

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

have been associated with Gen. I.c. *and darkness was upon the face of the waters. And the spirit of God moved (R. V. marg. brooded) upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.* According to a Syrian 'Taufliturgie' the Spirit remained (John i 32 f) over the head of the Son and *incubated over the waters* (Resch p. 363). Syr. M in John i 5 reads, 'And He, the light, in the darkness was shining'. Ephr. Syr. I.c. (Resch p. 358) gives poetically the sense of words of the Evangelists, to the effect that Jesus on being baptized, as soon as He emerged from the wilderness of the Temptation, was manifested as a *great light* (Matt. iv 16), the 'true light' which was in the beginning.

Resch's *Agrapha* as a collection was epoch-making, but he classes too many of his fragments as 'Logia', Ropes ends (p. 160 f) with a short list of 'wahrscheinlich echten Agrapha', including John vii 53—viii 11, but passing over other passages of interest rejected by critical editors of the N.T. (p. 132 f). One of the chief questions raised by the discussion of 'aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente' is, whether in that Pericope the Textus Receptus has preserved a narrative of historic worth.

C. TAYLOR.

## NOTES ON APOCRYPHA.

### I.

NICETA of Remesiana *de Psalmodyae Bono* 3 (p. 70 ed. Burn) says, in a passage preserved only in the MSS A, V (the Bibles of La Cava and of Farfa), 'Neque enim illud volumen temerarie recipiendum est cuius inscriptio est INQUISITIO ABRAHAE (Abrae A) ubi cantasse ipsa animalia et fontes et elementa finguntur. Cum nullius sit fidei liber ipse nulla auctoritate subnixus.'

The name *Inquisitio Abrahæ* does not occur elsewhere: and in the apocryphal books which we possess under Abraham's name there is nothing nearer to Niceta's matter (as both Dom Morin and Dr Burn have seen) than a talking tree.

There is, however, a book in which are set out in detail the hours of the day and night at which animals, fountains, and elements adore their Maker. I mean, of course, the Testament of Adam. The following sentences from it are to the point here (see *Texts and Studies* II 2, *Apocrypha Anecdota* I p. 140).

Third hour of the day	Adoration of the birds,
Fourth    "    "	Adoration of the animals on earth.
Eighth    "    "	Adoration of the light and of the waters.
Tenth     "    "	The prayer of the waters.
Second hour of the night	Adoration of the fish . . . .
Third     "    "	Adoration of the lower depths . . . .
Fifth     "    "	Adoration of the waters that are above the heavens. At this hour . . . I and the angels used to hear the sound of the great waves lifting up their voices to give praise to God.

These quotations make it easy to anticipate my conjecture. I can hardly doubt that Niceta had in his mind this section of the Testament of Adam, and that copyists have made him say *Inquisitio Abrae* (or *Abrahae*) whereas he really wrote *Dispositio Adae*. *Dispositio* is a legitimate equivalent of *διαθήκη*. Compare the last words of 3 Esdras in the two Old Latin versions. One reads *secundum dispositionem*, the other *secundum testamentum, domini dei Israel*.

## II.

In *Salomon and Saturn* (ed. Kemble p. 156), Salomon is speaking. He says:—

‘Tell me of the land where no man may step with feet.

*Saturnus* quoth: The sailor over the sea, the noble one was named Wandering Wolf (Weallende Wulf), well known unto the tribes of the Philistines, the friend of Nebrond (i.e. Nimrod). He slew upon the plain five and twenty dragons at daybreak, and himself fell down there dead; therefore that land may not any man—that boundary place any one visit, nor bird fly over it, or any more the cattle of the field. Thence the poisonous race first of all widely arose, which now bubbling through breath of poison force their way. Yet shines his sword mightily sheathed, and over his burial-place glimmer the hilts.’

The above is Kemble’s rendering of the verses. I have not preserved his division of the lines.

The question of the sources of *Salomon and Saturn* is very obscure. Believing as I do with Kemble that the foundation of it is to be sought in the *Contradictio Salomonis* which is mentioned in the so-called Gelasian decree, I am inclined to accept as probable the idea that traces of other apocryphal books may be found in it: and in the passage I have quoted I suspect that there exists a reminiscence, distorted, and amalgamated with Northern myth, of another book mentioned in the same decree and thus described:—

‘Liber de Ogia (Ugya) nomine gigante qui cum dracone post diluuium (v. l. ante dil. cum Drac.) ab haereticis pugnasse perhibetur.’

