

The Acts of John in Antiochus the Monk's *Pandect*

Marcus Bailey 

University of Oxford, UK

marcus.bailey@theology.ox.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

In the *Pandect* (c. 630), Antiochus the Monk draws heavily on Scripture and early church writings to counsel his fellow monks in Christian life and doctrine. To date, a comprehensive exploration of the text's abundant sources has not been attempted. One text that is overlooked in existing partial catalogues is the *Acts of John* (*AJ*). Antiochus quotes twice (*Pand.* 26 and 114) from three chapters (*AJ* 106, 107, and 108) of this second- or third-century apocryphal work, a century before its condemnation at the Second Council of Nicaea in 787. In this article, I edit, translate, and comment on the relevant passages in the *Pandect*. My edition more closely resembles Junod and Kaestli's critical texts of the *Acts of John* than the standard Migne edition of Antiochus' work. I then contextualize Antiochus' engagement with *AJ* 106–8, first by considering their seventh-century setting in the *Pandect* and beyond, and then by discussing the *Pandect's* prologue, in which the author gives a threefold division of his source material: canonical Scripture, apocryphal works, and the 'writings of the Church's teachers'.

1. INTRODUCTION

ANTIOCHUS was a monk at the Mar Saba monastery, near Jerusalem, in the early seventh century. This was a time of crisis;¹ the Persians were making incursions into the eastern Roman Empire, including the Holy Land and Asia Minor. From Ancyra came a cry for help. The hegumen of the Attaline monastery, Eustathius, wrote to Antiochus requesting a summary of the Bible for his monks' instruction. Forced to leave their monastery and its collection of books, the Attalinities had to move from place to place, 'starved not of food but of the

I would like to thank Markus Bockmuehl, Phil Booth, and the anonymous reviewers for feedback on previous drafts of this article. All websites mentioned were last accessed in July 2024.

¹ Crisis is the operative word in studies of this period; see, for instance, P. Booth, *Crisis of Empire: Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2014). A leitmotif of decline, however, is nuanced in recent treatments, such as L. Parker, *Symeon Stylites the Younger and Late Antique Antioch: From Hagiography to History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), pp. 16–74.

Word of God'.² In response, Antiochus penned the *Pandect*, a topical digest of Scripture organized in 130 chapters (κεφάλαια),³ most of which have a moral and practical orientation.

The *Pandect* is routinely dated to around 620.⁴ Phil Booth, to my mind rightly, proposes a later date of around 630.⁵ In *Pand.* 130, Antiochus recalls a report about 'Athanasius', doubtlessly Athanasius Gammolo, desiring the throne of the vacant (Chalcedonian) patriarchate of Antioch. This rumour spread after 629, when Athanasius is said to have met the Emperor Heraclius about a possible reconciliation between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians.

In the modern, critical period, the *Pandect* is best known as a trove of patristic quotations. Antiochus' use of Pseudo-Clement's *Epistle to the Two Virgins*,⁶ Ignatius of Antioch,⁷ Polycarp of Smyrna,⁸ and the *Shepherd of Hermas*⁹ is thoroughly documented. Scholars have further identified Clement of Alexandria, Evagrius of Pontus,¹⁰ Epiphanius of Salamis, Diadochus

² See Antiochus' prefatory *Letter to Eustathius* (PG 89.1421–8). Attaline (also transliterated Attalina) was one of three monasteries in late antique Ancyra, alongside three convents. See C. Foss, 'Late Antique and Byzantine Ankara', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 31 (1977), pp. 27–87, at 61. No definite archaeological evidence for the monastery has survived according to U. Serin, 'Late Antique and Byzantine Ankara: Topography and Architecture', in O. Brandt and P. Pergola (eds.), *Marmoribus Vestita. Miscellanea in onore di Federico Guidobaldi* (Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 2011), pp. 1257–80, at 1262 and 1276.

³ On this genre, see P. Géhin, 'Les collections de *kephalaia* monastiques: Naissance et succès d'un genre entre création originale, plagiat et florilège', in A. Rigo (ed.), *Theologica Minora: The Minor Genres of Byzantine Theological Literature* (Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 1–50. Though once contested, it is clear that Antiochus' chapters are 'homilies' (λόγοι). Indeed, this is one of Antiochus' own terms for them (*Pand.* 1, 52, 53, 66, 101, 128, 130). See K. Holl, *Die Sacra Parallela des Johannes Damascenus* (Texte und Untersuchungen 16.1; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897), p. 385; *pace* S. Vailhé, 'Antiochus', *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, vol. 1 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1909), col. 1440. Because of their continuous prose ('un exposé suivi'), they are discounted as florilegia by M. Richard, 'Florilèges spirituels grecs', *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, vol. 5 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1962), col. 499.

⁴ G. Bardy, 'Antiochus', *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, vol. 1 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936), col. 1701; Y. Papadogiannakis, 'An Education through Gnostic Wisdom: The Pandect of Antiochus as Bibliothekersatz', in P. Gemeinhardt, L. van Hoof, and P. van Nuffelen (eds.), *Education and Religion in Late Antique Christianity: Reflections, Social Contexts and Genres* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 61–72, at 61; D. Frendo, 'Religious Minorities and Religious Dissent in the Byzantine and Sasanian Empires (590–641): Sources for the Historical Background', *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 22 (2008), pp. 223–37, at 235 n. 36. C. Foss, 'The Persians in Asia Minor and the End of Antiquity', *The English Historical Review* 90.357 (1975), pp. 721–47, at 726, offers the range 620–28.

⁵ Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, pp. 95–6, 204. A late date (631–4) was earlier proposed on the same grounds by J. L. van Dielen, *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI. (610–715)* (Geschichte der griechischen Patriarchen von Konstantinopel 4; Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1972), pp. 230–1. See also W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 346–7, who dates this meeting to spring 631 and Antiochus' work to that time.

⁶ J. M. Cotterill, *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884).

⁷ S. G. Americano, 'Ignazio d'Antiochia nel "Pandette della Sacra Scrittura" di Antioco di San Saba (CPG 7842–7844): Tradizione manoscritta', *Augustinianum* 57.1 (2017), pp. 191–208; S. G. Americano, 'Ignazio d'Antiochia nel "Pandette della Sacra Scrittura" di Antioco di San Saba (CPG 7842–7844). Testo critico e commento', *Augustinianum* 57.2 (2017), pp. 541–67.

⁸ J. M. Cotterill, 'The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians and the Homilies of Antiochus Palaestiniensis', *Journal of Philology* 19 (1891), pp. 241–85; C. Taylor, 'St Polycarp to the Philippians', *The Journal of Philology* 20 (1892), pp. 65–110. See recently, M. Myllykoski, 'Antiochus of Palestine and the Text of *Epistula Polycarpi*', in *Studies on the Text of Epistula Polycarpi* (Sapere aude 5; Helsinki: Vartija, 2023), pp. 63–77.

⁹ S. G. Americano, 'Il Πανδέκτης τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς di Antioco di San Saba (CPG 7842–7844). Ricerche sul testo e primi sondaggi sulla tradizione manoscritta' (Ph.D. diss., University of Basilicata and École pratique des hautes études, 2018), pp. 282–300, 322–38.

