

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 16.—October, 1883.

I.

MILTON AND TENNYSON.

“ Blessings be with them and immortal praise,
Who gave us noble lives and nobler cares,
The Poets, who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth and pure delight by heavenly lays.”—WORDSWORTH.

TWO rivers, rising in the same lofty region and fed by kindred springs, are guided by the mountain-slopes of their environment into channels which, though not far apart, are widely different. The one, deeper and stronger from its birth, after a swift and lovely course through fair uplands of peace, is shattered suddenly by the turmoil of a fierce conflict, lifting but one foam-crested wave of warning, is plunged into the secret and tumultuous warfare of a deep cañon, emerging at length with wondrously augmented current, to flow majestically through a land of awful, thunder-riven cliffs, towering peaks, vast forests, and immeasurable plains,—a mighty land, a mighty stream. The other river, from a source less deep, but no less pure and clear, passing with the same gentle current through the same region of sweet seclusion, meets with no mighty obstacle, is torn by no wild cataract in its descent, but with ever-growing force and deepening, widening stream sweeps through a land less majestic, but more beautiful, not void of grandeur, but free from horror,—a land of shadowy vales and gardens; mysterious cities hung in air, and hills crowned with ruined castles,—a stream brimming and bright and large, whose smooth, strong flow often conceals its unsounded depth, and mirrors, not only the fleeting shores, but also the eternal stars, in its bosom.

Such is the figure in which I see the poetry of Milton and of Tennyson flowing through the literature and life of our English race.

F. Draper. 1883. This is a stimulating and valuable little book. It is modest and unpretentious, and yet contains a number of suggestions that ought to be carefully considered by the Revisers after the revised Old Testament has appeared, and when the final work of adjustment is undertaken. We think the recommendation of a final sub-committee of three men, who shall devote their whole time to it until the final revision is completed, an excellent one. We would suggest, further, that one of these should be chosen from the Old Testament Company and one from the New, and that Dr. Riggs himself be the third. One should be from Great Britain, one from America, and it would be appropriate that one who has spent a life in the translation of the Scriptures into Oriental languages should be the third.

C. A. BRIGGS.

II.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

DIE APOCRYPHEN APOSTELGESCHICHTEN UND APOSTELLEGENDEN. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte, von RICHARD ADELBERT LIPSIVS. Erster Band. Braunschweig. 1883. 8vo, pp. 622. [N. Y.: B. Westermann & Co.]

No branch of early Christian literature has been so neglected as the Apocrypha; and nothing could be more needed in that field of study than a thoroughgoing examination of any one division of it from the hands of Lipsius. His labors among the Apocrypha have long since borne rich fruit, as his numerous short papers in the periodical press, his articles on "Apocryphal Acts," "Abdias," etc., in Smith & Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography—his extended works on the "Acts of Pilate," the "Sources of the Roman Peter-legend," and the "Edessene Abgar-legend" abundantly prove. And although he modestly tells us that a final investigation into the Apocryphal Acts is as yet impossible, and that, owing to the mass of material still buried in unpublished documents, the results now attainable, if not altogether doubtful, will eventually need much modification; it is no less true that it is to Lipsius with one or two others that the Christian world must look for what knowledge is attainable on the subject, and that it is time that what is known should be made public. It is pleasant to learn also that much MS. material has been placed by Bonnet and others at the disposal of the author in the preparation of this volume, so that it has been prepared, not only by an exceptionally competent scholar, but also under exceptionally favorable circumstances. For some years, at least, it must rank as the standard work on the Apocryphal Acts, and though scholars will not find themselves in studying it reduced to simply saying "Ditto to Mr. Burke," they will not fail to find it, on the whole, an eminently satisfactory treatise.

