

W. B. HENRY

NOTES ON *JANNES AND JAMBRES* (P. CHESTER BEATTY XVI)

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 198 (2016) 59–67

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON *JANNES AND JAMBRES* (P. CHESTER BEATTY XVI)¹

The *editio princeps* of P. Chester Beatty XVI, our main source for the book, is due to A. Pietersma (*Apocryphon*). Further fragments of the text have been published by G. Schmelz in *Pap. Congr. XXII* (2001) 1199–1212 (P. Mich. inv. 4925 and P. Heid. inv. G. 1016), and by Pietersma himself in *Fragments* (P. Vindob. inv. G 180 v. and 28249 v.).² Hirschberger gives in an appendix (229–65) an edition and translation including all the known text except the fragments published by Pietersma in the same year, with some worthwhile new supplements;³ and a complete translation into German is included in Pietersma's *Jannes und Jambres* (JSHRZ NF II.4; 2013). The publication of the fragments of an Ethiopic translation recently identified by T. Erho is eagerly awaited.⁴ In the meantime, I attempt in the notes that follow to contribute to the establishment of the text of P. Chester Beatty XVI. The plates in the *editio princeps* include a complete reproduction of the papyrus; the photographs published on the website of the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts (http://csntm.org/Manuscript/View/BP_XVI) have also been helpful. My lemmata are taken from the *editio princeps*, and I have assumed that readers will have a copy of this to refer to.

1ab → 4 (p. 97)

.....] ὃν συνγράφος τοῦ βασι[λ]έως Φα[ραώ

In place of συνγράφος, I read σύντροφος, 'intimate friend'. A trace of the crossbar of τ is visible to the left of the upright; following ρ, ο is closed at the top, with no connection to φ. Cf. BDAG s.v. for parallels and references to secondary literature.

1c+ ↓ 15–19 (p. 113)

15 παρή]γγιλεν δὲ ὁ Ἰάννης πᾶσιν τ[οῖς
τεχ]νίτες οικοδόμοις καὶ ἀρχ[ι]τέκτο-
σιν περιτιχῖν τὸν παράδεισον καὶ [κ]οπ-
ῖν αὐτ[ὸν] ἄφηκεν αὐ[τὸν]].
.....]ατηρ αὐτῶν [

At the end of line 17 and the beginning of line 18, I read and supply [οἰ]κοδο[μητ]ῶν ἄφηκεν αὐ[τὸν], 'and when it had been built he gave it up (to ...)'. The sequence κοδο is written as in line 16. The new reading

¹ I am grateful to Albert Pietersma for his comments, and to Cornelia Römer for editorial suggestions. The following abbreviations may be noted:

Hirschberger	M. Hirschberger, <i>Die Magier des Pharao – Das Buch der Worte von Jannes und Jambres in seinem Kontext</i> , in ead. (ed.), <i>Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur in ihrem interkulturellen Kontext</i> (2012) 213–65.
Maraval	P. Maraval, <i>Fragments grecs du Livre de Jannes et Jambres</i> (Pap. Vindob. 29456 et 29828 Verso), <i>ZPE</i> 25 (1977) 199–207.
Oellacher	H. Oellacher, <i>Papyrus- und Pergamentfragmente aus Wiener und Münchner Beständen</i> , in <i>Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati II</i> (Fontes Ambrosiani 26; 1951) 179–88.
Pietersma, <i>Apocryphon</i>	A. Pietersma, <i>The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres the Magicians: P. Chester Beatty XVI (with New Editions of Papyrus Vindobonensis Greek inv. 29456 + 29828 verso and British Library Cotton Tiberius B. v f. 87)</i> (RGRW 119; 1994).
Pietersma, <i>Fragments</i>	A. Pietersma, <i>Two More Fragments of the Vienna Jannes and Jambres</i> , <i>BASP</i> 49 (2012) 21–9.

² P. Vindob. inv. G 180 v. (Pietersma, *Fragments* 23–4) joins fr. A, giving the first six lines of the column; what used to be line 1 is now line 7. I use the new numbering throughout.