¹⁰ S. Haidacher, 'Nilus-Exzerpte im Pandektes des Antiochus', *Revue Bénédictine* 22 (1905), pp. 244–50, catalogues quotations from *On Prayer* and *On the Eight Spirits of Wickedness/On the Eight Thoughts*. Both texts are now restored to Evagrius, having passed under Nilus of Ancyra's name for centuries. Recently, Paul Géhin (ed.), *Évagre le Pontique: Chapitres sur la prière*, Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 2017), p. 120, observed that Antiochus quotes a substantial portion of *On Masters and Disciples*, a now fragmentary text attributed to Evagrius, and one which Géhin regards as 'apocryphe'. He does not detail the location of the known fragments in the *Pandect*. These are *Pand.* 38 (frags. 4, 5, 6, 7), *Pand.* 80 (frags. 8, 9), and *Pand.* 111 (frags. 3, 10, 13). For the text of *On Masters and Disciples*, see P. van den Ven, 'Un opuscule inédit attribué à S. Nil', in *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth. II. Mémoires littéraires, philologiques et archéologiques* (Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège, 1908), pp. 73–81; J. Muyldermans, 'Le De Magistris et Discipulis de S. Nil, Quelques Corrections Textuelles', *Le Muséon* 55 (1942), pp. 93–6; English translation by G. Gould, 'An Ancient Monastic Writing Giving Advice to Spiritual Directors (Evagrius of Pontus, *On Teachers and Disciples*)', *Hallell* 22 (1997), pp. 96–103.

of Photice, Pseudo-Dionysius,¹¹ John of Carpathus,¹² and John Cassian¹³ among Antiochus' sources.¹⁴ However, as Dirk Krausmüller observes: 'No systematic comparison with other texts has been undertaken so far'.¹⁵ More recently, Yannis Papadogiannakis writes: 'Despite the efforts of the editors of the [*Patrologia Graeca*] and of other scholars there remains a lot to be done in regard to the sheer bulk of unattributed sources that need to be traced'.¹⁶ One such source is known as the *Acts of John* (*AJ*), from which Antiochus twice draws in *Pand.* 26 and 114.

The *Acts of John* narrates the apostle John's travels around Asia Minor, including his ministry and death in Ephesus. It is typically dated to the second or third century and survives substantially, though fragmentarily.¹⁷ Although it has been associated, in whole or in part, with the 'gnostic' stream of Johannine Christianity,¹⁸ it enjoyed a wide, and diverse, readership in the centuries after its composition. Augustine reports that Priscillianists sang the hymn in *AJ* 94–6 in their initiation rites (*Ep.* 237.2).¹⁹ Later, during the Iconoclastic Controversy, iconoclasts employed the *Acts* to show John's supposed hostility to a portrait of himself set up for veneration (see *AJ* 26–9). The iconophile Second Council of Nicaea denounced both the iconoclasts and their proof-text, the *Acts of John*, which it condemned to the flames.²⁰

No previous study known to me has considered the *Acts of John* as one of Antiochus' sources. Theodor Zahn, in his *Acta Iohannis*, references Antiochus, but only in connection with his misattribution of another, extra-canonical account about the apostle John, the story of *John and the Robber*.²¹ (In *Pand.* 122, Antiochus relates the story, known from Clement of Alexandria's *Who Is the Rich Man Who Will Be Saved?*, and ascribes it to Irenaeus.²²) More surprisingly, Éric Junod and Jean-Daniel Kaestli mention neither Antiochus nor his *Pandect*

¹¹ N. Marinides, 'The *Pandect* of Antiochus: A Neglected Witness to Learned Culture at the Lavra of Mar Saba in the Early Seventh Century', Byzantine Studies Conference, New York, 22–25 October 2015 <https://www.academia.edu/28392304/The_Pandect_of_Antiochus_A_neglected_witness_to_learned_culture_at_the_Lavra_of_Mar_Saba_in_the_early_seventh_century>, pp. 4–6, 11.

¹² D. Krausmüller, 'Dating John of Carpathus to the 6th Century. A Textual Parallel between His *Capita hortatoria* and the *Pandectes* of Antiochus of St. Sabas', *Gouden Hoorn* 7.1 (1999) <<https://goudenhoorn.com/2014/05/13/dating-john-of-carpathus-to-the-6th-century-a-textual-parallel-between-his-capita-hortatoria-and-the-pandectes-of-antiochus-of-st-sabas/>>.

¹³ P. Tzamalikos dissents from the typical identification of Antiochus' source with John Cassian, and rediscovers 'Cassian the Sabaite', a supposed predecessor of Antiochus at Mar Saba. See P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father. Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 111; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012); P. Tzamalikos, *The Real Cassian Revisited. Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 112; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012). His proposal has been roundly rejected. See C. Stewart, 'Another Cassian?', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 66 (2015), pp. 372–6; A. Casiday, 'Panayiotis Tzamalikos, A Newly Discovered Greek Father: Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles and The Real Cassian Revealed: Monastic Life, Greek "Paideia", and Origenism in the Sixth Century', *Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies* 3 (2014), pp. 119–25.

¹⁴ The most comprehensive list may be found in J. Popovski, 'Die *Pandekten* des Antiochus Monachus: Slavische Übersetzung und Überlieferung' (Ph.D. diss., University of Amsterdam, 1989), pp. 11–16.

¹⁵ Krausmüller, 'Dating John of Carpathus'.

¹⁶ Papadogiannakis, 'An Education through Gnostic Wisdom', p. 62.

¹⁷ For an extensive introduction and commentary, see É. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vols. 1 and 2 (*Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum* 1 and 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1983). See also J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 303–11.

¹⁸ See variously, Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 2, pp. 589–642; G. Luttikhuizen, 'A Gnostic Reading of the Acts of John', in J. M. Bremmer (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of John* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), pp. 119–52; P. J. Lalleman, *The Acts of John: A Two-Stage Initiation into Johannine Gnosticism* (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 4; Louvain: Peeters, 1998).

¹⁹ Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 303.

²⁰ Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, p. 1.

²¹ T. Zahn, *Acta Joannis unter Benutzung von C. v. Tischendorfs Nachlass* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1880), pp. cxli–cxlii.

²² As the editors of the Migne edition point out, the account is found in none of Irenaeus' extant works (*PG* 89.1813–4). The story is, however, found in Clement of Alexandria and reproduced in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (3.23.6–19). Unlike almost all his non-biblical quotations, Antiochus is sure to mention his purported source here, perhaps to vouch for its historicity. Attribution to Irenaeus perhaps made sense to Antiochus if he knew of the bishop's own claims about his connection to the apostle John through Polycarp (*Letter to Florinus*, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.20.4–8). In any case, the minor mystery of Antiochus' misattribution has a possible solution. Pierre Halloix, in his *Illustrium Ecclesiae Orientalis Scriptorum, Vitae et Documenta*, vol. 1 (Douai: Bogard, 1633), reasonably supposes that Antiochus read Eusebius and inadvertently transposed the churchmen's names. In *Ecclesiastical History* 3.23.2, Eusebius lauds Clement and Irenaeus together as 'ambassadors of church

in their study charting the reception of the *Acts of John* from the third to the ninth century.²³ Knut Schäferdiek likewise makes no mention of Antiochus in his conspectus of the Latin, Greek and Syriac reception of the *Acts*.²⁴

The texts under consideration in this study (AJ 106–7, 108) are drawn from the final section of the *Acts of John*, commonly called the *Metastasis*,²⁵ which narrates the apostle's final words and death (AJ 106–15).²⁶ It circulated independently and more widely than the rest of the *Acts*, often being read as hagiography on the apostle's feast day.²⁷ In their edition, Junod and Kaestli identify three forms of the *Metastasis* (to which they assign the Greek letters δ, γ, and β).²⁸ Antiochus' quotations stand in the tradition of Group δ and Manuscript B,²⁹ for which the editors produce a separate critical text.³⁰ The importance of the readings of this grouping may be seen in the recovery of what Junod and Kaestli offer as a 'primitive' text of the *Acts of John*.³¹ Though that critical edition was based on the readings of the three groups and the versional languages, the text little differs from that of Group δ and Manuscript B for AJ 106–8.³²

2. PRELIMINARY TEXT AND TRANSLATION

No critical edition of the *Pandect* has ever been produced.³³ There are well over a hundred manuscripts in Greek alone, making it a significant undertaking.³⁴ A critical text would allow us to make an informed comparison of Antiochus' source text with other texts of the *Acts of John*, including the critical texts of Junod and Kaestli. The primary edition of the *Pandect* is found in Migne (PG 89.1427–1850),³⁵ which reprints Fronton du Duc's 1624 edition of the Greek text.³⁶

orthodoxy' (τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πρεσβεύσαντες ὀρθοδοξίας). He then offers two short statements from Irenaeus' *Against Heresies* about John before relating Clement's tale of *John and the Robber*. Both A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (2nd edn.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1958), p. 316, and J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part II: S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp*, vol. 1 (2nd edn.; London: Macmillan, 1889), p. 441, accept Halloix's proposal. Now, whether Antiochus had the text in front of him is another question. He would have had to overlook Eusebius' intimation of his Clementine source immediately before (3.23.5) and after (3.23.19) his recounting the story. In any case, Antiochus offers an abridged version of *John and the Robber*, when compared with Clement.

