Lion and Lamb Apologetics

Truth in the Details:

The *Report of Pilate to Tiberius* as an Authentic Forgery

ANNE-CATHERINE BAUDOIN[1]
École normale supérieure (Paris)

Pontius Pilate, the fifth Roman prefect of Judea, holding the office between 26 and 36 A.D., is mostly known for the part he played in the sentencing to death of Jesus of Nazareth. His being part of the Roman administrative and military power, together with his non-Jewish origin and the mention of his governorship under Tiberius in the Gospel of Luke (3.1), may explain the presence of his name in Christian confessions of faith up to our days: Jesus Christ is said to have "suffered under Pontius Pilate." The preposition used here—in English (*under*) as well as in Greek (ἐπί) and in Latin (*sub*)—seems to serve as an indication of time: the name is used to link the event that took place in Jerusalem to a wider world and period—the Roman Empire. As such, Pilate's name works as a guarantee of authenticity. This use first appears in the canonical Gospels and in one of Paulinian letters (1 Tim. 6.13); it is taken over by second-century writ- ers, such as Ignatius of Antioch (*Trall.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 1.2; *Magn.* 11.1), Irenaeus of Lyon (e.g., *Adv. Haer.* 3.4.2; 4.23.2; *Dem.* 74; 77), and Justin of Neapolis and Tertullian, on whom I would now like to focus. Indeed, both Justin and his keen reader, Tertullian, allude to a document put out under Pilate's authorship: Justin mentions "acts recorded under Pontius Pilate" (1st *Apol.* ch. 35; cf. ch. 48) that his readers may consult, and Tertullian claims that Pilate announced to Tiberius the events happening in Judea (*Apol.* ch. 21 par. 24; cf. ch. 5 par. 2). Those testimonies echo two canonical characteristics of Pilate: he is a citizen of Rome and he is a governor (ἡγεμών, cf. e.g., Matt. 27.2); he is thus the most suitable person to represent a link between Judea and Rome. In the Gospel of John (19.19–22), he is said to have written the tablet placed over the cross (*titulus*), which makes him one of the few characters in the Gospels who engaged in the process of writing. Moreover, among the Jewish testimonies about Pilate are mentioned a letter sent by

[1] Anne-Catherine Baudoin. "Truth in the Details: The Report of Pilate to Tiberius as an Authentic Forgery." *Splendide Mendax. Rethinking Fakes and Forgeries in Classical, Late Antique, and Early Christian Literature*. Edmund P. Cueva and Javier Martínez (2016). Groningen: Barkhuis, 219-238, halshs-01526047.

four princes of Judea to Tiberius after Pilate had refused to put down the golden shields hanged in Herod's palace (Philo, *Leg.* 303) as well as Tiberius's answer addressed to Pilate (*Leg.* 304–305). The correspondence of the governor Pliny with the emperor Trajan as an example of communication between the representatives of the Roman power also frames the plausibility of a written exchange between Pilate and the emperor.

Late antique literature in the languages of the Mediterranean basin has transmitted or alluded to numerous writings attributed to Pilate. In my thesis (ch. 18),[2] I offer a survey of those "Pilatus-Schriften,"[3] which are classified as follows: allusions to a written document sent by Pilate to the emperor, texts of such documents, and allusions to or texts about an exchange between Pilate and King Herod. The texts assigned to Pilate match most of the six distinctive categories of forgeries proposed by Antonio Guzmán Guerra in the opening of *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature* (26–29). This corpus of Pilate correspondence may indeed be considered a forgery (*falso*), since it was apparently produced in an attempt to deceive the reader. The frame of the documents—e.g., the *inscrip- tio*, the addressee, the reference to Pilate's administrative situation—allows us to view them as plagiarism (*plagio*) since they pretend to imitate the style of a Roman governor. In so far as they associate the documents with the authority of a famous person, they may be impostures (*impostura*). The corpus could also be called "spurious" (*espurio*) if some parts were introduced in a period posterior to the original versions. However, it is unlikely that those texts would be considered pseudepigraphical (*pseudepígrafo*) in the same sense as Pseudo-Longinus' *On the Sublime*—wrongly attributed to an author—since the texts themselves claim their authorship; however, taken in its common meaning—attributed to an authoritative figure of the past—the word pseudepigraphical may describe precisely the situation of those writings. On the other hand, the category of "fiction" (*ficción*) is the one that the antique writer, or forger, intends to dismiss.

Referring to these categories will allow me to offer a fresh look at one of the texts placed under the authorship of Pilate and addressed to the emperor in Rome: the *Anaphora Pilati*, or "The Report of Pilate." I shall first briefly introduce this text and then focus on the paragraph that opens it in some manuscripts, prior to the first person narration. In a second part of the paper, I shall bring to light some pieces of information transmitted by the *Anaphora* that can help determine the milieu in which it originated.

---

[2] Baudoin 2012.

[3] The creation of a German word reflects the influence of Michl, "Pilatus." *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (1957–1965, vol. 8, col. 505), who speaks of "Pilatus-Schrifttum." However I choose to use a plural form to emphasize the material multiplicity: many textual witnesses are covered by the general concept of "Pilatus-Schrifttum."

Transmission, edition and the title of the Anaphora Pilati

The *Anaphora Pilati* presents Pilate's retelling of the events that just had happened under his governorship in Judea: the first part is devoted to a survey of some miracles performed by Jesus and the second to the unusual phenomena accompanying his death and his resurrection, the turning point being the very brief depiction of the trial before Pilate. There is no recent edition[4] of the *Anaphora Pilati*—to keep the title used by Geerard in his *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti* (sec. 65–66)—but it has been made available in print since the 18th century.

The first edition is likely to be that of Fabricius, published in 1703 and using two manuscripts (Paris, BnF, *gr.* 770 and *Codex Regis Galliae* 2431[5]). The second was produced by Birch, who in 1804 published two recensions of the text, one from a Vienna manuscript (ÖNB, *theol. gr.* 247) and another from the Paris copy (BnF, *gr.* 770) already used by Fabricius. Hence, he is the first scholar to bring to light the existence of two textual traditions, a point that will be discussed later. In 1832, Thilo offered an edition with a critical apparatus, based on four Paris manuscripts (BnF, *gr.* 770, *gr.* 929, *gr.* 1019, *gr.* 1331) as well as on Birch's edition of the Vienna manuscript. In 1837, back from a tour around Europe, Fleck published what he considered a "new recension" (143) of the *Anaphora* from a manuscript of Torino (BNU, c.II.5) that offered a different narrative order from those previously edited. Finally, in 1853, Tischendorf distinguished two recensions that he poetically names "A" (Geerard sec. 66) and "B" (Geerard sec. 65); he also numbered the paragraphs, emphasizing that one of the major discrepancies between both texts is the order of events in the second part of the narrative. For each of the recensions, he used five manuscripts, either reading them directly or relying on Birch, Thilo, and Fleck. To those editions one must add a short version of the *Anaphora* published by Abbott. Recension B of the *Anaphora* also exists in Slavonic, and recension A in Syriac, Arabic (both edited by Dunlop Gibson), Armenian and Slavonic. I shall focus here on the Greek text I edited in my master's dissertation (2007). The references will be given to Tischendorf's edition when possible; otherwise I shall quote the manuscripts themselves, which I identified, classified, and described in 2008.[6] To the distinction of two recensions I added the subdivision of each recension in two families (see *Appendix*).