³ The text appears to be based largely on the printed editions rather than on a fresh inspection of the papyri. Thus at 5f → 11, the diplomatic transcript in the ed. pr. (p. 212) correctly gives ἰάμβρη, but a misprint on the facing page at 5abcfp → 23 has produced ἰάμβρω, and Hirschberger 248 prints this with the note 'leg. ἰάμβρη' (n. 228). Similarly at 7i → 2, the ed. pr. has the correct εθητιδ in the diplomatic transcript (p. 254) but on the right-hand page (7abcfij → 15)]εθητιδ[, which is taken over by Hirschberger 256 in the form]εθητιδ[.

⁴ Erho was kind enough to show me the current state of his edition after I had completed my penultimate draft. Some significant advances will be possible in the parts of the text represented in the translation when his work appears.

usefully removes from the text an infringement of the standard rules of word-division, which the scribe should now be assumed to have observed throughout.⁵ ἀφῆκεν ἀϋ[τόν must be followed by a reference to Jambres in the dative if ἀϋτῶν in 19]ατηρ ἀϋτῶν [is to refer to the two brothers, as it surely does: π]ατήρ, suggested in the ed. pr. (122), is a likely supplement. Perhaps Jannes hands over primary responsibility for the παρόδειος to his brother either temporarily or on a permanent basis.

1ef → 4 (p. 125)

] ἔρκι πονηρῶ [. .

‘Wicked enclosure’ is a surprising expression. I should prefer to restore πονηρῶ[v. Then one could have e.g. πονηρῶ[v] | [δὲ νόων (cf. LXX Deut. 28:59 νόους πονηράς), perhaps with Hirschberger’s οὐχ εὐρί]σκω εἴαεν in line 5 (235 n. 77): ‘I do not find healing for serious illnesses.’

1ef ↓ 5 (p. 129)

λίπεται τῆς γυ[ναικὸς αὐτοῦ

At the end, I read not γυ[but ημ[. Both uprights of η are preserved, extending above the crossbar, and the final trace, the lower right-hand arc of a circle, would suit the first stroke of one form of μ; cf. e.g. ημ in line 3. We may supply e.g. ἡμ[αρτηκία, ‘the woman (?) who has sinned’: cf. 2 τῶν αμα [(τῶν ἀμαρ[τωλῶν Hirschberger 235 n. 83), 7–9.

2a → 5–8 (p. 137)

] καὶ εἶδων κ[αὶ αὐτοὶ
τ]ῆν φυτίαν θάλλ[ο]υσαν τοὺς π[ολλοὺς
κλά]δους ἤδη κιάζοντα εἴλαρος [χάριν
. .]αδὲ γενομέν[ο]ς κτλ.

εἴλαρος in line 7 is interpreted as a genitive singular formed from the Homeric word εἴλαρ,⁶ but this curiosity seems unwelcome here.⁷ The form is better taken as an itacistic spelling of ἰλαρός. With this recognized and a few other changes, the following version of these lines may be considered:

] καὶ εἶδῶν [.
τ]ῆν φυτίαν θάλλ[ο]υσαν τοὺς [.
κιε]ζούς ἤδη κιάζοντα, εἴλαρός [ῆν· ἐ-
πέ]ραδὲ γενομέν[η]ς κτλ.

‘... and seeing ... the planting flourishing (and) the ... ivies already providing shade, he (sc. Jannes) was glad; and when evening came’, etc.

A few letters are lost at the ends of lines 5 and 6: e.g. π[ῶ]σαν (too short?) and τοὺς τ[ε] ἐκεῖ may be suitable (giving ‘all the planting’ and ‘and the ivies there’). τοὺς π[ολλοὺς | κλά]δους, printed in the ed. pr., would be in asyndeton, and the supplement at the start of line 7 looks too long for the space. κιε]ζούς will fit, and]αδὲ is at least as likely a reading as]δ. ἐπέ]ραδ (δὲ) γενομένης is a familiar expression: cf. e.g. Ach. Tat. 3.16.1, 5.7.1, 5.14.1, 8.7.2.⁸

⁵ On these, see in general R. Janko (ed.), *Philodemus, On Poems Book 1* (2000) 75–6; also E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (BICS Suppl. 46; ²1987) 17 with n. 96 (where for ‘270’ read ‘220’). There are many more such breaches in the supplements printed in the ed. pr.: cf. e.g. below on 5a+ → 19–20.

