

## THE DERIVATION OF THE ACTA FROM EARLY ACTS OF PETER.

The following abbreviations will be used :—

*Syr. Hist. Jo.* = the recension of *Ac. Jo.* translated from the Syriac by W. Wright in *The Apocryphal Acts of Apostles* vol. 2.

*EP* = some late centoistic Acts based on early material and translated by Dr Budge from the Ethiopic in *The Contendings of the Apostles* vol. 2 p. 7 f and p. 466 f.

*VP* = the Vercellensian Acts of Peter or *Actus Petri cum Simone*, printed by Lipsius in *Acta Petri* p. 45 f.

Lewis = the English translation of Arabic Acts published by Dr A. S. Lewis in *Horae Semiticae* iv.

*Hist. Desp.* = the Acts of the Desposyni used by Hegesippus.

*KP* = *The Preaching of Peter* as numbered in the edition of E. von Dobschütz. It was perhaps written as early as Domitian.

*PPx* = a hypothetical and depraved Petro-Pauline Acts which was probably used in *VP*, *EP*, *Ac. Phil.*, *Story PP* (= *The Story of Peter and Paul* Lewis p. 175), and other Acts.

LIPSIUS, in an article in the *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, expressed a somewhat optimistic opinion of the value of the settings of the apocryphal Acts of Apostles as contrasted with the stories themselves, and in his great work he dealt very inadequately with the latter. Later students of this neglected literature have followed in the same path. The matter which is special to some of the more important Acts has been discussed with the view to determine the date and theological position of their authors ; the matter which is common stock has been almost wholly ignored.

It is the latter topic with which I am concerned in this article. A study of the Acta suggests that they derive from two volumes of Petrine Acts which were published at a very early date, and in the second volume probably contained the story of Thecla and other genuine traditions of St Paul. The only exceptions to this generalization which are of any importance are the matter derived from the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the influence of a narrative of our Lord's Passion upon the martyrdoms of SS. Peter and Paul, some matter which Leucius and the author of the Clementines probably derived from Papias, and, possibly, some didactic matter. As a rule the points in which the Acta vary from each other merely register the process of the depravation of the original Acts of Peter.

The narrative which was thus depraved brought the apostle Peter,

with Alexander, Rufus, John Mark, and other companions, to Lydda, Emmaus, Azotus, and Caesarea, where he preached and worked miracles in the pretorium, which was on the east of the city, and in the adjacent tetrapylon. He there healed a member of the household of Theophilus who is almost always the 'king' or 'ruler' of the *Acta*. A second volume brought the Apostle to Antioch, and either in this volume or in an early recension of it the Apostle reached Rome, where he encountered Simon Magus, preached, and was crucified. Except for some traditions of St Paul and of the Neronian persecution these Roman Acts were a mere *réchauffé* of Palestinian material.

It follows that when reading the *Acta* we must almost always substitute St Peter for the saint whose deeds they record, Theophilus for (e.g.) Abgar, Misdai, Leucius, and Caesarea for Edessa, Rome, and other scenes of legendary evangelization. Cornelius was at any rate in one line of the tradition the son of Theophilus. In some MSS these identifications are actually made by the copyists. Thus in *Preach. Simon* (Lewis, p. 117) Marcellus is mentioned, and one Arabic MS rightly identifies him with Cornelius, as does the Ethiopic of Dr Budge (*Ethiopic Contendings of the Apostles* p. 73). Again, *EP* probably identified Clement with Mark, and was, I shall argue, substantially right.

There are indications which suggest that the Clementine Romance and the source of the Thaddaean Acts preserve the original Acts of Peter by a line of descent which was independent of the source (? *PPx*) or sources of the other *Acta*. It will at any rate be advisable to have regard to this working hypothesis when handling our material. It may be added that there is probably a connexion of some kind between *Hist. Desp.* and the Clementines.

The real strength of the argument for my main hypothesis is the vast number of facts which it explains. It will only be possible on the present occasion to give one or two illustrations of it. I have chosen the topic of the Caesarean healing because it is the best instance of verbal agreement at an important point between *Acta* which are of widely different character, and because in one recension Theophilus is actually named. The second topic, the descriptions of the Apostles, has the advantage of being not entirely unfamiliar and is necessary to the complete discussion of the tradition that St Mark or 'John', as he was probably called at any rate in some passages of the original *Acta*, was the son of a priest named Aristobulus or Ariston. Moreover, the discussion of this tradition will lead us on to the question whether the source of the *Acta* did not claim to be Markan, and will involve the questions of the identity of Leucius with St Luke and of the use of a second Petrine cycle. It will also be found to have a bearing on the

Johannine problem, and it will prepare the way for an examination of the Clementine Romance.

