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\[50P = 130,13B: - \text{ἰτέον ὦν ὅσ ἐν μάλιστα ἐγγυτάτω τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, ὅν οἰκεία ἡ πλάνη κάκ τῆς προσόψεως ἐλέγχεται.} \text{ων* : όσ. — ἐλέγχεται Potter, vulg.}

\[51P = 132,5B: - \text{δραστήριος μὲν ἡ δημιουργική, ἀλλ' οἷς οίᾳ τε ἀπατήσαι (τὸ) λογικόν ο(LED µὴν τῶν κατὰ λόγον βεβαιώκοτας.}

At 874P fin. read ἡ γνώσης οἶνον [ὁ] λογικὸς βάνατος: at 160P, ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια λογικῆ (*: λογικῆς) κατὰ κρίσιν ἀστειῶν.

Ib. ζωγραφίας μὲν γὰρ δι' ὅμοιότητα σκιαγραφία περιστερᾶς προσ-έπτησαν πελειάδες καὶ ἵπποις καλῶς γεγραμμέναις προσεχρεμέτωσαν ἵππου. σκιαγραφία περιστερᾶς*: σκιαγραφία περιστερᾶ.

A plurality of doves is dearly bought at the price of such conjectures as σκιαγραφήταις (an unheard-of form) περιστερᾶς or ἐσκιαγραφημέναις περι-στερᾶς. — At 322P, it may be said in passing, σκιαγραφία should be changed into Clement's only form σκιαγραφία*.

Ib. (132,16B): —ἐπὶ τὸ ἔραν προάγουσα (*: προσάγουσα).
At 204P, the sense demands: —ποππυνυμὸς δὲ καὶ συμγυμὸς καὶ οἱ διὰ τῶν δακτύλων ψόφου, τῶν οἰκετῶν οἱ προσκλητικοί* (προκλητικοί cod., edd.).

J. JACKSON.

(To be continued.)

THE RAINER FRAGMENT OF THE APOCALYPSE OF PETER

I

I gratefully acknowledge that I owe my first inkling of the existence of this to a footnote in M. Vaganay's Évangile de Pierre (p. 189). It was first printed by Wessely in Patrol. Orient. xviii 482 (1924); more recently Father K. Prümm S.J. has written on it an interesting essay de genuino Apoc. Petri textu in Biblica x 62–80 (1929), and it is from this that I draw my text. The source is a parchment double leaf of the third or fourth century in the Rainer collection at Vienna.

It preserves the original Greek of a paragraph which is otherwise known only from the Ethiopic version, wherein it is largely unintelligible. An English rendering of the Ethiopic will be found in my Apocr. N.T. p. 518, and a German one (Weinel's) in Hennecke's N.T. Apocr., p. 325, both issued before the publication by Wessely (who, by the way, wrongly identified the fragment as part of the Acts of Peter).
The situation or context of the passage is this: at the end of the description of hell-torments we read in the Ethiopic:

‘Thereafter shall the angels bring mine elect and righteous... and bear them in their hands and clothe them with the raiment of the life that is above (or of everlasting life). They shall see their desire on them that hated them’, &c. Those who are in torment acknowledge the justice of their punishment. The angel Tartaruchos chastises them yet more severely and tells them that the time of repentance is past. They again acknowledge that God is righteous and they are justly punished.

The Ethiopic proceeds:

‘Then will I give’... and here begins our Greek fragment, which I will set out side by side with an English rendering. Emendations by me are underlined:

Then will I give unto my called and my chosen whomsoever they shall ask me for, out of torment, and will give them a fair baptism in (or unto) salvation from the Acherusan lake which men so call in the Elysian field, even a portion of righteousness with my holy ones. And I will depart, I and my chosen, rejoicing, with the patriarchs, unto mine eternal kingdom, and I will perform for them the promises which I promised them, I and my Father which is in heaven.

