be sanctified. (b) Through the suffering of the sinless son the creation which was subject to corruption is sanctified.) As for thee, thou art chosen according to the promise which I have given thee.'

For the moment it is enough to remark that the Ethiopic exhibits relics of the Greek text throughout, but in two places is gravely corrupted, and in one place is guilty of an important omission.

I will now try to justify my reading and interpretation of the passage. I have no doubt of the correctness of my restoration of the opening lines, for they are closely paraphrased in the following lines of *Sib. Orac.* II:

- 330 τοῖς καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἄφθιτος ἄλλο παρέξει
εὐσεβέσιν, ὅπῳταν θεὸν ἄφθιτον αἰτήσωνται
 ἐκ μαλεροῦ πυρὸς καὶ ἀθανάτων ἀπὸ βρυγμῶν
 ἀνθρώπουσ σῶσαι δώσει· καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσει·
 λεξιμένοισ γὰρ ἐσαῦθισ ἀπὸ φλογὸσ ἀκαμάτοισ
 335 ἄλλοσ' ἀποστήσασ πέμψει διὰ λαὸν ἑαυτοῦ
 εἰσ ζωὴν ἑτέραν καὶ αἰώνιον ἀθανάτοισιν
 Ἐλυσίω πεδίω, ὅθι οἱ πέλε κύματα μακρὰ
 λίμνησ ἀενάουσ Ἀχερουσιάδοσ βαθυκόλπου.

There is moreover a parallel passage in the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elias*:
 'The righteous will behold the sinners in their punishment, and those

who have persecuted them and delivered them up. Then will the sinners on their part behold the place of the righteous and be partakers of grace. In that day will that for which the (righteous) shall often pray be granted to them.'

And in the *Epistle of the Apostles* 40, Christ says: 'The righteous are sorry for the sinners and pray for them, making prayer unto my Father. Again, we said unto him: Lord, is there none that maketh intercession unto thee? and he said unto us: Yea, and I will hearken unto the prayer of the righteous, which they make for them'.

Further, it may be remembered that in the *Acts of Paul*, a book which shows traces of acquaintance with *Apoc. Petri*, the soul of a dead girl Falconilla is prayed for by Thecla that she may be translated into the place of the righteous.

These passages I quoted in *Apocr. N.T.* 521, and added: 'My impression is that the maker of the Ethiopic version . . . has designedly omitted or slurred over some clauses in the passage beginning, "Then will I give unto mine elect".' This guess is, I take it, shewn to be correct. The doctrine—which is indeed a very curious one—was thought dangerous.¹

Passing on, I note that *μέρος δικαιοσύνης* has its equivalent in the 'portion of the righteous' in Eth.: but there is nothing to correspond to Eth.'s 'adorn with flowers'. It is conceivable that something has dropped out of the Greek. Apparently in Eth. 'the peoples' is the equivalent of *τῶν πατριάρχων*.

The *συνσεως* of the MS is ingeniously interpreted by Wessely and Prümm as a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* meaning fornication. They connect it with *ὀπύειν* or *ὀπίειν*. It is true that Rome might, as in Rev. xvii &c., be described as the mistress of fornication: but I cannot help preferring the reading *δύσεως*, which was evidently that of Eth.

The sentence which Eth. has so sadly mangled, about *πῆ τὸ ποτήριον* is not rightly explained by Prümm. My rendering shews it to contain a plain allusion to Nero, who is regarded as the son of the devil. I do not know that we find exactly this description of him elsewhere; but in Rev. xvii 8 a beast, usually identified with Nero, *μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*; and in the Ascension of Isaiah iv 2-4, Nero is identified with Beliar, the king of this world who will descend from his firmament in the form of a man, a wicked king, the murderer of his mother. And of him it is said (3) that he will persecute the planting which the twelve apostles of the Beloved will have planted: and of the twelve, one will be delivered into his hands (*ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ*).

¹ Wessely-Prümm render 'electis meis (Deum) quando statuerint me ex punitione (!)', and Prümm connects the words vaguely with the disappearance of the Messiah and the phrase *τοῦ ἐν Ἄιδου*.

This was long ago interpreted by Clemen as a reference to the martyrdom of St Peter. The view was combated by Harnack and others; but surely the new fragment is decisive in its favour. The phrase 'the cup which I promised thee' shews that our author was acquainted, if not with John xxi, at least with the prediction of Peter's death embodied therein.

In the Greek the form *χειροῦν* is a little suspect: in view of the passage in *Asc. Jes.* I would read *χερσίν*. *Ἴνα ἀρχὴν λάβῃ αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀφάνεια*; I do not know whether stress ought to be laid on *ἀφάνεια* as meaning the disappearance of Nero. Prümm would interpret the whole sentence of the Messiah, and *ἀφάνεια* of that disappearance and concealment of the Messiah of which Rabbinic teaching spoke. But I cannot accept this, and think it safer to keep to the more general sense of the word.

