Israel Muñoz Gallarte
University of Cordoba

Ángel Narro
Universitat de València

Some Notes on *Andrápolis,* the Royal City: *Apocryphal Acts of Thomas* 3[*]

Introduction

Many issues come up when one tries to critically analyse the 3rd century *Apocryphal Acts of Thomas* (*AATh*), a long narrative that describes the evangelical mission of the apostle Thomas in India, where he is sent from Jerusalem by his alleged twin brother Jesus when the apostles divide up the regions of the earth for evangelisation.[1] One major problem is determining whether or not the original language of the text was Syriac, a hypothesis postulated by Burkitt,[2] Klijn[3] and Attridge,[4] and generally accepted by most scholars,[5] but recently contested by Roig Lanzillotta, who highlights the superiority of the Greek version,

---

[1] Jean-Daniel Kaestli, "Les scènes d'attribution des champs des mission et de depart de l'apôtre dans les Actes apocryphes", in François Bovon et alii (eds.), *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres. Christianisme et monde païen* (Genève: Labor et fides, 1981), pp. 249-264.

[2] See Francis C. Burkitt, "The original language of the *Acts of Judas Thomas*", *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1900), pp. 280-290, espec. 283-284.

[3] See Albertus F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas. Introduction, Text, Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2003² [1962]), pp. 5-7.

[4] See Harold W. Attridge, "The Original Language of the Acts of Thomas", in Harold W. Attridge *et al.* (ed.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday* (Lanham-New York-London: University Press of America, 1990), pp. 241-250.

[5] For an overview of this issue, see Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta, "A Syriac Original for the *Acts of Thomas?* The Hypothesis of Syriac Priority Revisited", in Ilaria Ramelli and Judith Perkins (eds), *Early Christian and Jewish Narrative. The Role of Religion in Shaping Narrative Forms* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) pp. 105-134, espec. pp. 107-108; see also Israel Muñoz Gallarte, "El 'Himno de la Perla' en el contexto de la literatura cristiano primitiva. Análisis y primeras conclusiones de *HT* 108-111.62", *Ilu. Revista de Ciencia de la Religiones* 22 (2017) pp. 245-265, espec. 246-249.

arguing that "it preserves the general tenor of the primitive text more accurately, it reflects the different parts of the text in a better way, and it shows fewer traces of editorial intervention".[6]

Even if an examination of this issue is not the main goal of this paper, the question is nevertheless significant, and the results of our analysis have direct implications in it. Indeed it may determine our preference for, on the one hand, the Greek or the Syriac text, and on the other hand, for one of two main textual groups within the Greek tradition of *AATh*, relating to the archetypes Δ and Γ in Bonnet's edition. It all boils down to a debate around a simple word, appearing in *AATh* 3,2, which differs depending on whether we are dealing with the Syriac version (Sanadrūk, Sandarūk, Sandrūk), or the Greek, in which we commonly find two different toponyms depending on the manuscript tradition. While most of the manuscripts reflect the variant *Andrápolis* – Ἀνδράπολις, in the Bonnet's Δ[7] – those relating to the family Γ present the textual variants *Enadróch* (Ἐναδρὼχ, H), *Enadóch* (Ἐναδόχ, G), or even *Edrón* (Ἐδρὸν, Z), which have been observed as a poor translation of the Syriac *Sandarūk*.[8]

AATh *and Historicity*

Nonetheless, before beginning with the arguments concerning the meaning and identification of *Andrápolis* in the Greek manuscripts, it is worth devoting a few words to the consideration of *AATh* as a historical document, which in our opinion is important for tackling the aforementioned issue. Many attempts to reconstruct the history of Christianity in the East, particularly in India, were based on this text.[9] In our view, however, even if the locations and proper names transmitted by *AATh* suggest a historical episode from the apostolic era, we cannot grant any truthfulness to the events narrated in the apocryphal text. It is clear that the narrative of Thomas's journey to India enjoyed great popularity in early Christianity, and there is a remote chance he undertook such a trip. However, in our

---

[6]　See L. Roig Lanzillotta, "A Syriac Original", p. 105. However, regarding the Greek version exclusively, the variegated and complex textual transmission represents a second serious problem, since at least two different variants are contained in the manuscripts, as can be seen in Bonnet's edition of the text; Maximillianus Bonnet, *Acta Philippi et Acta Thomae* (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1990²), p. 104; see also XIX-XXX.