Lo, I have manifested unto thee, Peter, and have expounded all this. And go thou into a city that ruleth over the west, and drink the cup which I promised thee, at the hands of the son of him that is in Hades, that his destruction may have a beginning; and (lit.) thou acceptable of the promise... (perhaps (become) a receiver of the promise).
δεκτός has always the passive sense of acceptable. If 'receiver' is the needed meaning, δεκτήρ is possible; the forms δεκτής and δεκτωρ seem to be poetical.

The best attainable equivalent of the Ethiopic must next be given. The sources are: Grébaut, quoted by me in full in J. T. S. 1910 (xii 52); Weinel ap. Hennecke i.e., and Duensing in ZNTW 1913, p. 73 (but he omits several lines as unintelligible). What I give here is essentially that of my Apocr. N. T. i.e.:

'Then will I give to mine elect and to my righteous the baptism and the salvation for which they have besought me in the field of Akrosja which men call Anēsλασλεία. They (shall) adorn with flowers the portion of the righteous (or A portion of the righteous adorneth itself with flowers) and I shall go... I shall rejoice with them. I will cause the peoples to enter into mine eternal kingdom, and will give (or show) them the everlasting good things whereon I have made them to set their hope, even I and my Father which is in heaven.

'I have spoken this unto thee, Peter, and declared it unto thee. Go forth therefore and journey unto the city (or land) of the west, into the vineyard which I shall tell thee of. (Two renderings of the next sentence are possible. (a) That by the sufferings of the son who is without sin the deeds of corruption may be sanctified. (b) Through the suffering of the sinless son the creation which was subject to corruption is sanctified.) As for thee, thou art chosen according to the promise which I have given thee.'

For the moment it is enough to remark that the Ethiopic exhibits relics of the Greek text throughout, but in two places is gravely corrupted, and in one place is guilty of an important omission.

I will now try to justify my reading and interpretation of the passage. I have no doubt of the correctness of my restoration of the opening lines, for they are closely paraphrased in the following lines of Sib. Orac. II:

330 τού θεο καὶ ο ο παντοκράτωρ θεο άφθιτος άλλο ιπεξει 
εύσεβεσιν, οπόταν θεον άφθιτον αιτήσωσιν 
EK μαλερίου πυρός καί αθανάτων άπό βροχόμω 
άνθρωπος σώσει δώσει καί τούτο ποιήσει

λεξίμενος γὰρ ἑστάθης ἀπὸ φλογὸς ἀκαμάτωο 
335 άλλος ἀποστήσας τέμυσε διὰ λαὸν έαυτοῦ 
εἰς ζωήν ἔτεραν καὶ αἴωνον αθανάτουσιν

'Ηλισίω πεδίω, οθι οί ιελε κύματα μακρὰ 
Λάμνης δενάν Αχρωσίαδος βαθυκόλπων. 

There is moreover a parallel passage in the Coptic Apocalypse of Elias:

'The righteous will behold the sinners in their punishment, and those
who have persecuted them and delivered them up. Then will the sinners on their part behold the place of the righteous and be partakers of grace. In that day will that for which the (righteous) shall often pray be granted to them.'

And in the Epistle of the Apostles 40, Christ says: 'The righteous are sorry for the sinners and pray for them, making prayer unto my Father. Again, we said unto him: Lord, is there none that maketh intercession unto thee? and he said unto us: Yea, and I will hearken unto the prayer of the righteous, which they make for them'.

Further, it may be remembered that in the Acts of Paul, a book which shows traces of acquaintance with Apoc. Petri, the soul of a dead girl Falconilla is prayed for by Thecla that she may be translated into the place of the righteous.

