THE ACTS OF TITUS AND THE ACTS OF PAUL.

In my first series of *Apocrypha Anecdotae* (1893, p. 55) I drew attention to a possible source of information with regard to the *Acta Pauli*, namely the Acts of Titus ascribed to Zenas 'the lawyer'. What I wrote then may as well be quoted by way of preface to the present article.

'The fullest form of this book known to me is an epitome contained in *Cod. Par. Gr.* 548, f. 192-196, which I read, but did not copy, in 1890. The Menaea give a much shorter analysis, and this latter was the only material accessible to Lipsius (iii 401). Among the facts not given in the Menaea are these: that Paul when preaching at Damascus cast a devil out of Aphphia, the wife of the governor (another noble matron, be it noted); that Titus accompanied Paul on the first missionary journey, and that at Ephesus Paul fought (πέμπτοις) with a lion. In this last clause undoubted use of the Acts of Paul is made; and it is surely a most probable conjecture—if not something more—that the cure of Aphphia (who has no connexion with Titus) was described in the lost book as well. After this incident at Ephesus, the story takes us to Crete, and from that point is either pure fiction or (founded on) local legend.'

Within the last few weeks I have had an opportunity (kindly procured for me by M. Omont) of examining the Paris MS above mentioned, and of copying out the portion of the text which precedes the Cretan matter. This text I now present for the edification of students of the *Acta Pauli*. There can be no doubt that it is in part drawn from that work and that it throws some fragmentary light upon the earlier episodes. It has also, as I think, the most destructive effect upon the conjectures which I advanced in a late number of the *Journal*.

The manuscript, I will just note, is of the eleventh century and is written in a fine sloping minuscule with semi-uncial headings.

εἴ ὁ τῆς ἀγίου ἀποστόλου Τίτου ἐκκλησίου γνωμάνων Κρήτης

πόλεως Γορτύνης μαθητοῦ τοῦ ἀγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου.

1 As will be seen, those words 'the governor' are not warranted by the Greek text.

2 *J. T. S.* January 1905, p. 244.
Ζηράς ο νομικός ουτισι μέμνηται ο δύο απόστολοι Παύλου οίτου ισινθ-
γραφεν τον βιον αυτού την ὑπάθους ξυντος ουτος. Τίτους ο αγιώτατοι εἰς
Μινώος τοιβα Μερήτης κατήγορε τον γένος ποθόν δὲ το το 'Ομήρου και
τῶν λοιπῶν φί/193/λογόσων ποιήματα τα και δράματα εἰκοσαετής
γεγονός δικοῦ φώνης λεγομένης ουτος. Τίτες, ἐνεπεδὴν «σε δε», ἐκδημοῦ
και την ψυχήν σου σώσα, ου γὰρ ἀφελήσῃ σε ἡ παιδεία αὕτη. Ἡττε τα
βουλόμενοι τῆς αὕτης ἀκούσαι φώνης, ἡδὲ γὰρ τῶν τας ἔξ ἀγαλμάτων διὰ
φώνης διδομένων πλάνως, ἓτσιγχων ἐτί ἐννέκρον, δὲ δράματος προσε-
τάχθη τῆς τῶν Β'υρώνικιον ἀναγγέλων' δὲ καὶ λαβών τὴν 'Ησίων
βίβλον εὑρέν ὦτως περιέχον, Ἠγεμονίζοντες πρὸς με νῦν τολλα
'Ισραήλ σώζεται ὄποι κυρίον σωτηρίαν αἰῶνοι, καὶ τὰ ἄξια.

Ὁ οὖν ἄνθυπατος Κρήτης οἱ καὶ θεϊος τοῦ ἄγιον Τίτου ἀκούσας την τοῦ
δεσπότου Χριστοῦ σωτηρίαν γέννησιν τα ταύτας καὶ τὰς θαματουργίας
δὲ τον Ἱεροσόλυμοι καὶ ἐτέρως τοῖς ἐτέλει, συμβούλων ποιήσας μετὰ τῶν
πρῶτων Κρήτης, ἀπέστειλεν Τίτον μὲ ἐτέρων τοὺς Ἰεροσολύμοις ὡς λόγον
ὄντα ἀκούσαι τα καὶ λαλῆσαι καὶ διδάξαι τα ὁμοί μέλλει θεάσασθαι.

