

Zusammenbruch der bisherigen ablehnenden Haltung heraus. Die Tatsache, daß ihnen der Sohn und Bruder als der *κύριος τῆς δόξης* erscheint, bringt den Umschwung von der Ablehnung zur Jüngerschaft.

3) Der Ort für die Angelophanie der Frauen, für die Christophanien der Verwandten Jesu und der 500 ist sicher Jerusalem oder dessen nächste Umgebung. In bezug auf die summarische Jüngerchristophanie teilen sich die Berichte: Matthäus verlegt sie nach Galiläa, Lukas Joh 20 nach Jerusalem, Markus fehlt. Die Entscheidung über sie hängt ab von der über die unmittelbar vorausgehende apostolische Einzelchristophanie. Da die des Jakobus nach I Cor 15 und Hebr. Ev. nach Jerusalem gehört, die des Paulus nach Damaskus, konzentriert sich die Frage lediglich auf den Ort der Christophanie vor Petrus. Die einzige positive Vermutung, die das NT in dieser Frage hat, ist die des Lukas, der sie nach Jerusalem verweist. Für Jerusalem spricht ferner, daß Petrus nach allen Evangelien Jerusalem nach der Verleugnung nicht verläßt — die Flucht der Jünger nach Galiläa ist eine Legende der Kritik —, daß die annähernde Gleichzeitigkeit der Christuserlebnisse der Jünger, Verwandten und Frauen nur bei der jerusalemschen Hypothese möglich ist. Gegen Jerusalem spricht nicht Mc 16 7, da dies Zitat einer nicht eingetroffenen Weissagung Jesu kein Zeuge für eine galiläische Jüngerchristophanie ist, auch nicht die aus Joh 20 und Ev. Petr. gezogene Schlußfolgerung, daß sie eine Erzählung von Petri Christophanie am galiläischen Meer enthielten (was durchaus unsicher bleibt). Das Mißverständnis jener Jesusweissagung Mc 14 27 ff., die Erzählungen vom Fischzug des Petrus und von der Predigt auf dem Berge erklären vollkommen die Entstehung der galiläischen Überlieferung, während die Erklärung der Entstehung der jerusalemschen Überlieferung ohne starke Gewaltigkeiten nicht möglich ist.

[Abgeschlossen am 10. Dezember 1922.]

The Armenian Acts of Cyprian.

By Fred C. Conybeare in Oxford.

Ruinart in his *Acta Martyrum Sincera* in his discussion of our sources of information concerning the Martyrdom of St. Cyprian of Carthage, after mentioning the *Vita et Passio* composed by his deacon Pontius, the two homilies of Maximus of Turin and the one of Fulgentius, continues as follows:

Et ante hos omnes Gregorius Nazianzenus unam orationem, quae scilicet est decima octava tomi 1, de eodem sancto martyre composuit. Verum in ea illud est incommodi, quod magnum Cyprianum confundit cum alio Cypriano, qui ex mago Christianus factus, cum Iustina virgine quam veneficiis frustra corrumpere tentaverat, martyrium Nicomediae sub Diocletiano subiisse fertur. In eundem scopulum impegisse videntur Prudentius in hymno de S. Cypriano, et alii nonnulli, potissimum e Graecis.

Among these Greeks is to be numbered the empress Eudoxia, as we know from Photius' *Bibliotheca*, cod. 184.

Father Hippolyte Delehaye in *Analecta Bollandiana* 39 (1921) p. 314—332 (I owe this reference to Father Akinean of Vienna) argues that Gregory of Nazianz and Prudentius used a common document composed in Greek and necessarily older than the year 379 when Gregory delivered his discourse. This source exists in a fifth-century Armenian version described by Father Aucher of the congregation of San Lazare in Venice as early as 1818. I copied parts of it several years ago from Paris MSS., but went no further. Father Akinean, of the Mechitarist Convent in Vienna, has now published the integral text in the last Jan. No. of his Convent's Journal, *Handes Amsoreay*, from the Paris codices, anciens fonds arm. 88 (= in Macler's Catalogue 178) and 46 C (= 118). The same text probably exists in old Georgian, but is unknown in Greek and Latin. I herewith translate the text:

The Martyrdom of S. Cyprian, Bishop.