These passages I quoted in Apocr. N.T. 521, and added: 'My impression is that the maker of the Ethiopic version ... has designedly omitted or slurred over some clauses in the passage beginning, “Then will I give unto mine elect.”' This guess is, I take it, shewn to be correct. The doctrine—which is indeed a very curious one—was thought dangerous.¹

Passing on, I note that ἡ κατασκευὴ has its equivalent in the portion of the righteous in Eth.; but there is nothing to correspond to Eth.’s ‘adorn with flowers’. It is conceivable that something has dropped out of the Greek. Apparently in Eth. ‘the peoples’ is the equivalent of τῶν πάτριαρχῶν.

The οὖσινως of the MS is ingeniously interpreted by Wessely and Prümm as a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον meaning fornication. They connect it with ὅπως ἢ ὅπως. It is true that Rome might, as in Rev. xvii &c., be described as the mistress of fornication: but I cannot help preferring the reading δύσεως, which was evidently that of Eth.

The sentence which Eth. has so sadly mangled, about πιέ το ποτήριον is not rightly explained by Prümm. My rendering shews it to contain a plain allusion to Nero, who is regarded as the son of the devil. I do not know that we find exactly this description of him elsewhere; but in Rev. xvii 8 a beast, usually identified with Nero, μέλλει ἀναβαλέναι ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου; and in the Ascension of Isaiah iv 2–4, Nero is identified with Beliar, the king of this world who will descend from his firmament in the form of a man, a wicked king, the murderer of his mother. And of him it is said (3) that he will persecute the planting which the twelve apostles of the Beloved will have planted: and of the twelve, one will be delivered into his hands (ἐν ταῖς χερσῖν αὐτοῦ).

¹ Wessely-Prümm render ‘electis meis (Deum) quando statuerint me ex punitione’ (1), and Prümm connects the words vaguely with the disappearance of the Messiah and the phrase τοῦ ἐν Ἀδων.
This was long ago interpreted by Clemen as a reference to the martyrdom of St Peter. The view was combated by Harnack and others; but surely the new fragment is decisive in its favour. The phrase 'the cup which I promised thee' shews that our author was acquainted, if not with John xxi, at least with the prediction of Peter's death embodied therein.

In the Greek the form \( x\nu\pi o\nu \) is a little suspect: in view of the passage in \( \text{Asc. Jes.} \) I would read \( x\nu\pi o\nu \). \( \text{I\varepsilon\nu o\nu \lambda\acute{\alpha} \beta\eta \ a\varepsilon\tau o\nu \ \eta \ \delta\acute{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon\nu \) \; I do not know whether stress ought to be laid on \( \delta\acute{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon\nu \) as meaning the disappearance of Nero. Priimm would interpret the whole sentence of the Messiah, and \( \delta\acute{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon\nu \) of that disappearance and concealment of the Messiah of which Rabbinic teaching spoke. But I cannot accept this, and think it safer to keep to the more general sense of the word.

The conclusion of the fragment is not quite satisfactory. As I have noted, \( \delta\epsilon k\tau o\varsigma \) has the passive sense, and an active one seems to be needed. The Ethiopic has here:

'As for thee, thou art chosen according to the promise which I have given thee;'

whence we see that he read \( \epsilon k\nu k\tau o\varsigma \) and not \( \delta k\nu k\tau o\varsigma \). Neither word construes quite comfortably with the genitive \( \tau\eta\varsigma \, \eta \tau\acute{\alpha} \gamma e\varsigma \lambda\varsigma \varsigma \); and I cannot at the moment suggest a probable supplement. Eth. continues:

'Spread thou therefore my gospel of peace throughout all the world (or my gospel ... in peace). Verily men shall rejoice. My words shall be (or are) the source of hope and of life, and in a moment the world shall rejoice (?) (or shall be ravished; i.e. with pleasure).'

The last clause of this also is suspicious.

Immediately upon this follows the vision of Moses and Elias, and of Paradise, which, in a different form, appears in the Akhmim text before the description of hell.