Which, again, I have no doubt, had some connexion with ἡ τῶν γιγάντων

*πραγματεία*, a Manichaean book mentioned in a list given by Timotheus of Constantinople (see Fabric. *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* i 139).

What principally induces me to think that in *Salomon and Saturn* an old Biblical apocryphon is being alluded to is the coupling of the dragon-slayer's name with that of Nimrod. In the original tale, Og cannot have succumbed in his fight (as in the poem): he survived to be killed by Moses, according to the Jewish legend. I suggest no more than that a reminiscence of his adventure may be fairly suspected in the passage I have quoted. We may expect more light upon the matter from the commentary on *Salomon and Saturn* which is to be given to us by Dr Arthur Ritter von Vincenti. (*Münchener Beitr. z. Roman. u. Engl. Philol.*)

### III.

Ælfric, in his *Homily on the decollation of St John Baptist* (ed. Thorpe i 486, Ælfric Soc.), says:—

'Some heretics said that the head (of John) blew the King's wife Herodias, for whom he had been slain, so that she went with winds over all the world: but they erred in that saying, for she lived to the end of her life after the slaying of John.'

A picturesque legend which I have not elsewhere met with. Should it not be connected with the myth that Herodias led a nightly train of followers, who under her auspices celebrated witches' sabbaths?

Compare, among many other passages, John of Salisbury, *Polykrat.* ii 17 'Quale est quod Noctilucam quamdam vel Herodiadem vel praesidem noctis dominam (*l. Dianam?*) concilia et conuentus de nocte asserunt conuocare,' etc.

### IV.

Among the manuscripts recently bequeathed to the Fitzwilliam Museum by our generous benefactor, the late Mr Frank McClean, is an especially interesting copy of the *Aurora* of Petrus de Riga with the supplements of Egidius of Paris. The *Aurora* is a versified Bible: the poem, if such it may be called, was written late in the twelfth century, and was very popular. It has never been printed *in extenso*. Of all the copies of it which I have seen, the McClean MS is by far the most interesting, in virtue of its very copious marginal annotations. The manuscript is of the thirteenth century and so are the marginal notes, which are in several hands. The script seems to me French, perhaps Eastern French: but I will not commit myself to any definite statement as to its provenance.

In the earlier part of the book three authorities are very largely quoted, viz. the *Ecloga* of Theodulus (ascribed here to John Chrysostom), the

Revelation of the Pseudo-Methodius, and—most interesting of all—the Pseudo-Philo *de Antiquitatibus Biblicis*, the book which, thrice printed in the sixteenth century, eluded the notice of modern scholars until Dr Cohn drew attention to it in a long and interesting article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* a few years ago. Of this legendary Biblical chronicle—that is, of the old Latin version in which alone we possess the extant portion—only three manuscripts are known to exist. The mediaeval Hebrew *Chronicle of Jerahmeel*, translated by Dr M. Gaster, has incorporated large portions of it, but is dependent on the Latin version. The work has left singularly few traces in mediaeval Western literature and seems to have been wholly unknown to the Eastern Church. There is one solitary quotation in the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor of Troyes; but I do not know where else to look for any evidence of use. It was known at Trèves. The Phillipps MS of it—our oldest—came from that city, and two other Trèves MSS, one at Cheltenham and one in the town library of Trèves, contain short extracts from it. It is, therefore, particularly interesting to find some thirty passages from this ancient and curious book quoted (usually in an abridged form) by our thirteenth-century annotator of the *Aurora*. He calls his author Philo throughout, and on one occasion ‘Phylo Alexandrinus disertissimus Iudeorum.’

The quotations are scattered over the whole text of the Pseudo-Philo, and there is no indication that the annotator possessed a more complete form of the book than we do, nor that his copy differed materially from ours.