### I. *The Healings at Caesarea.*

In the citations which follow, the words which are represented in parallel narratives are italicized:

Clem. Rec.	<i>Thaddaean Acts.</i>	<i>Proch. Ac. Jo.</i>	<i>Story of James (A)<sup>1</sup> (Lewis, p. 33).</i>
ii 70 The rest with bended knees prostrated themselves before Peter.	Eus. H. E. I xiii 17 Abdus, son of Abdus, who was podagrous fell at his feet and was healed by the imposition of hands. <sup>3</sup>	113. 16 John healed a son lame on both his feet.	Theophilus had a son whose feet were withered. . . . In the name of Jesus Christ. . . . He sprang up, stood and walked. . . . (Theophilus) did obeisance.
<i>Ib. Crowds.</i> He invoking upon them the name of God <sup>4</sup> (=Jesus) . . . healed the sick.	He healed also many other citizens.	112. 13 Many crowds.	
<i>Ib. A multitude was attracted.</i>	<i>Ac. Thadd.</i> 7 Laying his hands on them he healed by the invocation of Christ.	113. 6 In the name of the crucified.	
<i>Ib. He mounted a pillar . . . beckoning with his hand to the people to be still.</i>	Cf. <i>Doctr. Add.</i> (G. Phillips) p. 8.		
ii 70 He dismissed the people rejoicing (cf. iv 37) commanding them to come early next day.	H. E. I xiii 20 He commanded them to assemble early in the morning to hear.	109. 7 He shook his hand and they were all silent and he ascended to the housetop, and they were all close.	
<i>Ib. They dined in the court where the disputation was held.</i>		107. 6 He dismissed them to their homes.	
	<i>Ac. Thadd.</i> 4 He baptized him with all his house.	114. 6 A man with dropsy in the Stoa of Domitian.	
		110. 4 Thirty are baptized. <sup>5</sup>	Thirty baptisms.

<sup>1</sup> This narrative combines throughout two documents, one of which (A) is of great value.

<sup>2</sup> The use made of the priest here is obviously secondary. But in some forms of the tradition Theophilus was a priest.

<sup>3</sup> It is arguable that the phrase is distinctively primitive.

<sup>4</sup> 'God' = Christ in *Acta passim* e.g. *Ac. Thom.* 186. 8.

<sup>5</sup> The number probably underlies the thirty slaves mentioned in *VP* 25 f, where there is throughout the context a very depraved form of the same narrative. 'Thirty baptisms' and a 'household' (*Ac. Thadd.*) correspond.

These parallels speak for themselves, and the argument for them would be much stronger if I could discuss their contexts and the connected matter.

## 2. *The Descriptions of the Apostles.*

The following descriptions of the Apostles may be collected from the Acta and related documents:—

*Hom.* xii 6 (*Rec.* vii 6) ‘I use only bread and olives and rarely pot-herbs; and this is my only cloak and coat that I wear’.

*Hom.* xiv 1 (cf. xix 25) ‘Breaking bread for the Eucharist and putting salt upon it’.

*Rec.* i 73 Peter tells Zacchaeus that James was ‘still lame on one foot’.

*Hier. Comm. in Gal.* i 18 ‘Peter, who as Clement says in his Circuits, was bald-headed’.

*Hist. Desp. ap. Heg. ap. Eus. H. E.* ii 23 ‘He drank no wine . . . and ate no flesh. No razor came upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not use the bath. He alone was permitted to enter the Holy Place; for he wore not woollen but linen (*συδόνας*) garments’.<sup>1</sup>

*Heg. ap. Epiph. Haer.* 78. 13 ‘Who wore no second coat’.

*Heg. ap. Haer.* 78. 14 ‘Who wore no sandal’. For the derivation of this and the last passage from Hegesippus see Lawlor *Eusebiana* p. 13.

‘*Ac. Jo.*’ 5 (a Leucian passage) ‘His common, low, poor appearance . . . He took a few dates’.

*Syr. Hist. Jo.* p. 8 ‘His sustenance was from the ninth hour to the ninth hour, once when he had finished his prayer . . . bread and herbs with a mass of boiled lentils . . . drinking water only’.

*Ac. Thom.* 20 ‘He continually fasts and prays and eats only bread with salt, and his drink is water and he wears one coat . . . and he takes nothing from any one but gives to others what he has’.

*Ac. Thom.* 29 ‘And he took bread, oil, herbs, and salt, blessed it and gave unto them’.

*VP* 2 ‘They offered bread and water’ at the Eucharist.

*Mart. Paul.* 2 ‘Judas Barsabbas the flat-footed’.

*Ac. Paul. et Thec.* 3 ‘Paul . . . having curly, scanty hair and large eyebrows, bandy-legged, long-nosed’. See the note at the end of the article.

*Clem. Paed.* ii 1 ‘Matthew partook of seeds and nuts and vegetables without flesh’.

*Hipp. Philos.* vii 39 ‘Mark the stump-fingered’.