It must be reckoned a very fortunate circumstance that the Rainer fragment contains the passage which has been worse treated in Eth. than any other, and contains more puzzles. And altogether the fragment is very remarkable, both as containing early allusions to the martyrdom of Peter by Nero and the prediction of it by our Lord, and also as confirming very strongly the authority of the Ethiopic version, and that of the Sibylline oracles as a paraphrase. The greater part of Father Priimm's essay is devoted to championing Eth. as against the Akhmim text, and I am naturally very glad to be able to claim him as a supporter.
II

Perhaps I may be allowed to make this an occasion for some more general observations about *Apoc. Petri*, to which I have been led by Father Prümmer's essay and by Abbé Vaganay's edition of the Gospel of Peter, particularly the section of his Introduction in which he discusses the relation between Gospel and Apocalypse (p. 187-192). The excellence of this book, which I hope to review elsewhere in this JOURNAL, makes it a duty to consider carefully what the author has to say on a subject on which he disagrees with published views of mine.

First, what is the problem? As I see it, it is this. We have two widely divergent texts of the *Apocalypse of Peter*. One is represented by the Akhmim fragment, which exists in the single MS that also contains the fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*. The other is represented not only by the Ethiopic version, but also by Patristic quotations dating from the second century, by the Bodleian fragment 'of the fifth century', and by the Rainer fragment 'of the third or fourth'. Clearly the weight of external evidence warrants us in regarding this latter text as original, and the other as an edition. And internal evidence points the same way. The secondary character of Akhmim may, I believe be taken as proved.

But if Akhmim is secondary, if it is an edition, with what purpose was it made? Surely in order to fit it into another context; surely again, that context must have been a Petrine writing. Now, in view of the facts (1) that our single copy of Akh. is found in the same volume (not merely, as Vaganay says in the same tomb) as another piece of a Petrine writing (the Gospel) copied by the same scribe (2) that in the setting of it there are verbal resemblances to this other fragment, I have followed Zahn's lead and maintained that Akh. is a portion of *Apoc. Petri* embodied, with changes, in the Gospel, by the author of the latter.

Is this view borne out by the nature of the verbal resemblances? Obviously that is a most important question. Vaganay says no: I say yes.

Two of the most striking resemblances are: (1) the employment of ὃ κύριος to the exclusion of ὁ θανάτος throughout the Gospel (*EP*) and five times in the Apoc. (*AP*); (2) ἥμεισο οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί in both. Of the first Vaganay says (p. 191): 'Même l'absence du mot Jésus dans le fragment apocalyptique d'Akhmim ne saurait retenir l'attention, puisqu'il est parlé fréquemment de Jésus dans le texte éthiopien plus complet.'

Well, but is it not part of the thesis that the author of *EP* adapted

---

1 Vide infra.
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and altered AP. for his purposes? Of course the elimination of Jesus
would be one of the first changes he would make!

The other he explains ‘par une tendance commune à beaucoup
autres apocryphes (ήμεισν οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί dans E. 59 et AP. 5,
mais aussi dans l’Epistola Apostolorum (aeth.) p. 64 et dans l’Évangile
Of course, I reply, in any book ostensibly written by the twelve apostles,
they will speak of themselves thus. The point is that here we find the
phrase in a writing (or writings) attributed to a single apostle, Peter.
Look at the parallelism:

_Ep_. 59–60. ἤμεισν δὲ οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί τοῦ κυρίου ἐκλαίομεν...
ed δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος.

_Akh_. 5 sq. ἤμεισν οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί ἐδείχθησαν ... καὶ προσελθόν
τῷ κυρίῳ εἶπον.

And please note that the section of Akh. in question is one which
has been most interfered with by the adapter—changed in position and
in content—and one, consequently, in which traces of the adapter’s
hand should be most prominent.

On these two points, then, I think Vaganay’s arguments fail. I will
not spend time on the other verbal resemblances, which are by no
means without their force, but will notice Vaganay’s other objections:
‘Les détails historiques ... ne démontrent pas etc. Cette façon d’agré-
menter le discours se rencontre ailleurs ... Témoin l’Epistola Aposto-
lorum. En outre la publication du texte éthiopien a révélé que ces mêmes
détails (le discours de Jésus sur les faux prophètes, sa présence sur la
montagne avec les Douze) empruntés à Mt. xxiv 3 sq. appartiennent
ti la partie originale de l’Apoc de Pierre.’