Recension A of the *Anaphora* (Geerard sec. 66) is usually transmitted with the text known

---

[4] Gabriela Aragione (Univ. of Strasbourg) is currently preparing an edition of some Greek texts of the "Cycle of Pilate" for Brepols' *Corpus Christianorum Ser. Apocryphorum*, among which the *Anaphora Pilati*.

[5] = Paris, BnF, *gr.* 854? I have not been able to find this witness (cf. Baudoin 2008, 191 n. 33).

[6] Two additional manuscripts have recently been brought to my attention by Furrer 2010, 30; they are Athos, Lavra, *K.81*, 1368, and Athos, Vatopedi, *776*, 18th century.

as *Paradosis Pilati* (eleven out of seventeen manuscripts known to me[7]), whereas recension B (Geerard sec. 65) goes together with the *Rescriptum Tiberii* (eleven out of twenty). The *Paradosis* depicts the trial of Pilate before the emperor in Rome, his condemnation to death, and his decapitation as a blessed martyr. The text entitled *Rescriptum Tiberii* explains how the Jewish nation is punished by Roman soldiers and describes the violent death of the chiefs of the Jews, as well as that of Pilate. It may be argued that the distinction between the *Anaphora* and its two satellite texts is mostly a result of printed editions (Aragione 2009); indeed, manuscripts rarely distinguish the second text from the first one. Occasionally, however, they do (cf. ms. O; see *Appendix* and Baudoin 2008, 194–195), and I think it makes sense to read the *Anaphora* as a whole, without its satellites: among the manuscripts transmitting recension B of the *Anaphora*, five have it followed by the *Paradosis* and at least two intentionally omit it; for recension A, at least one of the manuscripts presents the *Anaphora* with the *Rescriptum* (ms. P; Baudoin 2008, 201–202).

In the manuscripts of the first family of rec. A the title reads Ἀναφορὰ Πιλάτου ἡγεμόνος περὶ τοῦ Δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πεμφθεῖσα Αὐγούστῳ Καίσαρι ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, "Report of Pilate the governor about our Lord Jesus Christ, sent to Augustus Caesar in Rome."[8] The title of the text in the manuscript tradition falls under the categories of both imposture and plagiarism, in so far as it purports to be a report sent to Caesar by a Roman governor. However, the designation of Jesus as "Our Lord Jesus Christ" points to a forgery. It is worth noting that the manuscripts of the second family have ἐπιστολή, "letter," instead of the more precise *ἀναφορά*, and that the word is more or less followed by the same elements, except for the mention of "our Lord Jesus Christ." Moreover, the emperor is designated as Augustus in most manuscripts, but as Tiberius in manuscripts A and FP, which is historically correct. Hence, it could be argued that the variations in the title as transmitted in the second family of rec. A are an attempt to render the forgery more credible.

In rec. B, most manuscripts of the first family begin with an introductory sentence referring to the text as Ἐπιστολὴ Ποντίου Πιλάτου πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Τιβέριον περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἧς ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ ἔχει οὕτως, "A Letter of Pontius Pilate to the King Tiberius concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, whose title is such" (rewritten in HLS), and then they give a variant of the title as found in rec. A and in the second family of rec. B. However, this second title is expanded in the first family with the mention of "Pontius" and specifies that he is governor "of Judea"; the mention of Jesus is omitted in

[7] To my description of the manuscripts (Baudoin 2008) that led to the sum of ten, I add a new information gathered from the reading of the manuscript of Munich, BSB, *gr.* 524: there the quite unusual form of the *Anaphora* is followed by a shorter version of the *Paradosis* (it does not include par. 10).

[8] Ms. B excepted—it begins with the prologue of the *Acta Pilati* (Tischendorf 1853, 413).

the first family and reappears at the end of the title in the second one. In all the manuscripts of rec. B that I read, the emperor is Tiberius. This comparison suggests that the core title of the text is Ἀναφορὰ Πιλάτου and that the scribes felt the need to gloss the rather uncommon and technical word *ἀναφορά* with the more usual designation ἐπιστολή.

The text is clearly attributed to Pontius Pilate, whether he is called with one or two names. His title is unanimously ἡγεμών, in agreement with the canonical gospels but at odds with historical reality, given that the proper title was ἔπαρχος (*praefectus*; Lémonon 1981, 23–33). The document is said to have been sent to the emperor. I shall leave aside the matter of the name of the emperor. Indeed, Luke mentions both Augustus (2:1, about the birth of Jesus) and Tiberius (3:1, about the beginning of John the Baptist's predication), and Augustus' name can easily be used as a generic title. The matter of Pilate's title is more interesting and, since it is taken up in the first lines of text, I shall now discuss it.

The introduction to the report (rec. A) as a link between **Acta Pilati** *and* **Anaphora**

In rec. A, a short introduction (omitted in OFP) provides a frame for the text; it does not appear in rec. B.[9] [8] It should be noted that none of the manuscripts of this second recension contains the *Acta Pilati*, whereas the manuscripts transmitting both *Acta Pilati* and *Anaphora*—rec. A—may belong to any of the three groups distinguished by the current editors of the *Acta* for the *Corpus Christianorum ser. Apocryphorum*—that is, family φ, family χ and the "inclassable" manuscripts (Furrer 2010, 12–15; 30). Hence, there is no link between the form of the *Acta* text and the presence of the *Anaphora*, but there is one between the form of the *Anaphora* and the presence of the *Acta*: it is *Anaphora* rec. A that occurs with the *Acta*. One could well assume that this introduction was intended as a link between the *Acta Pilati* and the *Anaphora*.

I copy here the translation made available to the Anglophone readership in 1870:

> In those days, our Lord Jesus Christ having been crucified under Pontius Pilate, procurator of Palestine and Phoenicia, these records were made in Jerusalem as to what was done by the Jews against the Lord. Pilate therefore, along with his private report, sent them to the Caesar in Rome, writing thus (Tischendorf 1853,

[9] It seems that the Arabic version also omits it (Dunlop Gibson 1896, 1).

413; trans. Walker 1886, 460[10]).

