

848. REVELATION xvi.

3.1 x 9 cm.

Fifth century. Plate I (verso).

Fragment of a leaf from a vellum codex, containing a few verses from Rev. xvi. The book was of remarkably small size, for only 11 lines are lost between the last line of the recto and the first of the verso, whence it follows that there were only 17 lines in the complete page; the inscribed surface would thus have been about 10 cm. in height. The bold upright uncials are similar in style to those of the Codex Alexandrinus, though rather heavier; they may be referred to the fifth century. Stops in both the high and middle position occur. The text agrees, so far as it goes, with that of the Codex Alexandrinus.

Recto xvi. 17-8.

Verso xvi. 19-20.

.
[του ναο]υ απο του
θρονου λεγουσα
γεγονεν και εγε
νοντο αστραπαι
5 και φωναι και βρο
ται· κ[αι σ]εισμος εγ[ε]

.
λη εμνη[σθη ενω
πιον του θυ· δου
ναι αυτη το ποτη
10 ριον του οινου
του θυμου της
[ο]ργης αυτ[ο]υ και
.

1. [του ναο]υ: so **NA**, W(estcott)-H(ort); του ναου του ουρανου B &c., T(extus) R(eceptus). ουρανου, if uncontracted, would occupy the same space as του ναου, and it is therefore possible that [ουρανο]υ should be read here.

απο του θρονου is omitted in **N** and του θεου substituted.

4-5. The MS. agrees with A (so W-H). **N** inadvertently has βρονται και before αστραπαι as well as και βρονται after φωναι. φ. και βρ. και αστρ. T-R with a number of cursives.

8. δουναι: του δουναι **N**.

9-12. το, του, and αυτου are omitted in **N**.

849. ACTS OF PETER.

9.8 x 9 cm.

Early fourth century. Plate I (recto).

A single leaf from a vellum codex of the *Acts of Peter* in Greek, the two pages being numbered 167 and 168 respectively. These so-called 'Gnostic' *Acts of Peter*, distinct from the so-called 'Catholic' *Acts*, are partially preserved in more than one shape. There is firstly the Latin Codex Vercellensis of the

seventh century, which contains an account of the acts of Peter at Rome in connexion with Simon Magus and of his martyrdom. Secondly, there are two Greek MSS. (of the ninth to eleventh centuries) containing only the martyrdom; dependent upon this recension are the Slavonic, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions. Thirdly, another Latin version of the martyrdom, ascribed to Bishop Linus and extant in a large number of MSS., is independent of the version in the Codex Vercellensis, which is shorter and written in much worse Latin. These three texts were edited by Lipsius in *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, I. pp. 1-22 and 45-103. Recently a fragment of a different portion of the *Acts* dealing with an incident during Peter's sojourn at Jerusalem has been published by C. Schmidt from a fourth or fifth century Coptic MS. at Berlin (*Die alten Petrusakten in Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. xxiv. Heft 1). The date and character of these *Acts of Peter*, and the history of the text in its different forms have been the subject of much discussion; and the discovery of a fragment of what is no doubt the Greek original is a new factor of considerable importance. Our fragment belongs to the portion of the *Acts* concerned with Simon Magus found only in the Codex Vercellensis, and corresponds to p. 73, ll. 16-27 of Lipsius' edition.

The leaf is practically perfect, but the ink is much obliterated in the last five lines of the verso. The handwriting is a medium-sized upright uncial of a common third to fourth century type. Had the material used been papyrus, we should have been more disposed to assign it to the late third than to the fourth century, but since vellum was not commonly used in Egypt until the fourth century, it is safer to attribute the fragment to the period from Diocletian to Constantine. The papyri with which it was found were rather mixed in point of date, ranging from the third century to the fifth. The usual contraction of *θεός* and its cases is employed, but *μητερ* is uncontracted. *ν* at the end of a line is sometimes indicated by a stroke above the preceding letter. There are no stops, breathings, or accents, but a coronis is employed to fill up a space at the end of l. 14. The scribe was not very careful; *θ(εο)ν* for *θ(ε)ν* occurs in l. 8 and *αποησομεθα* for *αποισόμεθα* in l. 9, while in ll. 1-2 it is clear that the text is seriously corrupt; cf. note *ad loc.* Apart, however, from this difficulty at the beginning, the agreement between the Greek of our fragment and the Latin of the Codex Vercellensis is on the whole very close. The Greek sometimes tends to be fuller than the Latin, there being two instances (cf. notes on ll. 6-7 and 19) where the Latin omits words or phrases found in the Greek: at other times the Latin is longer; cf. notes on ll. 14, 22, and 26. *σε . . . πειράσαι θέλων* in ll. 20-1 is wrongly rendered *confidens in te*, but as a rule the Latin is a singularly literal interpretation; cf. e.g. *libenter habet* for *ἡδέως ἔχει* in ll. 16-7, and the close resemblance in the

