

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



James' *Apocrypha Anecdota Texts and Studies*, Vol. II. No. 3. *Apocrypha Anecdota*, edited by Montague Rhodes James, M.A. 6s. net.

E. N. Bennett

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 101 - 103

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018758X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018758X

How to cite this article:

E. N. Bennett (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 101-103 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018758X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

recente; zeston feruentem; synceraston calda aqua'; and *Colloq. Monacensia* *ib.* 653^a 'βάλει νερόν mitte recentem; πρόσθεσ ἀκρατον adice merum; *ib.* πίνωμεν νερόν ἐκ τοῦ βαυκιδίου bibamus recentem de gillone.' Further examples from Byzantine authorities: *Apophth. Patrum* (ed. Migne t 46), p. 205 B καὶ ἀνέστη τις πρεσβύτερος μέγας δοῦναι τὸ κανκάλιον τοῦ νεροῦ. Leont. Neap. (ed. Migne t. 93) V.S. p. 1713 C, ἐκεῖ θερμόν καὶ νερόν καὶ ὦδε νερόν καὶ θερμόν. Porph. Adm. 77, 13, Βερούτζη ὃ ἐστι βράσμα νεροῦ. *Et.*

M. 597, 43 sq. ναρὸν τὸ ὑγρόν... Σοφοκλῆς Τρωίῳ: Πρὸς ναρὰ δὲ κρηναῖα χωροῦμεν ποτὰ. οὕτω Φιλόξενος καὶ ἴσως ἡ συνήθεια τρέψασα τὸ A εἰς E λέγει νερόν (cp. *Et. G.* 406, 23). That the etymological part of the last remark is a pedantic fiction of the *Et. M.* needs no special comment, since every student of this authority knows too well his absurd passion to connect every platitude with classical Greek.

A. N. JANNARIS.

JAMES' APOCRYPHA ANECDOTA.

Texts and Studies, Vol. II. No. 3. *Apocrypha Anecdota*, edited by MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, M.A. 6s. net.

THE general excellence of the series to which it belongs is fully maintained by Mr. James' *Apocrypha Anecdota*. Here is a volume of no less than thirteen apocryphal works compiled, as the editor states, without anything like a continuous or wide investigation from three British and two French libraries (Bodleian, British Museum, Cheltenham, Bibliothèque Nationale, Trèves). One can heartily sympathize with the editor's regret that so few professed theologians appear to have any liking for research in the field of apocryphal literature. Nor indeed is there any necessity why such research should be undertaken solely by the theologian. If some portion of the time which is at present wasted by men of ability over hack-work editions of Cicero's speeches or Virgil's *Aeneid* were devoted to the scholarly study of patristic literature, what enormous gains would result alike to classical scholarship and our knowledge of the history of the Empire! Of course if linguistic style be the criterion which determines the range of his pursuits, the classical student had perhaps better keep away from the present *Anecdota* lest the Greek of the *Apocalypsis Mariae* or the Latin of the *Visio Pauli*, like Jerome's Hebrew, injure his powers of composition. The language of several of these *Apocrypha* represents an interesting stage of transition between ancient and modern Greek. Curious words like κουβουκλείων, ἀκούμβιτος, κογχοστάτης, χανότης meet us at every turn.

The book opens with a complete Latin version of the *Visio Pauli*. Tischendorf's belief that the existing Greek text is

mutilated at the end is probably incorrect, as the present version, as well as the Syriac, concludes with the appearance of Elijah and Elisha.

One may perhaps regret that the editor has seldom attempted to discuss in any way the historical setting of pieces like the *Visio Pauli* and the *Acta Xanthippae et Polyxenae*, which furnish us with some internal indications of locality and date. In the case of the former document we find at the commencement: *Quo tempore palam facta est? Consule Theodosio Augusto minore et Cynegio*. Both the Greek MSS. used by Tischendorf read, in place of 'Cynegio,' Κωντιανοῦ, for which Tischendorf suggests Γπατιανοῦ. This is not in itself a very probable conjecture, but it is at any rate an attempt to place the date of the book under the reign of the elder Theodosius who shared the consulship with Gratian in 380. On the other hand it seems almost certain that the Latin version has preserved the correct form of the second consul's name. Cynegius (Quinegius) was consul in 388 with Theodosius the Great. Now it is easy to see whence the error *Theodosio Aug. minore* arose. The MS. from which the present copy of the *Visio Pauli* was made read, no doubt, *consule Theodosio II. et Cynegio*,—the Roman numerals referring, quite correctly, to the Emperor's second tenure of office,—and the scribe, misunderstanding the significance of the number, wrote down *minore*. Any doubt as to which Theodosius originally figured in the date is set at rest by Sozomen's statement (vii. 19), —τὴν δὲ νῦν ὡς ἀποκάλυψιν Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου φερομένην... πλείστοι μοναχῶν ἐπαινοῦσιν ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλείας (i.e. of Theod. I.) ἰσχυρίζονται τινες ταύτην ἠρῆσθαι τὴν βίβλον. The fact that the Syriac version

omits all mention of the consulship in question would seem to imply that it represents an earlier recension of the work than either the Greek or Latin versions. Perhaps after all the writing may be the old *ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου* mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria worked up at a later date in a different form. The *ἀναβατικόν* exists, I believe, in an Armenian version; if so, it ought to be examined.