The first points of interest in this paragraph appear to be linked to questions of translation. One is a detail: the use of the word "procurator" should be replaced by "governor" (ἡγεμών, not ἐπίτροπος). But most of all, the phrase "these records […] as to what was done by the Jews against the Lord" requires a closer look. The Greek text is τὰ ὑπομνήματα τὰ κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου πραχθέντα[11] ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. The Spanish translation of Santos Otero, one of the few translations of rec. A available in modern languages, offers the same reading as the English one: "estas memorias que refieren lo que hicieron los judíos contra el Señor" (1975, 478), as well as the Italian one of Moraldi: "il racconto delle cose passate da Gesù ad opera degli Ebrei" (1994, 742) and the 19th century French translation by Migne: "le récit des traitements éprouvés par Jésus de la part des Juifs fut écrit à Jérusalem" (1885, 754–755). From a grammatical point of view this seems too far from the actual syntax of the sentence. I think πραχθέντα is to be understood as an epithetical adjective supported by the repetition of the article; the presence of complements such as κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου and ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων made the repetition of τὰ necessary: τὰ ὑπομνήματα τὰ […] πραχθέντα […], "the records done […]." That is how Fabricius understood the Greek manuscripts he edited and translated into Latin: "Acta haec composita sunt Hierosolymis, quae adversus Dominum egerent Judaei" (1743, 457).[12] So as a first step I propose to amend the translation in modern languages to "the records done […] by the Jews."

Of course, the phrase vividly echoes the *Acta Pilati* whose title in the manuscripts is a development around the simple form ὑπομνήματα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πραχθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου[13] ("Memoirs of our Lord Jesus Christ done under Pontius Pilate"). That is just a reminder that the modern title of *Acta Pilati* does not refer to a document written by Pilate; most manuscripts attribute the ὑπομνμήματα to Nicodemus, whether in the prologue only (family φ, GCZ, and EIJ; Furrer 2010, 25–27),

[10] Ehrman 2011, 494-499 decided to translate rec. B, considering it "the more coherent and interesting of the two, with fewer secondary accretions" (491). Gounelle (2013, 307) translates rec. B following Thilo's edition.

[11] τὰ - πραχθέντα: τὰ πραχθέντα κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ B.

[12] In Syriac, Dunlop Gibson also felt it necessary to amend the translation, but she pointed out that she was adding something: "Memoirs of [the things] that were done to our Lord Jesus the Christ by the hand of the Jews, by means of a writing of Pilate himself." The Armenian version seems to add an "and," cf. ms. Jerusalem, St. James, 1365 (14th century?): "There was this memoir in the city of Jerusalem and what was done on our Lord Je sus Christ by the Jews, that Pilate sent with his signature […]" (trans. Bernard Outtier, personal communication).

[13] Ms. Milano, Ambr., *C 92 sup.*, ms. F of the *Acta Pilati* (Furrer 2010, 20), ms. M of the *Anaphora*, cf. Appendix.

or in the head title itself as well as in the prologue (family χ and N; Furrer 2010, 21–22). One should then suppose that the figure of Nicodemus, designated as "head of the synagogue of the Jews" in some manuscripts (family χ), corresponds to "the Jews" in the *Anaphora*. The author would reuse the generic designation as ὑπομνήματα and assign it to the Jews, suggesting that the *records*, and not the deeds, were done by them (Furrer 2010, 20–23).

This phenomenon can be compared to the redaction of the "preface" that alludes to a certain Ananias as a translator of the records from Hebrew to Greek. This passage, transmitted in Greek by two manuscripts of φ (Tischendorf's C— A of the *Anaphora*—and Z) as well as by the indirect witnesses of the *Narratio Iosephi rescripta* (Furrer 2010, 15), mentions "the records done at that time about our Lord Jesus Christ, that the Jews composed under Pontius Pilate" (τὰ ὑπομνήματα τὰ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον πραχθέντα ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἃ κατέθεντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, Furrer 2010, 24). This formulation is closer to the introduction to the *Anaphora*.

However, to stick to the title itself, none of the manuscripts of the *Acta Pilati* suggests that the *records*, and not the deeds, were done against Christ (Furrer 2010, 20–23). That may be the reason why ms. C and D of *Anaphora* rec. A omit τὰ ὑπομνήματα, which makes the sentence more usual: "the deeds done by the Jews against the Lord." This omission or correction is interesting because it matches the codicological data about the content of the manuscripts: among the witnesses for this introduction, C and D are also the only manuscripts not transmitting the *Acta Pilati*. Two hypotheses can be made: either a scribe removed the mention of τὰ ὑπομνήματα that did not make sense any more after the *Anaphora* had been separated from the *Acta* in ms. C and D, or a scribe added it to the other group of rec. A because the whole formula strongly reminded him of the title of the previous text. I would consider the first hypothesis more likely. This hints at a rather complex process of transmission of the text, considering that, among the second family, the *Anaphora* in ms. O and P—at least, to my knowledge—omits this introduction but follows the *Acta Pilati*.

In other words, the "records" are considered to be inimical towards Christ and are, as such, opposed to Pilate's own letter: he sends them (αὐτά [αὐτοῦ A]), nevertheless, together with his own report (μετ'οἰκείας αὐτοῦ ἀναφορᾶς [δι᾽ἀναφορᾶς ἰδίας B]). So, if the introduction of the *Anaphora* links it with the *Acta*, did the author of this introduction consider the *Acta* to have been "made by the Jews against Christ"?

This phrase may resonate with the well-known allusions of Eusebius of Caesarea to "[those] having forged records of Pilate and our Saviour" in book 9 of the *Historia*

Ecclesiastica (ch. 5, par. 1: πλασάμενοι […] Πιλάτου καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα); those writings are said to be "full of all blasphemy against Christ" (ch. 5, par. 1: πάσης ἔμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας) and are called, a few lines later, "the records forged in wantonness" (ch. 7, par. 1: τὰ ἐφ'ὕβρει πλασθέντα ὑπομνήματα). It is likely that Eusebius alludes to the same work in book 1, where he denounces "the forgery of those who recently spread the records against our Saviour" (ch. 9, par. 3: τὸ πλάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθὲς καὶ πρῴην διαδεδωκότων) and "those who forged the records against them" (ch. 11, par. 9: τοὺς τὰ κατ'αὐτῶν πλασαμένους ὑπομνήματα). It would be tempting to argue that the author of the opening lines of rec. A of the *Anaphora* took inspiration from Eusebius to describe the records as being done "against Christ." However, Eusebius insists that those forged records against Christ are recent, whereas the *Anaphora* opens with the statement that the records were done at the time of the crucifixion—that is, the author would not have consistently followed his source.