²³ É. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli, *L'histoire des Actes apocryphes des apôtres du III^e au IX^e siècle: le cas des Actes de Jean* (Cahiers de la Revue de théologie et de philosophie 7; Geneva, Lausanne, and Neuchâtel: La Concorde, 1982).

²⁴ K. Schäferdiek, 'Acts of John: Introduction', in W. Schneemelcher and R. M. Wilson (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: James Clarke/Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press), pp. 152–6.

²⁵ However, of the manuscripts of AJ 106–15 that bear their own title, only one is headed μετὰστάσις.

²⁶ I follow the chapter numbering for the *Acts* in Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*.

²⁷ Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, pp. 30–1.

²⁸ Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, pp. 30–63.

²⁹ In their sigla, B is Athos, Vatopedi MS. 431 (11th century). Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, pp. 31, 47, consider this manuscript with Group δ 'out of convenience'; they judge B to 'represent an earlier state of the text'.

³⁰ Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, pp. 317–28.

³¹ Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, pp. 292–315.

³² Variants in Antiochus will be discussed with relation to both critical texts, that is, δ and B and the so-called 'primitive text'.

³³ All translations of *Acts of John* are adapted from J. McCollum and B. Niedergall, *Acts of John* (Brepols Library of Christian Sources; Turnhout: Brepols, 2022). Otherwise, translations of the *Pandect* are my own.

³⁴ The *Pinakes* database (<<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/>>) offers an extensive listing of manuscripts. For the *Pandect's* Slavic translation and transmission, see Popovski, *Die Pandekten*.

³⁵ There is a more recent edition by N. Kephala, *Αντιόχου μοναχοῦ, Πανδέκτης τῶν θεοπνευστῶν ἁγίων Γραφῶν* (2nd edn.; Thessaloniki: Orthodoxos Kypseli, 1991). He reckons the text of the Migne edition to be 'rather carelessly published', and while he offers many corrections, these go unmarked in keeping with the devotional aims of his work (Kephala, *Αντιόχου μοναχοῦ*, p. 9). As for the passages under discussion, there is, in fact, only one meaningful departure. In *Pand.* 114, Kephala reads ἀμετάβλητος, rather than ἀμετάβολος, as does part of the manuscript tradition of the *Acts of John* (γ). The words appear synonymous in *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. 'ἀμετάβολος', 'ἀμετάβλητος'.

³⁶ F. du Duc, *Bibliothecae veterum patrum, seu scriptorum ecclesiasticorum: Tomus primus graecolatinitus* (Paris: s.n., 1624). Du Duc simply states that his edition is based on 'manuscripts of the library of the most Christian king', that is, the former Bibliothèque du roi, whose collections were subsumed into the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

What follows is a preliminary text of the passages in the *Pandect* which draw on the *Acts of John*. The first, from *Pand.* 114, takes up *AJ* 106–7; the second, from *Pand.* 26, corresponds to *AJ* 108. Comparison of the manuscripts yields a text of the *Pandect* which more closely resembles the critical texts of the *Acts of John* than the Migne (du Duc) edition would suggest. In fact, Migne omits several words and differs occasionally in the word order likely original to Antiochus.³⁷

For this edition, I employ 15 manuscripts for *Pand.* 26 and 10 for *Pand.* 114.³⁸ My selection is, admittedly, informed by those which were readiest to hand. Digitization efforts by the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris) and the Bodleian Library (Oxford) mean that their many manuscripts form the bulk of those in the apparatus.³⁹ Nevertheless, five centuries of textual transmission are represented. The oldest extant manuscripts of the *Pandect* are dated to the ninth century, around 200 years after Antiochus wrote; the earliest below were copied in the tenth century.⁴⁰ All manuscripts are assigned a date before the fourteenth century.

Sigla:

- A = Oxford, Bodleian MS Barocci 227, fol. 26r–v (14th cent.)
- B = Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Hagiou Saba 76, fol. 108r (10th cent.)⁴¹
- C = Oxford, Bodleian MS Barocci 30, fol. 85v (13–14th cent.)
- D = Paris, BnF gr. 881, fols. 44v, 141v–142r (10th cent.)
- E = Paris, BnF gr. 1080, fol. 57v; = BnF gr. 1079, fols. 142v–143r (11th cent.)⁴²
- F = Paris, BnF gr. 885, fols. 33r, 138v (11th cent.)
- G = Paris, BnF gr. 883, fol. 34v (12th cent.)
- H = Paris, BnF gr. 884, fols. 49v, 205v–206r (13th cent.)
- J = Oxford, Bodleian MS. Auct. D. 4. 1, fol. 318v (mid 10th cent.)⁴³
- K = Florence, BML Plut. 60.13, fols. 53r–v, 198v–199r (14th cent.)
- L = Florence, BML Plut. 4.28, fols. 66v, 243r–v (11th cent.)
- μ = Paris, BnF gr. 1081, fols. 57v–58r, 224v–225r (14th cent.)
- P = Paris, BnF Coisl. 256, fols. 46r–v, 174v (11th cent.)
- Q = Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, MS gr. 1909, fol. 296v (14th cent.)
- R = Paris, BnF gr. 1078, fols. 46r–v, 196r (11th cent.)
- S = Paris, BnF sup. gr. 1389, fol. 34r (12th–13th cent.)⁴⁴

³⁷ Omissions are found in the text of *Pand.* 26: πάντα¹, τε, and πάσας. Differences in word order are found in the same homily. Migne reads σου πατρός for πατρός σου, πᾶσι for πᾶσιν, and Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ θεέ καὶ κύριε instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ θεέ κύριε.

³⁸ A, G, J, Q, and S lack *Pand.* 114. C suffers some damage at fol. 106r for *Pand.* 114; I have ignored its readings.

³⁹ I consulted the microfilm of Bodleian MS. Auct. D. 4. 1 in person; the rest were accessed online.

⁴⁰ According to *Pinakes*, the three earliest extant manuscripts are dated to the ninth century. These are either extracts or lacunose, or both.

⁴¹ A lacunose manuscript that begins at *Pand.* 17; it lacks *Pand.* 26.

⁴² J. Leroy, 'Le Parisinus gr. 1477 et la détermination de l'origine des manuscrits italo-grecs d'après la forme des initiales', *Scriptorium* 32 (1978), pp. 191–212, at 198 n. 53, demonstrated that gr. 1080 and 1079 were originally a single manuscript; each now represents roughly half the text. See also A. Binggeli, 'Fragments du *Pandecte* d'Antiochus de Saint-Sabas dans le fonds du Supplément grec de la Bibliothèque nationale de France', *Scriptorium* 62 (2008), pp. 278–282, at 280.

⁴⁴ On this manuscript and its date, see Binggeli 'Fragments du *Pandecte*'.

Pand. 114 on Commandment-Keeping**Acts of John 106–7**

Ἐπεὶ ἐὰν καταφρονοῦμεν, οἶδεν κολάζειν, παρακουόντων ἡμῶν τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἐντολῶν. μὴ οὖν λυπεῖσθω καθ' ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἡμῶν θεός· ὁ εὐσπλαγχνος· ὁ ἐλεήμων· ὁ ἅγιος· ὁ καθαρὸς· ὁ ἀμίαντος· ὁ ἄυλος· ὁ μόνος· ὁ εἷς· ὁ ἀμετάβολος· ὁ εἰλικρινής· ὁ ἄδολος· ὁ ἀόργητος· ὁ πάσης λεγομένης καὶ νοουμένης ἡμῖν προσηγορίας ἀνώτερος καὶ ὑψηλότερος θεός, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· εὐφραίνεσθω σὺν ἡμῖν, καλῶς ἡμῶν πολιτευομένων· χαίρετω καθαρῶς βιούντων ἡμῶν· ἀναπαυέσθω σεμνῶς ἡμῶν ἀναστρεφομένων· εὐωχεῖσθω φιλοῦντων αὐτὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ καλῶς ἐγκρατευομένων καὶ σωφρονούντων ἡμῶν.