order of the words throughout. That our fragment represents the Greek text from which the Codex Vercellensis was translated admits of little doubt.

For the question of the relation of the two Latin versions and the Greek *μαρτύριον* to the Greek original of the *Acts of Peter* that conclusion is of cardinal importance. Lipsius had supposed that the Greek original was altogether lost, and that the longer Latin version found in the *martyrium* ascribed to Bishop Linus, so far as it went, represented the original more faithfully than the shorter Latin version found in the Codex Vercellensis, while he regarded the Greek text of the *μαρτύριον* as a retranslation from the shorter Latin version. Against this complicated hypothesis Zahn (*Gesch. d. NTKanons*, ii. pp. 832 sqq.) put forward the simpler explanation that the extant Greek *μαρτύριον* was part of the original *Acts of Peter*, that the Codex Vercellensis was a translation of it, the longer Latin version being an independent translation made at a later date with numerous elaborations, and a much less faithful representation of the original. The correctness of Zahn's explanation, which has been generally accepted (cf. Harnack, *Chron. d. altchr. Lit.*, ii. 1, p. 551), is thoroughly vindicated by the new discovery. Though the longer Latin version of that portion of the *Acts* to which our fragment belongs is not extant (whether the longer Latin version ever contained more than the *martyrium* is very doubtful), a comparison of the divergences in the two Latin versions of the *martyrium* shows unquestionably that the shorter and not the longer one is the form supported by our fragment. The rejection of the claims of the longer Latin version to be regarded as more authentic than the shorter also removes the principal reason for supposing the Greek text of the *μαρτύριον* to be a retranslation from the Latin, and this theory may now be finally abandoned. Since the Greek *μαρτύριον* agrees on the whole very closely with the conclusion of the Codex Vercellensis, Zahn is clearly right in accepting the former as belonging to the Greek original. Its relation to this shorter Latin version is very similar to that of our fragment to the corresponding portion of the Codex Vercellensis. The Greek tends to be rather fuller than the Latin, which however sometimes instead of abbreviating paraphrases the Greek at greater length and generally follows it closely. So far as the style of our fragment can be judged, it is quite in keeping with that of the *μαρτύριον*. The construction, for instance, *ὁρώντων . . . συνεπάθουν* in ll. 4-5 finds a parallel in the *μαρτύριον*, p. 82. 24-5 *καὶ καταπεσόντος αὐτοῦ ἀνῶθεν ἐκ(υθ)εῖς συστή.*

Did the MS. to which our fragment belongs begin at the point where the Codex Vercellensis commences, or did it also comprise an account of earlier doings of Peter, including perhaps the events at Jerusalem described in C. Schmidt's fragment, which apparently belongs to the period before Peter came to Rome? The two pages of our fragment, nos. 167 and 168 of the MS., correspond to 12