[7]　See M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum,* pp. XIX- XX. We follow Bonnet's nomenclature of the manuscripts (at p. XVI), with exceptions made for those that would have been unknown to the German editor in his time. For all variants, see below.

[8]　See A.F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas,* 24; Nathanael J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity to India in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), p. 46, with abundant bibliography regarding the Syriac variants.

[9]　As George Nedungatt highlights in "The Apocryphal 'Acts of Thomas' and Christian Origins in India", *Gregorianum* 92.3 (2011), pp. 533-557, espec. 556, we still do not have relevant studies of the monuments and/or archaeological sources relating to the Apocrypha. Therefore, our most reliable source is the text; see below for the last advances in the field of numismatics.

view, fiction and reality should be separated, especially so when we are dealing with sources of this kind, namely narratives created some time after the historical context in which the action takes place and whose narrative's primary concerns are moral instruction and good storytelling, rather than historical accuracy.

Regarding this, we agree with Andrade that *AATh* is extremely vague in terms of geographical, historical, and ethnical descriptions.[10] At the time in which *AATh* was supposedly written, the author had sufficient geographical information at his disposal, collated from diverse Greek and Roman authors.[11] India was a vast area and descriptions of different peoples, tribes and cities were common among historians and well-educated people of the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods. However, it is also true that during the Christian era there was significant confusion regarding the settlement of Indian populations, and peoples of the Arabic gulf area and North Africa were commonly alluded to as "Indians".[12]

At first sight, we can only find generic mentions of India (Ἰνδία) usually referring to the vast territory in which Thomas allegedly performed his evangelistic mission. Hence, in the narrative of *AATh* this territory seems to be divided into different kingdoms, as can be inferred from the existence of two kings, Goundaphor and Misdaeos.[13] The former appears as 'king of the Indians' (c. 2: Γουνδαφόρου τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἰνδῶν), whereas no royal title is given to the latter.

Of particular interest for our study is the alleged historicity of Goundaphor, linked with Northern India. Klijn[14] states the Iranian origin of this anthroponym and, following historical and archaeological evidence – mainly numismatic[15] – posits that the "legendary

---

[10] See Hans-Josef Klauck, *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. An Introduction* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), pp. 145-146; N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* pp. 42-44, takes into account the historicity of other terms, such as the names of King Goundaphoros or Goundaphores (Greek) / Gudnaphar (Syriac), and his brother Gad.

[11] Also from travellers and traders moving east. On this issue, N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* pp. 43-44, interestingly argues for two ways of deriving this knowledge: on the one hand, "knowledge of such names or titles, however, was probably transmitted to the Roman Near East through the Palmyrene commercial network that maintained active contact with north India between the late-first and late-third centuries CE"; on the other, "the author of the text, knowing virtually nothing about India (…), simply interwove existing traditions about the apostle with new material pertaining to his interactions with King Mazdai".

[12] See N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* pp. 69-93.

[13] The information regarding Midaeos, Misdaios or Misdai, king of Quantaria (Gandhāra or Kandahār) is very scarce. G. Nedungatt, "The Apocryphal 'Acts of Thomas'", p. 553, n. 62, resorts to H.H. Dodwell (ed.), *The Cambridge Shorter History of India* (Delhi, 1969), p. 71, in order to argue that "Misdaios, (…) is simply 'Mazdean' and is not mentioned by name", and concludes "The author of *ATh* may not have had *precise* information".

[14] See A.F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas,* p. 21.