<sup>1</sup> One probable object of *Hist. Desp.* was to exalt the Desposyni at the expense of St Peter. See below, p. 508. The corruptions of the passage (see Lawlor *Eusebiana* p. 5f) do not affect my argument. An independent but abbreviated and somewhat paraphrastic version may be found in Lewis, p. 144 f.

In these parallel descriptions we observe more especially the following points :—

(i) The scanty, curly hair of Paul and the baldness of Peter appear to be of one piece, as also the lameness of James, the bandy legs of Paul, the flat foot of Barsabbas, the long nose of Paul, and the stump finger of Mark.

(ii) The Apostle was a vegetarian, and drank water only. This was the case with James.

(iii) In all the descriptions use is made of Matt. x 9, 10 (Mk. vi 8, 9).

1. *Not two coats* occurs in *Hom.*, *Ac. Thom.*, Heg. ap. Epiph.

2. With Heg. ap. Epiph. *Who did not wear a sandal* compare Mk.'s *bound with sandals*, Matt.'s *Not bound with shoes*.

3. The injunctions just cited are used in a series of passages in the Acta which describe the embarking of the Apostles for their destinations, in the source = a voyage from Joppa to Caesarea.

(a) *VP* 5 Peter takes no provisions.

(b) In *Ac. Thom.* 3 the Apostle takes his master's effects on board, not his own.

(c) In *Ac. And. et Matt.* 6 Andrew has neither money nor bread, and cites a conflation of Matt. x 10, Lk. x 4.

(d) In a centoistic and probably heretical Acts of Peter which is preserved in Old Slavonic (*ZNTW*. iii p. 316) Peter cites Matt. x 9, 10.<sup>1</sup>

Our citations were probably intended to recall the clergy of the writer's time to apostolic simplicity, for there is a great deal of early matter which enforces this point (e. g. *Did.* 15, *Asc. Is.* 3. 23). They are clearly related, and the relation cannot be direct. It is especially interesting to observe that the passage from Christ's instructions to His Apostles which is cited in other Acts underlies *Hist. Desp.*

It may be added that the whole martyrdom of James contains indications of the influence of that of St Stephen, and this is clearer if we compare with it an ancient Slavonic martyrdom of Stephen which was translated by Franko in *ZNTW*. vii p. 153 f. This martyrdom has also affinities with other Acta,<sup>2</sup> which shew that they derive from its source. If Harnack's<sup>3</sup> argument that St Stephen's martyrdom was narrated in St Luke's Antiochene source be accepted, it is obvious that

<sup>1</sup> In some of these voyages Christ is the shipmaster, e. g. in *EP* p. 616. The idea was used in Iren. ap. Timotheus Aelurus (*J.T.S.* xv p. 433) where Christ is said to steer Noah and in *Ac. Phil.* 95 *In rivers and floods I will be your good pilot.* This conception may go back to the earliest Acts, for the presence of Christ with His Apostles is taught in *Domine quo vadis?*

<sup>2</sup> Compare it with *Rec.* i 44 f, *Eus. H. E.* II xxiii, *EP* pp. 638, 639, 646, Lewis, pp. 17, 18, 185, *Ac. Andr. et Matt.* 18 f.

<sup>3</sup> In *Acts* (Eng. tr.) p. 162 f.

these data accord with my hypothesis that the *Acta* derive from those documents.

3. *Aristobulus the father of John Mark.*

In the Arabic Lives of the Patriarchs (*Patr. Orient.* i p. 135) there is an interesting account of St Mark which tells us of a certain Aristobulus who lived in Pentapolis, where he was robbed of his wealth by Berbers. He was the brother (a well-informed glossator seems to correct this to brother-in-law) of Barnabas, and married a cousin of Peter, who instructed their son Mark. Mark is said to have carried the jar of water into the house of Simon of Cyrene at the time of the Last Supper, and after the Resurrection to have entertained the disciples in his house. He slew a lion near the Jordan and accompanied Peter to Azotus and Rome. In the fifteenth year of the Ascension he went to Pentapolis and Alexandria, like a *combatant of war*, a phrase which probably in literary relation with *like some noble captain of God* (*Eus. H. E.* II xiv 6).

Alexander the Monk, a careful and learned writer who tells us that he derived his tradition from the *Stromateis* and other ancient records, tells us that Barnabas was educated by Gamaliel, and that he brought to Christ his aunt, Mary, and endeavoured to convert Paul (*Lips. Apoc. Apost. gesch.* iii p. 298 f.).

Nicephorus in *H. E.* ii 43 (Migne *P. G.* cxlv 876) says that Mark was the nephew of Peter.

In the Constantinopolitan Synaxary (*Acta SS. Propyl.* Nov. p. 77) Simon marries the daughter of Aristobulus, the brother of Barnabas. 'Simon' is primitive and occurs in 2 Pet. i 1, *Didasc.* (*ad fin.*),<sup>1</sup> two contexts which may be regarded as very relevant.