lines of Lipsius' edition of the Codex Vercellensis. The previous 166 pages therefore ought to correspond to approximately 996 lines of his edition. As a matter of fact the preceding portion of the Codex Vercellensis occupies 908 lines, and when allowance is made for the circumstance that, judging by the *μαρτύριον*, the tendency of the Latin to abbreviate the original is less marked than usual in our fragment, there is every probability that the beginning of this MS. coincided with the beginning of the Codex Vercellensis, and that the acts of Peter at Jerusalem formed no part of it. This conclusion is not necessarily fatal to C. Schmidt's view that his fragments form part of the same work as the Codex Vercellensis, for from an early period the various apocryphal Acts tended to break up into distinct sections, if indeed these sections were originally combined. That the *Acts of Paul* comprised the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, the forged correspondence with the Corinthians, and the *Martyrium Pauli*, which were previously known as distinct documents, has only recently been made clear through C. Schmidt's discovery of the Coptic fragments of the Acts as a whole. Similarly of the *Acts of John* various sections have been preserved in different forms, but with considerable lacunae in or between them, in one of which is no doubt to be placed the new fragment in the present volume (850), itself containing the beginning of a distinct section with a sub-title of its own. But since the composition of the *Acts of Peter* is referred by the principal critics to A.D. 160-170 (Zahn), 200-210 (C. Schmidt), 200-220 (Harnack), our fragment was written little, if at all, later than a century afterwards; and the apparent absence in so early a MS. of any section corresponding with C. Schmidt's fragment certainly provides an argument in favour of G. Ficker, who (*Die Petrusakten*, pp. 6-7, *Neutest. Apokryphen*, ed. E. Hennecke, pp. 383-4) is disposed to regard that fragment as either not belonging to the *Acts of Peter* as such, or as later than the Acts of the Codex Vercellensis, and thinks that these Acts were intended to follow immediately after the *Acts of the Apostles*. On the other hand the subscription in the Coptic MS. Πρᾶξις Πέτρον certainly provides strong *prima facie* evidence that it belonged to the same work as the Codex Vercellensis, and, as C. Schmidt reminds us, in the stichometry of Nicephorus the *Acts of Peter* is credited with 2750 στίχοι (i.e. it was about the same length as Leviticus or St. Luke's Gospel), a number which is too large to be accounted for by the Greek original of the Codex Vercellensis alone.

On the disputed questions of the date of the composition of the *Acts of Peter* and their supposed Gnostic or 'vulgärchristliche' origin (cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, ii. 2. pp. 170-2) the new fragment has no direct bearing, but its appearance is useful in tending to clear the ground by a dispersal of the suspicions of having been tampered with which have hitherto attached to the Codex Vercellensis and

the Greek μαρτύριον (cf. Harnack's later view that the *Acts of Peter* are a compilation in *Texte und Unters.* Bd. xx. Heft 3, pp. 100 sqq., and C. Schmidt's criticism of this in his *Petrusakten*). For, putting aside the question whether C. Schmidt's Coptic fragment was an integral part of the *Acts* or not, there is now no longer any reason to doubt the substantial fidelity of the shorter Latin version, or to suppose that it and the μαρτύριον represent, as far as they go, anything else than the *Acts of Peter* in their original form.

Verso.

ρξζ

δι εμου μη μελλησαντες
 [] αυτου κατεχοντων ει α
 [] ρα αληθως απεθανεν και
 ορωντων οτι αληθως νε
 5 κρος εστιν συνεπαθουν
 τη γραιδι λεγοντες ει αρα
 βουλει μητερ και θαρρεις
 τω Πετρου θυ αραντες
 αυτον ημεις αποησομεθα
 10 εκει ινα αυτον εγειρας
 αποδω σοι τρυτων δε ου
 τως λαλουντων ο πραιφε
 κτος ατενιζων τω Πετρω
 ς ιδου Πετρε Ϸ

Recto.

ρξη

15 ο παις μου νεκρος κειται
 ον και ο βασιλευς ηδεως
 εχει και ουκ εφεισαμην
 αυτου καιτοι γε ετερους
 εχων μετ εμαντου νεανισ
 20 κους αλλα σε μαλλον και τῷ
 δια σου θν πειρασαι θελων
 ει αρα αληθεις εστε τουτῷ
 ηβουληθην αποθανειν και
 ο Πετρος εφη ου πειραζεται
 25 θς ουδε δοκιμαζεται Αγριπ
 πα αλλα φιλουμενος και
 παρακαλουμενος ακουει
 των αξιων επει δε νυνι

'... (the youths having examined his nostrils to see) whether he was indeed really dead, and seeing that he was in truth a corpse, consoled the old woman saying, "If indeed you wish, mother, and trust in the God of Peter, we will lift him up and carry him thither, in order that Peter may raise him and restore him to you." While they were thus speaking, the praefect looking intently at Peter (said), "Behold, Peter, my servant lies dead, who was a favourite of the king himself, and I did not spare him although I have with me other youths; but because I desired to try you and the God whom you preach, whether ye are indeed true, I wished him to die." And Peter said, "God is not to be tried or proved, Agrippa, but when He is loved and entreated He hearkens to those who are worthy. But since now . . ."