Another interesting series of notes, by a different hand, still of the thirteenth century, is found among the comments on the Gospel History.

f. 143<sup>b</sup>. ‘Dicitur quod cum herodes occidi iuberet innocentes [quod] mater Nathanahel abscondit eum sub foliis fici iuxta bethleem ne inueniretur ad occidendum, et sic euasit. Unde Ihesus dixit Nonne cum esses sub ficu uidi te?’

The same legend is in Solomon of Başrah’s *Book of the Bee*, ed. Budge, p. 86.

f. 158<sup>b</sup>. On the parable of Dives and Lazarus:—

‘Amonofis dicitur esse nomen diuitis. et nota historiam esse non parabolam.’

The names (hitherto known) given to the rich man are Phinees and Nineve. The Albi MS of the *Inventiones Nominum* printed by me in the JOURNAL<sup>1</sup> gives another name which I was quite unable to read.

<sup>1</sup> *J. T. S.* vol. iv no. 14 pp. 221 ff.

f. 161<sup>b</sup>. On the cleansing of the Temple. The text asks, 'Why did not the buyers and sellers resist our Lord?' The note is:—

'In libris euangeliorum quibus utuntur nazareni legitur quod radii prodierunt ex oculis eius quibus territi fugabantur.'

This is startling. Jerome *in loc.* has a remark which might be the source of the note, but says nothing about the Nazarene Gospel. 'Mihi inter omnia signa quae fecit hoc uidetur mirabilis esse: quod unus homo, et illo tempore contemptibilis . . . Scribis et Pharisaeis contra se saeuientibus, et uidentibus lucra destrui, potuerit ad unius flagelli uerba tantam eicere multitudinem . . . et alia facere quae infinitus non fecisset exercitus. Igneum enim quiddam atque sidereum radiabat ex oculis eius, et diuinitatis maiestas lucebat in facie.'

It is very likely the annotator's own conjecture that Jerome was using the Nazarene Gospel; but there is just a possibility that some other document may have given him grounds for his conjecture.

He is interested in this particular Gospel, for he elsewhere quotes somewhat incorrectly the statements (also found in Jerome on Matthew), that the man with the withered hand was a stone-mason, that Barabbas means 'filius magistri', and that the lintel of the Temple was broken at the Crucifixion.

Other curious notes of his are these:—

(Of those who rose from their graves at the Crucifixion.) 'Sanctus Scarioth unus eorum fuisse perhibetur, qui sepultus est in Ierusalem.'

(On the title on the Cross.) 'ebraice malcus iudeorum. et grece basileos exemosleon. latine rex confitentium.'

For *exemosleon* read *ἐξομολογούντων*. In certain pictures, chiefly early Italian, this inscription is actually found on the title of the Cross.

## V.

In the Leucian Acts of John (in a passage quoted at the second Nicene Council and also preserved in a Vienna MS first published by me in *Apocrypha Anecdota* II) there is the following curious sentence. St John is speaking of the Passion:—

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα οὐδὲ προσέμεινα αὐτοῦ τῷ πάθει, ἀλλ' ἔφυγον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν κλαίων ἐπὶ τῷ συμβεβηκότι. καὶ ὅτε τῷ ἀρουβάτῳ ἀπεκρεμάσθη, ὥρας ἕκτης ἡμερινῆς σκότος ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς γῆς ἐγεγόνει (Bonnet *Act. Apost. Apocr.* II i 199).

The following are the variants for the words underlined:—

τῇ ἀρούβα ἐκρεμάσθη, the Vienna MS.

τῷ στανρῷ, Ottobon. Gr. 27 cent. xv (Acts of the Nicene Council).

τὸ ἄρον ἐβοᾶτο { Vat. Gr. 1181

{ Labbe's *Concilia* 1671. " " "

tolle clamabatur, Latin version of the Acts of the Council by Anastasius Bibliothecarius.

The reading τῆ ἀρουβάρῳ is supported by three manuscripts of the Acts of the Council, one (Taurinensis B. ii 9) being the oldest, of cent. xiii-xiv.

I ventured a conjecture which Bonnet justly describes as 'speciosa sed falsa'.

Hilgenfeld in *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.*, 1897, p. 470, says:—

'Ich finde hier, wohl aus dem alten Hebräer-Evangelium, die אַרְבַּע־עֶשֶׂר, vespera sabbati, dies Veneris, die Παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶ προσάββατον (Mc. xv 42) in deren 6. Stunde τὸ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν (Mc. xv 33).'

