Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee   https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON   https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

A NEW TEXT OF THE APOCALYPSE OF PETER. III.

The two texts of the Apocalypse of Peter.

IN my first article (*J. T. S.* p. 54) I called attention to the very puzzling phenomenon presented by the Akhmim text as compared with the Ethiopic; namely, that *Akh.* gives the whole description of Hell in the past tense and represents it as a vision shewn to Peter, whereas *Eth.* puts the whole into the future, and does not represent it as a vision but as a prophecy. Moreover in *Akh.* the description is put into Peter's mouth, but in *Eth.* the whole must be taken to be a prediction uttered by our Lord. This important part of the text has therefore been recast by one or the other of our authorities. Which is the original?

At first sight it seems obvious that *Akh.* must preserve the older form. The presentation of the torments in a vision shewn to a seer, who narrates it, is, one would say, the simple and normal method, and the more likely to be original. To describe them under the guise of a prophecy is an elaborate procedure. And, further, the text in which we find this treatment is a version—most likely a version of a version—forming part of a late compilation preserved in a late manuscript. *Akh.* certainly has the advantage in all these points.

Looking a little closer, however, we find that *Eth.* (or rather the form of text which it represents) is not wholly destitute of support. The scanty patristic quotations afford some evidence which must not be overlooked. Those preserved by Macarius Magnes can be dismissed : they belong to the portion of the *A. P.* in which the Last Judgement was described, and this must in any case have been couched in the future tense. Those in Clement and Methodius, on the other hand, belong to the description of Hell ; and in these the tenses employed merit investigation.

In *Ecl.* 41 we have τὰ βρέφη . . . παραδίδοσθαι . . . παιδεύεσθαι καὶ αὔξειν. καὶ ἔσονται κτλ. ἔσονται, the future, applies to a state consequent upon the previous verbs, and cannot be pressed. The three present infinitives are compatible either with the description of a vision seen, or with a prediction. Or we may put it thus ; they are as little compatible with *Akh.* as with *Eth.* The setting of *Akh.* requires such a phrase as we have in *Paul* 40 (ἐδόθησαν αὐτὰ ἀγγέλῳ).

Methodius agrees with Clement in giving παραδίδοσθαι.

The next clause (ἀστραπὴ . . . πηδῶσα . . . καὶ πλήσσουσα) does not

help to a decision. The participles may have been governed by a verb either in the past or the future.

Ecl. 48 repeats παραδίδοσθαι, and has two futures, τεύξεται and μενεῖ ἄνευ κολάσεως. I do not regard these as quotations, but as Clement's own deduction from the *A. P.*, and do not press them.

In the passage that comes next (τὸ δὲ γάλα . . . γεννήσει θηρία . . . καὶ . . . κατεσθίει) we have a noteworthy use of the future. We know that *Akh.* has nothing corresponding to it; but we cannot suppose that it has merely omitted the words quoted by Clement : *no* sentence in the future would fit in to the text of *Akh.* We can tolerate it as part of a text in which a vision is being narrated; but in that case the narrative cannot have been in the form of *Akh.* It is also readily intelligible as part of a prediction; and it actually occurs in *Eth.* in such a setting, and in a form in which nearly all Clement's words are traceable.

From the Methodian quotation we do not gain any help : he employs παραδίδοσθαι, as has been remarked, and subsequently two imperfects, παρεδίδοτο and ἐκίκλησκον : but these are due to the form of the rhetorical question into which he has recast the passage.

I think that we may say that the Clementine quotations are made from a text in which the setting differed from that of *Akh.* It cannot have been couched, as that is, wholly in the past tense. We are not as yet in a position to say that it resembled *Eth.* to the extent of being couched wholly in the future.

Besides the patristic quotations we have the Bodleian fragment to consider. On the recto of this, which is fairly legible, there are present participles (which are of no importance) and a future 'ἀναπαύστως ἕξουσιν τὴν κόλασιν'. This future is again indecisive : no other tense was possible in speaking of an unending state.[1]

The verso, which is in bad condition, has a reading of great importance, ἔσονται ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες. The following words have not been deciphered with complete certainty, but after them the text has οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἵτινες κατέλιπον ὁδὸν θεοῦ. Mr Winstedt, who has repeatedly examined the original, has little doubt as to the presence of ἔσονται ; Professor Vernon Bartlet agrees with him, and, if they are right, we have here evidence as old as the fifth century of the existence of a Greek text in which the description of Hell was given in the future tense. This constitutes a powerful support for *Eth.* and tends to make it more probable that the Clementine passages are further specimens of a similar text.