⁶ Cf. now the *Diccionario Griego-Español* s.v.

⁷ The ed. pr. (141) writes that ‘the reading is assured, since no amount of phonetic juggling yields any acceptable sense and the word appears to be repeated on line 13’, but see below for the reading in that place.

⁸ Hirschberger 233 n. 56 supplies μί]αδ (sic) δὲ γενομέν[η]ς, but her translation (233), ‘Als der erste Wochentag kam’, appears to assume πρώτης.

12–14

ὥστε ἐκρι[ζ]ωθηῖναι τινὰ[ε
 κλ]άδους ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴ[λ]αρος ἰδὸν ταῦ[τά τε
 ὁ Ἰάννης ἔδραμεν κτλ.

In line 13, where the ed. pr. has τοῦ εἴ[λ]αρος ἰδὸν (cf. on 5–8 above), I read and supply τοῦ παραδίου, and in the preceding part, I believe that what followed τινὰ[ε was κυπα[ρ]ίσσου: ‘so that some cypresses were uprooted from the garden’.]ε is like the second and third sigmas of κυμας (10). As for the following letter, δ, as in the ed. pr., does not seem a probable decipherment, since the cap does not project to the left of the upright. In any case, we expect trees, not mere ‘branches’, to be ‘uprooted’. A cypress was of course prominent in the dream (1c+ → 10 and 13 (p. 107)). After παραδίου, e.g. τότε[ε δέ (‘then’) may be considered. The final trace is the lower part of a thin upright like that of the first letter of την in the line below. υ is possible but not suggested: there is no evidence of a second stroke. The preceding trace would suit α, but ο is also possible: there is no trace of a tail.

3abce → (pp. 150–51) and ↓ (pp. 166–7)

The positions of two of the smaller fragments in relation to 3ab are fixed by overlaps with P. Vindob. fr. B (edition: Pietersma, *Apocryphon* 269). 3e belongs at the top of the leaf, and 3c in a gap between lines 4 and 5 where the conservator has incorrectly joined two fragments that belong together but at a distance from one another.⁹ To judge by the appearance of the fragments, 3c is to be placed vertically below 3e. The extent of the gap below 3c is unknown for the moment. It is unlikely to be very great.

I begin with the ↓ side. The ed. pr. gives for 3ab → 21 – ↓ 4 the following text:

παρ]εκάλε[εν αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν μητέρα
 ↓ 1 αὐτοῦ μὴ αὐτὸν λυπ[εῖν· μνη]στήτη δὲ ὅτι
 ἐκινδύ]νευεν ἐν τῷ ηματι
]ε οὖν περὶ χρήματα
] πρὸς ἡμῶν ἐτοίμασεν

The supplements are drawn for the most part from P. Vindob. fr. B. Here is the lower half of the column:¹⁰

...] Εἰοάννης τὸν ἀδελ[φὸν
 ...] παρεκάλεσεν αὐτὸν [.....
 ... α]ὐτοῦ μὴ αὐτὸν λυπ[εῖν
 15 ... ὅ]τι ἐκινδύνευεν [.....
 ...]αι ὑπ’ αὐτῆς μὴ α[.....
 ...] χρήματα καὶ ἐπ[.....
 ...] ἡμῶν ἐτοίμασ[ον
 ... ἥ]δη γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμ[α
 20 ... ἀρ]γούμαι ὅτι ση[μεῖα
 ... ὀ]λίγον διαπν[.....
 ... το]ῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ
 ...] κ εἶπεν μ[.....
 foot

⁹ For other incorrect joins of this kind, cf. the ed. pr., pp. 108 (1d), 208 (5f). Cf. also below on 4a+ → (p. 175). With 3c inserted, the divergence between the two papyri discussed on p. 171 of the ed. pr. is eliminated.