"Οὕτως παραγεγένομεν καὶ θεασάμενος καὶ προσκυνήσας τοῦ δεσποτῆς Ἰερου-
πάντα τὰ θαμασία αὐτοῦ θαύματος" εἶθεν τα καὶ τὰ σωτηρία τοῦ δεσποτῆς
πάθη, τὴν ταφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν καὶ τὴν θείαν ἀνάληψιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ παπαγώ
τυγματος εἰς τοὺς θείους ἀποστόλους ἐπισημάνων καὶ ἐπίστευσαν καὶ συνη-
ρμοθὴ τοὺς ἐκατον εἰκόνας καὶ τοὺς τραγολογία τοὺς πινετὶ/193/β/ου τῷ
κυρίῳ διὰ τῆς τοῦ κορυφαίου Πέτρου διδασκαλίας, καθὼς καὶ γέγρασσο ὁ Ἐρ.
Κρήτης καὶ 'Αραβεύς πρὸς χρόνος τα ὑπήρχεν καὶ ξένω τοῦ τυγματε ἀεὶ μετὰ
δὲ ἐτή τρία προσέτισαν τῃ πίστῃ ἀνδρῶς πνεύμασινοι καὶ μετὰ ἐτή
dιὸ τοῦ χειλοῦθερου καὶ παραπεπειλουτα τα μὴ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ ὕστερα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ
καὶ προσόπων των ἱερών αὐτούς Γαμαλήλα δομοιδιάκονος
ἐκκύκλωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν βοηθίαν. Ἐπετατεύχος δὲ γεγονότος χρόνον Στέφανον
ἀδιάβασθι οθὲν τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἄγιον Παῦλον τελεύταυ εἰς Δαμασκόν, ἤμοι τὴν
ὑπόλοιπος καὶ ἡ ἀνάβλεψις καὶ κρῆτης πρώτων τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν
Δαμασκῇ, καὶ Ἀφήλια γυναῖκα Χρυσιτίτου διαμοιωθεὶς ὁ Παύλος ὁ ἀόγατος καὶ
καὶ εἰς κηρυκείαν τοῦ ὑπὸν ἤμερων τῇ ἱσόβιλῳ τοῦ 'Απόλλωνος κατεβάλεν". εἰτα εἰς
'Ιεροσόλυμα παραγίνεται καὶ ἄθικς ἐς Καπαδόκια καὶ χειροσπάντα τὸν Αὔγος τοῦ
ἀγὼν παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἀποστέλλεται μετὰ Παύλου διδασκάνων καὶ
χειροτονεῖν ὑπὸ ἔκατον Παύλου δοκιμάσθη καταλαβόντες δὲ 'Αντιδεόσιν εἰδωρ
Βαρνάβαν τὸν ὑπὸν Παγχάρων ἐς ἤγερεν τὸ Παύλος. Ὠ δὲ 'Ηρώδης ο λετράχης
dὲ ἐναλίκησεν 'Ιακώβου τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρα. μετὰ τοῦτο ἐρχομένη εἰς
Σαλέλκειαν καὶ Κύπαρι καὶ Πάφον κάκευσε εἰς Παρθίαν τῆς Παμφυλίας, καὶ Παλίν εἰς
Ἔρταν ἐς 'Αβί/194/ταύχειαν ἐς Πισιδίαν, καὶ εἰς Ἰκόνιον εἰς τὸν ὄρκον 'Ονυσφόρου ἐφιπτε προείρετον τοῦ Τίτου το ἀοτὰ τὸν Παύλον,
We need not dwell much upon the course of events recorded in these Acts before the moment of Paul's conversion. Titus, like Eutropius of Sintes, Martial of Limoges, Ursinus of Bourges, and others, is represented as having witnessed the events of our Lord's ministry and passion: probably he was thought of as one of the Greeks who desired to see Jesus (John xii). The events of the early chapters of the canonical Acts are briefly narrated, with a chronology whose source I do not know.

Between Pentecost and the conversion of the 5,000, three years are said to have elapsed, and then (as it seems) two more before the healing of the lame man and the persecution of the Apostles, which is entirely out of harmony with the canonical narrative. After seven years (more?)
comes the stoning of Stephen, and then the conversion of Paul. We now approach the more interesting part of our text: a new source begins to be used. Paul 'preached the word of Christ first in Damascus and healed Aphphia the wife of Chrysippus, who was possessed of a devil: and, fasting for seven days, he cast down the idol of Apollo'. Then he went to Jerusalem, and thence to Caesarea (Acts ix 26, 30). Titus was ordained by the Apostles and commissioned to teach and ordain with Paul. 'They went to Antioch and there found Barnabas the son of Pancharas, whom Paul raised.' Herod killed James the brother of John with the sword. Then follows the first Missionary Journey. They went to Seleucia, Cyprus, Perga, Antioch of Pisidia, 'and to Iconium to the house of Onesiphorus whom Titus informed beforehand concerning Paul, since he (Titus) was Paul's precursor in every city'. Thence to Lystra and Derbe. Here a sentence of general import to the effect that Titus was Paul's partner in preaching and suffering, and that both enlightened the unbelievers by signs and wonders as is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. At this point we see evident signs that our text is an epitome of a larger one. Two detached sentences occur, one—somewhat corrupt—mentions Paul's deliverance at Philippi by the earthquakes. The other refers to the reading Τίριον or Τίριον Ἰωάννον in Acts xviii 7. 'Some write Τίριον Ἰωάννον, others Τίριον ψαλτοῦ.' This latter reading (ψαλτοῦ) does not seem to be found in any other authority.