Perhaps the most interesting document in the book is the *Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena*. It is difficult to see any justification for Tillemont's remark, 'nous nous consolons aisément de ne les avoir.' Mr. James has pointed out very carefully the numerous coincidences, verbal and otherwise, which exist between the present Acts and those of Paul and Thekla, Andrew, Philip and Thomas. In fact Mr. James is always thoroughly at home in dealing with the inter-relation of apocryphal writings.

If the date assigned by Mr. James to these Acts,—the middle of the 3rd century,—be correct, several interesting results follow. For example, we get one of our earliest clues to the whereabouts of the mysterious 'Babylon' of 1 Peter. When Polyxena has been carried off by one of her rival lovers, he hires a vessel and sets sail—(I suppose ὄρμουν is for ὄρμων)—ἐπὶ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν· εἶχεν γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἀδελφὸν τοπάρχην ὁ καθαπαύσας αὐτήν. In the introduction Mr. James speaks of Polyxena's 'forced voyage to Greece.' But Βαβυλωνία cannot denote Greece or any part of Greece. It might of course refer to the ordinary Babylon, but it is very improbable that a document written, as the present was almost certainly, in the east should speak of a sea-voyage from Spain to Babylon on the Euphrates. The identity of the Βαβυλωνία here is, I venture to think, rendered almost certain by the use of the word τοπάρχης in connection with it. This title was, it is true, occasionally used in a loose way of oriental rulers in Arabia and parts of Asia Minor [cp. e.g. Joseph. *Ant.* viii. 7, 2, Spartian, *Had.* 13]. But its special employment to denote a definite magistracy seems, as far as I can gather, to have been confined to two localities, viz. Edessa and Egypt. Abgarus was a 'toparch' of Edessa; cp. Procop. *Bell. Goth.* i. 12. Αὔγαρος ἦν τις ἐν τοῖς ἀνω χρόνοις Ἑδέσης τοπάρχης, οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς κατὰ τὸ ἔθνος βασιλεῖς τηνικαῦθα ἐκάλουν. But Edessa will scarcely suit the 'Babylon' of these *Acta*. On the other hand Egypt suits them very well: the fugitive vessel is on its way to Egypt when it is stopped by contrary winds and

ultimately carried to the coast of Greece. The question of the Egyptian magistracies is a difficult one, but there were, apparently, τοπάρχαι of single τόποι [cp. *C.I.G.* 4976 Ἑρμίας τοπάρχης Ἀριανσαίτιος], as well as of composite τοπαρχίαι, the latter of whom answered to the δήμαρχοι of Herod. 3, 6. In short the only locality which could be reached by sea from Spain, be called Βαβυλωνία and possess toparchs must be Egypt. The Coptic Church has, I believe, always held that 1 Peter was written from some part of Egypt and it is curious that in mediaeval Spanish MSS. Cairo is very commonly spoken of as 'Babylon.' If the words ἡ ἐν Βυβλῶνι in 1 Peter are not after all a primitive corruption which conceals some female name, probably that of Peter's wife, the theory that he wrote from Egypt is at any rate supported by the passage we have been discussing in a writing of the 3rd century. And it may be remarked in passing that it is difficult to see on what grounds Alford speaks of the Babylon in Egypt mentioned by Strabo as 'an insignificant fort.' So far from being insignificant it was the headquarters of one of the three army-corps which garrisoned Egypt, and a large number of chained convicts were permanently employed in working the τροχὸί and κογχλῖαι upon the canal which supplied the town with water from the Nile.

There are many other points of interest which meet one in reading these early *Acta*. For example, the private use of a wooden cross (*vide* § xxiii.) in the middle of the 3rd century is worth noticing. Again there is a clear reference to antiphonal singing in § vi. where Xanthippe hears the birds singing ὡσὰν ἐξ ἀντιφώνων καὶ ὑπηκόων. In § xii. our Lord is spoken of as ὁ δὸς ὑπνον ἀνεπαίσθητον τῷ δράκοντι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτὸν τὴν ἐνανθρώπησίν σου. This comes no doubt from the well-known passage in Ignatius' letter to the Ephesians (§ xix.) quoted again and again by the fathers. But is the expression ὁ δὸς ὑπνον ἀνεπαίσθητον with its mythological associations derived from any known source?

