Pachomios and the Testament of Isaac. As to the Vision of Ezra, besides being influenced by the Apocalypse of Paul, it has a model in an Ur-Ezra Apocalypse, now lost, which also was the model of the Greek Apocalypse of Ezra. Finally, it should be remarked that more texts are discussed than the tours of hell proper, e.g. the Apocalypse and the Testament of Abraham, 2 and 3 Baruch, 1, 2 and 3 Enoch, the Hekhalot Literature, Lucian, and the Qumran Pesharim.

This is a courageous study in a very thorny field. Still, much more has to be done: more texts should be compared (how much materials are hidden in the libraries of East Europe?), more points of comparison should be studied, and more previous studies should be used. Among these I should like to mention: E. NORDEN, P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI, Leipzig 1927; M. ERBETTA, Gli apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento, Torino 1966-1981; P. DINZELBACHER, Die Jenseitsbrücke im Mittelalter, Wien 1973 (for p.163), and P. COURCELLE, "Le thème littéraire du bourbier dans la littérature latine", Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 1973, pp. 273-289 (for pp. 107-108, 111, 115).

A. HILHORST


The edition reviewed here contains the Latin text of the Apocalypse of Ezra, otherwise known as 4 Ezra 3-14 and hereinafter abbreviated as 4 Ezra. This edition is intended for use in the preparation of the new edition of the Apocalypse of Ezra in the Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller. There one column will contain a German translation of this text. This book contains an introduction (p. 9-22), the text with critical apparatus (p. 23-90), an appendix with citations from 4 Ezra in later literature and the prologue to the work in MS L (p. 91-100), and a grammatical index prepared by G. MUSSIES (p. 101-108).

The content of the introduction can be summarized as follows: the Apocalypse of Ezra seems to have been written in Hebrew, although there are also traces of Aramaic (p. 11). The original text has been lost, as has also the Greek translation. There are extant, however, various translations based on the Greek translation. One of these is the Latin 4 Ezra. Comparison with other translations, especially the Syriac, demonstrates that the Latin translation is not entirely accurate (the evidence on p. 12, however, rather points to an accurate translation of an inferior Vorlage). The various MSS are described (on p. 13 it is confusingly stated that S refers to the copyist of S. In reality, S refers to the copyist, S+ to his self-
corrections, and S+ to the corrections by a different corrector. The same applies to MS A on p. 14) and the stemma is given (in which the siglum of MS A is missing). Then the citations from, allusions to and parallels with 4 Ezra in other writings are discussed. Among other matters it is demonstrated that there is a relationship in vocabulary with the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch and with the Antiquitates Biblicae of Ps. Philo, although these works are not dependent on 4 Ezra. Finally, the authorship and the time and place of origin of the work, i.e. the original Semitic text, are treated. Both the thematic and the literary unity point to a single author. The work is dated to 100 A.D.; the place of origin is difficult to determine: a place where Hebrew was understood, thus somewhere in the East.

From this summary it will appear that various issues are presented which are not particularly relevant to the Latin translation. On the other hand, certain questions remain unanswered. Where and when did the Latin translation originate? This is relevant to the linguistic character, and thus the interpretation, of the text. What earlier editions are there of the Latin 4 Ezra, and what are their characteristics and their value? How much is new in Klijn’s edition? (Only the Preface refers to this: ‘‘In der Wiedergabe des Textes und des kritischen Apparates ist im allgemeinen die Ausgabe von Violet zugrunde gelegt. An mehreren Stellen ist der Text geändert, und die von ihm benutzen Handschriften sind durch P und E ergänzt’’). One misses a treatment of the relationship within the two groups, Φ (the French branch) and Ψ (the Spanish branch), a discussion of the criteria for the constitution of the text, and a justification of the order in which the MSS are cited. In the discussion of the MSS it would have been useful to name the other works which they contain. For example, MS G is one of the most important sources for Ps. Methodius, a work whose problems show striking parallels with those of 4 Ezra.

We arrive at the discussion of the text. The editor has worked eclectically: from the two main groups he sometimes chooses a reading from Φ, and sometimes, though less often, from Ψ. This is a proper procedure, since even though Ψ sometimes has the better text (in chapter 3 e.g.: 4 quando, plasmasti, orbi; 14 temporum finem / tempora finis; 31 derelinqui), Φ is more often to be preferred. In Ψ there appears to be a tendency to bring the linguistic form into conformity with classical norms, a tendency which we meet also in some other vulgar texts in parts of the manuscript transmission (see my dissertation, Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri, Groningen 1984, note 480). Since this tendency, as far as I can see, has not previously been written about—Klijn does not mention it either—it may be illustrated here with a few examples. In the following list one finds first the reading from (a part of) Φ, then from (a part of) Ψ:

3,21 baiolans: baiulans
13,4 detenebam: detinui