(106) οἶδεν γὰρ καὶ ὕβριν τὴν ἐξ ὑμῶν, οἶδεν καὶ ἀτιμίαν, οἶδεν καὶ ἐπιβουλήν, οἶδεν καὶ κόλασιν παρακουόντων ὑμῶν τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἐντολῶν. (107) μὴ οὖν λυπεῖσθω ὁ ἀγαθὸς ὑμῶν θεός, ὁ εὐσπλαγχνος, ὁ ἐλεήμων, ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ καθαρὸς, ὁ ἀμίαντος, ὁ ἄυλος, ὁ μόνος, ὁ εἷς, ὁ ἀμετάβολος, ὁ εἰλικρινής, ὁ ἄδολος, ὁ ἀόργητος, ὁ πάσης λεγομένης καὶ νοουμένης προσηγορίας ἀνώτερος καὶ ὑψηλότερος θεός Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· εὐφραίνεσθω σὺν ὑμῖν καλῶς ὑμῶν πολιτευομένων· χαίρετω καθαρῶς βιούντων ὑμῶν· ἀναπαυέσθω σεμνῶς ὑμῶν ἀναστρεφομένων· ἀμεριμνεῖτω ἐγκρατῶς ὑμῶν βιούντων· ἡδέσθω κοινωνούντων ὑμῶν· γελάτω [μειδιάτω] σωφρονούντων ὑμῶν· εὐωχεῖσθω φιλοῦντων ὑμῶν αὐτόν.

ἐπεὶ] ἐπὶ D | καταφρονοῦμεν] καταφρονῶμεν BER | παρακουόντων] παρακουόντων KL | ἡμῶν] add. καὶ B | λυπεῖσθω] λουπίσθω D; λυπήσθω H; λυπιθείσθω M | ἡμῶν θεός] θεός ἡμῶν K | εὐσπλαγχνος] εὐσπλαγχνος F | ἐλεήμων] ἐλεήμον L | ὁ καθαρὸς] om. H | ὁ εἷς] om. ὁ H | ἀμετάβολος] ἀμετάβουλος M | εἰλικρινής] εἰλικρινῆς EP; εἰληκρινῆς F; εἰληκρινῆς HK | λεγομένης καὶ νοουμένης] νοουμένης καὶ λεγομένης B | λεγομένης] λεγομένης L | καὶ νοουμένης] om. H | προσηγορίας] προσεγορίας M | ἀνώτερος] ἀνότερος K | ὑψηλότερος] ὑπιλότερος LP; ὑψηλώτερος EF | εὐφραίνεσθω] εὐφρενέσθω LH; εὐφρενείσθω D | καλῶς] καλὸς P | πολιτευομένων] πολιτευόμενον L | καθαρῶς] καθαρὸς FL | ἀναπαυέσθω] ἀναπαυείσθω D | ἀναστρεφομένων] ἀναστρεφωμένων KL | εὐωχεῖσθω] εὐοχεῖσθω F; εὐοχίσθω K | αὐτὸν ἡμῶν] ἡμῶν αὐτόν KLMR; ἡμῶν αὐτῶν P | αὐτόν] αὐτῶν DHP | καλῶς] καλὸς L | ἐγκρατευομένων] ἐγκρατεωμένων L | σωφρονούντων] σωφρονούντων F

Whenever we despise him, he knows to chastise us when we do not heed his holy commandments. Therefore, do not let our good God be grieved by us—he who is compassionate, merciful, holy, pure, undefiled, immaterial, the only, the one, the unchangeable, the sincere, the guileless, the unwrathful, the God who is above and beyond every name spoken or understood by us—Jesus Christ. Let him be glad with us as we conduct ourselves well! Let him rejoice as we live pure lives! Let him find rest as we behave honourably! Let him be delighted as we love him and successfully exercise self-control and temperance!

Ναὶ κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, χαρακτήρ καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τοῦ εὐλογημένου πατρός σου· ὁ ἐγκατασπίρας τοὺς θεῖους σου λόγους εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν· ὁ μόνος κηδόμενος τῶν σῶν δούλων καὶ ἰατρὸς δωρεὰν ἰώμενος· ὁ μόνος εὐεργέτης καὶ ἀνυπερήφανος· ὁ μόνος ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλόανθρωπος· ὁ μόνος σωτὴρ καὶ δίκαιος· ὁ αἰεὶ ὢν καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ὢν καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὼν καὶ πάντα περιέχων καὶ πληρῶν τὰ πάντα, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ θεε κύριε· σὺ ταῖς σαῖς δωρεαῖς καὶ τῷ σῷ ἐλέει περισκέπε ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐπὶ σε ἐλπίζοντας· ὁ ἐπιστάμενος ἀκριβῶς τοῦ πανταχῆ ἡμῶν ἀντιδίκου τὰς τέχνας τὰς τε ἐπιρειαίας πάσας ἄς καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιβουλεύει, κύριε, σὺ μόνος βοήθησον ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ σου τῇ ἀγία.

Καὶ εἶπὼν ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἠΰξατο οὕτως· Ὁ τὸν στέφανον τοῦτον πλέξας τῇ σῆι πλοκῇ, Ἰησοῦ· ὁ τὰ πολλὰ ταῦτα ἄνθη εἰς τὸ ἀδιάπνευστόν σου ἄνθος ἐναρμόσας· ὁ ἐγκατασπίρας σου τοὺς λόγους τούτους· ὁ μόνος κηδόμενος τῶν σῶν δούλων καὶ ἰατρὸς δωρεὰν ἰώμενος· ὁ μόνος εὐεργέτης καὶ ἀνυπερήφανος· ὁ μόνος ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλόανθρωπος· ὁ μόνος σωτὴρ καὶ δίκαιος· ὁ αἰεὶ ὢν καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ὢν καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὼν καὶ πάντα περιέχων καὶ πληρῶν τὰ πάντα, θεε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ κύριε· σὺ ταῖς σαῖς δωρεαῖς καὶ τῷ σῷ ἐλέει περισκέπε πάντας τοὺς ἐπὶ σε ἐλπίζοντας· ὁ ἐπιστάμενος ἀκριβῶς τοῦ πανταχῆ ἡμῶν ἀντιδίκου τὰς τέχνας τὰς τε ἐπιρειαίας πάσας ἄς καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιβουλεύει· σὺ μόνος, κύριε, βοήθησον ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ σου τοῖς σοῖς δούλοις.

ναὶ] καὶ H | Χριστέ add. καὶ H | πατρός σου] σου πατρός M | σου] om. P | ἐγκατασπίρας ACFGLPQRS] ἐγκατασπίρας DEHJKM | θεῖους] om. S | σου λόγους] λόγους σου S | κηδόμενος] κιδεμῶν F; κοιδόμενος M; φιδόμενος P | τῶν σῶν δούλων καὶ ἰατρὸς] καὶ ἰατρὸς τῶν σῶν δούλων F | ἰατρὸς] ἰατρείας P | δωρεὰν] δωρεᾶς H; δωρεᾶς MP; δωρεῶν Q | ἰώμενος] ἰόμενος F | ὁ μόνος εὐεργέτης καὶ ἀνυπερήφανος] om. Q | καὶ] om. K | ἀνυπερήφανος] ἀνυπερίφανος HMS | ἐλεήμων] ἐλεήμον Q | καὶ³] om. καὶ S | πᾶσιν] πᾶσι CM | παρὼν] παρὸν M | καὶ] add. τὰ CFK | περιέχων] παρέχων C; περιέπων FQ; add. καὶ πάντα περιέχων Q; add. καὶ τὰ πάντα κατέχων F | θεε κύριε] κύριε καὶ θεε G; θεε καὶ κύριε M | σε] σοὶ HMP | ἐλπίζοντας] ἐλπίζοντας GR | ἐπὶ σε ἐλπίζοντας] ἐλπίζοντας ἐπὶ σε Q | τοῦ] τοὺς P | πανταχῆ] πανταχὸν H; πανταχεῖ KS; πανταχοῦ P; om. F | ἀντιδίκου] ἀντιδίκους P | ἡμῶν ἀντιδίκου] ἀντηδίκου ἡμῶν F | τε] add. καὶ P | ἐπιρειαίας CEGMQS] ἐπιρία D; ἐπειρία FHK; ἐπειρία L; ἐπιρία AR; ἐμπειρία P | πάσας] ἀπάσας LR; om. M | ἐπιβουλεύει] add. καὶ H | κύριε σὺ μόνος ACFGHLMQR] καὶ σὺ μόνος E; σὺ κύριε μόνος KP; σὺ μόνος κύριε D; κύριε ὁ μόνος S | βοήθησον] βοήθεισον A; βοηθός P; βοηθήσων S | ἡμῖν] ἡμῶν M | ἐπισκοπῇ] ἐπισκοπὴ D | ἀγία] add. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν G