[15] Joseph-Toussaint Reinaud, "Mémoire géographique, historique et scientifique sur l'Inde antérieurement au milieu de XIe siècle de l'ère chrétienne", *Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 18 (1849), 1-399; Alexander Cunningham, "Coins of Indian Buddhist Satraps with Greek Inscriptions", *Journal of the*

king" may have reigned from about 30-15 BC.[16] The keyword for understanding the whole debate, as well as our particular approach, is the term "legendary" as employed by Klijn. The author of *AATh* clearly resorted to legendary proper names, connected either historically or geographically with the popular knowledge of India that they may have had, or at least suggesting an Indian provenance or identification. Thus, in our view, the description of exotic or remote lands follows the classical technique of novelistic literature: the use of common *topoi* to refer to imaginary communities or places, albeit on the basis of historical traces.[17]

Andrápolis, *The Royal City*

Having established the context of *AATh* as largely fictional, even if it evokes the already-legendary age of the Apostolic era at least one or one and a half centuries earlier, we are going to deal with the case of *Andrápolis* and its variants throughout the Greek manuscript tradition. The first time the term is mentioned is at the end of chapter 3.2 of *AATh*, when the apostle Thomas and his owner Abban stop for a little while on their journey by boat from Jerusalem to India:[18]

> Ἤρξαντο οὖν καταπλέειν· ἔσχον δὲ ἐπιτήδειον ἄνεμον, καὶ προθύμως ἔπλεον ἕως ὅτε κατήντησαν εἰς Ἀνδράπολιν, πόλιν βασιλικήν.
>
> So they began their voyage. They had a favourable wind, and sailed prosperously until they arrived at Andrapolis, a royal city.

As has already been pointed out, the setting of this journey indicates that it should be understood in novelistic, fictional terms. Accordingly, with regard to the point of departure, as Andrade highlights, "Jerusalem is an inland city. Even if it had been located

---

Asiatic Society of Bengal 23 (1854), 679–719; André-Jean Festugière, *Les Actes Apocryphes de Jean et de Thomas. Traduction Française et Notes Critiques* (Genève: Patrick Cramer, 1983), p. 45, n. 1.

[16] See also N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* pp. 42-44, who concludes: "The author of the text, knowing virtually nothing about India (other than a king named Gudnaphar/Goundaphores), simply interwove existing traditions about the apostle with new material pertaining to his interactions with King Mazdai", p. 44.

[17] This stylistic strategy of blending historical (or even pseudohistorical) information is one of the best-known characteristics of *AAA*. For instance, it is worth mentioning the city of dog-headed men, where the apostles are sent on their evangelizing mission in the *Apocryphal Acts of Andrew and Matthew* (IVth CE) – *AAMT* 1, and the *Apocryphal Acts of Andrew and Matthew* (Vth CE) – *AAAB* 1,1-2. However, the location and historical veracity of this place are as doubtful as they are in the *Indika* of Ctesias the Cnidian – Ctes. F45 Jacoby = Phot. *Bibl.* 72, p. 45A21-50A4.

[18] See *AATh* 3, ed. M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum;* transl. by Han J.W. Drijvers, "The Acts of Thomas", in Wilhelm Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha,* vol. II (Cambridge-Louisville: WJK, 1992), pp. 322-411.

on the Mediterranean coast, one would not have been able to sail to India from it".[19] With regard to destination, it should be noted that what we have here is only a brief mention of a supposedly Indian or near-Indian city, so-called Ἀνδράπολιν, πόλιν βασιλικήν.