The conclusion of the fragment is not quite satisfactory. As I have noted, *δεκτός* has the passive sense, and an active one seems to be needed. The Ethiopic has here:

'As for thee, thou art chosen according to the promise which I have given thee,'

whence we see that he read *ἐκλεκτός* and not *δεκτός*. Neither word construes quite comfortably with the genitive *τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*: and I cannot at the moment suggest a probable supplement. Eth. continues:

'Spread thou therefore my gospel of peace throughout all the world (*or* my gospel . . . in peace). Verily men shall rejoice. My words shall be (*or* are) the source of hope and of life, and in a moment the world shall rejoice (?) (*or* shall be ravished; i. e. with pleasure).'

The last clause of this also is suspicious.

Immediately upon this follows the vision of Moses and Elias, and of Paradise, which, in a different form, appears in the Akhmim text *before* the description of hell.

It must be reckoned a very fortunate circumstance that the Rainer fragment contains the passage which has been worse treated in Eth. than any other, and contains more puzzles. And altogether the fragment is very remarkable, both as containing early allusions to the martyrdom of Peter by Nero and the prediction of it by our Lord, and also as confirming very strongly the authority of the Ethiopic version, and that of the Sibylline oracles as a paraphrase. The greater part of Father Prümm's essay is devoted to championing Eth. as against the Akhmim text, and I am naturally very glad to be able to claim him as a supporter.

II

Perhaps I may be allowed to make this an occasion for some more general observations about *Apoc. Petri*, to which I have been led by Father Prümm's essay and by Abbé Vaganay's edition of the Gospel of Peter, particularly the section of his Introduction in which he discusses the relation between Gospel and Apocalypse (p. 187-192). The excellence of this book, which I hope to review elsewhere in this JOURNAL, makes it a duty to consider carefully what the author has to say on a subject on which he disagrees with published views of mine.

First, what is the problem? As I see it, it is this. We have two widely divergent texts of the *Apocalypse of Peter*. One is represented by the Akhmim fragment, which exists in the single MS that also contains the fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*. The other is represented not only by the Ethiopic version, but also by Patristic quotations dating from the second century, by the Bodleian fragment 'of the fifth century', and by the Rainer fragment 'of the third or fourth'.¹ Clearly the weight of external evidence warrants us in regarding this latter text as original, and the other as an edition. And internal evidence points the same way. The secondary character of Akhmim may, I believe be taken as proved.

But if Akhmim is secondary, if it is an edition, with what purpose was it made? Surely in order to fit it into another context; surely again, that context must have been a Petrine writing. Now, in view of the facts (1) that our single copy of Akh. is found in the same volume (not merely, as Vaganay says in the same tomb) as another piece of a Petrine writing (the Gospel) copied by the same scribe (2) that in the setting of it there are verbal resemblances to this other fragment, I have followed Zahn's lead and maintained that Akh. is a portion of *Apoc. Petri* embodied, with changes, in the Gospel, by the author of the latter.

Is this view borne out by the nature of the verbal resemblances? Obviously that is a most important question. Vaganay says no: I say yes.

Two of the most striking resemblances are: (1) the employment of ὁ κύριος to the exclusion of Ἰησοῦς throughout the Gospel (*EP*) and five times in the Apoc. (*AP*); (2) ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί in both. Of the first Vaganay says (p. 191): 'Même l'absence du mot Jésus dans le fragment apocalyptique d'Akhmim ne saurait retenir l'attention, puisqu'il est parlé fréquemment de Jésus dans le texte éthiopien plus complet.'

Well, but is it not part of the thesis that the author of *EP*. adapted

¹ *Vide infra*.

and altered *AP.* for his purposes? Of course the elimination of *Jesus* would be one of the first changes he would make!

The other he explains 'par une tendance commune à beaucoup d'auteurs apocryphes (ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ dans *EP.* 59 et *AP.* 5, mais aussi dans l'*Epistola Apostolorum* (aeth.) p. 64 et dans l'*Évangile des douze Apôtres* (?) ed. Revillout *Patrol. Orient.* 11. 2, p. 160 et 182).' Of course, I reply, in any book ostensibly written by the twelve apostles, they will speak of themselves thus. The point is that here we find the phrase in a writing (or writings) attributed to a single apostle, Peter. Look at the parallelism:

EP. 59-60. ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκλαίομεν . . . ἐγὼ δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος.

Akh. 5 sq. ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐδεήθημεν . . . καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶπον.

And please note that the section of *Akh.* in question is one which has been most interfered with by the adapter—changed in position and in content—and one, consequently, in which traces of the adapter's hand should be most prominent.