Yes, Lord Jesus Christ, radiance and exact imprint of your blessed Father, who sowed your divine words in our hearts! You alone are concerned for your servants, even a physician who heals freely. You alone are a benefactor and not arrogant; you alone are merciful and benevolent; you alone are Saviour and righteous. You are in all and everywhere present, comprising all and filling all. Christ Jesus, God, and Lord, with your gifts and your mercy protect those of us who set our hope in you, who know well all the cunning and threats by which our adversary contrives against us everywhere. O Lord, help your servants by your sacred care.

3. COMMENTARY

Acts of John 106–7 in Pand. 114

Antiochus' subject in this chapter is keeping the commands of God and religious leaders. Through biblical stories, scriptural prooftexts, and patristic aphorisms, he sets out the

consequences of obedience and disobedience. Positively, the person who loves God and neighbour is far from sin, possibly quoting Polycarp (*Ep. Phil.* 3:3).⁴⁵ Negatively, those who despise God's commandments may expect chastisement. This statement begins the quotation of the *Acts of John*, which thereafter consists of a series of negative and positive exhortations to holy living. The passage includes a distinctive multiplication of divine titles of the good God, Jesus Christ, who is grieved by human disobedience but rejoices with those who live uprightly.

The above text largely reproduces the first half of *AJ* 107.⁴⁶ The most common differences are in pronouns (e.g. ὑμῶν instead of ἡμῶν); here perhaps Antiochus is adapting the words to himself and his audience.⁴⁷ The most interesting difference, however, comes in the first two lines, which resemble the end of *AJ* 106. The *Acts* read: οἶδεν καὶ κόλασιν παρακουόντων ὑμῶν τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἐντολῶν ('he also knows chastisement when you disobey his holy commands'). The *Pandect* reads: ἐπεὶ ἐὰν καταφρονοῦμεν, οἶδεν κολάζειν παρακουόντων ἡμῶν τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἐντολῶν ('if we despise [him/them], he knows to chastise [us] when we disobey his holy commands'). The addition of the conditional clause notwithstanding, the difference in language is subtle (κόλασιν and κολάζειν are near homophones); the difference in meaning, however, is not. Antiochus would invert the object of chastisement from Christ to disobedient Christians.⁴⁸ By this short sentence, Antiochus shows knowledge of *AJ* 106, the chapter which begins the *Metastasis*, or the abridgement of the *Acts of John* narrating only the apostle's final deeds and death. Whether Antiochus encountered *AJ* 106–8 in the longer *Acts* or in an abridgement is considered below.

Acts of John 108 in *Pand.* 26

Pand. 26 concerns *acedia*, an emotion (or 'a fearful demon', *Pand.* 26) which generated much discussion in monastic circles.⁴⁹ As in several other chapters (see *Pand.* 19, 25, 27, 77, 84, and 85), Antiochus here offers a model prayer as a remedy for the afflicted monk. Among his prayers, this one exhibits perhaps the greatest diversity of sources. He quotes the Psalms (142:7, 3, 4, 7, 8),⁵⁰ Baruch (3:1),⁵¹ Paul (1 Cor. 10:13, Heb. 1:3,⁵² cf. 2 Thess. 3:2), as well as the *Acts of John* in closing.⁵³

The introduction to his quotation of the *Acts* begins by addressing Jesus as the 'radiance' (ἀπαύγασμα) and 'exact representation' (χαρακτήρ) of his blessed Father—an allusion to Hebrews 1:3. Antiochus commonly addresses Jesus by name in prayer (twice in *Pand.* 26,

⁴⁵ Neither Popovski, *Die Pandekten*, p. 13, nor Americano, 'Π Πανδέκτης τῆς Ἀγίας Γραφῆς', pp. 112–14, nor Myllykoski, 'Antiochus of Palestine', p. 64 catalogue this reference. It is, however, discussed by Cotterill, 'The Epistle of Polycarp', pp. 264–6. See also Bardy, 'Antiochus', col. 701.

⁴⁶ The final clause (καὶ καλῶς ἐγκρατευομένων καὶ σοφρονοῦντων ἡμῶν) is not found in the *Acts of John*. It resembles two lines found in *AJ* 107 but not Antiochus. (*Metastasis* [δ and B]: ἀμεριμνεῖτο καλῶς ὑμῶν ἐγκρατευομένων. ἡδέσθω κοινονοῦντων ὑμῶν τοῖς παθήμασιν αὐτοῦ. γελᾶτω, μειδιάτω σοφρονοῦντων ὑμῶν. Junod and Kaestli's 'primitive text' of the *Acts* reads ἀμεριμνεῖτο ἐγκρατῶς ὑμῶν βιοῦντων. ἡδέσθω κοινονοῦντων ὑμῶν. γελᾶτω [μειδιάτω] σοφρονοῦντων ὑμῶν.) There are another two differences in words (the presence of καθ' ἡμῶν and ἡμῶν) and one difference in word order (ἡμῶν αὐτὸν instead of αὐτὸν ἡμῶν; a reading found in some manuscripts of the *Pandect*).

⁴⁷ Of course, some manuscripts of the *Acts of John* read ἡμᾶς, ἡμῖν, etc. as predictable variants.

⁴⁸ Though οἶδεν καὶ κόλασιν may also translate as 'he knows to chastise', the original context makes clear my reading. In the *Acts*, Jesus 'knows the insult that comes from you; he also knows the dishonour; he also knows the betrayal, he also knows the chastisement' (οἶδεν γὰρ καὶ ὕβριν τὴν ἐξ ὑμῶν, οἶδεν καὶ ἀτιμίαν, οἶδεν καὶ ἐπιβουλήν, οἶδεν καὶ κόλασιν).

⁴⁹ Especially Evagrius, see G. Bunge, *Acedia: la doctrine spirituelle d'Évagre le Pontique sur l'Acédie* (Spiritualité orientale 52; Bégrolles-en-Mauges: Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1991); F. Joest, 'The Significance of "Acedia" and "Apatheia" in Evagrius Ponticus: Part 1', *The American Benedictine Review* 55 (2004), pp. 121–50; F. Joest, 'The Significance of "Acedia" and "Apatheia" in Evagrius Ponticus: Part 2', *The American Benedictine Review* 55 (2004), pp. 273–307.

⁵⁰ I employ LXX numbering for the Psalms throughout this article.

⁵¹ With the important catchword ἀκηδία. Baruch is an important source in Antiochus' *Prayer of Confession* (PG 89.1849–

56).
⁵² Antiochus believed Paul authored Hebrews (e.g. *Pand.* 81).