However, as stated previously, the question regarding the original language of *AATh* is also of significance in determining the name of the city. Scholars who argue for the Syriac version over the Greek give preference to the variants *Sanadrūk / Sandarūk / Sandrūk.* Consequently, two possibilities stand out among others.[20] The first is that *Sanadrūk / Sandarūk / Sandrūk* may be a reference to a certain site in Bahrain where the Sasanian king Ardashir I (224-242) killed a king named *Sanatruk / Sanatruq.* Since Bahrain was one of the main stopovers between Mesene and the Indian Ocean, it is possible that the fortress acquired the eponymous name of the king killed there.[21] The second possibility is that the name is related to the island of *Kharg / Kharak / Harak,* based on the testimonies of Claudius Ptolemy and Pliny, who attest that in the second century the island was known as Ἀλεξάνδρου / Ἀραχία or *Kassandra.*[22]

The Greek equivalent of the toponym has deservedly received scholarly attention. Ἀνδράπολις traditionally relates to the *Andrha,* a people in South India.[23] Guttschmidt proposed this identification on the basis of the testimony of Pliny the Elder *HN* VI 22, concerning *Andarae,*[24] which may have formed an independent kingdom.[25] Its capital may have been a settlement, whose name demands our attention: *Amārāvatī,* also known as *Andhranagari,* could be designated as a 'royal city', which can perhaps be identified as the *Andrápolis* of *AATh.* Could the Greek Ἀνδράπολις possibly refer to the Indian *Amārāvatī?* The linguistic evidence may indeed support this hypothesis. Even if the Greek toponym Ἀνδράπολις can be understood to be a Hellenic creation, meaning the "City of the Andhra", this is most likely a derivation from either *Amārāvatī* or *Andhranagari.*

In the first hypothesis Ἀνδράπολις may represent a sort of hybrid of the compound toponym *Amārāvatī,* whose meaning in Sanskrit is "place or garden (*-vati*) of immortals or divine men (*amārā-*)". The initial *amārā-,* which shares with Greek the Indo-European root

---

[19] N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* p. 44.

[20] The possible relation to the *santalum,* 'sandal-wood', or the *sandarach,* 'red sulphuret of arsenic', phonetically related to this *Sandarūk,* does not offer a convincing explanation. More likely is the hypothesis that the name is an imitation of the Persian *Sind(a)rund* meaning 'Indus river', formulated by Ernst Herzfeld, *Archaeological History of Iran* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), p. 62. This would imply a different location for the city of the wedding celebration, in which occurs the first act of the apostle.

[21] N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* p. 46, proposes this possibility, "though tenuous", following Huxley and others; see also nn. 73 and 74.

[22] Ptol., *Geog.* 6.4.8; Plin., *NH* 6.3. See N.J. Andrade, *The Journey of Christianity,* p. 47.

[23] A.F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas,* p. 24.

[24] Alfred von Guttschmidt, "Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten", *Kleine Texte* 2 (1890), pp. 362-363.

[25] Edward J. Rapson, *The Cambridge History of India. Volume I: Ancient India* (Cambridge: University Press, 1922), pp. 599-600.

ἀμβροσία ("ambrosia, food of Gods, divine"), may have evolved phonetically into ἀνδρα-, whether within the Indian context, as with *Andhranagari*, or in the Greek. Here, an evolution such as *amārā- > *amra- > andra*, with the introduction of an epenthetic [*d*] to ease the pronunciation of the two syllables – since the combination [*m*] + [*r*] is not attested in Greek – is plausible. The -πολις compound would here be understood to be a Greek translation of the Sanskrit -*vatī*.

Attending now to the second hypothesis, namely, the derivation of Ἀνδράπολις from *Andhranagari*, the Sanskrit toponym may in this case be translated as "the city of the *Andhra*", although in our opinion an etymological relationship of this ethnonym with the aforementioned *amārā*, and an internal evolution towards *and(h)ra*, cannot be ruled out. Thus, in the Greek adaptation, the final part of the word does not change with regard to the schema presented by the first hypothesis, although –πολις in this case would perfectly match the Sanskrit *nagari*, meaning "city", whereas ἀνδρα- may be straightforwardly transliterated.