On these two points, then, I think Vaganay's arguments fail. I will not spend time on the other verbal resemblances, which are by no means without their force, but will notice Vaganay's other objections: 'Les détails historiques . . . ne démontrent pas etc. Cette façon d'agrémenter le discours se rencontre ailleurs . . . Témoin l'*Epistola Apostolorum*. En outre la publication du texte éthiopien a révélé que ces mêmes détails (le discours de Jésus sur les faux prophètes, sa présence sur la montagne avec les Douze) empruntés à Mt. xxiv 3 sq. appartiennent à la partie originale de l'*Apoc. de Pierre*.'

I do not see the force of this. A person adapting a book to a new context uses details from that book. How could he help it?

'La découverte des fragments évangélique et apocalyptique d'*Akh.* mim dans le même tombeau n'est pas une preuve qu'ils aient appartenu au même livre. Tout au plus pourrait-on admettre qu'ils ont été copiés par le même scribe, et encore la chose n'est pas sûre. La présence de feuillets blancs avant et après les deux fragments, la façon dont le premier se termine au milieu d'une phrase, tout cela indique que le copiste a transcrit consciencieusement des débris d'ouvrages, en laissant un espace pour les compléter si possible; ce n'est pas un motif sérieux de croire que ces bribes faisaient partie du même évangile.'

They were found, not only in the same tomb, but in the same book-cover, bound together, and most likely (I should say, clearly) in the same hand. The argument furnished by the MS is of course not conclusive, but plainly it is permissive of the belief that the scribe was

copying two detached fragments of a single book. If anything, it rather favours that belief. Something more solid is to come:

'On peut indiquer rapidement deux raisons qui établissent la diversité des deux morceaux. . . . (a) Il suffit de lire le fragment évangélique pour juger de la sobriété du récit qui s'apparente beaucoup à la narration synoptique. Jusque dans les passages où l'auteur se montre le plus indépendant, par exemple dans l'histoire de la résurrection (35-44) il garde encore une réserve remarquable auprès des autres livres apocryphes. Singulièrement le tableau des apparitions angéliques forme un contraste frappant avec la même peinture dans l'*Apoc. de Pierre*. D'un côté, quelques légers traits (*EP.* 36 and 55 quoted). De l'autre, une profusion de couleurs dans un tableau dessiné avec complaisance (*Akh.* 6-10 quoted). On saisit la différence: ce n'est ni la même inspiration ni la même touche. A l'évidence, ce dernier morceau ne porte pas la marque du pseudo-évangéliste.'

But these are not both descriptions of angels. The first relates to the angels at the sepulchre: the second to two departed saints, whom the apostles have specially desired to see, and have asked what their appearance would be, 'ποταποί εἰσι τὴν μορφήν'. Of course in their case a description was called for, and the more elaborate the better. In the other case, beyond saying that the apparitions were bright, details were out of place.

But in general, Vaganay seems to miss the point of the theory he is opposing. If a man adapts another man's writing, we shall inevitably find inconsistencies of style.

And I must observe that the Passion fragment of the *EP.* does not enable us to say that we know all about the style or habits of its writer. We do not know in the least how he treated the discourses or miracles of our Lord. We do know—Vaganay has shewn it admirably—that he used sources. He may not have made a mosaic out of the Four Gospels, but he was at any rate dependent upon Catecheses and Testimonia in his Passion-narrative—a section of the history in which these sources were of outstanding importance for his purpose. Suppose that he wished to write of the future life: would he not be likely again to use sources? A more or less accredited source lay ready to his hand in the shape of *AP.* And as he is admittedly desirous of giving prominence to Peter and adding lustre to his name, is not Peter's own revelation precisely the book he would use?

(b) 'La tradition patristique touchant l'*Évangile* et l'*Apoc. de Pierre* confirme que les deux fragments d'Akhmim ne sauraient appartenir au même livre. D'une part, l'*Évangile* est resté confiné longtemps en Syrie dans des cercles très étroits et n'a jamais exercé qu'une action très restreinte. De l'autre, l'*Apoc.* a été répandue un peu partout:

Clément d'Alexandrie, le canon de Muratori, Méthodius (etc.) sont là pour l'attester. Elle a joui d'un grand crédit. . . Si le fragment apocalyptique d'Akh. avait été inséré par le ps.-Pierre dans son évangile, l'œuvre entière, sans nul doute, aurait connu un certain succès. Ici ou là, on aurait retenu quelques-unes des particularités édifiantes du récit apocryphe, on aurait célébré le nom de Pétronius, bref, on n'aurait pas laissé tomber la partie la plus importante de l'ouvrage dans un oubli aussi profond. L'Év. et l'Apoc., pour être placés sous le même patronage, n'en restent pas moins deux livres qui n'ont entre eux aucun rapport.'