I do not see the force of this. A person adapting a book to a new
context uses details from that book. How could he help it?

‘La découverte des fragments évangélique et apocalyptique d’Akh
mim dans le même tombeau n’est pas une preuve qu’ils aient appartenu
au même livre. Tout au plus pourrait-on admettre qu’ils ont été copiés
par le même scribe, et encore la chose n’est pas sûre. La présence de
feuilles blancs avant et après les deux fragments, la façon dont le
premier se termine au milieu d’une phrase, tout cela indique que le
copiste a transcrit consciencieusement des débris d’ouvrages, en laissant
un espace pour les compléter si possible ; ce n’est pas un motif sérieux
de croire que ces bribes fussent partie du même évangile.’

They were found, not only in the same tomb, but in the same book-
cover, bound together, and most likely (I should say, clearly) in the
same hand. The argument furnished by the MS is of course not con-
clusive, but plainly it is permissive of the belief that the scribe was
copying two detached fragments of a single book. If anything, it rather favours that belief. Something more solid is to come:

'On peut indiquer rapidement deux raisons qui établissent la diversité des deux morceaux. . . . (a) Il suffit de lire le fragment évangelique pour juger de la sobriété du récit qui s'apparente beaucoup à la narration synoptique. Jusque dans les passages où l'auteur se montre le plus indépendant, par exemple dans l'histoire de la résurrection (35-44) il garde encore une réserve remarquable auprès des autres livres apocryphes. Singulièrement le tableau des apparitions angéliques forme un contraste frappant avec la même peinture dans l'Apoc. de Pierre. D'un côté, quelques légers traits (EP. 36 and 55 quoted). De l'autre, une profusion de couleurs dans un tableau dessiné avec complaisance (Akh. 6-10 quoted). On saisit la différence: ce n'est ni la même inspiration ni la même touche. A l'évidence, ce dernier morceau ne porte pas la marque du pseudo-évangeliste.'

But these are not both descriptions of angels. The first relates to the angels at the sepulchre: the second to two departed saints, whom the apostles have specially desired to see, and have asked what their appearance would be, 'πορασει εις την μορφήν'. Of course in their case a description was called for, and the more elaborate the better. In the other case, beyond saying that the apparitions were bright, details were out of place.

But in general, Vaganay seems to miss the point of the theory he is opposing. If a man adapts another man's writing, we shall inevitably find inconsistencies of style.

And I must observe that the Passion fragment of the EP. does not enable us to say that we know all about the style or habits of its writer. We do not know in the least how he treated the discourses or miracles of our Lord. We do know—Vaganay has shewn it admirably—that he used sources. He may not have made a mosaic out of the Four Gospels, but he was at any rate dependent upon Catecheses and Testimonia in his Passion-narrative—a section of the history in which these sources were of outstanding importance for his purpose. Suppose that he wished to write of the future life: would he not be likely again to use sources? A more or less accredited source lay ready to his hand in the shape of AP. And as he is admittedly desirous of giving prominence to Peter and adding lustre to his name, is not Peter's own revelation precisely the book he would use?