⁵³ See also Wis. 11:26 for the title 'Master who loves souls' (δέσποτα φιλόψυχε).

twice in *Pand.* 77, four times in *Pand.* 84, and once in *Pand.* 85),⁵⁴ which is also a striking feature of the *Acts of John*.⁵⁵ These words differ from the more esoteric, 'Jesus, you who crafted this crown by your own weaving; you who fixed all of these blossoms into your abiding blossom', which begins the prayer in extant versions of the *Acts*. The difference between the *Pandect's* 'your divine words' (τοὺς θεῖους σου λόγους) and the extant *AJ* 108's 'these your words' (τοὺς λόγους τούτους) may well reflect the many scriptural citations Antiochus offers in his chapters for the monks' instruction. As in *AJ* 106–7, this prayer features a distinctive multiplication of divine titles, appealing to Jesus as the upholder of the cosmos, who saves, protects, and heals his servants. As the prayer against *acedia* continues, the wording converges; differences are largely confined to Antiochus' likely appropriation of the words for himself and his readers (περίσκεπε πάντα becomes περίσκεπε ἡμᾶς; βοήθησον... τοῖς σοῖς δούλοις becomes βοήθησον ἡμῖν).⁵⁶ No longer is the prayer a fictional John's parting request for others, but one which Antiochus prays with his fellow monks. This transformation of the *Acts of John* is seemingly without parallel in the text's reception.⁵⁷ Certainly, *AJ* 106–15 served as liturgical hagiography, while material from the *Acts* (*AJ* 38–44, 46–7) inspired an encomium to the apostle.⁵⁸ Yet Antiochus' use of *AJ* 108 goes beyond these examples of public exhortation to the realm of private devotion. The monk preserves most of the words but transforms their meaning; he maintains the genre of prayer but changes its context.

4. CONTEXT

There are two main contexts which illuminate the texts under consideration: their place in the *Pandect* and their wider setting. To determine these, it is necessary to think more about their origin as well as their incorporation into the *Pandect*. The working hypothesis of this article has been that Antiochus excerpts from the *Acts of John* or the *Metastasis* directly. Yet, given the complex transmission history of the *Acts of John*, it is not entirely certain that Antiochus knew the texts either as the *Acts of John* or even as part of the *Metastasis*. There are other ways of configuring the literary relationship between Antiochus and the apparent extracts, and these deserve consideration.⁵⁹

The first, and least likely, is that these are in fact not extracts at all; Antiochus is the true author. His words would later be incorporated into the *Acts of John*. This makes very poor

⁵⁴ Explicit references only. Antiochus' prayers are thoroughly Trinitarian, see especially *Pand.* 19. Therefore, it is challenging to disambiguate 'God' (θεός), 'Master' (δεσπότης), and 'Lord' (κύριος).

⁵⁵ All prayers in the extant text of the *Acts of John* have Christ as their addressee—not that other divine Persons are clearly distinguished in the prayers of *Acts of John*. Jesus is not invoked in contrast to the Father, nor do all prayers explicitly mention 'Jesus' or 'Christ'. Petitioners sometimes address 'God' and 'Jesus' interchangeably too. (For a convenient presentation of the addressees of prayer in certain manuscripts of the *Acts*, see J. A. Snyder, *Language and Identity in Ancient Narratives: The Relationship between Speech Patterns and Social Context in the Acts of the Apostles, Acts of John, and Acts of Philip* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014], pp. 258–61.) The closest text comes to any sort of differentiation in *AJ* 109: 'We glorify your name, the one spoken by your Father; we glorify your name, spoken through the Son' (δοξάζομεν σου τὸ λεχθέν ὑπὸ σοῦ πατρὸς ὄνομα. δοξάζομεν σου τὸ λεχθέν διὰ σοῦ υἱοῦ ὄνομα). Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 2, pp. 425, 581–9; however, consider *AJ* 109 to be an interpolation. Antiochus, on the other hand, prays to both Jesus and God the Father. In *Pand.* 27, the entirety is clearly offered to 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' who is called 'the true God' (cf. John 17:3), an expression Antiochus would have interpreted in the light of centuries of Trinitarian debate. In *Pand.* 77, he moves between addressing God and Christ within the same prayer. He asks Jesus to aid him in his battle with temptation and later asks his 'Master' to call him again to faithfulness 'through [his] only-begotten Son our Saviour', a clear reference to the Father.

⁵⁶ Though see note 47 above. The remaining differences are as follows: the critical text of the *Acts of John* reads τὰ πάντα περιέχων (with K, cf. CF), θεῖ Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ κύριε, σὺ μόνος κύριε (with D), and omits the final τῆ ἀρχαί.

⁵⁷ Priscillianist use of the hymn in *AJ* 94–6 excepted. An n-gram search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (<<https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>>) yields no similar adaptations of the material in *AJ* 106–15.

⁵⁸ A homily misattributed to John Chrysostom. For the text, see Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, vol. 1, pp. 412–19.

⁵⁹ That Antiochus used two independent sources, one which supplied *AJ* 106 and another which provided *AJ* 107–8, generates too great a coincidence to be given further consideration. His citation of other writings, both canonical and extra-canonical, shows him usually returning to sources more than once and resuming with material proximate to what he has already used. That he would quote *AJ* 108 in *Pand.* 26 and return to *AJ* 106–7 in *Pand.* 114 fits this pattern.

sense of the supposed fragments' highly distinctive vocabulary as well as Antiochus' compositional habits, which favour the prodigious use of sources. And while Antiochus shows himself at his most creative in composing prayers (like the one in *Pand.* 26 of which *AJ* 108 would form part), this is not what *AJ* 106–7 is. Rather it is exhortation, both in the context of the *Metastasis/Acts of John* and in Antiochus. To be sure, Antiochus readily offers his own exhortation in response to his sources. (Sometimes he even adapts his sources to this end.) Yet, his words are directed corporately ('let us...') or sometimes individually ('let [the monk]'). Nowhere else does he give exhortation with respect to Christ's response to Christian behaviour (e.g. 'let him be delighted...'). This is a tell-tale sign of a source.

The second option is that Antiochus and the extracts trace their origin to a shared source, one which would presumably post-date the original composition of the *Acts of John*.⁶⁰ Manuscript evidence of such a source is lacking, though this is not fatal to the argument. There nonetheless ought to be a preference for positing fewer sources rather than more.

A third possibility is that Antiochus obtains the fragments from a book of extracts or a prayer book. The existence of an intermediary source collection (one Antiochus found in the monastery's library, say) cannot be asserted with confidence.⁶¹ There is no obvious seam in the text, as in *Pand.* 17. In this sermon, Antiochus quotes a catena of verses from Proverbs and Sirach, stating afterwards that 'Solomon uttered these words' (ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Σολομών). This concluding statement more readily hints at an intermediary collection of extracts than is the case for the passages from the *Acts of John*. A book of prayers is not wholly without merit. It could explain the unparalleled prayer in *Pand.* 85, which shares the distinctive ὁ μόνος formulation of the *Acts of John*:

Lord, the only good and benevolent one, the only kind and gentle one, the only true and just one, our God who alone is compassionate, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, rose on the third day, and entered into his glory and yours...⁶²

These words could come from a book of prayers or from Antiochus' own pen, inspired by *AJ* 108 and the stock language of prayer.⁶³ The narrative elements of the prayer ('crucified', 'rose', 'ascended') are most familiar from credal statements which post-date the initial composition of the *Acts*. The expression 'Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate' is earlier, appearing as an exorcism formula in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* 30.⁶⁴ Moreover, Pilate's name features in the early prayer of *Acts* 4:24–30. The biggest problem with positing a book of prayers remains the hortatory material in *AJ* 106–7, which is of a different genre.

Most likely then is Antiochus' access to a copy of the *Metastasis*, or something very similar, in connection with liturgical use. Given the centrality of Mar Saba in the development

⁶⁰ For scholars who situate the prayer in *AJ* 108 in an existing second-century Christian milieu, such a source could theoretically precede the *Acts of John* written at a similar time. For the debate on origins of the prayer, see B. Paschke, 'La prière liturgique à Jésus-Christ au chapitre 108 des Actes apocryphes de Jean reflète-t-elle la prière chrétienne du IIe siècle? L'hypothèse de Gustave Bardy revisitée'. *Mélanges de science religieuse* 74.4 (2017), pp. 5–16.