Codex Vercellensis (Lipsius, *Acta Apost. Apocr.*, p. 73).

iuvenes autem qui uenerunt nares pueri considerarant si uere mortuus esset. uidentes autem quoniam mortuus est consolabantur matrem ipsius dicentes: Si uere credis in deo Petri tollentes eum perferimus ad Petrum ut eum suscitans restituat tibi. haec dicentibus iubentibus

praefectus autem in foro intuens Petrum dixit: Quid dicis, Petre? ecce puer mortuus iacet quem et imperator libenter habet et non illi peperci; utique habebam alios conplures iuvenes; sed confidens in te et in dominum tuum quem praedicas, si uere certi et ueri estis: ideo hunc uolui mori. Petrus autem dixit: Non templatur deus neque ex(is)timatur, sed dilectissimus ex animo colendus exaudiet qui digni sunt. Sed quoniam nunc . . .

1-2. Line 1 is not only far removed from the equivalent of the Latin at this point (something like τῶν δὲ νεανίσκων προσελθόντων καὶ τὰς ρίνας would be expected), but is obviously quite inappropriate. δι' εμου is unintelligible, while the case of μελλήσαντες is in contradiction to κατεχόντων . . . ὁρώντων in ll. 2-4, and though in itself the nominative would yield a better construction than the genitive, a parallel for this kind of genitive absolute is cited from another part of the *Acts of Peter* in introd. Nor can αὐτου κατεχόντων in l. 2 be right, for a participle meaning 'examined' is necessary in view of the following clause εἰ ἀρα ἀληθῶς ἀπεθάνεν. By altering κατεχόντων to κατ(ε)ιδόντων l. 2 may be retained, but δι' εμου μη μελλήσαντες is almost hopeless to emend. μη μελλήσαντων might be read and connected with *qui uenerunt* (cf. *continuo surrexerunt* four lines previously, and, for μή instead of οὐ in this phrase, *Acts of John*, ed. Bonnet, p. 191. 23 μὴ μελλήσασα), but δι' εμου would remain unaccounted for, and it would still be necessary to suppose the omission of καὶ τὰς ρίνας before αὐτου. It seems more probable that δι' εμου μη μελλήσαντες has come in by mistake from some other passage. δι' ἐμοῦ presumably occurred where the Latin has *faciens per me* a few lines after the passage preserved in our fragment, and perhaps again two lines later where *per meam uocem* is found. μὴ μελλήσαντες, however, does not suggest itself as an equivalent for any Latin expression on p. 73 of Lipsius' edition, except *continuo* in l. 11 where δι' ἐμοῦ would be out of place.

2. [] αὐτου: there is a hole which occupies the place where the first letter of this line and of l. 3 would have come, if these lines began evenly with ll. 1 and 4-14, and it is therefore possible that a letter is lost before αὐτου and ρα respectively. But this hypothesis is not satisfactory in l. 2, where αὐτου is preferable to e.g. [τ] αὐτου or [σ] αὐτου, and leads to much difficulty in l. 3; for though the ρ of ρα is very faint the α is practically certain (χ is the only alternative), and that ἀρα is the word meant is shown clearly by ll. 6 and 22. Hence if [α]ρα is read in l. 3, the α at the end of l. 2 becomes superfluous. We prefer to suppose that the hole was there when the leaf was written upon, and that the scribe therefore began ll. 2-3 further to the right than l. 1. ἄρα ἀληθῶς is rendered by only one word in the Latin, *uere*; cf. l. 22 where in rendering ἄρα ἀληθεῖς the Latin is redundant.

6-7. For τη γραυδι the Latin has *matrem ipsius*, omitting to translate βουλεῖ μητερ και.