There is another consideration which cannot but affect our view of

---

[1] It is worth noting that in *Akh.* a different expression is used, which avoids the future tense, viz. μηδέποτε παυόμενοι τῆς τοιαύτης κολάσεως.

Eth. Is it a tolerable supposition that the description of Hell was originally written in the future tense throughout? There is no parallel to it, and, as has been said, the presentation of such thing in the form of a vision (as in *Akh.*) seems far more natural.

The difficulty appeals to me; but there is a justification for the form of *Eth.* What it describes is the condition of things subsequent to the final judgement. Support can be found in early writings for the view that until that judgement has taken place the souls of men are to be confined in 'storehouses', *promptuaria*, where the good will, indeed, be happy and the wicked unhappy, but where neither the bliss nor the pain of eternity will be theirs. This is the view of *Enoch* (xxii) and of 4 *Esdras* (vii). But in the later visions, though it is sometimes said that bliss and pain will be intensified after the Judgement, there is unanimous testimony that actual torments of various kinds, and actual happiness, are being meted out at this moment to disembodied souls.

It may be objected that in *Eth.*, as well as in *Akh.*, certain righteous souls are represented as already dwelling in Paradise. I answer that warrant for this may also be found in *Enoch.* The teaching of that congeries of writings is inconsistent with itself. In xxii the souls of the righteous dead are apparently in the storehouses of souls in the west, Paradise being at that time empty (xxxii 3-6); but in lx 5 (a Noachic fragment) we read of 'the garden where the elect and righteous dwell': in lxi 12 of 'all the elect who dwell in the garden of life': in lxx 9 Enoch 'saw the first fathers and the elect from the beginning who dwell in that place'. Nothing analogous to this, however, is stated of the souls of sinners, so far as I can see. Thus the writer of *A.P.* was at liberty to select such features as suited him from the teachings of *Enoch*; and we have seen that the book lay before him in its present form, since there are in his work evident reminiscences of a quite late portion of it (viz. ch. cvi).

There seems, then, to be some reason for regarding *Eth.* as representing, in this particular, an early stage of belief. Not the earliest, for the pagan visions of the next world know of no final judgement, and represent punishment and reward as following immediately after death; but a form of belief which was to be found in at least one Jewish book (*Enoch*) from which the *A.P.* demonstrably drew.

There is, moreover, a detail (absent from *Akh.* but supported by the Bodleian fragment) which it is difficult to explain save on the supposition that *Eth.* is right in its presentation. I allude to the statement that idolaters are to be tormented in the presence of the actual idols which they have worshipped. That this is the meaning of *Eth.* I cannot doubt: and *Bodl.* confirms it in the words ἔμπροσθεν τούτων ⟨τῶν⟩ εἰδώλων τῶν πλάνων. One cannot imagine a transference of the actual

idols to Hell as a process which could be going on now, or could precede the Judgement ; and yet the conception has early support as part of the text of the *A. P.*

From what has been said so far I hope it will have appeared that the future tenses of *Eth.* are neither without justification in themselves, nor incompatible with the theory of an early date.

We have seen reason to believe that Book II of the Sibylline Oracles is very largely based upon the *A. P.* ; and this is expressed wholly in the future.   But I have not adduced it as supporting *Eth.* in this respect, and I do not do so, inasmuch as the future tense is a necessary result of the attribution of the whole to the Sibyl ; and this form of expression runs through almost the whole of the Sibylline Corpus.   The evidence of the Sibyl may, however, fairly be adduced when we enquire into the order of the contents of *A. P.*   Perhaps the time for making that enquiry has now been reached.

In *Akh.* we have :

(*a*) Fragment of an eschatological prophecy spoken by our Lord.

(*b*) Transition of our Lord and the Apostles from some place unknown to ' the Mountain '.

(*c*) Appearance of two glorified saints in answer to a request of the Apostles.

(*d*) Paradise shewn to the Apostles.

(*e*) Hell shewn to Peter.

In *Eth.* :

(*a*) Our Lord on the Mount of Olives. A long eschatological prophecy including the description of Hell (= *a* + *e* of *Akh.*).

(*b*) Transition to the ' Holy Mountain ' (= *b Akh.*).

(*c*) Appearance of two glorified saints (= *c*).

(*d*) Paradise shewn to the Apostles (= *d*).

(*e*) Narrative resembling that of the Transfiguration : obviously containing later elements if not wholly late.