⁶¹ Such a collection ought to be distinguished from Antiochus' own notes which may have grouped the *Pandect's* many excerpts by text or theme in the preliminary stages of the work's composition.

⁶² κύριε, ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλόανθρωπος, ὁ μόνος χρηστὸς καὶ ἐπιεικὴς, ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς καὶ δίκαιος, ὁ μόνος οἰκτιρῶν θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰσοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντος, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντος, καὶ εἰσελθόντος εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν σὴν. (Here, I reproduce the text in Migne.)

⁶³ Could this otherwise be an unknown fragment of the *Acts*? It would represent a significant departure from the prayers in the known text, which are addressed to Jesus (see note 55 above), and the *Acts'* Christology in general, which collapses distinctions between Jesus and God the Father. This holds true except in portions of *Acts* judged to be 'secondary additions' (*AJ* 94–102, 109), in which both Father and Son are mentioned (see R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans], 2008, p. 143).

⁶⁴ See also Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 76, 85; 2 *Apology* 6.

of Byzantine liturgy,⁶⁵ if any monastery retained a copy of the text for public reading, then surely it would be this one. Its popularity as a text circulating in Greek and ancient versional languages makes it the likeliest form in which a reader would have encountered these passages. Knowledge of the *Metastasis* squares with Antiochus' evident interest in other extra-canonical narratives about the apostles, especially those which concern their deaths. In *Pand.* 72, he incorporates material from the *Martyrdom of James the Just* into his sermon.⁶⁶ In *Pand.* 116, he recalls the death of another James, the son of Zebedee.⁶⁷ And finally, as mentioned above, Antiochus uses the story of *John and the Robber* in *Pand.* 122 to illustrate the care for souls that a bishop ought to maintain. While liturgy could well explain the ongoing use of these accounts, the presence of such texts at Mar Saba in the first place, and perhaps also in the *Pandect*, reflects historical as well as moral interest. The lives and deaths of these saints, which Antiochus sets alongside the canonical deaths of Jesus and Stephen the first martyr (*Pand.* 72), serve not only as moral exemplars but also reassert Jerusalem as a Christian city at a time when this identity was threatened for the first time in centuries.⁶⁸

5. THE PROLOGUE: ANTIOCHUS' REFLECTION ON HIS SOURCES

In the Prologue to the *Pandect*, Antiochus explains his use of sources by way of an allegorical interpretation of Song of Songs 6:8: 'There are sixty queens, eighty concubines and young women without number'.⁶⁹ He interprets the first as the 'authoritative' (ἐγκρίτους) sixty 'canonical' (ἐνδιαθέτους) books of the Old and New Testaments; the second are books which are 'not accepted' (μὴ ἐγκρινομένας), called 'apocryphal' (ἀποκρύφους); and the third are the innumerable writings of the Church's teachers. From the 'loom' of these 60 queens, Antiochus wishes to 'unpick a few threads and make a garment to keep warm those who obtain it by faith'. Scripture, then, is the principal material that Antiochus weaves through his topical addresses. Apocryphal works, like the concubines, are of secondary status. And, despite Antiochus further defining them as 'unmentionable' (ἀπαρρησίαστος) and 'inauthentic' (νόθος),⁷⁰ he has 'no hesitation' using them as sources.⁷¹

⁶⁵ D. Galadza, 'Liturgy at the Great Lavra of St. Sabas from its Beginnings to the First Crusade: A Preliminary Survey', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 85 (2019), pp. 113–38. See also D. Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018). Antiochus attests to the influence of his monastery in the *Letter to Eustathius*. Justin, a former Sabaites who is appointed hegumen of St Anastasius' monastery, retains 'the rule of the Laura unaltered, as well as the rest of the observances'. Antiochus boasts that 'in all the land the offspring of our holy father Sabas shine as bright lights'.

⁶⁶ Antiochus likely knows the account from Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.4–18), who names Hegesippus as his source. It did circulate separately, as in the 'Jerusalem dossier', Sinai gr. 493. This eighth- or ninth-century collection brings together various works on Constantine, the relics of the crucifixion, and the martyrdoms of Stephen and James the Just (called 'the first of the bishops' in the title, which is suggestive of the dossier's Jerusalem origins), no doubt to bolster the properly Christian identity of the Holy Land then under Islamic rule.

⁶⁷ Antiochus' account goes beyond the brief details given in Acts 12:1–2. It perhaps comes from Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 2.9.3), who states that he is quoting from book seven of Clement of Alexandria's lost *Outlines*. The wording is different in Antiochus and Eusebius, however. This could point to another source or Antiochus' own storytelling.

⁶⁸ On the role of Stephen's cult in shaping a Christian Jerusalem, see H. Méndez, *The Cult of Stephen in Jerusalem: Inventing a Patron Martyr* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022).

⁶⁹ For more on the Prologue, see Americano, 'Il Πανδέκτης τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς', pp. 50–81.

⁷⁰ While νόθος is a familiar term in early Christian canon debates—see, for instance, Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 3.25.1–7, 3.31.6)—ἀπαρρησίαστος is not. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 177, offers one much later parallel from Arethas of Caesarea's *Commentary on Revelation* 13, for which he offers the glosses 'not to be divulged, secret'. Antiochus' use of the term may connect to the Church of Jerusalem and its scriptural canon several centuries before. In *Catechetical Lectures* 4.33–37, Cyril, the fourth-century bishop, addresses the canon and admonishes catechumens to only read the books of the Old and New Testaments, which alone are read openly in church (ταύτας μόνας μελέτα σπουδαίως ἄς καὶ ἐκκλησία μετὰ παρρησίας ἀναγινώσκομεν). If Antiochus understands ἀπαρρησίαστος in this connection, it could be glossed as 'not to be [read] publicly'. Such an understanding need not preclude the idea that a more mature Christian could read extra-canonical texts, including apocryphal ones, privately.

⁷¹ T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons, Volume II.1: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1890), p. 293.

Antiochus does not spell out his scriptural canon. A roughly contemporaneous canon list, called the *List of Sixty Books*, offers a 34-book Old Testament and a 26-book New Testament, notably excluding Revelation.⁷² A biblical canon of 60 books was widespread in the Greek-speaking Church in later centuries.⁷³ As Zahn observes, the fact that ‘sixty books’ passes without enumeration in Antiochus’ allegory shows that it had become well-known.⁷⁴ The *List* moreover places Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, Esther, Judith, Tobit, and 1–4 Maccabees ‘outside the Sixty’ and then notes 25 ‘apocryphal writings’ (ἀπόκρυφα).⁷⁵ Antiochus shows familiarity with almost all the Twenty-Six (the short letters of Philemon and 2–3 John excepted⁷⁶). His Old Testament canon, however, is less clear. He shows familiarity with most of the Thirty-Four but also routinely uses texts outside the Sixty. Tobit is quoted several times and Sirach liberally. Material from Sirach and Wisdom is cited as ‘Scripture’ (γραφή) in *Pand.* 6, 8, 25, 44, 51, 79, 85, 103 and 111 (cf. also 17, 37, 69), and *Pand.* 81 and 109, respectively. What this means for his 60-book canon is uncertain.⁷⁷

Among the *List’s* 25 apocryphal works is the ‘Travels and Teachings of the Apostles’ (περίοδοι καὶ διδασκαί τῶν ἀποστόλων). At the Second Council of Nicaea in 787, three sections of the *Acts of John* (27–8, 93–5, 97–8) are discussed and condemned under the similar title, the ‘Pseudepigraphal Travels of the Holy Apostles’ (ψευδεπιγράφων περιόδων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων).⁷⁸ This suggests that the *Acts of John* was but one of the apocryphal Acts in the codex used by the Council and that the full text may not have been reproduced.⁷⁹ The ongoing awareness of apocryphal Acts betrayed by these documents raises the possibility that Antiochus could have known the *Acts of John* more substantially and under the category of apocrypha.