1. Thus is narrated the heroism of the great witness Cyprian in Karkedon city, for such was the man formerly in his life time, and after death in all the world are bruited abroad his sufferings for Christ's sake. Many (have given) other accounts of his former life; but we are constrained to tell of his end, entering into the zeal which he entertained for Christ.

2. He was to begin with a philosopher and a priest of idols, for from childhood his parents devoted him to the service of idols, and so renowned was he in evil that he surpassed all magicians, Yanes and Jambres; and he was excessively rich, so that none dared utter any ill word against him. And so supreme was he in wizardry that without effort he could induce noble ladies to leave their couches by night and stoop to gratify shameful lusts.

3. And he lusted himself after a fair damsel, who had dedicated her virginity to our Saviour Jesus Christ. Having beheld her as

she passed he was smitten, and sent his familiar fiends to terrify the damsel, and inflame her with passion for him, but the damsel sealed herself with the sign of Christ's cross. Now she was of noble and rich parents, who for Christ's sake shared their riches with the needy. And the damsel bethought her discreetly that it was better to bestow herself upon Christ than for a season to enjoy sin, and that, if she should bestow herself on a man and forfeit his (Christ's) love for herself, she could not save herself from torments, how much more shall one who keeps not Christ's deposit, pay the penalty? And she pondered Paul's word: Such shall have trouble in the flesh (I Cor 7²⁸), and: He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit (ibid. 6¹⁷). Forthwith she took refuge in the haven, Christ, though she wavered in judgement; she consumed her body with fasting, so as to mortify herself before death; and she ravaged her beauty by choosing as her couch the hard ground, and drove off with prayers and psalms the demons; and these, after importuning her for a while and unsuccessfully, departed ashamed from her.

4. And Cyprian questioned the demons concerning their delay; but they declared openly it was impossible to persuade the damsel. So the blessed Cyprian, having pondered right well, said to them: Why till now have ye deceived us, saying that We are superior to Christ? For if passion for him conquers you, then clearly the weak is subdued by the strong, as a torch by the sun and light by lightning. Without doubt he is the stronger, as indeed he is of the nature of God.

5. Having spoken thus and cast away the evil before him, he thenceforth found refuge with the saviour. And he ran and reached the synagogue (= συναγωγή), to the consternation of the congregation, and flinging himself down at the door asked for release from his error, pleading ignorance. Those who were heads of the church deemed his action to be counterfeit, and a bit of cunning and fraud; and great was the tumult among the priests, who said it was easier for a flint to change than for Cyprian to come into accord; but he wants (they said) to feign religion. But he addressed words of supplication to them, and that it was not a fraud he established by his repentance clear testimony. And the bishop demanded of him as an earnest of his faith to burn his book of magic before the congregation; and he without scruple did so before their eyes. And along with the book he also consumed with fire the riches he had acquired by wickedness, but what he owed to honest labour he distributed among the needy. And he stayed in the street with the

poor, an outcast; and kept away from the church, deeming himself unworthy of that life (or salvation). Enough for me, he said, is the temporal life, who am infamous in the street, and all my error do I publish abroad. And what mourning, he said, is greater than this, that being utterly dead, I am still numbered among the living? I am bound to suffer condemnation for my vain deeds; and unless I do so, I have lost many thro' my wizardry and wickedness. And having said this he put on sackcloth and spread ashes for his couch near by the synagogue and resolutely endured, fulfilling in himself the saying: I have chosen rather to repair unto the house of my God (Ps 83¹¹).

And for a space of three years he thus laboured and practised patient endurance, and with tears and fasting repented his former life. And all marvelled at his sudden conversion, and truly could it be said: This is the renewal of the righthand of the most high (Ps 76⁹).