The work opens with a short introduction (which is largely a German version of the article "Apocryphal Acts" in the Dictionary of Christian Biography), followed by a thorough discussion of the legend of the Separation of the Apostles to preach the Gospel through the world (pp. 11-34), and a Sketch of the Literature of the subject (pp. 35-43). Then the basis of the work is firmly laid in an investigation of the Extant Sources of the Apocryphal Apostle-legends (pp. 44-224), including discussions (1) of Leucius Charinus and the Gnostic Acts of the Apostles, (2) of the Latin Collection of *Passiones* which has come down to us under the name of Abdias, and (3) of the remaining Greek, Latin, and Oriental sources. On the ground of this investigation follows the main portion of the work: Special discussions of the Acts and Legends of the Separate Apostles. This volume contains those on the Acts of Thomas (pp. 225-349), John (pp. 348-542), and Andrew (pp. 543-622). The next will contain those on Peter, Paul (with an Appendix on the Acts of Paul and

Thekla), Philip, Matthew, Bartholomew, Simon, Judas, and the two Jameses, followed by an Appendix on those of Barnabas, Mark, Luke, Timothy, and Titus.

The second century already teemed with legends of the Apostles. Some of them were called out by the curiosity and thirst for wonders of the people; others met local desires to find an apostolic origin for a church or line of Bishops; others were meant to give apostolic authority to a special teaching, and thus were pure tendency-writings. Once in existence, they were reworked by every mouth they passed through until, although most of them sprang from heretical circles, they were gradually shaped to tolerable orthodoxy and retained little of their original contents except the miracles. Even *written* legends of the Apostles were current as early as the second century, which, in a more or less altered form, we still possess. There are three classes of these: 1. Ebionite *κηρίγματα* and *περίοδοι*, such as we find, for instance, in the Clementina; 2. Gnostic Acts of the Apostles, of which those of Peter and Paul certainly, and that of John probably, are as old as the second century; and 3. Orthodox Acts which sprang, for the most part, out of local traditions—such as the Syrian Acts of Addæus, the Armenian and Coptic Acts of Bartholomew, etc. Recent study has not led to the ascription of any great historical value to these works; they do contain real reminiscences, but these largely belong to the background of the stories rather than to the stories themselves; Lipsius thinks they preserve almost no facts concerning the Apostles. The important legend of the separation of the Apostles and the distribution of the world among them, Lipsius thinks sprang from Matt. xxviii. 19, and both originated and developed in Jewish-Christian circles.

The discussion of Leucius Charinus and the Gnostic Acts takes largely the form of a polemic against Zahn's *Acta Johannis*! Certainly Zahn goes much beyond the evidence when he contends that the Leucianic writings were held authoritative in the Christian Church, and hence must have arisen before their heresy was accounted heresy. But Lipsius no less is overanxious to prove that they were little used in Orthodox circles, and even tampers with the evidence in the effort to demonstrate the early existence of Catholic recensions of them. It is only, for instance, by a very unjustified reconstruction of the text of Philaster of Brescia (p. 52) that he can make him a witness for their existence in A.D. 330; they appear to be first mentioned, rather, by John of Thessalonica in the seventh century (p. 57), who, moreover, declares that they were made very near his own time (*τοὺς ἐναγχοῦς ἡμῶς προηγησάμενους*)—a statement which Lipsius sets aside very arbitrarily. If the Syrian MSS. containing them (p. 61) are correctly assigned to the sixth century, they probably set the beginning of the sixth century as the earliest date to which we can assign the origin of Catholic recensions in the face of John's words and the failure of all earlier mention of them in the East and West. The Leucianic collection itself, Lipsius holds, passed through two stages. Photius in one passage speaks of it as if containing acts of all twelve apostles, and in such a way as to leave the impression that it existed in this form as early as the middle of the fourth century. Elsewhere he enumerates only five parts for it; and this seems to have been at once its earliest (against Zahn) and most widely circulated form. The existence of the Acts of Peter, John, and Andrew in the first quarter, and of Paul and Thomas in the last quarter, of the fourth century can be proved; all of these seem older than Eusebius, and probably none of them are younger than the middle of the third century. Traces of the Acts of Peter, John, and Paul reach back to the second century; the Acts of Thomas belongs probably to the beginning of the third, and the Acts of Andrew scarcely later. It seems to be probable that they were collected some time before the middle of the third century into a collection of five, to which the other seven were added about a half century later (p. 83). The polemic against Zahn is continued warmly into the discussion of who "Leucius" was, and what is his relation to these writings. The conclusion is stated in the form of a dilemma (p. 116): he was *either* the author of