In a later publication of the text (*l.c.*, 1900, p. 14) he reads in the text τῆ ἀρουβᾶ and in the note 'ארובא vel ארובחא'.

I am unable to say how far this conjecture met with acceptance: to myself, so long as it was not backed up by evidence of usage, it was unconvincing, and it had entirely disappeared from my mind. Recently, when reading the *Book of the Bee*, composed by Solomon of Basrah in the thirteenth century, and edited with translation by Dr E. A. Wallis Budge in *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (1886), I noticed in ch. xlv 'Of the Passion of our Lord' (p. 99) this passage:—

'As regards the name of 'arūbhā, [i.e. the eve of the Jewish Sabbath], it was not known until this time [that is, the time of the Passion], but that day was called the sixth day. And when the sun became dark, and the divine care also set and abandoned the Israelitish people, then that day was called 'arūbhā.'

The word recalled to me the ἀρουβάρῳ of the Acts of John, and on consulting Bonnet's edition, I found the reference to Hilgenfeld's conjecture.

The passage from Solomon, late as it is, is very valuable as supplying evidence of Christian<sup>1</sup> usage of the word 'arūbhā in the sense of Friday, and thus giving needed and to my mind strong confirmation of Hilgenfeld's brilliant interpretation. The juxtaposition of the word both in the Acts of John and in Solomon with the darkness is accidental but noteworthy.

The passage in the Acts of John gains an excellent sense from this interpretation: 'And when on the Friday He was hung (on the cross), at the sixth hour of the day darkness had come (or came) over all the earth.'

There is, I think, no other instance of an unusual Semitic word in

<sup>1</sup> Instances of Jewish usage of the word in this sense are, as Professor Burkitt informs me, readily producible.

the text of these Acts. Does the occurrence of one here point, as Hilgenfeld thought, to the use of the Hebrew Gospel, or to a common employment of this particular term in the sphere of influence of the writer, whom we call Leucius, and whom we suppose to have lived in Asia Minor?

M. R. JAMES.

### PROLEGOMENA TO THE COMMENTARY OF PELAGIUS ON THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

THE purpose of this paper is twofold. I desire, in the first place, to enumerate all the manuscripts known to me of those works from which alone the commentary of Pelagius on the Pauline Epistles can be (partly or wholly) reconstructed. Secondly, I give a list of *initia* and *finis* of the Pseudo-Jerome's and Pseudo-Primasius's commentaries, in the hope that librarians and scholars willing to help may discover and make known to me other manuscripts of importance. The ultimate object of this work is an edition of Pelagius's commentaries, which has been undertaken for the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*<sup>1</sup>.

(1) Quotations in Augustine:—

*De Peccatorum Meritis* (III 1-6; 9; 21).

*De Gestis Pelagii* (39).

*De Peccato Originali* (23).

For manuscripts of the second and third see the edition by C. F. Urba and J. Zycha (*Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.* vol. xxxiii).

The following manuscripts of the *De Peccatorum Meritis* are known to me:—

Troyes 646 (saec. xii).

St Omer 108 (saec. xii).

St Omer 206 (saec. xii).

Douai 276 (saec. xii).

(2) Quotations in Marius Mercator:—*Commonitorium super nomina Caelestii* (II 1-9) Rome, Bibliotheca Vaticana Palatina, 234 (saec. ix-x).

(3) The Pseudo-Jerome Commentary on thirteen Pauline epistles:—

(a)

Paris, B. N. 1853 (saec. ix).

St Gall 330 (Col. Tit. (?) 1, 2 Tim. (?)

Épinal 6 (saec. ix-x).

(saec. ix).

Munich 13038 (saec. ix).

Rome (fragm.) (saec. vi).

<sup>1</sup> I am already indebted to Dr H. Zimmer's *Pelagius in Ireland*, and Dr S. Hellmann's *Sedulius Scottus*, as also to private communications from Dr Bonnet, Dr Holder, Dr Mercati, Prof. J. E. B. Mayor, Dom Morin, Monsieur H. Omont, and Mr C. H. Turner. The French Minister of Public Instruction kindly caused the MS of Épinal to be sent to Paris for my use.