Regarding the link with Eusebius, I would suggest that the understanding of the preposition κατά followed by the genitive as meaning "against" in the modern translations of the *Anaphora* is influenced by this author. It could actually be translated as "concerning our Lord," a meaning widely attested. It may also have to do with the specific attribution of the records to the Jews. Indeed, the most recent researches on the *Acta Pilati* tend to describe it as a "Judeo-Christian text"—that is, a text originating in a Jewish milieu influenced by nascent Christianity (Gounelle 2013). Could the indication of "records done by the Jews" be an allusion to the Jewish aspects of the text that would have been even clearer to the antique reader than they are to us today? Why not consider that this introduction transmitted at least by four witnesses out of nine[14] containing both the *Acta Pilati* and the *Anaphora* (Furrer 2010, 30) is an addition by a scribe who felt the strong difference of tone between the Jewish text of the *Acta Pilati* and the *Anaphora*? Of course this is likely to be a hyper-historical reading of the text. Unfortunately, I have not yet uncovered any additional clues that might support this hypothesis. So let me now focus on another point of the introduction to rec. A.

Geography and history: about the date of composition

In the introduction to the report itself, Pilate is said to have sent to Rome both the records and his own report, whose text follows, as indicated by οὕτως. It is not the place here to study all the other pieces of the so-called "Pilatus' cycle" (Geerard sec. 64–78) nor to guess

[14] Based on my own reading of the manuscripts.

which came first. Since I decided to focus on the *Anaphora*, I shall carefully consider the geographical indications that appear in the introduction and compare them to other references scattered in the text.

Palestine: a post-Eusebian mention?

In all manuscripts containing the introduction to rec. A known to me, Pilate is designated as "the governor of Palestine and Phoenicia."[15] This is not usual. The name "Palestine," if biblical, is not used in the New Testament. Indeed, it does not refer to a political entity in the first century; it first appears in the denomination "Syria-Palestina," when Syria and Judea are merged by Hadrian during the Bar-Kochba revolt, in 134 (Sartre 1998, 430). Referring to this province by its almost contemporary name,[16] Tertullian alludes to Tiberius "having himself received intelligence from <Syria->Palestine of events which had clearly shown <there> the truth of Christ's divinity" (*Apologeticum* ch. 5, sec. 2, Dekkers 1954, 94–95: *annuntiata sibi ex Syria*[17] *Palaestina, quae illic ueritatem istius diuinitatis reuelauerant*; trans. Thelwall 1885, 22, with my amendments indicated by < >). Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* transmits a Greek translation of this passage[18] where the indication of place is changed to "from Palestine" (bk 2, ch. 2, par. 6: ἐκ Παλαιστίνης). It echoes the summary that introduces the translation: "Pilate shared with the emperor Tiberius the rumours of the resurrection from the dead of our Saviour Jesus that were noised abroad to all through the whole Palestine" (bk 2, ch. 2, par. 2).[19] Hence, I suggest that the mention of Palestine as the province of Pilate may be linked to Eusebius' mention. To my knowledge there is no other mention in late antique literature of Pilate being the governor of *Palestine*. This may be a second hint of the Eusebian influence on the introduction to the *Anaphora*.

The most unusual mention

---

[15] Also Syriac: "Pilate, to whom was committed the dominion of Palestine and Phenicia" (Dunlop Gibson 1896, éd. [640], trans. [492]), and Armenian: "Judge of the Palestinians and of the land of Phœnicians" (by courtesy of Outtier).

[16] Actually in 195, to diminish the power of the legate of Syria, Septimius Severus also divides Syria into Coele-Syria and Syria-Phœnicia, thus fulfilling a project of Hadrian (Abel 1938, 168). The *Apologeticum* is dated around 197.

[17] It is interesting that the word Syria would here be omitted by Thelwall in the translation as well as in ch. 21 sec. 18, *Syriam tunc ex parte Romana procuranti* (Dekkers 1954, 126), translated as "at that time Roman governor" (Thelwall 1885, 35). Unfortunately, I do not have access to any more recent, printed English translation.

[18] Whether Eusebius translated it himself or used a previous translation, maybe Julius Africanus', is discussed by Harnack (1892).

[19] τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ εἰς πάντας ἤδη καθ'ὅλης Παλαιστίνης βεβοημένα Πιλᾶτος Τιβερίῳ Βασιλεῖ κοινοῦται (my translation).

of Phoenicia and the question of Pilate's jurisdiction

The second province mentioned in Pilate's title is Phoenicia. That again is extremely unusual. Phoenicia, when named in the biblical text, is usually associated with Coele-Syria (2 M 3:5.8; 4:4; 8:8). It is among the places visited in the *Acts of the Apostles* (11:19; 15:3; 21:2). Historically speaking, however, it was not under Pilate's jurisdiction: Pilate was in charge of Judea, a territory that grew during the 1st century A.D., but never incorporated Phoenicia (Lémonon 1981, 33–41). Moreover, in the New Testament, the only verse associating Pilate with a territory speaks of Judea ("Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea," Luke 3:1) and distinguishes it clearly from other tetrarchies.

In the *inscriptio* of the *Anaphora*, rec. A and B, "Pilate" refers to "himself" as "administrating the government of the East" (ὁ τὴν ἀνατολικὴν διέπων ἀρχήν, Tischendorf 1853, 413–420).[20] Variants on the verb are not relevant here, but one may notice that some manuscripts read the more technical ἐπαρχίαν instead of ἀρχήν (rec. A, ms. A, cf. Tischendorf 1853, 413,[21] and OFP). The classical meaning of ἐπαρχία could be either *praefectura*, the Greek equivalent of *praefectus*, "prefect" being ἔπαρχος, or *provincia*. Would the word be used as an attempt to ensure the plausibility of plagiarism? But nowhere in late antique literature is Pilate called "prefect" (ἔπαρχος) or in charge of a ἐπαρχία. However the word ἐπαρχία is used again a few lines later in both recensions in a closely related sentence, "in the very ἐπαρχία that I administrate" (ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἥνπερ διέπω ἐπαρχίαν, with the antecedent being attracted into the relative clause, rec. A, par. 1, Tischendorf 1853, 414, cf. rec. B, ταύτην γὰρ διέποντός μου τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, "as I was administrating this ἐπαρχία": 420). So the rather technical use of ἐπαρχία calls for attention.

The structure of the sentence that follows also requires a closer look. In both recensions the main verbal group of the sentence is "the whole crowd of the Jews delivered to me a man called Jesus"[22] and that is clear enough. But a relative clause is added between this group and the mention of the ἐπαρχία in both recensions.[23] Rec. B seems a little easier to

---

[20] Cf. Syriac versions ("of the region of the East, of the cities of Phœnicia," Dunlop Gibson 1986, ed. [640] trans. [492]). Arabic has: "over Palestine and the coast" (Dunlop Gibson 1896, trans. [493]). I am not able to read Arabic.

[21] B has a variant reading: ἀνατολῆς τελωνάρχης (Tischendorf 1853, 413).

[22] ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων παρέδωκάν μοι ἄνθρωπόν τινα λεγόμενον Ἰησοῦν, rec. A, par. 1, Tischendorf 1853, 414, cf. rec. B: 420.