The *List* also records among the apocrypha the ‘Teaching of Ignatius’ (Ἰγνατίου διδασκαλία) and the ‘Teaching of Polycarp’ (Πολυκάρπου διδασκαλία), most likely the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp. If this is so, then Antiochus likely operates with a different definition of apocrypha to the *List*. For the *List*, apocryphal works are those which lie outside the biblical canon, for whatever reason. For Antiochus, apocryphal writings are not only extra-canonical but also inauthentic. Yet, in *Pand.* 124—one of his rare attributions of extra-biblical material—Antiochus credits to ‘Theophorus Ignatius’ several excerpts from the Ignatian corpus in the middle recension (*Poly.* 6:1; *Phil.* 7:2; *Trall.* 2:2; *Smyrn.* 8:2a, 8:2b–9:1; *Trall.* 2:2–3:1).⁸⁰ Antiochus thus recognizes the letters as authentic works whose author is the early bishop of Antioch. He likely, then, locates Ignatius’ and Polycarp’s writings in his third category, the innumerable teachings of the Church.

⁷² H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), pp. 209–10, notes the *List’s* appearance in three manuscripts: Oxford, Bodleian MS Barocci 206, fol. 115v, London, British Library Add. MS 17469, fol. 1v, and Paris, BnF Coislin 210, fols. 216v–217r. The second counts Ruth and Judges separately for a total of 61 books (see Swete, *An Introduction*, p. 210 note 1).

⁷³ W. Schneemelcher, ‘General Introduction’, in Schneemelcher and Wilson (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 1, p. 42.

⁷⁴ Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 293.

⁷⁵ For the complete list, see Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, pp. 290–2; for a partial list in English, see also Schneemelcher, ‘General Introduction’, vol. 1, pp. 42–3.

⁷⁶ Antiochus does not quote Revelation either.

⁷⁷ It is highly unlikely that 60 is a round number. Antiochus gives no definite number to either apocryphal or patristic works.

⁷⁸ For the conciliar Acts, see E. Lamberz, *Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum. Concilii Actiones I–III, IV–V, VI–VII* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2008–16); English translation by R. Price, *The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787)* (Translated Texts for Historians 68, vols. 1 and 2; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2018). The later *Stichometry of Nicephorus* (c. 9th century) lists the ‘Travels’ (περίοδοι) of Peter, John, and Thomas (separately), 1 and 2 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Shepherd of Hermas as New Testament Apocrypha.

⁷⁹ Price, *The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea*, p. 397.

⁸⁰ See Americano, ‘Ignazio d’Antiochia. Testo critico e commento’, pp. 546–7. I disagree with Americano’s identification of his third citation, which he claims is *Smyrn.* 8:1. In fact, it is a continuation of *Phil.* 7:2. Moreover, what Americano cites as *Phil.* 7:1 is *Phil.* 7:2, at least in the edition by M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (3rd edn.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

6. CONCLUSION

The *Acts of John* holds an important place among Antiochus' sources in the *Pandect*, a work which may be summarized as 'prayerful paraenesis'. The monk's purpose in engaging the *Acts* is no different. Unique among the apocryphal sources, *AJ* 108 features in one of Antiochus' prayers, where its distinctive address to Jesus 'the Only...' precedes petitions for help and protection. The audience is no longer fabled followers of the apostle but acediac monks who are to pray these words themselves. *AJ* 106–7 serves to exhort the monks to upright living, reminding them that God joys at their obedience and grieves at their disobedience of his commands.

In quoting *AJ* 106–7 and 108, Antiochus shows knowledge of the final section of what we know as the *Acts of John*. These chapters circulated separately, and much more widely, as the *Metastasis* or the farewell narrative of the apostle John. A thoroughgoing examination of the *Pandect* fails to reveal Antiochus' knowledge of earlier parts of the *Acts*, whether in lengthy excerpts and short quotations, or in echoes and allusions.⁸¹ Therefore, it is not certain whether Antiochus would have recognized what he quoted as the 'Acts of John' or as some separate hagiographical account, perhaps read on the apostle's feast day. However, the odds that he knows the text as hagiography are increased by his interest in other accounts of the apostles' lives and deaths in the *Pandect*. Be that as it may, within a century of Antiochus, the *List of Sixty Books* and the Second Council of Nicaea maintain a witness to the past and present circulation of the wider περίοδοι of the apostles, including John. The former describes the *Travels* as 'apocrypha' and the latter as 'pseudepigrapha'. The conciliar definition coheres with Antiochus' apparently narrower understanding of apocrypha as 'spurious' and 'inauthentic'. Given this continued circulation, it is possible that Antiochus knew the text as the *Acts of John* either at length or in abridged form. At minimum, the *Pandect* is evidence of a further stage of the text's appropriation in the Christian mainstream.⁸² Beyond the transformation of the *Acts* into acceptable hagiography, Antiochus uses its words to pray and to exhort others; this is a century before the fateful censure of the *Acts* at the Council.

To account for Antiochus' silence on his source, we need only consider his clear *modus scribendi*: biblical sources are almost always cited, while extra-biblical sources almost never are. Beyond Antiochus' broad custom, however, there are two further explanations for his silent quotation.

First, Antiochus quotes *AJ* 108 in his prayer against *acedia*, and citing sources in prayers is not common.⁸³ Scripture, especially the Psalms, forms the Christian language of prayer from the earliest period.⁸⁴ As such, Christians' complaints, petitions, and praises draw on this well-spring of pre-existing material; using prayer texts from the *Acts of John* is an extension of this trend. Otherwise, citation is used on occasion to lend authority to an appeal, grounding it in

⁸¹ An n-gram search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* identifies no further significant textual parallels between the *Pandect* and the *Acts of John*. The closest is the words of a prayer in *AJ* 22: νῦν καιρὸς κάμνουσιν ἡμῖν τῆς ἐκ σοῦ βοήθειας ἰατρῆ δορεῶν ἰομένω. John again appeals to Christ as a 'physician who heals freely' and dispenses '[his] aid', as in *AJ* 108. The presence of this echo must be treated with caution, however. Schäferdiek, 'Acts of John: Introduction', 153–4, for one, cautions against the singular phrase 'the physician who heals freely' in Ps.-Macarius' *Homilies* (I 12.2.4/II 20.6) as evidence of that author's 'direct knowledge' of the *Acts of John*. (In citations of the Macarian corpus, I follow M. Plested, *The Macarian Legacy: The Place of Macarius-Symeon in the Eastern Christian Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 9 note 3, 10 note 4.) The expression lends itself to becoming a trope in Christian sermons and prayers.

⁸² In *Pand.* 130, Antiochus anchors himself firmly in neo-Chalcedonian orthodoxy. He expounds his Christology using dogmatic material from Cyril of Alexandria and repudiates a long list of heretics and heresies. Though the list is mostly borrowed from Epiphanius (*Panarion* Proem I.3.1–4.8), Antiochus adds 19 more recent names, including Dioscorus, Severus, and Jacob the Syrian.

⁸³ Only occasionally does Antiochus mention his source in his prayers. For instance, the prayer in *Pand.* 26 begins with a call to 'closely attend to David's words', after which Psalm 142 is cited.

⁸⁴ H. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), p. 20.

some spiritual principle or truth.⁸⁵ Therefore, it is unsurprising that *AJ* 108's distinctive, yet generic, enumeration of divine titles, as well as its subsequent petitions, are not given attribution.

Second, and more significantly, Antiochus is familiar with apocrypha as a category, and perhaps recognizes this text explicitly as such. In *Pand.* 122, his attribution of another extra-canonical story about the apostle, *John and the Robber*, to Irenaeus affords a chain of custody which perhaps the *Acts of John/Metastasis* lacked. John remains a named speaking character in Antiochus' recollection of that story. By contrast, in both unattributed extracts of *Acts of John*, the apostle is the 'silent speaker' or, rather, Antiochus assumes his voice. In this case, the claim to the apostle John's *ipsissima verba* would seem unwarranted from Scripture or the apostle's disciples (or theirs in turn). Instead, these words—like those of Evagrius, Diadochus and many others—passed into the *phronema*, or collective wisdom, of those who, like Antiochus, read, memorized, prayed, or summarized them.

⁸⁵ See his *Prayer of Confession*, in which he grounds his appeal on Matthew 7:7.