Either way, the original semantic meaning of the place name gets completely lost in the Greek term Ἀνδράπολις, which paradoxically would have been interpreted by the Greek readers of *AATh* as 'the city of men' rather than 'the city of the *Andrha*'. This *Amārāvatī* is located in East India, on the bank of the river Krishna in the current Andhra Pradesh region, and was in fact a royal city, as is alluded to by *AATh*'s author. Furthermore, it is located on the navigable part of the river, so the travellers could have reached the city by boat, as in the text. If this identification is right, it implies that Thomas and Abban may have travelled from a harbour in nearby Jerusalem across the Arabian Gulf and arrived in East India by sea, then headed north to the kingdom of Goundaphor in Northern India, identified in the text simply as 'India'.

In any case, one should not forget that we are dealing with a literary text, a fictional document. The point is that if we assume that *AATh* cannot be read as history, but only interpreted in its literary context, then this Ἀνδράπολις was used by the author of *AATh* to represent a city of India, as it would have been somehow known and recognized as such within his community, perhaps as an imperial city among one of the many "Indias" of the Greek conception of this territory.

Therefore, the name Ἀνδράπολις used for the imperial city mentioned in *AATh* can be considered as an attempt to describe a mythical geography of the East, even if the city did indeed happen to exist. Other questions emerge at this point: was the author of *AATh* conscious of the location of this city? Not necessarily. He probably knew that it was an imperial city in India, but had no further information to go on other than, at best, its location near a navigable but unspecified place. This idea is supported by the scarce details provided in the text, as in the case of characters with a historical basis, such as the aforementioned Goundaphor.

The Variants of Ἀνδράπολις *in the Greek Tradition*

Whichever possibility we accept, a new problem emerges with the variant *Enadróch,* attested by an important group of Greek manuscripts of *AATh,* otherwise known as family Γ in Bonnet's edition.[26] Actually, the presence of this variant is one of the main features distinguishing family Γ from family Δ, and is cited as alleged proof of the fact that the Greek is a translation from the Syriac version. In our view, the inclusion of the variant *Enadróch* in the Greek manuscript tradition is a contamination proceeding from the Syriac transmission, rather than evidence of the priority of the Syriac original, as has generally been assumed. New textual witnesses transmitting *AATh* reveal a well-established textual tradition within the texts comprising Γ in Bonnet's edition – in reality, a summary created from the version of the story found in family Δ – and show that the variant *Enadróch* is exclusive to the manuscripts comprising family Γ in the Bonnet's work.

The aforementioned question concerning the use of the variant *Enadróch / Andrápolis* with regard to distinguishing family Γ was as follows. The branch Γ was integrated by four manuscripts collated by Bonnet, and attests the following variants:[27]

B Paris. gr. 1468, s. XI, ff. 91ʳ-95ʳ: εἰς Ἀνδράπολιν, πόλιν βασιλικήν.
G Escur. Y II 9, s. XI, ff. 50ᵛ-58ᵛ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐναδόχ, τῆς περιχόρου Ἰνδίας.
H Escur. Y II 6, s. XII, ff. 100ᵛ-106ᵛ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐναδρὼχ τῆς Ἰνδίας περίχωρον.
Z St. Pet. Φ. 906 gr. / 213 gr., s. XII, ff. 22ʳ-28ʳ; 121ʳ-126ʳ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐδρὸν τῆς Ἰνδίας.

This list can be enlarged with five newly-discovered witnesses,[28] collated in the edition of the text that we are currently preparing. The numbers are provisional, but useful for identifying the codices:[29]

---

[26] M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha,* pp. XIX-XXI.

[27] Also, ACF read ἀνδράπολιν, S ἀνδρόπολιν, Y ἀνδράπολιν, while the Latin version Q uses "*Andranopolim*"; see M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha,* p. 104.