¹⁰ For the sake of clarity, I have taken out most of the supplements printed by Pietersma. In 17, Oellacher 186 gives ἐπ[at the end, and I have followed him, but dotted the π. In 21, ὀ]λίγον (preceded by καί) is proposed by Hirschberger 239 n. 124; after it, Oellacher’s διὰ πν[εύματος is one possibility (187), but Hirschberger’s διαπν[έων (or another part of the verb) is attractive. In 23, Oellacher 187 gives ο]ὐκ εἶπεν μ[. The crossbar at the start is rather low for the right-hand side of υ, but ε (Maraval 202) does not seem possible in this context: the other letters all appear certain. If the text is sound, one may think of supplying e.g. ο]ὐκ εἶπεν μ[αταίως, ‘did not speak in vain’.

P. Vindob. fr. A

top
 .. γιγ]νόσκειν μητ[c. 12 letters
]με μῖναι ἐν τρι[c. 11
]λ ἄγων γ ἔτη co[c. 12
]ας καὶ ἐπιτῆν[αι c. 11
 5] ὁμολογήσας δ[ε c. 11
 ... ο]ῦν κύλλου μ[c. 12

P. Chester Beatty 4a+ →

5] [c. 19 letters
] εἶπεν [c. 17
 β]ασιλέα [c. 17
 8] ἄγων [c. 17
 8a
 8b
 9 μ]ηκέτ[ι οῦ]γ κύλλ[ου c. 13

It is unclear to what extent P. Vindob. fr. A 1–2 diverged from the text given in P. Chester Beatty: both papyri are very fragmentary in the relevant lines. Still, there is no longer any reason to suppose that the divergent part stretched over more than two lines. If the proposed arrangement is correct, there will also be two lines missing between P. Chester Beatty 4a+ ↓ 8 and 9 (p. 185).

2 καὶ μαθηθεῖς τὸ ζῶμα

μαθηθεῖς is associated with μαδάω in the ed. pr. (177–8), but it is easier to take it as the aorist participle passive of μαδίζω, with η for ι as commonly (Gignac, *Grammar* i 235–9).¹³

10 α]ῦτῆς¹⁴ μ[ήπ]οτε πις[ρανθῆς

The first trace suggests the right-hand side of η. We appear then to have here the vocative μ]ήτηρ that Pietersma (Fragments 24) supplies in the preceding line. μ[at the end of fr. A 6 of the Vienna papyrus (Pietersma *ibid.*) may represent instead e.g. μ[ηδέ.

13 . .]επλάγην δὲ καὶ ἴ[άμ]βρ[η τῶ ἀδελφῶ μου

At the start, I read and supply ἐν]επιτάμην (or ἐπ]επιτάμην), with -τιλ- for -τειλ-, ‘I gave orders’. Cf. LSJ s.vv. ἐντέλλω I, ἐπιτέλλω (A).

The new reading may shed some light on the preceding sentence. Jannes instructed his brother too to care for their mother faithfully (14 προ]ρέχιν κοι πιςτω).¹⁵ We should then expect Jannes to have indicated in what precedes that he will care for their mother. Here is the text of 4a+ → 11–12 as printed in the ed. pr.:

.]ς καθ’ ἡμέραν δὲ [ἀποτελῶ] ἄνθρ(ωπ)ο[ν ἐε
 το]ῦ γινώσκιν τὰ κα[τεγκλή]ματα μοι

The text on the right is given by fragment i, which the ed. pr. ‘placed with some hesitation’ (177). I should prefer to take it out. There is no evidence of fibre continuity, and the Greek is problematic!¹⁶ ἐε as subject of the articular infinitive should not precede the article, and the dative μοι with the substantive τὰ κα[τεγκλή]ματα seems hard to parallel. LSJ records κατέγκλημα only from Eustathius (*Il.* p. 922.46).¹⁷

With 4i removed, I suggest the following reconstruction, in which I have placed the parts given by the Vienna fragment (8–9) between half-brackets:

.]ς καθ’ ἡμέραν δὲ [ἀποτελῶ πρό]ς ἐε
 το]ῦ γινώσκιν τὰ κα[τεπ]είγοντα πάντα

¹³ Hirschberger 240 has μαδιθεῖς in the text but comments ‘leg. μαθηθεῖς’ (n. 240).

¹⁴ Pietersma gives the opening of the line as .] , τη , in Fragments (24).