The collocation of the two sentences seems to shew that the original text contained some survey of the events of Acts xvi–xviii.

We now revert to the Cretan legend. Paul and Titus come to Crete and are well received by the governor Rustillus (Rutilius?) 'who is the uncle of Titus'. Paul raises his son. After three months he sends them away and himself goes to Rome, where, in accordance with a prediction of Titus, he attains honour, and is made consul. The Jews, it is obscurely said, are unable to do more than dispute verbally with the Apostles. They are afraid of attempting violent measures because of Titus's connexion with Rustillus. On their departure from Crete the two Apostles went to Asia, and to Ephesus. The visit to Crete must therefore be placed either at Acts xviii 22, 23, or at xix 1. At Ephesus twelve thousand people were converted by Paul's teaching; and he was exposed to a lion in the amphitheatre.

After this the epitomizer's hand reappears. In two short paragraphs we are told that the second Epistle to the Corinthians (of the Corinthians, says the text, but the meaning seems to me evident) was brought by Titus, Timothy, and Erastus; then that Titus, Timothy, and Luke remained with Paul until his martyrdom under Nero: that they then returned to Greece where Luke was established, and that Timothy
departed to Ephesus, and Titus to Crete. The portion of the Acts which I have not transcribed tells of the welcome accorded to him there, of the destruction of idols and erection of Christian churches, and of the long episcopate and peaceful death of the hero at an advanced age. Some details in it may very probably be of interest to investigators of the Christian antiquities of Crete, but I satisfied myself that for the elucidation of the Acts of Paul nothing further could be gained from it.

It is undeniable, however, that the text here printed has several points of contact with these Acts. Let us take in their order the statements concerning Paul which may, broadly speaking, be termed apocryphal.

1. "Paul preached the word of Christ first in Damascus, and healed Aphphia, the wife of Chrysippus, who was vexed with a demon, and, keeping a fast for seven days, he cast down the idol of Apollo."

In the Acts of Paul (Schmidt, p. 62) there is a fragmentary episode, headed "When he was gone out of Sidon and would go to Tyros:" which relates a cure of a demoniac. The names of the people concerned are Chrysippus and Αμφίων. This is evidently the original of our sentence. The Coptic translator has corrupted the name of Αφφια.

Similarly in the pages immediately preceding (Schmidt, 58–62) there is the story of an occurrence at Sidon where Paul and others are shut up in the temple of Apollo. Paul fasts for three days and eventually the image of the god and part of the temple fall.

2. "Then he goes to Jerusalem and then to Caesarea and the holy Titus is ordained by the Apostles and sent forth with Paul to teach and ordain whomsoever Paul should approve, and arriving at Antioch they found Barnabas the son of Panchares whom Paul raised."

The first extant episode in the Acts of Paul (p. 24 &c.) tells of the raising of the (nameless) son of Anchares and Phila at Antioch. The Coptic translator has, I suppose, mistaken the initial Π of Παγγάρις for the Coptic article. In the name Barnabas, given to the son, I scent a confusion. In Acts xi 25 Barnabas the Levite went out to Tarsus to seek Saul καὶ σὺρων ἡγαγεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. Does it not seem probable that the epitomizer of the Acts of Titus had before him a mention of the arrival of Barnabas to join the party and that the son of Panchares was nameless, as he is in the Acts of Paul?

3. "(They came) to Iconium to the house of Onesiphorus whom Titus informed beforehand of what concerned Paul since he (Titus) was the one who preceded Paul in every city."

This is clearly dependent on the Acts of Paul and Thecla (Schmidt, p. 28: Lipsius § 2, p. 237) ἅγγασατο γὰρ αὐτῷ Τίτος ποιησάτω ἄνιν τῇ ἀλφῇ Ἰ Παύλος. The other clause saying that Titus was Paul's bar-
binger is either from another part of the Acts of Paul or is the author's own invention.

4. 'And having gone forth from Crete they came into Asia, and in Ephesus at the teaching of the holy Paul twelve thousand believed: here also the Apostle fought with beasts, being cast to a lion.'