8. θν is a mistake for θω.

9. ἀποισομεθα: l. ἀποισόμεθα.

10. ἐκει: *ad Petrum* Lat., which is clearer.

12. πραιφεκτος: for this form cf. ch. 12 of the *μαρτύριον* (p. 100. 16, ed. Lipsius) τῷ πραιφέκτῳ Ἀγρίππᾳ. The Latin has *haec dicentibus iubenibus praefectus autem in foro*, putting *autem* too late. The addition of *in foro*, however, makes the passage clearer, since the preceding lines refer to what took place at the house of the old woman.

13. ἀτενίζων: cf. ἀτενίσας in chs. 55 and 56 of the *Martyrium Petri et Pauli* (ed. Lipsius, pp. 164. 21, 166. 6), which is supposed to be based on the older *Acts of Peter* (cf. Harnack, *Chron. d. allchr. Lit.*, ii. 2, p. 177).

14. The Latin has *dixit: Quid dicis, Petre? ecce puer mortuus, &c.*, and we should expect at the beginning of this line ἔφη τί φής; , for which there is not room. The doubtful s might be ε, i.e. the termination of εἶπε, which is, however, insufficient by itself. The leaf is torn at this point, and the ink very much obliterated, so that decipherment is impossible.

15. μου is omitted in the Latin.

16. βασιλεὺς = *imperator*, as frequently in the *Martyrium Petri et Pauli*.

18. καίτοι γε ἑτεροὺς: the point of this is that the boy chosen to die was the favourite servant, and that Agrippa might have chosen one of his other attendants.

19. In place of μετ' εἰμαντοῦ the Latin has *conplures*.

20-1. τὸν διὰ σου θεοῦ = *dominium tuum quem praedicas*. The addition of a participle such as κηρυττόμενον would be an improvement, but is not necessary. πειρασαὶ θελῶν is mistranslated by the Latin *confidens in*, which does not suit the following clause *si uere certi*, &c.

22. εἰ ἀρα ἀληθεὺς: the Latin is redundant, *si uere certi et ueri*. In ll. 2-3 on the other hand ἀρα ἀληθῶς is rendered by one word *uere*.

25. Ἀγριππα is omitted in the Latin.

26-7. φιλούμενος καὶ παρακαλούμενος: this is clearer than the Latin *dilectissimus ex animo colendus*.

850. ACTS OF JOHN.

12.1 × 10.7 cm. Fourth century. Plate I (recto).

The upper portion (apparently) of a leaf from a codex of the *Acts of John*, containing a mutilated account of two incidents, neither of which occurs in the extant portions of that work. The handwriting is a good-sized, irregular and rather inelegant uncial of the fourth century. Stops (middle and low points) are freely employed, as well as occasional breathings. The ordinary theological contractions of θεός, Ἰησοῦς, and κύριος occur. The recto has in one or two lines at the top of the page the sub-title of the section of the *Acts*. This sub-title is unfortunately incomplete, and no light is thrown upon it by the actual contents of the fragment; but the mention of Andronicus supplies a point of contact with the extant portions of the *Acts of John*, in which that individual is mentioned several times as a στρατηγός of Ephesus who, at first a sceptic, afterwards became one of the apostle's chief disciples in that city. The following incident is of a type familiar in apocryphal Acts. The apostle goes to visit the brethren apparently at a village near Ephesus, and on the way has to cross a bridge, where his passage is barred by a demon in the form of a soldier, who threatens violence. The military aspect assumed by the demon recalls a similar story in the *Martyrium Matthaei*, which is not impossibly here copying the *Acts of John*; cf. l. 26, note. Rebuked by St. John, the demon vanishes, and on reaching his destination the apostle exhorts the brethren to worship and joins with them in prayer (ll. 22-36). The verso (ll. 1-19) is concerned with a quite different episode which is much more obscure. The scene is a church (cf. l. 16), and apparently a person called Zeuxis (l. 13) had just tried to hang himself but had been miraculously saved by St. John (ll. 5-6), who in ll. 4-13 offers up a thanksgiving of a character for which there are numerous parallels in the extant *Acts of John*. Afterwards