[23] Rec. B has an expanded version with a direct address to the emperor, ὦ δέσποτα, "Master" (equivalent of Latin *Domine*), the mention of Pilate's subordination to him, κατὰ πρόσταξιν τῆς σῆς γαληνότητος, "according to the commandment of your clemency." Variants are minor; the one worth noting is the use of plural of majesty in the second family of rec. B, τῆς ὑμετέρας γαληνότητος.

understand: "(the ἐπαρχία) that is one of the Eastern cities, called Jerusalem" (ἥτις ἐστὶ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν πόλεων μία καλουμένη Ἱερουσαλήμ,[24] Tischendorf 1853, 420[25]), assuming that ἐπαρχία would here be reduced to one city.[26] We could rely on this understanding of rec. B to read rec. A as "(the ἐπαρχία) that, [being] one of the cities, is called Jerusalem" (ἥτις μία τῶν πόλεων καλεῖται[27] Ἱερουσαλήμ, Tischendorf 1853, 414[28]). At this point we face an alternative: either the *Anaphora* is using a technical word, describing precisely Pilate's jurisdiction as historically known, but not attested elsewhere in ancient literature, or it makes a wide approximation, reducing this jurisdiction over Judea to the city of Jerusalem. Let us add that when the reader reaches this line of the first paragraph, he has already been told that Pilate was "governor of Judea" (rec. B, first family) or "governor of Palestine and Phoenicia" (rec. A, excl. OFP[29]).

I think that the presence of the relative clause designating the ἐπαρχία as "Jerusalem" makes it clear that the forger is using the word ἐπαρχία not in its classical meaning but with a Byzantine, ecclesiastical meaning. Indeed, it can be compared with letter 569 of Barsanuphius to the hesychiasts: Barsanuph explains that three men who are perfect in the eyes of God have the power to bind or to unbind (cf. Matth. 18:18) and he exhorts his correspondents to pray with them. The three men are designated as follows: "There are John in Rome, Elias in Corinth, and another in the eparchy of Jerusalem" (Εἰσὶ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ Ἠλίας ἐν Κορίνθῳ, καὶ ἄλλος ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ Ἱεροσολύμων, Neyt 2001, 734). This third person is likely to be Barsanuph himself, modestly not spelling out his name (Neyt 2001, 735 n. 4). Historians note here that it implies that Barsanuph's monastery, lead by abbas Seridos, is in the eparchy of Jerusalem; what is important for us is that a monk living in the first half of the 6th century would refer to his region as the

---

[24] Rec. B, first family, adds: ἐν ᾗ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους καθίδρυται, "in which the temple of the people of the Jews is established" (second family: ἐν ᾗ τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος καθίδρυται).

[25] Rec. B, mostly first family; second family has somehow ἥτις ἐστὶ μία τῶν πόλεων καλουμένη Ἱερουσαλήμ.

[26] That is how it was understood by Walker 1886, 462 ("For while […] I was discharging the duties of my government which is one of the cities of the East, Jerusalem by name"), Gounelle 2005, 311 ("alors que j'exerçais cette charge de préfet […] sur une des villes d'Orient appelée Jérusalem"); Moraldi 1994, 745 adds a verb to match historical situation ("Alloché io avevo il governo […] e mi trovavo in una città orientale di nome Gerusalemme").

[27] καλεῖται CD Tischendorf 1853: κέκληται MEAB.

[28] I don't see how one could follow Walker 1886, 460 ("For in this governement of mine, of which one of the cities is called Jerusalem"), Moraldi 1994, 742 ("Nell'eparchia […] che io amministro in una città di nome Gerusalemme"). Santos Otero 1975, 478 may be closer ("en esta provincia que gobierno, única entre las ciudades en cuanto al nombre de Jerusalén").

[29] It is not the place to study the longer prologue of those manuscripts that develop the narrative frame although, to my knowledge, they have not yet been edited.

"eparchy of Jerusalem."

This prompts a question: when would someone refer to the region surrounding Jerusalem as "the ἐπαρχία of Jerusalem"? As we saw earlier, the region's official name is Palestine, with or without a mention of Syria, since the 2nd century A.D. In the 4th century, the correspondence of Libanios (*Ep*. 337) attests to a division of Palestine into *Palestina* and *Palestina Salutaris*. The *Synecdemos* by Hierocles, a table of administrative divisions of the Byzantine empire composed under Justinian, before 535, reveals the existence of three Palestines—as well as two Phoenicias and two Syrias; Jerusalem (par. 718.8, Honigman 1939, 41) belongs to the first (ΠΑΛΑΙΣΤΙΝΑ Α', ἐπαρχία Παλαιστίνης, par. 717.8, Honigman 1939, 41). This division into three Palestines dates back to 400 at the latest (Abel 1938, 170). The metropolis is Caesarea of Palestine (Caesarea Maritime) (Abel 1952, 318) but Jerusalem has an honorific primacy (Abel 1938, 198[30] [29]). So we could assume that the designation of the region as "ἐπαρχία of Jerusalem," alluding to the highest ranking city of Jerusalem, could date back to the time when ecclesiastical provinces were created in the 4th century. The allusion to the "eparchy of Jerusalem" in the first paragraph of the *Anaphora* would give a first *terminus a quo* in the Constantinian era.

However, I think it would be wise to put this date forward by taking under consideration both the insistence on Jerusalem and the mention of Phoenicia. During the council of Chalcedon the patriarchate of Jerusalem is established: hence the official designation of the geographical area integrates the name of the city. And a rearrangement of the episcopal jurisdiction leads to the reunion of the two Phoenicias and Arabia under the jurisdiction of Maxime of Antioch, whereas Juvenal of Jerusalem is in charge of the three Palestines. After 451, Palestine and Phoenicia are two patriarchates. Hence I would keep the second half of the 5th century A.D. as the *terminus a quo* for the *Anaphora*—at least in the form of the text that has reached us.

The emphasis put on two miracles

The report of Pilate consists out of two main parts, a retelling of some miracles and a depiction of events accompanying the crucifixion and the resurrection. The miracles are introduced by a list echoing Matth. 11:5 (influenced by Isa. 35:5–6); then some acts performed by Jesus are described more precisely, first Lazarus, taken from John 11, and then Matthean miracles that have parallels in the other synoptic Gospels, the possessed by devils in the country of the Gadarenes (8:28–33), the man with the withered hand

[30] "L'évêque du chef-lieu de la province devenait naturellement le centre du groupement épiscopal de l'éparchie ecclésiastique, sauf quelques exceptions dues aux origines mêmes de l'évangélisation" (Abel 1938, 197).

(12:10–13) and a woman suffering from hemorrhages (9:20–22).