[28] The following newly-discovered accounts follow the reading of Ἀνδράπολις with a few variations: 8 Vat. gr. 1608, ss. XII-XIII, ff. 1ʳ-12ʳ: εἰς Ἀδράπολιν; 9 Vat. gr. 1985, s. XI, ff. 77ʳ-101ʳ: εἰς Ἀνδρόπολιν βασιλικὴν; 10 Vat. Ottob. gr. 1, 18ᵛ-26ʳ: εἰς Ἀνδράπολιν. ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ πόλις βασιλική; 17 Jer. Panagios Taphos 66, s. XVI, ff. 90ᵛ-106ʳ: εἰς Ἀνδράπολιν; 31 Lon. Brit. Lib. Add. 10014, ss. XV-XVI, 143ʳ-148ᵛ: εἰς Ἀνδρόπολιν βασιλικὴν; 50 St. Catherine Mon. Gr. 497, ss. X-XI, 115ᵛ-129ʳ: εἰς Ἀνδράπολιν, πόλιν βασιλικὴν; 56 Vat. gr. 544 (palimps.), s. XI, ff. 45-138-111-84-85-106-143-44-114-95-124-125-90-119: εἰς Ἀνδρόπολην, πόλην βασιλικήν.

[29] See Israel Muñoz Gallarte, "The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas: Textual Witnesses Revisited", in L. Roig Lanzillotta, I. Muñoz Gallarte (eds.), *New Trends in the Study of the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas: Revisiting the Scholarly Discourse Twenty Years Later* (forthcoming).

7   Vat. gr. 866, s. XI-XII, ff. 38ʳ-40ʳ: εἰς πόλην Ἐδραχὼν τῆς Ἰνδίας.

11   Oxon. Barocc. 180, s. XII, ff. 41ᵛ-49ᵛ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐδρὼχ τῆς Ἰνδίας τῶν Περσῶν.

23   Athen. gr. 346, s. XV, ff. 71ʳ-76ʳ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐναδρὸχ τῆς Ἰνδίας.

36   Ann Arbor, SCRC 36, s. XVI, ff. 29ʳ-36ʳ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐναδρώχ τῆς Ἰουδαίας περίχωρον.

37   Ambros. A 063 inf., s. XI, f. 221ʳ-240ᵛ: εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐναδρὼχ τῆς Ἰνδίας.

In our view this abridged version follows Bonnet's text quite closely and seems to be the result of a progressive, step-by-step reduction of the content of the full version.[30] In fact, we can trace a path from earlier to later manuscripts, on the basis of the transmission of the city's name: 37 > 7 | B | 11 | > G-H-36-54. 37 would here constitute the first testimony of Ἐναδρὼχ, from which different rewritings could be done independently (7, B and 11). From these would be created a final group, which would be the most stable and homogeneous in terms of textual uniformity.

In all these manuscripts, with the sole exception of B – which consists of a quite bizarre case of *contaminatio* – we find a form akin to *Enadróch*: *Enadróch* (Ἐναδρὼχ H, 36; 37; Ἐναδρὸχ 23), *Enadóch* (Ἐναδόχ G), *Edrachón* (Ἐδραχὼν 7), *Edróch* (Ἐδρὼχ 11), *Edrón* (Ἐδρὸν Z). Where does this *Enadróch* come from? We are not quite sure, but phonetic similarities with the Syriac *Sandarūk* cannot be denied.

This variant is a characteristic of family Γ, but is not an exclusive feature of it, as it appears similarly in codex 43 (Athon. Karakallou 8 [Lambros 1521], s. XIII, ff. 40v-49r), a manuscript clearly related to family Δ, but where in chapter 3 we read εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ἐναδρὼχ. The witness makes the Bonnet's distinction between the families Γ and Δ much more complex, since this variant *Enadróch* is the only similarity codex 43 shares with the group represented by Γ. In any case, this manuscript points at a *contaminatio* of different textual traditions relating to the apostle Thomas. It contains chapters 1-29 of *AATh*, as in the manuscripts of family Δ, but the text is followed by the final part of the unedited commentary of Symeon Metaphrastes on Thomas (*BHG* 1835). The section of one and a half folio included in this manuscript shows how different textual traditions were sometimes used to create versions of the story differing from the alleged original, especially when these versions were abridged texts, such as those comprising family Γ. With this phenomenon in mind, one may propose contact or familiarity with the Syriac textual tradition to explain the adaptation *Enadróch* in these manuscripts, without the assumption of a Syriac original, which is based on linguistic premises as doubtful as this *Enadróch* in the Greek textual tradition.