We are not in this study concerned directly with historical problems, but there are several indications of the value of these traditions.

(i) The story of St Mark's escape from the lion is not absurd, and must be Palestinian. Lions haunted the thickets of the Jordan (Jer. xlix 19, Zech. xi 3), where they were still found in the twelfth century (Reland *Pal.* i p. 274), and they were sometimes attacked by shepherds single-handed (1 Sam. xvii 34 f., Amos iii 12, Judges xiv 6). The story derives from the source of a series of topographical notices of Caesarea and Jerusalem which underlie the *Acta*, and are of great accuracy and value. Our traditions are Palestinian.

(ii) The statement that the Last Supper was held in the house of Simon of Cyrene must represent an early tradition which Alexander deserted in favour of the information which he obtained on the occasion

<sup>1</sup> See Preuschen's reconstruction in *ZNTW.* 1913, p. 12 (line 29). Preuschen argues rightly that the passage derives from the source of *Acts*.

of his visit to Jerusalem. The view that the Last Supper was eaten in the house of Mary is as old as the source of Cureton's document in *Anc. Syr. Doc.* p. 24 and Jerome, who translated both ἀνάγαυον (*Mk.* xiv 15, *Lk.* xxii 12) and ὑπερῷον (*Ac.* i 13) by *coenaculum*. The Arabic tradition appears to be primitive and historical for the following reasons. (a) The change of word suggests that the two rooms were not identical. This argument is the more cogent if St Luke is following Markan Acts. (b) There must have been a strong tendency for traditions to gravitate to the house of Mary and 'the Holy Zion'. (c) Our Lord's object was secrecy, and there was probably no place where He was more likely to be sought than in the house of Mark. When a few hours later He went to Gethsemane, which some have thought belonged to St Mark's family (*Expos.* iv 3. 220), He knew that He was going to His cross. (d) Alexander and Rufus were mentioned in the source of the Acta as evangelists of Caesarea, and may have been among the witnesses mentioned in *Ac.* x 39 f. Simon was a known follower of Christ. (e) The connexion of Mark with Simon agrees with the tradition of Mark's Cyrenian origin.

(iii) Peter follows Philip at Azotus as he did at Samaria and Caesarea and, according to the Acta, at Lydda. The precursors of the Clementines were probably evangelists. The Apostle, according to the uncanonical tradition, 'confirmed' and established churches.

(iv) The attempt of Barnabas to convert Paul agrees well with St Luke's characterization of him, and above all with *Ac.* ix 26 f. His connexion with Gamaliel is supported by the prominence of the latter in the Acta. They bring him into close contact with the Church. His daughter Neshra was a member of St Peter's evangelistic party together with Tabetha, the daughter of Tobias, and Calletha, the daughter of Nicodemus.<sup>1</sup>

This group of traditions underlies the Acta.

(i) In *EP* pp. 483, 485 Aradus is confused with Azotus. Azotus, therefore, must have occurred in the source. On p. 509 Mark's father is 'Aresto'. On pp. 475, 476, 491 the Apostles meet in 'Zion', i.e. the house of Mary. The whole subject of this house is admirably discussed by Zahn in *Die Dormitio Sanctae Virginis* (Deichert).

(ii) In *VP* 6 Ariston, *who always feared the Lord*, is Peter's host.

(iii) In *Ac. Barn.* 14 Ariston is the host of Mark and Barnabas.

<sup>1</sup> These women accompany Mary (= Peter) in *Trans. Mar.* p. 25 (*Lewis Stud. Sinait.* xi). For the women companions compare *Rec.* ii 1, ix 38, *Ac. Phil.* 30. For Nicodemus cf. *Rec.* ii 1, for Gamaliel (a secret Christian) *Rec.* i 65, for Tabetha *Proch. Ac. Jo.* 7. 6, and for Tobias the Jerusalem Bishops' List and Eus. *H. E.* I xiii 10. The tradition is very coherent and supported by *Lk.* viii 2, and by a topographical note in *Trans.* p. 23. Cf. *Ev. Nicod.* 15 'house of Nicodemus'.

In *Ac. Thom.* 8 a lion kills a cupbearer who, like the Mark of our tradition, had gone to the fountain to draw water. The lion laid hold of his right hand, an incident which we should probably connect with the epithet 'stump-fingered'!<sup>1</sup>

(iv) In *Ev. Matt.* 33 (=*Ev. Thom.* 11) Jesus goes to draw water at a fountain, and in ch. 35 encounters lions near the bank of the Jordan.

(v) In Cod. Paris. 1468 we read at *Ac. Jo.* 45 that John left there (at Smyrna) as president (*πρόεδρον*) Boukolos and Polycarp his disciples and Andronicus. 'Boukolos and Polycarp' is obviously an interpolation, but Andronicus, Zahn suggests (*Forsch.* vi 101 an.), represents Ariston who was, according to *Ap. Const.* vii 46, the first bishop of that see. If Zahn's bow was drawn at a venture, an examination of the allusions to Andronicus shews that his arrow hit the mark.