(*f*) Descent from the Mountain.

The important difference being that in *Akh.* the matter relating to Paradise precedes the description of Hell, but follows it in *Eth.*

This is a case in which patristic quotations afford us no help.   I believe that the only approach to external evidence is that derivable from the Second Book of the Sibylline Oracles.   This may fairly be claimed as a supporter of the order given in *Eth.*, to this extent, that its description of Hell follows immediately upon that of the Judgement.   The parallelism continues to the end of the passage in which the Acherusian lake and the Elysian fields are mentioned.   But it has nothing corresponding to the vision of the glorified saints or of Paradise.

For the rest, I do not see what can guide us save the analogies of other Apocalypses in which Heaven and Hell are described. *Enoch*, from whom *A. P.* has borrowed some traits, certainly is shewn some places of punishment before he sees Paradise, but he also sees some subsequently. In the fragmentary *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (as I still call what Steindorff has edited as an anonymous Apocalypse) the seer seems to pass through the underworld and thence to Paradise, from which he sees something of the torments of Hell. *Paul*, which copies *A. P.* in many places, is obviously composite. Paradise is followed by Hell, and then is introduced again ; and some of the same characters meet Paul on both occasions. In the later Apocalypses of the Virgin, and of Esdras, as well as in practically all mediaeval visions,[1] Paradise is placed last. As to the pagan Apocalypses to which *A. P.* is thought to be so deeply indebted, if we may take the Sixth Aeneid as a fair specimen, Elysium follows Hades. Analogy, however, cannot be strongly pressed. All that one can say is that the order presented by *Eth.* is the more usual one ; and an answer to this, that *Eth.* is a later text, made to conform to current usage, is not far to seek.

The Apocalypse and the Gospel of Peter.

The view that *Akh.* is a portion of the *A. P.* has commanded the assent of the very large majority of critics, but not of all. Among the dissentients, two are of special eminence, namely A. Dieterich and Zahn. Both of these have maintained that *Akh.* is a second fragment of the *Gospel of Peter* (*Ev.*). The grounds they adduce for this belief shall be set forth here.

Dieterich deals with the question in *Nekyia* pp. 13 sqq. He begins by saying that he can find no place in *Akh.* for the majority of the patristic quotations from *A. P.* He goes on to remark upon the juxtaposition of the two pieces (*Ev.* and *Apoc.*) in the Gizeh manuscript. Turning to internal evidence, he maintains that the setting of *Akh.* is that of a Gospel. Its opening sentences find a parallel in the eschatological discourses of our Lord. After these the narrative proceeds ' καὶ προσθεὶς ὁ κύριος ἔφη· ἄγωμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος ', κτλ. This (he says) is quite in the manner of the Gospels ; and the point needs to be more sharply emphasized than has hitherto been done, that it is the earthly life of our Lord that is here in question ; whereas in other Apocalypses, current as separate books, it is the risen or glorified Christ who is the source of revelation. It follows that we have here, not an independent Apocalypse—not *the Apocalypse of Peter*—but a portion of a Gospel. The short eschatological speech, the going to the mountain, the vision of the two glorified saints (so closely resembling the story of the Trans-

---

[1] The Vision of Adamnan is an exception.

figuration, and so evidently developed out of it), and the visions of
Heaven and Hell, were excerpted from a Gospel as being appropriate to
be placed in a tomb with the dead, just as the narrative of the Passion
and Resurrection taken from the *Gospel of Peter* was so placed.   That
the Apocalyptic portion comes from this same Gospel is not only the
most natural supposition, but is clear, from the fact that in both Peter
is the narrator.   The Apocalyptic portion will have preceded the
Passion-narrative, and (as in the Synoptic Gospels) will have been
separated from it by no long interval.

Out of this portion of the *Gospel* the separate *Apocalypse of Peter*
was developed.   We see in the fragments of the latter, on the one hand,
obvious though not exact correspondences, and on the other hand,
equally plainly, heightening of colour and amplification.   In its separate
form it became, of course, a revelation of the ascended Christ, given to
Peter alone, and a vision shewn to Peter of the next world.   We see
the process clearly.   The Apocalyptic section of the *Gospel* was
circulated separately, and nothing is more natural than that an
Apocalypse of Peter should have been developed out of it.   The *Gospel*
must be placed not later than in the beginning of the second century ;
Clement of Alexandria and the Muratorian fragment are the first to
mention the *A. P.*, which belongs to the second half or to the end of
that century.   This relation of dates is what we should have been
compelled to assume even apart from external evidence.