the first collecton, or the "I" of the "Wanderings of John"—he cannot be *both*. In the former case we must be content to say that he was an unknown Gnostic who wrote these books, and must refuse credit to Epiphanius' statement that he was John's companion (τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν ἁμῶν αὐτῶν Λευκίου καὶ ἀλλήσας πολλῶν). In the latter, we must still ask whether he was a pure myth, or whether the author of this Gnostic life of John hid himself behind the name of a really historic personage, "a younger friend of John's in Ephesus" (Zahn). This cannot be decided by simply saying that the latter is the only natural supposition; one is *per se* about as possible as the other, and most of the persons in these Acts are purely fictitious. The date of "Leucius" is also somewhat, but in a less degree, dependent on the solution of the dilemma: if the latter horn of the dilemma be true, the date of the second century "Wanderings of John" settles it—if the former, his life must continue to the first half of the third century. It is, however, not probable that the Wanderings of Thomas and of John came from the same hand (although on internal grounds those of John and Peter seem to have the same author). It is certainly not to be supposed that the name is a pure invention; and the supposition has much in its favor that behind this name we are to seek a real or putative author of the *πράξεις Ἰωάννου*, to whom the whole collection was afterward attributed—certainly by the fourth century, perhaps immediately on its collection.

The origin of the Abdias collection is investigated with equal care, although its later date detracts from its interest. It is pointed out truly enough that it has been ascribed to an Abdias only through a misunderstanding, although we can hardly accept the confident account of the rise of the misunderstanding (pp. 118-120). It is also shown that the collection of the *virtutes* is later than that of the *passiones*, was mechanically made, and dates from a time subsequent to the sixth century. The *passiones* themselves cannot be older than the second half of the sixth century, although earlier than Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus († 609). Their home was France; they are an original Latin work, although they use Greek material; and their value is small beyond their preservation of some earlier matter.

We reach the heart of the work, however, only when we turn to the discussion of the Acts of the separate Apostles. We cannot pretend to give an abstract of these closely-packed pages; let us indicate the method of the discussion in one instance only, as a sample. Take the Acts of John (pp. 348-542). The Church traditions concerning the Apostle are first collected and the question started how far they belong to the Apostle and how far to the Presbyter John—for Lipsius still believes in the exploded myth of a Presbyter John. The answer is returned that this question cannot now be decided; enough, it is said, that it was universally believed in the last quarter of the second century that John was the Apostle of Asia. At all events, the banishment of the Apocalypticist to Patmos and the long abode of John, the disciple of Christ, at Ephesus, are the two firmly-established data which lie at the base of all later legends in all their modifications. There follows an account of the Patristic notices of the Gnostic "Wanderings of John," and of the attempts which have been made to collect its fragments. The question is then broached as to the light which may be thrown on its original form by its later use, and this opens the way to a full discussion of Prochorus, Abdias, Pseudo-Melito, Pseudo-Isidore, etc., etc., with especial reference to their notices concerning John and their relation to the Gnostic *περίοδοι*. The fragments contained in the original are next discussed in full, and an attempt is made to restore the original form. Other fragments are pointed out beyond those which Zahn has printed. The date of the work is assigned to the second half of the second century (which is, perhaps, a little too late). Finally, its historical value is investigated with the result of reducing it to nothing in regard to the life of John (still against Zahn), but of pointing out its high value in the history of Gnosticism.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.