¹⁵ Cf. BDAG s.v. προρέχω 1. The ed. pr. (176) takes the verb in the sense ‘heed’, but this seems less suitable in the context as now understood. P. Vind. fr. A 10–11 had a longer text, perhaps προνοεῖσθαί κοι, προρέχιν κοι πιςτω, as suggested by C. Römer in an unpublished paper: we would expect the genitive with προνοεῖσθαί, but κοι may be due to the influence of προρέχιν κοι. Maraval’s προκλεισθαί (201) is wrongly divided: cf. above on 1c+ ↓ 15–19 (p. 113).

¹⁶ Cf. P. W. van der Horst, *JSJ* 25 (1994) 330.

¹⁷ The *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* adds a fourth-century example, Sopat. Rh. VIII 229.17 Walz, but C there has ἀντέγκλημα: cf. D. Innes and M. Winterbottom, *Sopatros the Rhetor: Studies in the Text of the Διαίρεσις Ζητημάτων* (BICS Suppl. 48; 1988) 175.

‘I shall send to you daily to find out all your pressing needs.’ This seems better suited to the context: Jannes will attend to his mother’s needs while he is away, and he has ordered Jambres too to look after her. πρό[ε], supplied by Pietersma in the Vienna fragment, can now be accommodated in the Beatty text.

In the corresponding part of the Vienna fragment (7–9), Pietersma (Fragments) gives the following:

καθ
ημεραν] δε αποτελο προ[ε ανθρωπον ως
τε εξετ]ασε και σε τα κατεγ[κληματα μοι

If the above suggestions are accepted, we may substitute e.g.

καθ’ ή-
μέραν] δὲ ἀποτελῶ πρό[ε σε τοῦ παρα-
σκευ]άσε καὶ ἐν τὰ κατεπ[είγοντα

‘I shall send to you daily so that you too can provide your pressing needs.’

The reference to κατεγκλήματα here was the only direct textual evidence for a trial.¹⁸ If I am right to substitute κατεπείγοντα, it is no longer necessary to suppose that such a trial formed part of the narrative.

15–16

συνέ[χων] τὰ [δάκρυα· ἐξελθού-
της δὲ χ]ηδὸν ἄφ[ηκεν τὰ] δρ[α]κρυα

The beginning of the word ending]ηδον in line 16 is preserved only in the Vienna papyrus, fr. A 13 (Pietersma, Fragments 24), where, following ἐξελθούσης δὲ αὐτῆς, we read π . δ .¹⁹ A suitable adverb is πιδακηδόν, ‘like a spring’; the Vienna papyrus will have spelt it itacistically, π[ε]τ[ι]δ[α]κ[η]δόν. Cf. the familiar use of κρουνηδόν in connection with tears, e.g. Thessal. *De virtutibus herbarum*²⁰ 1 proem. 19 (51.16 Friedrich) κρουνηδόν μοι τῶν δακρύων φερομένων. The word is new but regularly formed: cf. e.g. ἐλικηδόν, κλιμακηδόν, πινακηδόν, χυδακηδόν. The Beatty papyrus will then have divided after ἐξελθούσης, with δὲ πιδακ]ηδόν at the start of line 16.²¹

16–18

καὶ
περιέλαβεν τ]οὺς φ[ίλους] ἑαυτοῦ, π[άντα]
παρακαλέσ[α]

The supplements are largely taken from P. Vindob. fr. A 14–15. Pietersma (Fragments 24) prints the following in the relevant part:²²

και περ[ι]ε[λ]α[βεν]
φιλουσ αυτου{c}, παντασ παρακαλεσ[α]

¹⁸ Cf. n. 12 above on P. Vind. fr. A 3 αγω.

¹⁹ So rightly Maraval 201; Oellacher 186 had read π . δ[ι], while Pietersma, *Apocryphon* 273, gives π . δ[ι]. See Pietersma’s photographs (*Apocryphon* 300; Fragments 29), or the digital images available on the website of the papyrus collection of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/RZ00004001>. Pietersma prints π[α]ρ[α]χ[ε]ιδόν at 13–14 in Fragments (deemed ‘not impossible, but uncertain at best’ in *Apocryphon* 180 (15–16 n.)), but the photographs confirm Maraval’s reading.