So far Dieterich, for whom the *Gospel* is the parent of the *A. P.*   Of Zahn's
view, the only exposition known to me is in a note to his *Grundriss d.
Gesch. d. neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ed. 2, 1904, p. 24).   After stating the
ordinary view that *Akh.* is a fragment of the *A. P.*, he says : ' Against
this view are the following considerations : (1) The MS from which
both fragments (*Ev.* and *Akh.*) are derived gives no support to the
hypothesis that they come from two different writings attributed to Peter ;
(2) in the Apocalyptic fragment no single one of the certain quotations
from *A. P.* (which, be it remembered, was a very short book) is to be
found in the same form ; (3) the late (post-Mohammedan) Arabic
Apocalypse of Peter shews resemblances to a quotation from *A. P.* in
Clement,[1] and to 2 *Peter*, but none to *Akh.* : see Bratke *Zeitschr. f.
wiss. Theol.* 1893, 454–493 ; (4) the contents of *Akh.* are not suitable
to the use made of *A. P.* in Holy Week, as reported by Sozomen ;
(5) the literary form of *Akh.* is exactly that of the *Gospel of Peter.*   In
both Peter speaks in the name of the Twelve Apostles (I omit Zahn's
references) ; and the name of Jesus does not occur in either : He is
always ὁ κύριος.   This Apocalyptic piece can only be a further fragment
of the *Gospel of Peter.*   The comparison of the quotation in Clement,

---

[1] The resemblance is of the most shadowy description.

Ecl. 47 and *Akh.* 26, shews that the author of the *Gospel* drew, among other sources, from the certainly older *Apocalypse of Peter.*

Thus for Zahn the *A. P.* is the parent of this portion of the *Gospel.* Of the various arguments adduced by Dieterich and Zahn in favour of the view, that the two fragments in the Akhmim manuscript are parts of one book, two seem to me to deserve further investigation : first, the evidence of the manuscript which contains them, and, next, the similarities of diction which connect them.

1. As to the first point, I believe that the following is an accurate statement of the facts. The two documents— *Ev.* and *Akh.*—are found, in the single manuscript which has preserved them, written in the same hand (a hand differing from that of the remainder of the volume), and in juxtaposition.

The arrangement is as follows :—

      p. 1 of the manuscript is occupied by a drawing of a cross, and the letters A and Ω.

      pp. 2–10 contain *Ev.* : a line of rude ornament is drawn across the page at the end of the text.

      pp. 11–12 are blank.

The above pages form a quire or gathering of six leaves.

The next quire, of four leaves, is bound in upside down. Its first page is blank. The text of *Akh.* begins on the second page (the verso of leaf 1), and continues to the eighth page (the verso of leaf 4), which it does not quite fill. Thus three pages are left blank between the end of *Ev.* and the beginning of *Akh.*

These facts are compatible with any of the following suppositions : (*a*) that the copyist was making an extract from each of two separate writings ; (*b*) that he was transcribing a single fragmentary writing, and left pages blank to shew his consciousness of a lacuna that might some time be filled up ; (*c*) that he had selected two passages from a continuous original for some reason. (Dieterich suggests that they were from their subject-matter appropriate to be placed in a tomb with the dead.)

The fact that the two portions begin and end in a fragmentary manner, *Ev.* in particular breaking off in the middle of a. sentence, favours supposition *b* as against *a* or *c*.

2. As to the second point, similarities of diction. I find the following, which I set down in the order of the Gospel fragment (*Ev.*), employing the Harnack-Preuschen numeration of verses.

Ev. ὁ κύριος (never Ἰησοῦς) 1 *et passim*   *Apoc. Akh.* 4, 6, 12, 15, 20
    πεφονευμένῳ 5, 15   25
    ἑστῶτες 9   6, 25

$Ev.$		$Apoc.$ $Akh.$
μαστίζειν	9	27
ἔνδυμα	12	7, 17, 21
ἐπειδή	15, 23, 50	11
καὶ τότε	21	3
δύο ἄνδρες	36	6 (in both cases of supernatural beings)
ἰδόντες οὖν	38	11
φαίνονται	44	6
ἀφέντες	45	34
ἐξηγήσαντο	45	7, 9
προσελθόντες . . . ἐδέοντο	47 (cf. 3, 29)	5, 12
ἐφλέγοντο	50	23, 27, 29, 34
ἔλεγον	52	24, 25
ἀπελθοῦσαι	55 (MS) ἀπήλθαμεν 60 (cf. 56)	5
ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί	59	5

Note also the frequency of ἐκεῖ (ἐκεῖθεν, ἐκεῖσε) in both pieces :

Ev. 3, 32, 33 (36), 55 (twice), 56. *Ap.* 15 (16), (18), 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 (twice), (32), 33.