Following an Asian tradition which has some links which connect it with Papias, Leucius in *Ac. Jo.* 30 refers to the deacon Berus who ministered to him at Ephesus, who must represent the Ephesian deacon Byrrhus who ministered to Ignatius.<sup>2</sup> In ch. 31 he introduces Andronicus, a prominent Ephesian. In ch. 37 the brethren from Miletus say that they have been long at Ephesus, and suggest that they should go to Smyrna. The support which Andronicus gives to the proposal indicates that his traditional prototype, if he had one, was in some way connected with that city. The conjecture that he had such a prototype is confirmed by the fact that we have a traditional phrase in his description of John as 'the teacher', and there is another probable fragment of tradition in the quite unmotived statement that the wonderful works of God had been spoken of there. Leucius was acquainted with a tradition of Christian teaching at Smyrna. We may compare the phrase of ch. 45 where John wishes to go to Smyrna in order that *the servants of Christ there may turn to God*. The strange form which this statement assumes may be due to the working in of a phrase from the source. The use of a source is the more probable inasmuch as Zahn has shewn (*Forsch.* vi 16) that Leucius probably used and connected with Smyrna the story of the rich young robber, Clement's introduction to which refers to St John's journeys. We conclude, then, that in matter connected with the church of Smyrna Leucius is probably following tradition, and that he connects Andronicus with that church.

The evidence which follows shews the identity of Andronicus with Ariston.

<sup>1</sup> The Acts of Thomas in this context are exceedingly difficult to interpret. The hymn seems to be substituted for the epitome of Christ's career, and a cryptic attack on St Mark may be suspected in this passage.

<sup>2</sup> His name is spelt Byrrhus in ps.-Abdias *Ap. Hist.* v 23.

In *Ac. Jo.* 46 John remains in the house of Andronicus. The brethren meet there in chs. 62, 86, and it is assumed that they worship there. We also observe that Andronicus is mentioned in ch. 59, and an inn in the following chapter. Inasmuch as in our tradition he was the host of the Church of Jerusalem, these passages are evidence for the identification of Andronicus with Ariston or Aristobulus.

A trace of Mary, the mother of Mark, may survive in Drusiana, the wife of Andronicus, who was an exceptionally pious woman. In ch. 46 a priest is mentioned who is some one's kinsman. Ariston in one recension of our tradition was the brother of Barnabas, and we shall find that in that tradition he was a priest. This conjecture is confirmed when we turn to pseudo-Abdias and find in *Ap. Hist.* v 21 a priest named Aristodemus to whom John gives a garment. St Mark's priestly garment was, we shall find, mentioned in our tradition. Such retesselations as these of old material are thoroughly in accordance with the methods of Leucius and some others of the apocryphists.

The reader who is not familiar with these strange writers will attach more importance to the fact that in ch. 59 an Aristobula occurs among the Apostle's companions, and with her Cleobius, who was Simon's colleague when he opposed Peter (*Ap. Const.* vi 16, *Ep. Cor. ad Paul.* i 2), and whose name is misused in *VP* 48. 6 much in the same way as it is in *Ac. Jo.* In a related context in the former Acts (51. 17) we find another parallel which clinches my reconstruction. We read of an *Ariston with whom he was wont to stay*. The very same phrase is used of Andronicus in *Ac. Jo.* 62. In *VP* Ariston keeps an inn and in *Ac. Jo.* 60, as we saw above, an inn is mentioned.

We may safely conclude that Leucius was in *Ac. Jo.* using a tradition of Aristobulus or Ariston the father of Mark, that he was acquainted with the tradition of Ariston of Smyrna which underlies *Ap. Const.* vii 46, and that rightly or wrongly he identified the two. It may be added that Leucius made much use of his Petrine source in the parts of his work which only survive in recensions. This is especially clear in his narrative of the writing of the Gospel, an incident which is undoubtedly to be assigned to him.

#### *The Mitre of John Mark.*

The allusions of Leucius to the priests bring us to the tradition that St Mark was of priestly descent. The most familiar authority for this is the old prologue according to which he was *Petri in baptismate filius . . . sacerdotium in Israhel agens, secundum carnem Levita* (Corrsen *Monarch. Prolog.* p. 9). The tradition is supported by the Levitical descent of St Barnabas who, according to our tradition, was related to Mark on his father's side. The tradition of the prologue underlies

*Ac. Barn.* 14, where Ariston is described as a temple-servant, and *ib.* ch. 2, where Mark is baptized by St Paul at Iconium, and probably derives from the tradition cited on p. 8 according to which St Mark was instructed by St Peter. St Paul and Iconium are obviously absurd adaptations of a tradition suggested by the writer's Petrine source.