Let us turn our attention to the miracles involving the possessed and the woman suffering from hemorrhages. First, it should be noted that they form part of the same narrative of the synoptic Gospels: Jesus is teaching and performing miracles in Capernaum (Matth. 8:5–22); then he takes a boat and crosses the Sea of Galilee to the land of the Gadarenes (8:23–34), and comes back to Capernaum (ch. 9) where he heals a paralytic (9:2–8),[31] teaches, heals the bleeding woman, and finally resurrects the daughter of Jairus. Gounelle (2005) has pointed out that the emphasis put on the possessed in the country of Gadarenes might refer to a cult that developed in this region (306); indeed, such a cult is attested from the 5th century at Chorsias (Maraval 1985, 296–297): the place is identified as the New Testament Gergessa, whose monastery and church could be dated to the 5th century; a baptistery was added in 585 (Tsaferis 1972, 410–411). Cyril of Scythopolis (6th century) speaks about a pilgrimage of Sabas († 532) and his companions who prayed "in Chorsias, in the Seven-Springs, in the other holy places around there and as far as Paneas" (par. 24[32]). One could also add that to the veneration of the tomb of Lazarus in Bethania, attested from the 4th century onwards (Maraval 1985, 277), but I have not been able to find any reference to a place where the healing of the paralytic or of the man with the withered hand was commemorated.

The last miracle to be mentioned is the healing of a woman suffering from hemorrhages. It takes place, according to the Synoptic Gospels, in Capernaum (Matth. 8:5; 9:9). I shall focus here on the last sentence. The text of the *Anaphora* says that after being healed, she started running to her city. In rec. A, she runs "to her own city, Capernaum" (εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς πόλιν Κεφαρναούμ, Tischendorf 1853, 416) and in rec. B "To her city, Paneas" (εἰς τὴν αὐτῆς πόλιν Πανεάδα, Tischendorf 1853, 422). Actually, for rec. B, Paneas is a conjecture of Tischendorf, following Thilo on this point. As he notes himself, ms. A and B have Σπανίαν, C and D omit this passage. My own reading of the manuscripts indicates that CGOEP have a larger omission,[33] D and F omit the indication of place, and the name of the city is Ἰσπανίαν in HLS and πανίαν in M. The correction suggested by Thilo is influenced by Eusebius who mentions "at Caesarea Philippi, which the Phoenicians call Paneas" (ἐπὶ τῆς Φιλίππου Καισαρείας, ἣν Πανεάδα Φοίνικες

[31] It would be tempting to assume that the miracle described in the *Anaphora* (par. 3) is a rewriting of the story of the man with the withered hand, influenced by the story of the paralytic, considering the emphasis: "And not the hand only, but rather the half of the body of the man, was petrified, so that he had not the form of a man, or the power of moving his body" (Tischendorf 1853, 416, trans. Walker 1886, 460; cf. rec. B, Tischendorf 1853, 422, trans. Walker 1886, 462).

[32] εὐξάμενοι εἰς τὸν Χορσίαν καὶ τὴν Ἑπτάπηγον καὶ εἰς τοὺς λοιποὺς αὐτόθι σεβασμίους τόπους καὶ ἕως Πανιάδος, Schwartz 1939, 108.

[33] From καὶ γέγονεν to the end of the paragraph (par. 4) in Tischendorf's edition.

προσαγορεύουσιν) two memorials to the bleeding woman, her house and a statue that he describes as the woman kneeling in front of Jesus[34] (bk 7, ch. 17–18). The origins of this cult is debated (Wilson 2004, 81–93) but it is widely attested in the 5th and 6th centuries (108–109), as we saw earlier with Sabas mentioning his praying there. Besides Eusebius' testimony, supporting Thilo's conjecture is the mention of Phoenicia in the introduction to rec. A. Indeed, as Eusebius alludes to, Paneas belongs to the "eparchy of Phoenicia," according to Hierocles (par. 715.5, Honigmann 1939, 40, cf. 716.9, 41).

But to use the mention of Phoenicia as an argument brings us back to the reading offered here by rec. A, where the woman is said to run "to her own city, Capernaum" (par. 4). That reading does not follow the synoptic Gospels where the miracle actually *takes place* in Capernaum. I would suggest two possibilities. The edited text could be amended from εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς πόλιν Κεφαρναούμ (Tischendorf 1853, 416) to εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς πόλιν <ἐκ> Κεφαρναούμ. The correction is slight from a palaeographical point of view but no manuscripts attest it; however, it is supported by the Arabic version of the text, according to Dunlop Gibson's translation: "[she] went running to her own town, Banias, from Capernaum" (Dunlop Gibson 1896, 494 n. 1). That agrees with the indication that she reaches her city with a six days journey (rec. A[35]). Another possibility is to assume multiple corrections done by successive scribes. The original text would read "to her own town, Banias." A copyist expert in Palestinian geography would add that it is "six days away." Then a well-meaning copyist would correct "Banias" into "Capernaum," following the New Testament text but leaving the comment about the journey. In this regard the Munich manuscript (BSB, *gr.* 524) would offer an attempt to correct this last stage by reading "to her own town, Capernaum, six days away from Jerusalem." Either way we cannot assume that the indication of place in the original text was different from that of the Gospels; there must have been some disturbance in the transmission.

The study of two miracles retold in the *Anaphora* confirms both hypotheses built earlier in this paper: 5th century A.D. seems a likely date of composition and the geographical origin of the text put in Palestine and Phoenicia is confirmed by New Testament details such as the probable mention of Paneas and the expression of the distance between this

[34] For further remarks on the woman with the issue of blood and her identification, cf. Dubois 2012.

[35] The Greek text is πλησιάζειν τὴν πορείαν ἡμερῶν ἕξ (Tischendorf 1853, 416) without variants but the omission of τήν in B. Modern translators understand it as a six days journey, but the grammatical structure is not easy and most of the time they avoid a precise translation, as I shall do here ("et sex dierum iter absoluere potuit," Fabricius 1743, 461; "so as to accomplish the journey in six days," Walker 1886, 460; "con un viaggio di sei giorni," Moraldi 1994, 743; "estando a punto de igualar la marcha de seis jornadas," Santos Otero 1975, 481; cf. Arabic, "And that was not near it, a journey of six days," Dunlop Gibson 1896, 494).

city and Capernaum, if one of the propositions of emendation has convinced the reader.