Non sequitur. Granted, the *EP.* was never a well-known book. Therefore however much it contained of interest, whether borrowed or original, whether discourses, miracles, or revelations, very few people read it. It is all very well to say that if it had been known to contain the *AP.* it would have become popular. All one can say is that it never did. Who knows why? Not impossibly one reason was that it contained hardly anything that could not be found elsewhere in a more acceptable form.

Since writing the first part of this article I have become aware that the Bodleian and Rainer fragments of the *AP.* must be parts of one and the same MS. They agree in dimensions, in the number of lines to the page (13), and in the number of letters to the line (8-10). The Rainer collection came to Europe in the eighties, and the Bodleian fragment was bought in 1894. It is assigned to the fifth century by the cataloguers, whereas Wessely ascribes his fragment to the third or fourth; but the divergence of opinion is not fatal, especially in view of the very poor condition of the Bodleian leaf.

A line-for-line transcript of Wessely's text will probably be welcome, together with a copy of his preliminary remarks. He does not identify the fragment rightly, but believes it to belong to the *Acts of Peter*, and prints it next to the Oxyrhynchus fragment of that book.

'Feuille arrachée à un livre (codex) en parchemin, 78 x 53 mm. Collection Rainer. Écriture onciale du iii^e ou iv^e siècle avec les abbréviations $\overline{\nu\upsilon}$ $\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta$, $\overline{\pi\eta\rho}$ $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$, $\overline{\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\nu}$ $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$. Notons l'usage de la cédille et du supplément des lignes: à la fin de la page 3 $\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$, δ : page 3, l. 6 δ .'

Page 1.	Page 2.	Page 3.	Page 4.
ἐξομαι τοιο	ηλυσιω πεδιω	και ποιησω με	χουσαν οπνσε
κλητοις μου.	μεροσ δικαιο	τ'αυτων τασ επα(γ)	ωσ και πι
και εκκλε	συνησ μετα	γελιασ μου ασ ε,	ε το ποτηρι
κτοις μου $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$	των αγιων	πηγγειλαμην	ον ο επηγ7

Page 1.	Page 2.	Page 3.	Page 4.
εαν, στησων	μου και απε	αυτοις εγω και ο	γειλαμην σοι 5
τα 'με εκ της	λευσομαι ε,	πῆρ μου ο: εν	εν χειροιν του
κολασεωσ και	γω και οι εκλε,	τοις ουνουσ.7	υῦτου εν αι
δωσω αυτοις	κτοι μου αγαλ	Jιδου εδηλωσα	δου εινα αρ
καλον βαπτι	λιωντες με,	σοι πετρε	χην λαβη αυ
σμα εν σωτη	τα των πατρι	και εξεθε	του η αφα 10
ρια αχερουσια(σ)	αρχων εισ τη(ν)	μην παντα.	νια και συ7
λιμνησ ην κ(α)	(α)ιωνιαν μου	και πορευου	δεκτος της
λουσιν εν τω	(β)ασιλειαν7	εισ πολιν αρ:	επαγγελει

Wessely writes the iota subscript, but this, with accents and breathings, I omit.

M. R. JAMES.

ST FELICITY IN THE ROMAN MASS

It seems to me convenient to start this article by a discussion of a various reading, a mere question of the order of a list of names, but I hope to shew that it leads to the consideration of wider issues and to a reorientation of some current ideas about the history of the Christian Liturgy in the Dark Ages.

First, as to the various reading. Towards the end of the Roman Canon of the Mass 'we sinners' (*nobis quoque peccatoribus*) ask to be in some way conjoined with the holy Martyrs of old, a list being given, first of men then of women. The women are (1) Felicitas, (2) Perpetua, (3) Agatha, (4) Lucia, (5) Agnes, (6) Caecilia, (7) Anastasia. This is the present order, and it is confirmed by the MSS of the so-called 'Gelasian' and 'Gregorian' Sacramentaries. The *Missale Francorum* (Vat. Reg. 257) is here missing, but the *Bobiense* (*Bo*) and the Stowe Missal (*St*) have Perpetua², Agnes⁵, Cecily⁶, Felicity¹, Anastasia⁷, Agatha³, Lucy⁴, *Bobiense* also adding Eugenia at the end.

This division of the MSS is quite normal. It represents the Irish or 'insular' tradition opposed to what—at least in the times of Charlemagne and his Pope Hadrian—was regarded as specifically Roman. The division corresponds very much in general character to what we find in the MSS of the New Testament: the 'Irish' type corresponds to the Western text, the 'Roman' to the Alexandrian or Hesychian. The latter is, as a rule, more correct, but the former, like the Western text of the New Testament, represents a very old branch of transmission and amidst many errors seems to preserve a certain number of original readings lost elsewhere.