²⁰ On the date of this text, see most recently I. S. Moyer, A Revised Astronomical Dating of Thessalus’ *De virtutibus herbarum*, in B. Holmes and K.-D. Fischer (edd.), *The Frontiers of Ancient Science: Essays in Honor of Heinrich von Staden* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 338; 2015) 437–49, who argues that it ‘was composed between the middle of the first century A. D. and the early third century A. D., with dates in the second century most probable’ (437).

²¹] δρ[α]κρυα at the end is a curious corruption; cf. perhaps Κρυπρι[ε] for Κύπρι in the Antinoë Theocritus at 1.101 (A fol. 2 verso; A. S. Hunt and J. Johnson, *Two Theocritus Papyri* (1930) 30).

²² I have restored the sublinear dots and comma from the version in *Apocryphon* 273.

In two places, I read the papyrus differently. In line 15, Oellacher 186 rightly transcribes φίλου ἑαυτοῦ: the ε is certain. We have then simply -ου -ουc in place of -ουc -ου. As for the main verb, editors have offered various readings at the end of line 14. Oellacher 186 has ἐπερχ[, while Maraval 201 more cautiously reads .περ . [. Some progress is possible here. The new digital image shows that Oellacher and Maraval were right to detect ink between και and πε. But the letter in question is not ε, but α, formed like that in the preceding και: both the lower end of the loop and the oblique tail are clearly recognizable. Then after the clear πε we have a series of letter-tops: a trace suiting the upper left-hand corner of c; a damaged patch with no ink preserved;²³ the upper part of an upright with a crossbar emerging from its top on the right; touching the right-hand end of the crossbar, the upper part of another upright, with a short blank space to its right; and finally a trace suiting the top of an oblique descending precipitously from left to right. I suggest reading and supplying ἀπέετιλ[ε, τοῦc (for ἀπέετειλε, τοῦc) and taking out the comma after ἑαυτοῦ: ‘he sent out, exhorting all his friends’ etc. The Vienna papyrus turns out to have room for the article given in the Chester Beatty papyrus after all. The two papyri are here in full agreement except for a minor confusion in relation to the endings in P. Vindob. fr. A 15.

18–19

] προν[οεῖcθ]αι αιcθ . . τῆ[c μη-
 τρὸc αὐτοῦ]

In 18, I read and supply] πρόν[οιαν] ποιεῖcθαι τῆ[c,²⁴ ‘to show care for (his mother)’. Cf. for this idiom LSJ s.v. πρόνοια II.1, BDAG s.v. πρόνοια B. Similarly in the Vienna papyrus, we may now supply at fr. A 15–16 παρακαλέc[αc πρόνοιαν ποι]ῖcθαι.

20–21

λαβῶ[v τὴν βί-
 βλον εἰπ]εν δ[ῆ τῶ Ἰάμβ]ρη

P. Vindob. fr. A is reported as having at the start of line 18 βιβλον ειπε δη: only Pietersma, *Apocryphon* 273 dots the η. But the new image shows clearly not δη but δαι (for δέ). So δ[έ is to be supplied in P. Chester Beatty; the sentence boundary falls before εἰπ]εν, not before λαβῶ[v.

5a+ → 1–2 (p. 213)

. ἄλλου]c νεκροῦc εἶδον καὶ οὐδῖc
 ἦν παραπλήcιοc] σοί, τέκνον, ἐνταῦ[θ]α ἦcο

ηcο at the end of line 2 will represent ἦ col[φ, e.g. ἦ col[φία ἦ κάλλει, (e.g. there is no one similar) ‘to you here, child, in either wisdom (or beauty)’. Jannes was of course famous for his wisdom: cf. e.g. lines 6–7 of the Latin text in London, BL, Cotton Tiberius B V, part I, f. 87r (Pietersma, *Apocryphon* 280), ‘sapientior I eram omniu(m) sapientium magorum’. The poetic form ἦcο would not be expected to appear in a text of this kind: cf. above on 2a → 7, 13.