6. But when he conceived a desire for divine reading, he became an auditor, but still for a term of three years. More than before he braced himself in his habits. And again after desiring and receiving baptism, he persevered with hope in prayer. This excess of virtue the bishop marked and instituted him a doorkeeper; and after the lapse of a short time he was held worthy of the rank of server. Forasmuch as he gave himself up greatly to virtue and practised himself in lections more and more, he was thereupon admitted to the order of the diaconate and began to instruct the laity as a loudvoiced preacher of Christ.

7. And when the bishop of the land died in his company, the congregation eagerly chose him by divine lot (or appointment, κλήρος) through the witness of the holy spirit and of the congregation, and the congregation rejoiced at his acceptance of the lot from the Table. For he was on terms of friendship and peace with all, by words instructing and by works rousing, nor was he inferior to the first apostles.

8. But the haters of good did not tolerate this, and the adversary appeared once again, the same one who earlier consumed his life in wilful conduct. Consumed thenceforth by jealousy, he could not brook it, but excited against the Church persecution many a time before that, embroiling the ecumenical Church; and under Decius Caesar he aroused a fresh war, and this was the graver one, in that not only Christians, but also their friends, they shared the same (? fate) with them; for he commanded them to

sacrifice, and his whole anxiety was to convert Cyprian. For he expected at once to convert all the laity, if only he could convince him. Accordingly he sent for him; and with adulation and bribes he thought to convert him.

9. But the virtuous one with firm resolution and fearless soul answered the king: If it were someone else who tempted and some unapparent error were made clear, if he could furnish him with some plausible hope of error, then indeed, he said, we would have words to get ready for the conflict; but inasmuch as it is he who is guilty of the evil, whose shame of idolatry moreover I have dashed to the ground, I deem it superfluous to be tempting myself, nor is there any justification for casting down into the same abyss one converted from error. And for thee anyhow, O tyrant, it is not meet to dream of things that cannot be. Hope not then that any of God's servants will in thy behoof shun destruction by idolatry and set himself afar from God who created all. The king said: Thou art guilty of evil and a doer of it. Cyprian said: This satan is guilty of evil, whom you worship, who bore a grudge against man, because man alone of all creatures was made in the image of God. The judge said: But who made him evil? Cyprian said: Him did God create good, bestowing on him excellence above that of all creatures. But because he heard God say: Let us make man in our image, his heart was smitten with jealousy, he fell from glory; and he that was first of all became last, the good (became) evil, the glorious one disgraced, because his whole nature is altered except his divinity. Wherefore God set him to war against men, and spread out the world as a vast arena, in order that the victory over evil might be seen in conflict with him, victory over whom only our Saviour wrought for all the virtuous and raised them to heaven. The judge said: And how is it you worship the man Christ as God? Cyprian said: Because he was Word of God; made man for our sake, he accepted suffering for sake of our salvation, and so appeared victorious, God made man, though one who was unchangeable by nature and invisible. Otherwise (or other) he could not appear to the God of creatures¹, unless he had made his own (= *ὀκσιόματα*) creatures¹. Accordingly creatures have the same desire.

And when he had said this, the king feared lest he should convince all his hearers, and being excited with anger he threatened him afresh with condemnation: I do not tolerate thee, he says, thou

¹ Or render creation. We have here an anti-marcionite thesis.

promoter of antics (?), but without more delay thou must sacrifice to the Gods, to whom we behold creation obedient without pretext. Wherefore sacrifice to the sun that came to be for my sake, that unresting circles round ocean in a single course?

Cyprian said: Call not idols Gods, led astray by idolatry of demons.

And the king hearing this and not being indulgent towards him, smote him with whip the more, and had him cast into a pit, imagining that by length of time and confinement in the dark he would be reduced to obedience through torture. But he was utterly indifferent to torture; nay, by his letters he led many others as well to undergo martyrdom. However he did not in any way annul the sentence of God because of what had occurred, but requited after no long time the miserable man, by means of others him destroyed requiting (?), and for a season the persecution was stayed.

10. And once again sprung up a secret war, for it was the resolve of Satan to disturb religion. And meeting externally with a little repose, men freely held intercourse with the city of Rome, and a council held that it is right to pardon those who sacrificed against their will. But Satan a second time downed his pride of vanity and said: God does not admit such men, and he who transgresses religion receives not remission. With many other pronouncements also he blasphemed the benevolence of God and attempted to keep the land from the loving kindness of God.