(b) 'La tradition patristique touchant l'Évangile et l'Apoc. de Pierre confirme que les deux fragments d'Akhmim ne sauraient appartenir au même livre. D'une part, l'Évangile est resté confiné longtemps en Syrie dans des cercles très étroits et n'a jamais exercé qu'une action très restreinte. De l'autre, l'Apoc. a été répandue un peu partout:
Clément d'Alexandrie, le canon de Muratori, Méthodius (etc.) sont là pour l'attester. Elle a joui d'un grand crédit.... Si le fragment apocalyptique d'Akh. avait été inséré par le ps.-Pierre dans son évangile, l'œuvre entière, sans nul doute, aurait connu un certain succès. Ici ou là, on aurait retenu quelques-unes des particularités édifiantes du récit apocryphe, on aurait célébré le nom de Pétronius, bref, on n'aurait pas laissé tomber la partie la plus importante de l'ouvrage dans un oubli aussi profond. L'Év. et l'Apoc., pour être placés sous le même patronage, n'en restent pas moins deux livres qui n'ont entre eux aucun rapport.'

*Non sequitur.* Granted, the *EP.* was never a well-known book. Therefore however much it contained of interest, whether borrowed or original, whether discourses, miracles, or revelations, very few people read it. It is all very well to say that if it had been known to contain the *AP.* it would have become popular. All one can say is that it never did. Who knows why? Not impossibly one reason was that it contained hardly anything that could not be found elsewhere in a more acceptable form.

Since writing the first part of this article I have become aware that the Bodleian and Rainer fragments of the *AP.* must be parts of one and the same MS. They agree in dimensions, in the number of lines to the page (13), and in the number of letters to the line (8–10). The Rainer collection came to Europe in the eighties, and the Bodleian fragment was bought in 1894. It is assigned to the fifth century by the cataloguers, whereas Wessely ascribes his fragment to the third or fourth; but the divergence of opinion is not fatal, especially in view of the very poor condition of the Bodleian leaf.

A line-for-line transcript of Wessely's text will probably be welcome, together with a copy of his preliminary remarks. He does not identify the fragment rightly, but believes it to belong to the *Acts of Peter,* and prints it next to the Oxyrhynchus fragment of that book.

*ʻFeuille arrachée à un livre (codex) en parchemin. 78 x 53 mm. Collection Rainer. Ecriture onciale du iii\textsuperscript{e} ou iv\textsuperscript{e} siècle avec les abbreviations \textsuperscript{v}w \textsuperscript{v}i\textsuperscript{v}, πηρ πατήρ, ο\textsuperscript{v}νοι ο\textsuperscript{v}ρανοι. Notons l'usage de la cédille et du supplément des lignes: à la fin de la page 3 αρ:χουσαν, δ: page 3, l. 6 δ.‘*
ST FELICITY IN THE ROMAN MASS

It seems to me convenient to start this article by a discussion of a various reading, a mere question of the order of a list of names, but I hope to shew that it leads to the consideration of wider issues and to a reorientation of some current ideas about the history of the Christian Liturgy in the Dark Ages.

First, as to the various reading. Towards the end of the Roman Canon of the Mass ‘we sinners’ (nobis quoque peccatoribus) ask to be in some way conjoined with the holy Martyrs of old, a list being given, first of men then of women. The women are (1) Felicitas, (2) Perpetua, (3) Agatha, (4) Lucia, (5) Agnes, (6) Caecilia, (7) Anastasia. This is the present order, and it is confirmed by the MSS of the so-called ‘Gelasian’ and ‘Gregorian’ Sacramentaries. The Missale Francorum (Vat. Reg. 257) is here missing, but the Bobiense (Bo) and the Stowe Missal (St) have Perpetua², Agnes⁸, Cecily⁶, Felicity¹, Anastasia⁷, Agatha³, Lucy⁴, Bobiense also adding Eugenia at the end.

This division of the MSS is quite normal. It represents the Irish or ‘insular’ tradition opposed to what—at least in the times of Charlemagne and his Pope Hadrian—was regarded as specifically Roman. The division corresponds very much in general character to what we find in the MSS of the New Testament: the ‘Irish’ type corresponds to the Western text, the ‘Roman’ to the Alexandrian or Hesychian. The latter is, as a rule, more correct, but the former, like the Western text of the New Testament, represents a very old branch of transmission and amidst many errors seems to preserve a certain number of original readings lost elsewhere.

M. R. JAMES.