Our tradition probably underlies also the statement of Theophylact that the young man with the linen cloth mentioned in *Mark* xiv 52 (see Swete *ad loc.*) was resident in the house where our Lord had eaten the Passover. Inasmuch as in the later tradition of the Church of Jerusalem the Passover was eaten in the house of Mary (cf. Zahn *op. cit.* p. 25) the tradition of Theophylact must have identified the youth with St Mark. The identification is plausible, but the only feature of the narrative which is likely to have suggested it to an ancient exegete is St Mark's statement that the youth wore a *sindon*. This may have suggested the linen of the priests. There is a fragment of evidence which supports our conjecture. According to Dr Swete, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Bede identify the youth with James, the Lord's brother, and the only possible connexion between the two is the fact that, according to Hegesippus, James wore the *sindon*.

There is now in our hands a thread which we had let drop. We found in the portrait of James traces of the descriptions of the Apostles which occurred in the source of the *Acta*. It is probable enough, then, that its author would derive matter from the tradition of Mark and Aristobulus. The saint is said to have worn *sindons* and the *petalon*, and to have entered into the Holy Place.

It is impossible for any one who has studied the *Acta* on comparative principles to refuse a very thorough application to them of the principle formulated by Tertullian, *Quis tam otiosus stilo ut materias habens fingat?* James, then, is evidently wearing borrowed garments. To whom, then, did they belong? Can we doubt that in the source of the *Hist. Desp.* they were worn by John Mark? My conjecture is established when we find that Polycrates (ap. Eus. *H. E.* V xxiv 3), using the exact phrase of Hegesippus, makes the astonishing statement of John of Asia that he wore the *petalon*. He has evidently confused the two Johns. My hypothesis, which was adopted on quite other grounds, has explained two enigmatic passages.

In *Ac. Barn.* 2 'John' describes himself as the ὑπηρέτης of the high-priest. It is possible that this statement is based on *Ac.* xiii 5, but *Ac. Barn.* is based on Petrine Acts and makes strangely little use of the canonical Acts. It is at least equally probable that the word derives from St Luke's Antiochene source which continued to the end of ch. xv. That this is the case appears from *Proch. Ac. Jo.* 7. 3, where each of the Apostles is accompanied by one of the seventy as his ὑπηρέτης. 'Pro-

chorus' is distinguished from all other apocryphists by his amazing dreariness, and he is certainly following Leucius in the opening part of his work; the ultimate source is throughout the context Petrine. If, then, 'Leucius' described himself as the *ἰπηρέτης* of John in a Petrine context, the hypothesis immediately suggests itself that he must be identified with St Luke, and that 'Luke' was suggested by 'Mark'.

The identification of Leucius with St Luke has been advocated in *Apoc. Anecdota* ii p. x, by James, who bases his argument on the assumption that 'Leucius' was the supposed author of *VP*. Schmidt in *Alten Petrus-Akten* has shewn that there are doctrinal differences between these Acts and *Ac. Jo.*, but it is probably easier to explain them as due to an interval of time than to postulate two writers who, in the queer ingenuity of their perversions of tradition and in their love of sentimental stories and sermonisings and of coarse and foolish humour, not only closely resemble each other, but are quite unlike all other apocryphists. The argument from the priority of *Ac. Paul.* falls to the ground from my point of view, for both Acts derive from *PPx*.

I may add an important point to the arguments of James. He did not observe that the author of *Ac. Phil.* who certainly used an *Acts of Peter*, and I think myself *PPx*, mentions in ch. 40 a Leucius, who was physician to a king, who like most other apocryphal kings, may be presumed to represent Theophilus. That this passage derives from *PPx* is shewn by the parallel narrative in the *Story PP* (Lewis, p. 177), *Trans. Mar.* p. 34, and other parallels. Further in ch. 84 a Theophilus is mentioned in a narrative of a healing which is parallel with that of *The Story of James* and *VP* 25 f (see p. 497), the name Theophilus being transferred from the father to the son. Again in the former healing Nicocleides, the father of the healed child, is described as a recorder (*Ac. Phil.* 38). Now we find a ruler in *Proch. Ac. Jo.* 12. 13 who is described as a *scriniarius*, and as having come from Antioch on public business. Further in *Rec.* x 71 Theophilus appears at Antioch, and in x 55 Cornelius has been sent on public business.

We may conclude as the result of this section of my argument that in the source of the *Acta* Leucius was St Luke and the physician of Theophilus and, inasmuch as Theophilus was said to have freed his slaves (cf. *EP* p. 11, *VP* 77. 7, *Ac. Phil.* 85), that he was not only his *patronus libri* but also his *patronus*. Further, inasmuch as Leucius is often the name of the king in the *Acta* (Prochorus corrupts it to 'Seleucus') it is probable that Leucius was one of the *tria nomina* of Theophilus in the original tradition.