---

30 See I. Muñoz Gallarte – Á. Narro, "The Abridged Version(s) of the So-Called Family Γ of the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas" in T. Nicklas; J.E. Spittler and J.N. Bremmer (eds.), *The Apostles Peter, Paul, John, Thomas and Philip with their Companions in Late Antiquity* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), pp. 254-269.

Our current investigation does not allow us to speculate much further. The only certainty is that the variants *Andrápolis / Enadróch* indicate two undeniable facts. Firstly, *Andrápolis* was the preferred term in the Greek textual tradition; *Enadróch* only comes up in manuscripts containing abridged versions of *AATh* (family Γ), which are derived from the most stable family of Greek manuscripts (family Δ), and the particular case of codex 43 proves that this version was created from two different texts: *AATh*, and the commentary of Symeon Metaphrastes on Thomas. Secondly, as these abridged versions were dependent on the most complete and stable Greek textual tradition represented by the family Δ, the inclusion of *Enadróch* in the Greek versions would be secondary to and linked with the contact between the Greek *AATh* and the Syriac version, which is quite difficult to date on the basis of the data to hand. Nevertheless, the inclusion of *Enadróch* in the version of the family Γ cannot be used as evidence for the alleged Syriac origin of the text, but rather as confirmation of the eventual contact between the two textual traditions.

Linguistically, the Syriac influence over the Greek version, resulting in the inclusion of *Enadróch*, seems the most likely explanation. The transformation from *Andrápolis* into *Enadróch* may have come about the Syriac *Sandarūk*. To the scribe or writer reworking the Greek *AATh*, *Andrápolis* would here mean simply 'city of men'. Besides this, they may perhaps have believed that this place name sounded too Greek and decided, either by his own initiative or with the help of a Syriac interpreter, to check the Syriac version, in which he found the place name *Sandarūk*. As this name contains non-Greek features, such as the consonantal ending, *Enadróch* was a better candidate with which to suggest a city in India, or at least somewhere beyond the limits of the Hellenistic world.

The writer would then have phonetically adapted the name according to the Greek spelling of his time. Although the loss of the initial *s-* can be understood as an incompatibility, we have found a curious testimony that may shed some light on this. A certain γή Ἐδρὰχ is attested in Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets*. In interpreting the Book of Zechariah 9, the author mentions the *Septuagint* Ἐδρὰχ, which is in fact a reference to *Sedrách* (Σεδράχ), near Damascus. This was perhaps the toponym that the scribe of codex 11 had in mind when he wrote Ἐδρὼχ. In any case, what is more interesting, in our opinion, is the appearance of the same phonetic pattern, i.e. the loss of the initial *s-* during the adaptation into Greek of a non-Greek place name beginning with this phoneme; that is, if we assume – as many have done so – the relationship between the Syriac *Sandarūk* and the Greek *Enadróch*.

As far as we know, few linguistic studies on this topic exist that would allow us to collect other testimonies in support of this hypothesis. This field of study, i.e. the behaviour of loanwords from Eastern languages in Late Antique or Byzantine Greek, is one of the most neglected points of current research.

Conclusion

It is time to draw some conclusions. We agree with almost all scholars that the level of historicity in *AATh*'s narrative is very low. It seems that the author is not interested in offering a historical account at all, but in providing an edifying story. In doing so, the author resorts to the *topoi* of the genre, mixing into the scenes of his Christian novel some new material that is hard to trace back to source, but with echoes of Scripture,[31] as was usual in early Christian literature, in order to frame the adventures of the apostle within a plausible world. Consequently, the attempt to reconstruct Thomas's itinerary seems as ill-advised as the many other proposals of scholars up to the present day.[32] In our view, the ᾿Ανδράπολις of *AATh* may or may not be the historical *Amārāvatī* or *Andhranagari*, since the implications of this identification change nothing with regard to either the historicity of the text or the poor knowledge of the Indian region that we have attributed to the author of *AATh*.