This study has focused on only a handful of details of the first part of the *Anaphora Pilati*. Prior to the address and the official beginning of the letter, the introduction given by rec. A has revealed three peculiarities. First, it mostly exists as such as a link between the *Acta Pilati* and the *Anaphora*; secondly, the attribution to the Jews of the "Memoirs done against (or concerning) the Lord" may result from an almost exact quote from some specific manuscripts of the *Acta Pilati*, which implies that the *Anaphora* as we read it today was composed later to accompany the *Acta* and that it was influenced by Eusebius; and finally, Pilate is called "governor of Palestine and of Phoenicia," which may also suggest a dependence on Eusebius and point to the near-Eastern provinces as a place of its origin. Then, in the first paragraph, the close study of the grammatical structure and the use of the word ἐπαρχία offer a plausible date of the redaction after the council of Chalcedon, when the former province of Judea is known as the "eparchy of Jerusalem." Indications of the introduction and of the first paragraph can be confirmed by a possible allusion to the cult of the healed from demonic possession in Chorsias, on the Eastern coast of the Sea of Galilee, and to the woman suffering from hemorrhages in Paneas (Caesarea Philippi), a southern city of the eparchy of Phoenicia. That would point to the text originating in a Palestino-Phoenician milieu, maybe among the Byzantine monks of the late 5th– early 6th century. None of our manuscripts was copied before the 12th century; that is why Dunlop Gibson was absolutely right in assuming that the Arabic versions "possess a higher antiquity than the Greek texts published by [Tischendorf]" (1896, xiii), considering that one of her manuscripts is dated 799 A.D. The early translation into Arabic could be an additional hint of the region of origin.

There is no more place here to properly study other details of the text such as the biblical quotations or allusions, the depiction of the events accompanying the death and the resurrection of Christ, the question of the moment of the resurrection and its consequences for the Jews, which could also reflect specificities of the period and place of composition. I shall conclude by underlining that this text, though presented as a "report" of Pilate about Jesus, is actually a true testimony on the cults of a specific Christian community. The real forgeries attached to this text are actually the 19th and 20th century attempts to correct in the translation the difficulties of the Greek text. All of that cries for a new, complete edition of the *Anaphora Pilati* that would also take under consideration versions other than Greek.

Appendix:
***some manuscripts of the* Anaphora Pilati**
grouped by recensions and subfamilies

These are the manuscripts I read and edited in my master's dissertation (2007). Letters A to E have been given by Tischendorf (unfortunately, his choice was not consistent in the edition of the *Acta Pilati* and of the *Anaphora*: for instance, manuscript A of the *Anaphora*, Paris, BnF, *gr. 770*, is called C in the edition of the *Acta*). Others are my choice and follow as closely as possible the initial of the city or of the collection. Some codicological indications and details about the dating and transmission are given in Baudoin 2008.

Recension A (*CANT* 66)
first family: ME CD
M (Milano, Ambr., C 92 sup. (N155)) [called F by the editors of the *Acta Pilati* for the *Corpus Christianorum ser. Apocryphorum*, cf. Furrer 2010, 12]
E (London, BL, *Harl.* 5636) as copy of M or such [K, cf. Furrer 2010, 13]
C (Milano, Ambr., E 100 sup. (307))
D (Paris, BnF, *Coisl.* 117) closely related to C, maybe a copy
second family: A B OFP
A (Paris, BnF, *gr.* 770) [called C by Tischendorf 1853, lxxi; cf. Furrer 2010, 12]
B (Paris, BnF, *gr.* 929) [E by Tischendorf 1853, lxxi, cf. Furrer 2010, 12][36]
O (Oxford, Bodl., *Holkham gr.* 9)
F (Athens, 2972), closely related to O
P (Paris, BnF, *Suppl. gr.* 1169) probably shares an ancestor with O
Recension B (*CANT* 65)
first family: DA BKHLS MF
D (Paris, BnF, *gr.* 1019A)
A (Vienna, ÖNB, *theol. gr.* 247) probably shares an ancestor with D
B (Torino, BNU, c.II,5 (302))
K (Athos, Mon. Lavra, K. 64) probably shares an ancestor with B (but I had access to a very small portion of the text)
H (London, BL, *Harl*. 5556) closely related to K (descendant?) **L** (London, BL, *Burn.* 342) closely related to K (descendant?) **S** (Paris, BnF, *Suppl. gr.* 78) copy of L
M (Milano, Ambr., H 22 sup. (426))
F (London, BL, *Add.* 25881) probably shares an ancestor with M
second family: CGO EP
C (Venezia, Marc., II, 42)

[36] The *Anaphora* text transmitted in Munich, BSB, *gr. 524*, and on which, to my knowledge, no study has ever been published, seems to be closely related to this manuscript.

G (Madrid, Escor., ω IV.18 (570)) copy of C
O (Oxford, Bodl., *Linc.* 1) probably shares an ancestor with C
E (Paris, BnF, *gr.* 1331)
P (Patmos, Mon. of St John the Theologian, *448*) probably shares an ancestor with E.

References

1. Editions and translations of the Anaphora Pilati (chronological order)

Fabricius, Johannes Albertus. (1743), *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, repr. 2d ed., vol. 2, Hambourg: Christian Herold.

Birch, Andreas. (1804), *Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi Novi Testamenti Fabriciani, continens plura inedita, alia ad fidem codd. emmendatius expressa*, fasc. 1, Copenhagen: Arntzen and Hartier.

Thilo, Johann Carl. (1832), *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, e libris editis et manuscriptis, maxime Gallicanis, Germanicis et Italicis, collectus, recensitus notisque et prolegomenis illustratus*, Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel.

Fleck, Ferdinand Florens. (1837), *Wissenschaftliche Reise durch das südliche Deutschland, Italien, Sicilien und Frankreich*, vol. 2, Leipzig: J. H. Barth.

Tischendorf, Constantin. (1853), *Evangelia Apocrypha, adhibitis plurimis codicibus Graecis et Latinis maximam partem nunc primum consultis atque ineditorum copia insignibus*, Leipzig: Avenarius et Mendelssohn.

Walker, Alexander. (1886), "Report of Pilate the procurator concerning our Lord Jesus Christ sent to the August Caesar in Rome, first Greek form" and "second Greek form." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325* 8. Ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., rev. 1951, 460–463.

Dunlop Gibson, Margaret. (1896), "Anaphora Pilati. Three recensions (in Syriac and Arabic)". *Studia Sinaitica* 5. *Apocrypha Sinaitica*. London: C. J. Clay and Sons. intr. vii–xiv [419–485]. ed. syr. [640]–[635], ar. [624]–[617], trans. [492]–[497].

Santos Otero, Aurelio de. (1975), *Los Evangelios Apócrifos. Colección de textos griegos y latinos, versión crítica, estudios introductorios y comentarios*. 3ª ed., Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos.

Moraldi, Luigi. (1994), *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento*. vol. 1: Vangeli, Casale Montferrato: Piemme.

Gounelle, Rémi. (2005), "Rapport de Pilate. Réponse de Tibère à Pilate. Cycle de Pilate." *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, vol. 2. Ed. Pierre Geoltrain et Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Paris: Gallimard, 299–327.

2. *Antique writers*

Barsanuph and John of Gaza. *Quaestiones et responsiones ad coenobitas (Epistulae 224– 616)*. ed. Neyt, François, and Angelis-Noah, Paula de, trans. Regnault, Lucien. vol. 2, *Aux cénobites*, t. 2: *Lettres 399–616*. Sources chrétiennes 451. Paris: Cerf, 2001.