In the same section a passage occurs which may have some bearing on the date of these Acts. Xanthippe utters a long prayer in which she addresses Christ as being λόγῃ νυγείς τὴν πλευρὰν ἵνα τὴν ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς γενομένην πληγὴν τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἀποθεραπεύσης· πλευρὰ γὰρ οὕσα ἡ Εὐὰ πληγὴν εἰργάσατο τῷ Ἀδὰμ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ. Now this extraordinary exegesis is attributed to Apollinarius of Laodicea by Cordeus in his *Catena* and is, I believe, found

nowhere else. What inference are we to draw? If the exegesis be Apollinarius' own, then Mr. James has dated these Acts too early. But, of course, this may not have been the case, and this fanciful explanation of the Johannine passage may have been more or less prevalent in the 3rd century. No decided opinion can ever be offered on a point like this until the numerous 'Catenae' of the New Testament which exist have been properly examined,—a work still open to the theological student and full of promise.

Documents like the present *Acta* would often repay careful study on the lines pursued with such ability and success by Professor Ramsay in the case of the Thekla legend. For instance, can we find any historical facts incidentally mentioned which bear on the genuineness of the incidents recorded? The husband of Xanthippe is Probus, an *ἀνὴρ βασιλικός*. Now the name Probus occurs with some frequency amongst Spanish inscriptions, especially, I believe, those of Tarraconensis, in which province the plot must necessarily be laid. At first sight, indeed, the name Xanthippe as that of the lawful wife of a Roman official under the early empire might cause surprise. But in *C.I.G.* 4272 one finds an inscription from Tarraconensis,—

M.GRANIO PROBO DEC. PONTIFICI
AEDILICIIS HONORIBVS FVNCTO.

In the rest of the inscription a sister of this magistrate is mentioned called 'Aphrodite.' This seems to indicate that there is no *a priori* reason against a Roman official with a Greek-named wife having lived in Spain in the reign of Claudius. At the same time 'Probus' is a name which would readily be used by the compiler of a fictitious narrative.

Amongst the other contents of the volume is a full text of the well-known *Apocalypsis Mariae Virginis*. This has been transcribed from a Huntingdon MS. in the Bodleian which furnished Tischendorf with his printed selection from this Apocalypse.

Another Bodleian MS. (Rawl. Auct. G, 4), unnoticed by Tischendorf but mentioned by Mr. James, contains what may perhaps be the latest recension of this Apocalypse. The text in this MS. is not only, as the editor remarks, much shorter, but quite different from the one before us. For instance we get no help from the later MS. towards

filling up the unimportant lacuna¹ at the end of § xvii. for the Greek is different,—*ἄνθρωπος κεκραμένος· καὶ θηρίον πτερωτὸν ἔ κεφαλᾶς...καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Μιχαὴλ καὶ εἶπεν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν τὴν διάλυσιν τῆς ἀναγνώσεως κ.τ.λ.* I do not know how to construe the last words.

With respect to the three short fragments which conclude this selection Mr. James has suggested very reasonably that they may all perhaps be amplifications of the ordinary LXX. text. Even a slight acquaintance with cursive MSS. of the LXX. reveals the fact that such additions occur frequently.

In the supplement to the *Acta Philippi* there occurs one of the few known references to the talking cross which figures in the Gospel of Peter and very probably in the still earlier Ignatian Epistle to the Smyrnaeans (vid. *Academy*, Dec. 23rd, 1893). The whole section in the Acts where this incident occurs is full of interest; and I may mention that the expression *πολλὰι φωναὶ ἤχησαν ἐν οὐρανοῖς τὸ ἄμην* lends support to my suggestion in a former number of the *Classical Review* (vol. vii. p. 42) that the *το ναί* of the Petrine Gospel is not an answer to a question but a response equivalent to *ἀμήν*. We have also in this section a voice from heaven as in the Gospel of Peter. Perhaps it is worth mentioning that a reference to a voice at the Crucifixion is found in the *Christus Patiens*, l. 2256 sq.

ἐκ δ' αἰθέρος φωνή τις, ὡς μὲν εἰκάσαι,
θεὸς πατὴρ ἤχησεν ἐν βοῇ ξένη.

The incidents of the voice and the talking cross and so forth must, one would think, have been borrowed originally from some very early Christian work of the apostolic or sub-apostolic age which may perhaps be yet recovered.

Mr. James has edited the frequently corrupt and mutilated text of these *Apocrypha* with great skill and has seldom given up a passage as hopeless. Can the very difficult *istic mel apex magnus* of the 'Oratio Moysi' conceal *iota vel apex manet unus*? This is the Old Latin rendering of 'jot or tittle.'

E. N. BENNETT.

¹ The contracted cursive scrawl on f. 346 of the older document which Mr. James was unable to decipher does not, as he surmised, furnish the missing words. It seems to contain a couple of silly iambic lines,—perhaps,

... πῶθος οὖν τὸ γράφημ' ὧν μανθάνειν
νέας δ' ἀφορμὰς καὶ τροποὺς ἐγκαρδίας κ.τ.λ.