Besides this, a much more interesting interpretation can be formulated, since the inclusion of this Indian toponym with all the necessary caveats may support the hypothesis that Greek is the original language. Such an identification with a real location in India suggests the higher quality of the Greek version over the Syriac; the latter's toponym *Sandarūk* seems to us much more obscure. It is not a minor question, since, as we have already highlighted, this reference to *Andrápolis* is the only time the author of *AATh* uses a single name of an Oriental city. The Indian origin of the Greek ᾿Ανδράπολις points to a slightly higher attempt at geographical accuracy in order to make the story trustworthy.

Concerning the use of proper names, if a foreign author were to write a novel situated in 19ᵗʰ-century Spain, he might situate the story in a place generally well known to his readers such as Seville, as did Merimée in his work of 1845, *Carmen*. The realistic background exists, but historical accuracy is not the intended purpose. The same narrative technique is displayed, in our view, by the author of *AATh*, who uses proper names to evoke India, in a general sense, to his readers. This would therefore be a narrative technique shared by the rest of the *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, in which the use of generic names is very widespread, since these texts are basically edifying narratives with novelistic and propagandistic purposes, rather than historiographical or biographical works aiming at historical accuracy or lack of bias.

---

[31] Antonio Piñero – Gonzalo Del Cerro, *Hechos apócrifos de los Apóstoles. Vol. II. Hechos de Pablo y Tomás* (Madrid: BAC), pp. 888-894.

[32] As is the case with identifying the *Andrápolis* named in *AATh* with the *Andronpolis* in Lower Egypt: Helmut Waldmann, *Das Christentum in Indien und der Königsweg der Apostel in Edessa, Indien und Rom* (Tübingen: Tübinger Gesellschaft, 1996), pp. 48-49. As Van den Bosch points out, this possibility "evokes more questions than it offers solutions": Louens P. Van den Bosch, "India and the Apostolate of St. Thomas", in Jan N. Bremmer, *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), p. 126, n. 4.

Abstract: The following paper aims to explore the meaning and significance of the so-called royal city *Andrápolis* (Ἀνδράπολις) within the narrative of the *Apocryphal Acts of Thomas'*s (3.2). The identification of this toponym and the attempt to extract the few reliable historical traces supposedly transmitted by the apocryphal text have attracted the attention of many scholars during the last century, as well as recently. After a short introduction, in this paper, we deal with the alleged historicity of the text. We then assess the different variants of the location in the Syriac or Greek transmission of the *Acts of Thomas* and propose a new interpretation. Finally, we check the remaining Greek variants among the manuscripts – collating new discoveries and those of by Bonnet –, in an attempt to explain the differences between them and the better attested *Andrapolis*. We close with some final remarks.

Resumen: El interés del presente artículo reside en el estudio del significado e importancia de la conocida ciudad regia *Andrápolis* (Ἀνδράπολις) según la narrativa de los *Hechos Apócrifos de Tomás* (3,2). La localización del topónimo y el intento de extraer un mínimo de información histórica supuestamente transmitida por el apócrifo han atraído la atención de numerosos estudiosos durante el siglo pasado, así como recientemente. Tras una breve introducción, la investigación aborda la hipotética historicidad del texto. A continuación, se problematizan las variadas interpretaciones que se han aportado a esta ciudad, según los textos siríaco y griego de los *Hechos de Tomás,* y se propone una nueva interpretación. Finalmente, se repasan todas las variantes textuales griegas del término en la tradición manuscrita griega —tanto los testimonios colacionados por Bonnet, como los nuevos descubrimientos—, a fin de analizar las diferencias entre ellos y explicar la variante mejor atestiguada, *Andrápolis.* Finaliza el artículo con la sección de conclusiones.