*The original Petrine Acts were attributed to St Mark.*

A more important question is raised by the last term of the equation

Prochorus = Leucius = Luke = Mark. If I am right, Leucius was using in the beginning of his work (i) early Petrine Acts which (ii) claimed to be written by St Mark.

Is there, then, any evidence which suggests that in early Petrine Acts St Peter made a journey to Syria which can have suggested those of John and Prochorus? The evidence is difficult and cannot be adequately discussed on the present occasion, but there is enough for the purpose.

In *KP* 7 (Clem. *Strom.* vi 6, 48) Christ bids Peter and the rest of the Apostles go forth into the world at the end of twelve years. That the journey was in the earliest tradition actually undertaken is proved by the fact that *VP* 5 explicitly connects St Peter's journey to Rome with the command. If allowance be made for the preaching on the way my hypothesis explains the chronological system which brought the Apostle to Rome c. A.D. 42, as for instance in the Arabic *History of the Patriarchs* where Mark leaves Rome in the fifteenth year of the Ascension. According to this tradition St Peter was accompanied by St Mark as was St John by Prochorus, the voyage of the former Apostle, as we have already seen, corresponding with that of the latter. Lastly, St John and the other Apostles went forth, according to Prochorus, after the death of Mary. This constitutes another parallel with the Petrine tradition, for this event is said to have taken place in the eleventh year of the Ascension.<sup>1</sup>

The following evidence connects St Peter's journey with Syria :—

(i) In *Proch. Ac. Jo.* 9. 7 Prochorus is shipwrecked off Seleucia, the port of Antioch. This suggests that Peter may in the source have visited Antioch. In 8. 6 Prochorus is bidden to return to James. This suggests that in the source Mark may have returned. In *Syr. Hist. Jo.* p. 59 Peter and Paul go to James at Jerusalem and journey thence to Antioch.

(ii) In *VP* 23 Peter and Paul are together at Jerusalem.

(iii) In *EP* p. 656 Paul and Philip return to Jerusalem. A line or later a slip of the pen reveals the fact that they were in the source Peter and Paul.

(iv) I believe I can prove that a recension of the Clementine Romance which was written c. A.D. 145 brought Peter to Laodicea and Antioch, and that this writer used Papias's tradition of the writing of Mark and described Clement who was an esoteric counterpart of St Mark in terms of it. In all recensions of the Romance important events take place at Laodicea.

(v) In *EP* p. 488 the centoist following the earliest recension of the

<sup>1</sup> Basnage *thes. mon.* III i 27, 29, 35, cited by von Dobschütz *Das Ker. Pet.* p. 53. It is connected with the missions of the twelfth year in *Transitus Mariae*, but the Apostles return from their destinations to the deathbed of the Virgin.

Romance brings Peter to Laodicea. On p. 490 he has turned to his non-Clementine source and forgetting that he has already stated that Peter had journeyed to this city he brings him there again, adding in words which have a ring very different from that of apocryphal fictions, *Where we dwelt for two years preaching . . . and through us there believed multitudes. . . . And we returned again to Jerusalem and met there with all the disciples, and my master commanded my father and mother to dwell in Jerusalem.* These words cannot have been spoken in the source by Clement to whom the centoist assigns them, but presumably originally referred to Ariston whom *EP* mentions and to Mary. That this is the case appears on p. 491 where Peter is accompanied to Antioch by John, who must be John Mark, for unlike Peter he understands the language of the people. This tradition of the two years' work of the Apostle at Laodicea explains the prominence of that city in the Clementine Romance.

(vi) There is an allusion to Laodicea in the chaotic narrative of *Ac. Barn.* (ch. 11).

(vii) A Northern journey of Peter is implied in *KP* 7 cited above. There is no tradition of a journey of Peter to the South. Journeys to the East or West are obviously impossible.

I may add that two cycles of the Apostle's activity are suggested by *Ac. Thom.* where a second journey begins at the Seventh Act and by *Ac. Thadd.* where the first (i. e. the Caesarean) cycle ends in ch. 5. The Apostle then goes to Amis and Beyrout where he remains five years, i. e. the interval between the seventh year of the first cycle (*Rec.* i 43, ix 29) and the twelfth year.

I cannot attempt within the limits of this article to shew that the evidence collected above can be reduced to a coherent tradition which fits in with the canonical and other evidence, but such, I believe, is the case. The data, however, suggest as a working hypothesis a second cycle of Acts in which St Mark played a part, and in which the Apostle visited Laodicea and Antioch.