ἐκεῖνος is also very common in both, six times in *Ev.* and thirteen times in *Apoc.*

We may perhaps add to the above lists :—

ἔμπροσθεν (τοῦ θεοῦ) 48	6 (ἔμπρ. τοῦ κυρίου)
ἐκαθεζόμεθα . . . κλαίοντες 27	26 (καθήμενα ἔκλαιον)
ἐξελθόντας ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου 39	5 (ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου)

ἐξέρχεσθαι occurs again in *Ev.* 58, *Ap.* 7.

It should be noted that § 5 of *Ap.* presents several coincidences with *Ev.*, and, among them, the most striking of all, namely, ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί. This section is the one small portion of narrative, as distinguished from prediction or vision, which *Ap.* contains. ˙

These are the considerations which make for the hypothesis that *Ev.* and *Ap.* are two portions of the same book—the *Gospel of Peter*. We now have to ask, assuming that such is the case, whether the separate *Apocalypse of Peter* is more likely to have been developed out of the *Gospel*, or incorporated into it.

In favour of the latter alternative I submit the following considerations :—

(*a*) The absorption of smaller separate documents into larger ones is a common phenomenon in the literature with which we are dealing. It has plainly taken place in the case of *Enoch*, where a plurality of Enochic and Noachian books have been welded together into a single whole, and also in that of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, where the *Martyrdom*

and the *Vision* were current as separate writings. The same process has been postulated with varying degrees of probability in regard to the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, and 4 *Esdras*, to say nothing of the hypotheses which concern the eschatological discourses of our Lord, and the *Apocalypse of John*. Of the converse process, the developement of a separate book out of an episode in a larger work, I know no single instance. The nearest approach to it is the excerption of episodes out of longer books, such as we see in the *Epistle of Baruch*, detached from his *Apocalypse*, or in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, and the correspondence with the Corinthian Church, both taken from the *Acts of Paul*. But, in these cases, was the text of the detached episode recast? The *Acts of Paul and Thecla* were, in later times, altered in the direction of furnishing a completer narrative of the life of Thecla, for liturgical use ; and liturgical use accounts for modifications of the text of miracles and martyrdoms which were extracted from continuous Acts of Apostles and read on their feast-days. In the case of the *Epistle of Baruch* it does not appear that the text was recast or expanded. In short, I submit that the absorption of *A.P.* into the *Gospel* is in accordance with a tendency or literary fashion which may fairly be described as common.

(*b*) The incorporation of an existing document is in accordance with the habits of the author of the *Gospel of Peter*. No one doubts that this writer borrowed extensively from the Canonical Gospels. The amount of verbal coincidence with them is very large, allowing for the intentional variation of expression. It is not an overbold supposition that such a writer, finding another Petrine book ready to his hand, might have borrowed large portions of it, with changes chiefly affecting the tense and order of the matter.

The uncritical reader would be no more inclined to reject either *Apocalypse* or *Gospel* on the ground of community of matter than to reject any of the Synoptic Gospels on like grounds. When criticism began the credit of both the Petrine books was bound to perish for other reasons ; and perish it did.

(*c*) The hypothesis is not contradicted by external evidence.

The *A.P.* is first mentioned in the Muratorian fragment (170–200) and by Clement of Alexandria. The history of its reception is, in the beginning, not very unlike that of 2 *Peter*, and similarities have been pointed out between these two books, which may indicate that they were produced in the same *milieu*. Use of 2 *Peter* seems probable on the part of Aristides (*circ.* 140?). The celebrity of the *A.P.* was far greater than that attained at any time by the *Gospel*. This fact weighs, if very slightly, in the direction of the view that the *A.P.* is the older book of the two.

The *Gospel*, it has been held, was known to Justin Martyr. The point is doubtful. It was certainly known to Serapion of Antioch (190). The general verdict places it about 150.

There is, I believe, nothing in the nature of external evidence which renders it impossible that the *A. P.* should have preceded the *Gospel* by some twenty or thirty years.