There is a reference to the episode preserved by Nicephorus Callistus and alluded to by Hippolytus (see Schmidt, p. 111). The statement that twelve thousand believed is new. It may have been suggested by the words of Acts xix 7 ἡευν δὲ οἱ πάντες ἀνέπει ὠσεὶ δόκεα.

5. 'Titus and Timothy and Luke remained with Paul the Apostle until his consummation under Nero.'

In the Martyrium Pauli (the last section of the Acts) Titus and Luke are mentioned as awaiting Paul in Rome, and as praying at his tomb after his martyrdom (Lipsius, pp. 104, 117: Schmidt, p. 88).

These are the passages in which it is possible to trace a direct connection between the Acts of Titus and those of Paul. They at least centre on the proper form of two names Ἀφφία and Παγγάρῳ. Do they give us any further help?

In the first place it is very plain that the order of events in the two texts is discrepant. The succession of episodes in the Coptic Acts of Paul is as follows:

1. Antioch. Son of Anchares.
2. Iconium. Thecla.
4. Sidon. Temple of Apollo.
5. Tyre. Chrysippus.

In the Acts of Titus:

1. Damascus (?). Chrysippus and Aphphia.
2. (?). Idol of Apollo.
3. Antioch. Son of Panchares.
4. Iconium (Crete).
5. Ephesus. Fight with lion.

The main difference is that the events which the old Acts place at Sidon and Tyre after the visits to Iconium and Myra are placed by the Acts of Titus before the present opening of the old Acts, and are located apparently at Damascus.

With regard to the diversity of place, we must remember that we are dealing with the work of an epitomizer and that he may very easily have omitted the names Sidon and Tyre: with regard to the difference of order in time, there seems to be no ground whatever for preferring the order of the later document, and we must allow, I think, that Pseudo-Zenas has in these respects disfigured and corrupted his original source.
I am inclined, however, to believe that he must have found pretty frequent mention of Titus in the Acts of Paul; otherwise I see no good reason why he should have consulted that work at all in writing the life of Titus. It may very well even have been the case that there was some mention in the Acts of Paul, of the visit to Crete, and of the governor Rustillus, and of the raising of his son. I would note that there is something of a coincidence between the two writers in this portion. Rustillus counselled Titus not to speak against the gods of the Greeks. At Ephesus, the governor Hieronymus said that Paul's words were good but that the present was not the right time for them (Schmidt, p. 111).

Whatever else the Acts of Titus may be made to contribute to the elucidation of the Acts of Paul, one thing is quite clear—that they exclude the possibility of such a theory as that which I put forward (with all reservation) in a recent number of the Journal. The Acts of Paul were not a sequel to the canonical Acts, but a supplementary narrative running parallel thereto. From this conclusion I do not see any way of escape. It is not to me conceivable that the author of the Acts of Titus, using, as we see he does, the Acts of Paul, should have taken passages from them and intercalated them into the narrative of the canonical Acts. That he or his epitomizer might disturb their order I can understand: that he should transplant all his known episodes to such an extent as my former hypothesis required is more than I can believe.

Nevertheless I am not sorry that I went so far as I did in formulating the theory. Possibilities of this kind are worth considering, if only because they lead to closer study of the documents concerned, and to the searching out of fresh evidence.

It is at least interesting to find a fairly late Catholic writer (for I suppose we must think of Pseudo-Zenas as belonging to the age of Pseudo-Paulines and the author of the Acts of Barnabas) using the text of the Acts of Paul. The discovery tends to confirm me in my belief that the Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena contain some touches drawn from those Acts—and not only from the Thecla-episode.

Cannot some one find for us a complete text of the Acts of Titus? At present the Paris copy is the only one that I have encountered. In most of the collections of Lives of Saints for August the encomium of Andrew of Crete (who uses Pseudo-Zenas to a slight extent) has replaced the older text. This encomium immediately follows the Acts in the Paris MS.

In his interesting supplement to the first edition of the Acts (pp. xxi-xxv) Dr Schmidt reprints an English version by E. J. Goodspeed of the Ethiopic Epistle of Pelagia à propos of the 'fabula baptizati
leonis'. It might, I think, be worth the while of readers who are looking into this problem to consult the Life of Paul in *The Contendings of the Apostles* translated from the Ethiopic by Dr E. A. Wallis Budge. They will find matter of the same kind in great plenty; and the document—which I reviewed in this *Journal* on its publication—deserves attention from its possible connexion in parts with the older Acts. The two volumes—text and translation—were published in 1899 and 1901 respectively by Henry Frowde. I repeat these particulars here, because so far I have not noticed that foreign scholars have made use of the book.

M. R. James.

1 *J. T. S.* vol. iii p. 286.