My equation 'Prochorus' = 'Mark' has been confirmed by the fact that I have shewn the existence of a second Petrine cycle, and that in this cycle St Peter and John (Mark) visited Syria as did Prochorus. My hypothesis is again confirmed when we find that in *Ac. Barn.* 2 'John'<sup>1</sup> is the writer of those Acts. It will be established, if I can, as

<sup>1</sup> 'John' is thus used in *EP* p. 491 and probably in p. 481. Though St Mark was so designated when St Luke wrote (Col. iv 10, 1 Pet. v 13), St Luke only so designates him in his last notice (xv 39). Elsewhere he calls him 'John' (xiii 5, 13) or laboriously 'John called Mark' (xii 12, 25, xv 37). Clearly his source used 'John' as does *EP* and the source of Polycrates. 'John', then, like 'Simon', is primitive, and in my view Markan.

I believe I can, shew that Clement is the counterpart of Mark, for in *Rec.* i 72 Peter is bidden by James to send him every year an account of his sayings and doings, *and especially at the end of every seven years*. The words 'every year' may be attributed to the wish of the Ebionite writer to subordinate Peter to James. The italicized words suggest that in the tradition there were two volumes of Acts and Preachings. The first volume, I am inclined to think, derived matter from a catechetical manual which St Mark drew up for the use of the Church of Caesarea, containing an epitome of Christ's career such as we find in *Ac.* x 36 and in parallel sermons in the *Acta*. The second volume was pseudo-Petrine and Roman, and should probably be identified with *KP*. But the Apocalypse to which *KP* probably alludes (for Christ bids the Apostles reveal the future in their preaching), was probably included in the same cycle. In the Akh. fragment ch. 2 the twelve ask Christ to reveal the condition of the righteous in order that they may encourage their hearers.

If my discussion has been somewhat digressive and discursive, the data have been difficult, and it has not been easy to illustrate the main features of my reconstruction of the *Acta*, and my view as to the methods employed by their authors without assuming results which it was impossible to prove within the limits of this article. In order to complete the treatment of the subject of the descriptions of the Apostles a note is appended on that of St Paul.

#### *The Description of St Paul.*

The data for the description of St Paul are as follows:—

(i) In the Armenian version (*Conybeare Monuments of Early Christianity* p. 62) the description runs: *Of moderate stature, with curly hair . . . scanty, crooked legs, blue eyes, and large nose; and he was full of grace and pity in the Lord, sometimes having the appearance of men and sometimes looking like an angel.*

(ii) Conybeare gives the Syriac thus: *Of middling size and his hair was scanty and his eyebrows met and his nose was somewhat long; and he was full of grace and mercy; at one time he seemed like a man and at another he seemed like an angel.*

The two following passages are interesting as illustrating the use of the source of *Ac. Paul.* i.e. *PPx*.

(iii) *Mart. Mark* (Lewis, p. 150): *Of middle height with dark blue eyes and large eyebrows with curly hair, full of divine grace.*

(iv) *Story PP* (Lewis, p. 191), Satan addressing Paul, says, *O bald pate.*

(v) *EP* p. 501 (cf. p. 531): *Bald with red hair.*

(vi) Greek *Ac. Paul. et Thec.* 3: *Small in size, baldheaded, bandy-legged, of noble mien, with eyebrows meeting, rather longnosed, full of grace, sometimes like a man and sometimes like an angel.*

It will be observed that the borrowed Arabic description of St Mark varies at three points with the Armenian against the Greek.

There can be no doubt that the description of the Apostle is Petrine. This is shewn not only by the parallels to the allusions to his hair and legs, but also by the statement that he sometimes looked like a man and sometimes like an angel. We compare the vision which Abgar saw appear on the face of Thaddaeus and before which he prostrated himself (Eus. *H.E.* I xiii 13), and also *Ac. Thom.* 8 where the flute-girl looks at Thomas whose form changes. She says, *This is either God or God's apostle.* Both incidents are related to *Ac. x* 25 f, the source of which passage, I shall shew, much influenced the Acta.

The Armenian recension of the Story of Thecla is undoubtedly, as Conybeare argues, superior to the Greek, but it is not likely to represent the earliest form of the story unless the story was in its earliest literary form adapted to some depraved Acts of Peter, a hypothesis which is exceedingly improbable. That the opening is Petrine is shewn by the parallelism with *EP* p. 7, where the tetrapylon must be that of Caesarea and original. In each case the Apostle preaches immediately on his arrival and borrows his sermon from the same book.

H. J. BARDSLEY.

## ST AMBROSE AS AN INTERPRETER OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

ALLEGORICAL interpretation of the Scriptures has been described as 'a convenient method of interpretation by which anything whatever can be made to prove anything one likes'.<sup>1</sup> But it was employed by St Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St Ambrose, and St Augustine—to make no mention of smaller names—and is a chapter in the history of Biblical exegesis which cannot be ignored. At the beginning of the Christian era it was known in Jewish circles. Philo<sup>2</sup> found in it a means of combining Hellenic philosophy with Jewish religion.

<sup>1</sup> H. F. Hamilton *The People of God* i p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> DCB. s. v. Philo.