This, then, is the thesis for which I ask consideration: we have two texts, *Eth.* and *Akh.*, for each of which the claim has been made that it represents the *Apocalypse of Peter*; of these I suggest that *Eth.* represents the *A. P.* known to Clement of Alexandria, Methodius, and Macarius Magnes, and that *Akh.* is a portion of the *Gospel of Peter*, almost wholly derived from the *A. P.*, which was already current as a separate book when the *Gospel* was compiled.

Contents of the original Apocalypse of Peter.

On the supposition that *Akh.* is not a portion of the *A. P.* (whether it is an earlier or a later form thereof does not affect the question) we must allow that certain passages in it did not appear in that work, while it is clear that the contents were differently arranged in the two texts.

My own present notion of the order and contents of the *A. P.* (which is, of course, very much subject to correction) is as follows :—

It began with an enquiry of the apostles, addressed by Peter to our Lord, as to the signs of the end. The scene of this may have been the Mount of Olives.

Our Lord's answer took up the greater part of the book. It began with a warning against false Christs. This portion of the answer (which I take to have been brief) ended with *Akh.* 1–3 πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ... υἱοὺς τῆς ἀνομίας.

Then came the long description of the Judgement and of Hell, which was introduced by the words 'Behold now what shall overtake them in the last days' (*J. T. S.* p. 39), and ended with the paragraph 'Then will I give to mine elect', &c. (l. c. p. 52): the following paragraph ('I have spoken to thee, Peter', &c.) containing little, if anything, of the original.

Thereupon followed the transition to the Holy Mountain (*Eth.*), the appearance of the two saints, the vision of Paradise. And this, I believe, was followed by a narrative resembling that of the Transfiguration, and by the descent from the mountain, with which the whole concluded.

I believe that the *A. P.* differed from *Akh.*, in that it identified the two saints with Moses and Elias. Consequently, *Akh.* 5 (ἀπερχόμενοι δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ ... τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπους [1]) will not have appeared in this form in *A. P.* Similarly *Akh.* 13, 14, in which our Lord describes

---

[1] It will be remembered that in these lines of *Akh.* the most striking resemblances to *Es.* occur.

the saints as 'your righteous brethren', and Peter asks where the rest of the righteous are, stood, in *A. P.*, in a different form. •

Again, *Akh.* 17–19 and 21 are not represented in *Eth.*, and 21 at least is incompatible with the order adopted therein. A phrase of 17 has an echo in 21 : 17 has ἐνδεδυμένοι ἦσαν ἔνδυμα ἀγγέλων φωτεινῶν, καὶ ὅμοιον ἦν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτῶν τῇ χώρᾳ αὐτῶν : cp. 21 οἱ κολαζόμενοι ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ κολάζοντες ἄγγελοι σκοτεινὸν εἶχον τὸ ἔνδυμα κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ τόπου. In these lines, therefore, there has been adaptation on the part of one of our texts. *Akh.* 20, where our Lord says 'This is the place of your leaders (?), the righteous men', has an equivalent in *Eth.*, 'Hast thou seen the company of the Fathers? This is their rest'.

A question akin to the last treated is, whether the whole of the matter which I suggest was contained in the *A. P.* could have been compressed within the 300 στίχοι (each presumably of 34–36 letters) which is recorded as having been the compass of the book in Greek (the Latin numeration of the Codex Claromontanus gives 270). I think an affirmative answer is reasonable. The Akhmim text gives us something to go upon. In it the prediction (vv. 1–3) makes about 7 στίχοι : the next paragraph (not all of which was in *A. P.*, as I think) another 7. The section on Paradise (6–20), 39 στίχοι. The description of Hell, 81 : in all, 134. We know that in *A. P.* the description of Hell, even in the portion parallel to *Akh.*, was somewhat longer : say that it contained 100 στίχοι. I believe that the prophecy of Judgement, and the remainder of the description of Hell, could be got into 150 στίχοι ; and 50 would remain for the introduction and conclusion. This is largely guesswork, but it seems worth while to record the fact that no insuperable obstacle to the identification of *Eth.* with the *A. P.* arises on the score of the known length of the latter.

M. R. JAMES.

THE TYPE OR TYPES OF GOSPEL TEXT USED BY ST JEROME AS THE BASIS OF HIS REVISION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ST LUKE'S GOSPEL AND CODEX VERCELLENSIS (*a*).

IN the investigation of the Old-Latin authorities for the text of the Gospels it is of the utmost importance that we should secure as a starting-point a text of the Vulgate as it left the hands of St Jerome, and there can be little doubt that the edition of Wordsworth and White has practically conferred this upon us. In individual passages it is, of course,