Cyril of Scythopolis. *Vita Sabae*. ed. Eduard Schwartz. *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*. Texte und Untersuchungen 49.2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939, 85–200.

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Ed. Eduard Schwartz. *Eusebius Werke zweiter Band: die Kirchengeschichte. Erster Teil: Die Bücher I bis V*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 9.1, Eusebius 2.1, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903.

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Ed. Eduard Schwartz. *Eusebius Werke zweiter Band: die Kirchengeschichte. Erster Teil: Die Bücher VI bis X*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 9.2, Eusebius 2.2, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1908.

Hierocles. *Synekdemos*. ed. Ernest Honigmann. *Le Synekdèmos d'Hiéroklès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre*. Corpus bruxellense historiae byzantinae; Forma imperii Byzantini 1. Bruxelles: Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves, 1939.

Justin of Neapolis, *Apologia* 1. Ed. Denis Minns and Paul Parvis. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr. Apologies*. Oxford Early Christian Text. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009

Tertullian of Carthage (Quintus Septimus Florens). *Apologeticum*. Ed. Eligius Dekkers. *Tertulliani opera. Pars I: opera catholica, aduersus Marcionem.* Corpus Christianorum Ser. Latina 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954, 77–171.

Tertullian of Carthage (Quintus Septimus Florens). *Apologeticum*. Trans. Sydney Thelwall. Ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325* 3: *Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885, 17–55.

3. Studies and instruments

Abel, F.-M. (1952), *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*. t. 2: *De la guerre juive à l'invasion arabe*. Études bibliques, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^ie^.

Abel, F.-M. (1938), *Géographie de la Palestine*. t. 2: *Géographie politique. Les villes. Études bibliques*, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^ie^.

Aragione, Gabriela. (2009), "Anaphora Pilati, Paradosis Pilati et Tiberii Responsum." Oral communication given during the Dole, June 2009 Annual meeting of Association pour l'Étude de la Littérature Apocryphe Chrétienne.

Baudoin, Anne-Catherine. (2007*), Édition et traduction d'un texte apocryphe grec: le Rapport de Pilate à Tibère*. Unpublished master diss. École pratique des hautes études, Paris.

— (2008), "Témoins manuscrits connus et inconnus du Rapport de Pilate à Tibère (CANT 65 et 66)," *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 54: 183–206.

— (2012), *Ponce Pilate: la construction d'une figure dans la littérature patristique et apocryphe*. Unpublished diss. École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.

Dubois, Jean-Daniel. (2012), "La figure de Bérénice et ses sources dans la version copte des Actes de Pilate," *Tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies*. Rome, 17–22 September 2012.

Ehrman, Bart D., and Pleše, Zlatko. (2011), *The Apocryphal Gospels. Texts and Translations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Furrer, Christiane. (2010), "La recension grecque ancienne des Actes de Pilate," *Apocrypha* 21: 11–30.

Geerard, Maurice. (1992), *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*. Corpus Christianorum, Turnhout: Brepols.

Gounelle, Rémi. (2013), "Un nouvel évangile judéo-chrétien? Les Actes de Pilate". *The Apocryphal Gospels within the Context of Early Christian Theology*. Ed. Jens Schröter. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 260, Leuven: Peeters, 357–402. Guzmán Guerra, Antonio. (2011), "Problemas teóricos de la falsificación literaria." *Fakes and forgers of classical literature = Falsificaciones y falsarios de la literatura clásica*. Ed. Javier Martínez, Madrid: Ediciones clásicas, 25–30.

Harnack, Adolf von. (1892), "Die griechische Übersetzung des Apologeticus Tertullians." *Texte und Untersuchungen* 8.4, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1–36.

Lémonon, Jean-Pierre. (1981), *Ponce Pilate*. 2d ed. Paris: éditions de l'Atelier, 2007. rev. ed. of *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée: textes et monuments*. Études bibliques, Paris: Gabalda.

Maraval, Pierre. (1985), *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*, Paris: Cerf.

Migne, Jean-Paul. (1858), *Dictionnaire des Apocryphes, ou collection de tous les livres apocryphes relatifs à l'Ancien et au Nouveau Testament, pour la plupart, traduits en fran- çais, pour la première fois, sur des textes originaux, enrichie de préfaces, dissertations critiques, notes historiques, bibliographiques, géographiques et théologiques*, vol. 2, Pe- tit Montrouge: J.-P. Migne, 1858.

Michl, J. (1957–1965), *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*. Ed. Michael Buchberger, Josef Höfer, Karl Rahner. 2d ed. 10 vols., Freiburg: Herder, vol. 8, s.u. «Pilatus», c. 505.

Sartre, Maurice. (1998), "L'Orient sémitique." *Rome et l'intégration de l'empire, Rome et l'intégration de l'empire. 44 av. J.-C.—260 apr. J.-C.*, vol. 2: *Approches régionales du Haut-Empire romain*. Ed. Claude Lepelley, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 385– 433.

Tsaferis, V. (1972), "Chronique archéologique. Kursi, monastère byzantin," *Revue biblique* 79: 409–411.

Wilson, John Francis. (2004), *Caesarea Philippi. Banias, the Lost City of Pan*, London–New York: I.B. Tauris and Co.

Seven Significant Summary Statements

1. **Pilate's Role in Christian Tradition**: Pontius Pilate, the Roman prefect of Judea, is historically significant for his role in sentencing Jesus to death. His name is used in Christian confessions to link the crucifixion to the Roman Empire, serving as a marker of authenticity.

2. **The Anaphora Pilati**: This text, attributed to Pilate, recounts the events of Jesus' miracles, trial, crucifixion, and resurrection. It is considered a forgery, created to imitate the style of a Roman governor's report and associate the events with Pilate's authority.

3. **Historical Inaccuracies**: The Anaphora Pilati contains historical inaccuracies, such as referring to Pilate as the governor of "Palestine and Phoenicia," regions that were not

under his jurisdiction during his tenure. This suggests the text was written much later, likely in the 5th or 6th century.

4. **Connection to Eusebius**: The text shows possible influence from Eusebius of Caesarea, particularly in its references to "records done against Christ" and the use of the term "Palestine," which was not historically accurate for Pilate's time.

5. **Geographical and Cultural Context**: The text likely originated in a Palestino-Phoenician milieu, possibly among Byzantine monks in the late 5th or early 6th century. This is supported by references to specific locations like Paneas and Chorsias, which were significant in Christian pilgrimage and cult practices during that period.

6. **Manuscript Variations**: The Anaphora Pilati exists in multiple recensions (A and B), with variations in titles, introductions, and narrative details. These differences suggest a complex transmission history and possible attempts by scribes to make the text more historically plausible.

7. **Need for Updated Editions**: The document highlights the need for a new, comprehensive edition of the Anaphora Pilati, incorporating Greek and other versions (e.g., Arabic and Syriac) to better understand its origins, transmission, and historical context.

---

[37] **HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.