Thereupon the blessed one settled that conflict also by the holy Spirit, and put forward Peter as foundation and canon of the Church, and as having received from Christ the keys of heaven. And those who wilfully denied the faith in order to magnify themselves in glory and riches of the world, were unworthy of the grace of God. But one who could not endure the tortures of tyranny and did not wilfully do homage, him in return for penitence they held worthy, the Saviour having said, The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak; and Peter after thrice denying and thrice confessing was loved of Christ, taking account of his profession. Understanding this they anathematised the proud one as froward and arrogant, because he denied the loving kindness of God.

11. And a second disturbance he aroused in the time of Valerianus and Valiôn, who by their unholy edicts disturbed the world, shewing great savagery against Cyprian: Either let him sacrifice, they said, and on a great scale receive reward; or, if he will not sacrifice, let him be tortured to excess.

Cyprian gently answered them: Cease the error of your idolatry.

Do unto me whatsoever ye will, for even if the kings bestow on me the entire world, they cannot alienate me from this resolve of mine and from this true piety which dispenses all things. For so hath it pleased me, not to be softened by promises nor because of men's praise to obey, nor to give way under torture, I confessing God the Father and his only begotten Son and the Holy Spirit consent to immolate myself.

The second Caesar answered and said: For a long time, Cyprian, despoiling the altars in every season thou hast made thyself an enemy of the Gods of Rome and a transgressor. And now neither by rewards nor by honors have the kings been able to persuade thee, nor divers torments, to humble thyself to the religion of the gods, as the blessed leader of the order of Christians. Wherefore it is the good pleasure of the kings that Cyprian shall die by the sword.

And, slain by the sword, the blessed one reached the goal of the upper call in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen.

Such is the Armenian text now published by Father Akinean. It was assumed by Cave, Ruinart and all who have approached the problem that Prudentius, Gregory of Nazianz and Eudokia confused Cyprian with a magician of the name martyred under Diocletian, and it is certain that Eudokia and Gregory were guilty of such confusion. Prudentius, however, does not name Diocletian, and this document names Decius in § 8.

Its author used directly or indirectly the *Acta proconsularia*, but not so obviously the *Vita et Passio* composed by Pontius, Cyprian's deacon. Pontius writes as a contemporary of Cyprian, if not as an eyewitness of his passion; but certain critics, e. g. R. Reitzenstein, contend that this was the pose of some later writer who really composed the *Vita et Passio*.

Be that as it may, the question arises whether the author of our document used the *Vita et Passio*. Possibly. For the following passages seem have a literary connection with each other: § 6. "Forasmuch as he gave himself up greatly to virtue and practised himself in lections more and more, he was there upon admitted to the order of the diaconate".

Vita et Passio c. 2: *Deinde, quod maius est, cum de lectione divina quaedam iam non pro conditione novitatis, sed pro fidei festinatione didicisset; statim rapuit quod invenit pro merendo Deo futurum.*

It may be that a common document here lies behind the Armenian source and the *Vita et Passio*. For even if Pontius was a contemporary of the saint, as I believe he was, yet he admits his use of sources, when he writes thus: c. 2: *Si quibus eius interfui, si qua de antiquioribus eius comperi.*

The Armenian source certainly uses the *Acta* very freely, and in c. 4 he confirms the presence of the word *secta*. So does Pontius c. 17 when he wrote: *Sententiam gloriosam in qua dictus est sectae Signifer et inimicus deorum*. This is echoed in the Armenian § 11: "As the blessed leader of the order of Christians"; where the epithet blessed is of course an interpolation, for the pagan magistrate could not have so qualified a *sectae signifer*. Still less could he have used the words *ad sectam caerimoniarum suarum* (sc. *Romanarum*). Here all the MS. texts of the *Acta* are equally impossible, as P. Corssen has pointed out in the *ZNW* 1914, p. 231. The Armenian alone preserves the true text, somewhat as follows: *Diu sacrilega mente vivisti . . . et inimicum te constituisti diis Romanis . . . nec te . . . principes nostri . . . revocare potuerunt, tanto tempore . . . ad caerimoniae, tanquam sectae signiferum*. This is not unlike the restoration that Corssen suggests: *Nec te . . . ab secta felicissimorum temporum suorum contemptrice obduratum furore ad ceremonias . . . potuerunt revocare*.