19–20

ἀ]νοῖξασ τὰ β[ιβλία ὑπὸ] τῆc μηλόεc ἐποίη[c-
 ε]ν νεκρομαντ[είαν]

I read and supply

ἀ]νοῖξασ τὰc [βίβλους] τῆc μαγίαc ἐποίη[cεν
 νεκρομαντ[είαν]

²³ There is no reason to suppose that this area was originally blank. Note the damage hereabouts in the preceding line.

²⁴ εἰcθ was already read by Pietersma in *Fragments* (25), where he prints {εἰcθ . } in place of his earlier reading αιcθ . .

μαγιας in line 19 is clear. The ed. pr. considered τὰς [βίβλους as an alternative to τὰ βιβλία, judging it ‘not impossible but rather long’ (219), but with ὑπὸ] removed from the text, the lacuna is of the right length to accommodate it; in any case, β[does not seem an acceptable reading. In ἐποίη[σεν, ε is added above the line to replace a spoilt ε written on the line, and ι is a supralinear insertion. There is room for the remainder of the verb in the gap at the end; ἐποίη[σεν] would be incorrectly divided.²⁵ At the start of line 20, a perpendicular left-hand margin is produced by taking the first letter-trace on the line (an upright) to represent the ν at the start of the line. The complete ν above and to the right of it belongs rather to the first word of line 19. As for the termination, [ιαν] seems a better fit than [ειαν].

The new reading in line 19 is of some interest. With ‘under the apple-tree’ gone and the books ‘of magic’ in its place, the Greek now corresponds closely to the first two lines of the Latin (Pietersma, *Apocryphon* 280), ‘Ap(er)uit Mambres libros magicos fratris sui | Iannis (et) fecit necromantiam’.

6a+ ↓ 24 (p. 233)

I suggest e.g. ἀποθα[ν]ῖν δὲ οὐκ ἀφίεται ἡμῖν | [ἀπόνως, ἀλλὰ κτλ. (‘it is not conceded to us to die painlessly, but ...’). The infinitive is likelier than νῖν for νῶν (so the ed. pr.): a contrast of this kind (with some earlier time?) seems out of place.

26

ἀπ]οθανοῦμεθα

In the middle, νομ is clear (as in 23). The initial trace is compatible with ν (the second upright, joined from the left at the foot). We may supply e.g. ἐπιλα]γθανόμεθα, ‘we forget’ (of the dead).

7a+ ↓ 1–4 (p. 247)

τη[. . .] οἱ προσκυν[οῦμενοι καὶ οἱ προσ-
κυνή[σ]αντες τοῖς εἰδώ[λοις καὶ χωνευτοῖς καὶ
γλυπτ[οῖς] {ε}ώς γενομέ[νοις θεοῖς] ἀπό-
λιαν σὺν τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀ[ύ]των

At the start of line 3, I read and supply συμπτ[ώ]σεως γενομέ[νης, ‘when collapse occurs’. The idols collapse and their worshippers are ruined along with them (3–4). Cf. LSJ and the Revised Supplement s.v. κύπτωσις I. The end of line 2 is now better left unsupplemented.

22–3

. . .]χωροῦνται ἀπὸ το[
. . .]λαιγὲν σὺν δὲ ὅσον δι[

At the start of 22, τι]μωροῦνται, ‘are punished’, of the sinners, is likely both as a reading and as sense. Then at the start of the next line we have not]λαιγ but]λαβῖν, ‘take’. For the form of the cursive β, cf. e.g. 25. Its upright extends down from the tail of α, as at 6a+ ↓ 23 (p. 233); its right-hand side, with the distinctive leftward curve at the top, has ι growing out of it. At the end of the line, . [(an ascending oblique) is close to the upright and will belong to the same letter; we may restore the familiar phrase ὅσον δύ[νασαι, ‘so far as you are able’.

8b ↓ 3 (p. 259)

I read not ἄλογωνζωη (so the ed. pr.) but]αλογωνζωω[, i.e.] ἀλόγων ζώω[v, ‘irrational animals’. Perhaps sinners (or certain sinners) were compared to irrational beasts.

W. B. Henry, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London
w_b_henry@yahoo.co.uk

²⁵ Cf. on 1c+ ↓ 15–19 above.