

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* (*pēthāḥa*) in the first syllable. I suggested that they should '(probably)' have the usual long *ā* (*sēḥāpha*), 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