The narrative of Prudentius is based on the Armenian document. Thus he represents the saint as cast into a pit by the king after the first trial and confined in darkness:

*Antra latent Tyriae carthaginis altius reposita
conscia tartariae caliginis, abdicata soli:
clausus in his specubus sanctus Cyprianus etc.*

There are some obscurities in the Armenian text. Thus the last lines of § 9 are unintelligible. And what is the sense of the words "the second Caesar" in § 11? Valion in that section is a mistake for Galion, **V** and **G** being easily confused in an Armenian uncial. On the whole however the Armenian is a clear and straightforward text. It is almost certainly the rendering of a Greek original, and the style is quite that of fifth century Armenian, as Dr. Akinean insists.

When we contrast the comparative sobriety of these Armenian *Acta* with the florid story told by Eudokia and preserved in the pages of Photius, a doubt insinuates itself whether the conflation with the story of Cyprian of Antioch has yet begun in the former.

It involves no anachronisms, it mentions neither Justina nor Diocletian. Nor is there anything improbable in the story of Cyprian's falling in love with a young lady of noble family, and of her reciprocating his passion, as she evidently did. Both parties may have sacrificed themselves to the Encratite scruples so diffused in that age, and particularly in Carthage, as we know from Cyprian's own letters. The average hagiographer of that epoch or of any would certainly concoct out of so innocent an incident a story of demons, magic, love philtres and the rest. Pontius in his *Vita et Passio* almost hints at some stifled passion as the first step in his hero's march to perfection: *Inter fidei suae nihil aliud credidit Deo dignum, quam si continentiam tueretur. Tunc enim posse idoneum fieri pectus et sensum ad plenam veri capacitatem pervenire, si concupiscentiam carnis robusto atque integro sanctimoniae vigore calcaret. Quis unquam tanti miraculi meminit?*

[Abgeschlossen den 20. November 1922.]

Eschatologie und Mystik im Urchristentum¹.

Von Karl Ludwig Schmidt in Gießen.

Die Frage nach der Eschatologie und der Mystik im Urchristentum scheint eine Einzelheit zu betreffen, zielt aber auf eine Gesamtbeurteilung des Urchristentums ab in bezug auf seine Eigenart und Entwicklung. Nach der üblichen Begriffsbestimmung verstehen wir unter Eschatologie die Lehre von den letzten Dingen, unter Mystik die Erfassung des Übersinnlichen, Göttlichen nicht durch die Sinne und das Denken, sondern durch eigenartige innere Erfahrung; diese, vielfach gesteigert bis zur Wesenseinigung mit dem Göttlichen, kann als Henosis die zweite Stufe der Mystik genannt werden². Eine weitere Ausführung an dieser Stelle empfiehlt sich nicht, da wir es mit Problembegriffen zu tun haben.

Für die Anlage der Darstellung sehe ich zwei Möglichkeiten: ich könnte meine eigene Meinung aussprechen, in stiller Auseinandersetzung mit der bisherigen Forschung. Diese Art scheint mir das Vorrecht des Veteranen eines wissenschaftlichen Faches zu sein. Da ich bekennen muß, eine abgeschlossene Meinung über die vorliegende Aufgabe nicht zu haben, wähle ich einen anderen Weg, den der betonten Auseinandersetzung mit der bisherigen Forschung.

¹ Aus einer von der Gießener Theologischen Fakultät GUSTAV KRÜGER zu seinem 60. Geburtstagsfest (29. Juni 1922) überreichten handschriftlichen Festgabe.

² Vgl. Rudolf Otto, *Das Heilige*, jetzt 8. Aufl. 1922. Liste übertragener Fremdworte.