
127 579

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

NEW CHAPTERS IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

NEW CHAPTERS IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

BY
EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1937

Copyright, 1937, by
EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Set up and printed. *Published October, 1937.*
First printing.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

In Memoriam

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED,
A.B., University of Rochester, 1853,
Graduate, Rochester Theological Seminary, 1856,
D.D., University of Rochester, 1869.

THOMAS W. GOODSPEED,
A.B., University of Rochester, 1863,
Graduate, Rochester Theological Seminary, 1866,
LL.D., University of Rochester, 1913.

PREFACE

THIS volume constitutes the Ayer Lectures for 1937. The Ayer Lectureship was founded in May, 1928, in the Rochester Theological Seminary, by the gift of twenty-five thousand dollars from Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred W. Fry, of Camden, New Jersey, to perpetuate the memory of Mrs. Fry's father, the late Mr. Francis Wayland Ayer. At the time of his death Mr. Ayer was president of the corporation which maintained the Rochester Theological Seminary.

Shortly after the establishment of the Lectureship the Rochester Theological Seminary and the Colgate Theological Seminary were united under the name of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. It is under the auspices of this institution that the Ayer Lectures are given.

Under the terms of the Foundation the lectures are to fall within the broad field of the history or interpretation of the Christian religion and message. It is the desire of those connected with the establishment and administration of the Lectureship that the lectures shall be religiously constructive and shall help in the building of Christian faith.

Four lectures are to be given each year at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School at Rochester, New York, and these lectures are to be published in book form within one year after the time of their delivery. They will be known as the Ayer Lectures.

The lecturer for the year 1936–37 was Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

THE invitation of the Committee on the Ayer Lectureship of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, I have welcomed as offering an opportunity to discuss some matters closely related to New Testament study which are not precisely within the scope of introductions, commentaries, or similar standard types of writing but are nevertheless of much importance to it. The variety in subject within the volume is thus explained. As some of these chapters may be read and referred to for their specific bearing I have sought to make each complete in itself, at the risk of some slight occasional repetition of facts essential to the matter immediately under discussion. Mr. Harold H. Hutson, Fellow in the New Testament department of the University of Chicago, has very kindly read the chapters through in manuscript.

My hereditary debt to Rochester was already great, but my obligation to the Divinity School has been increased by the generous hearing given the lectures delivered there in March, 1937—chapters II, III, IV and VI of this volume.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

CONTENTS

NEW CHAPTERS IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

CHAPTER I

PUBLICATION AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

NO ANALYSIS of New Testament literature is more fruitful than that made from the point of view of publication. Were these writings intended for private use or to be published? This question at once organizes the literature in a most significant and illuminating way. For the writings of a private character naturally went unpublished until some later situation led to their publication, while the others must have been published from their first appearance.

The Letters of Paul were private communications, addressed to Paul's friends in the several Christian congregations he had formed or wished to communicate with. Written with no thought of publication, for a long time they went unpublished. A gospel like Matthew, on the other hand, was meant for somewhat general reading and must have been published at once, and circulated, first in the place of its origin and later in other Christian centers.

There remains, however, a group of New Testament books which cannot be so summarily classified. Yet it is

precisely for these that the distinction must be made and when made proves most fruitful. Everyone will agree that Mark, Luke-Acts, and John were not private communications, but books intended for publication. That publication may have been modest and limited at first, but it was unmistakably publication. But what of that epistolary literature which arose apparently in imitation of the Pauline letter type, Hebrews, I Peter, James, the Letters of John, Jude, II Peter, the Pastoral Letters, and the Revelation? Were these writings private, or were they written for publication and published forthwith? This matter, though little considered by writers upon these books or upon introduction, is indispensable to a full understanding of them and of their place and influence in the development of early Christian literature.

The matter is complicated and obscured in the public mind by the current confusion between publication and printing. If one speaks of the publication of a book, most people instinctively think of printing as publication, and of course the ancients had not developed that art. But this does not at all mean that they were ignorant of publication. They were familiar with publishers, booksellers and libraries. Of course the mere fact of the existence of great ancient libraries proves the practice of publication. Tradition credits Pisistratus with having formed a great library in the Parthenon in Athens, but it was probably Aristotle who first developed the reference library of which Ptolemy's library

in Alexandria is the most famous example. In this latter, efforts were made to see that correct copies of classical Greek writers were reproduced and offered for sale, so that the librarians became textual critics, and copying establishments, or as we should say, publishing houses, were organized in connection with the library.

Books to be offered for sale were not written in the running hand of business or personal correspondence, but in clear, stately letters, sometimes called uncial, from the fact that at Rome it became the custom to write an average of twelve letters to the line; the Romans, it will be remembered, were great duodecimalists, dividing the pound into twelve ounces, the foot into twelve inches; why not therefore the line into twelve uncials? The word in this sense is first met with in a well-known passage in Jerome.[1]

Whatever the origin of the term "uncial letters," there can be no doubt that there were regular "book hands" which were used only in copies offered for sale, or what we should call "books," properly speaking. The Greek papyri have brought us hundreds, even thousands, of examples of such books from Ptolemaic and Roman times. Any papyrologist running through a box of papyrus pieces offered him by an Egyptian dealer, instinctively culls out at a glance the book hands, for fragments written in such hands are sure to be literary

[1] *"Uncialibus, ut vulgo aiunt, litteris," Preface to Job;* cf. W. H. P. Hatch, "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Uncial," *Classical Philology,* XXX (1935), p. 247.

—pieces of classical, scriptural or later literary works. No one who has looked over a score of such pieces and compared them with ordinary everyday business hands can doubt for a moment that the former are the work of skilled scribal labor; they are parts of copies made in a publishing house to be offered for sale.

Very rarely, it is true, a bit of literary text or part of one is found written in the cursive, running hand of business, but as compared with the vast majority of handsome book-hand copies of literary works, such pieces are insignificant, aggregating less than one per cent. Indeed, there is as much difference between ancient business cursive writing and ancient book hands as there is between modern handwriting and modern typewriting.

Papyrus fragments of Homer are more numerous than of any other writer, but Sir Frederic G. Kenyon reported in 1933 that P. L. Hedley had listed 157 fragments of the New Testament Greek text, and 174 of the Old, including some on vellum and ostraca.[2] Among the Oxyrhynchus papyri alone, we actually possess fragments of published copies of Homer, Sappho, Alcæus, Pindar, Euripides, Menander, Callimachus, Plato, Xenophon, Chariton, Cercidas, Hellanicus, Pancrates, Hesiod, Bacchylides, Herodotus, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Sophocles, Satyrus, Apollonius Rhodius, Thucy-

[2] Frederic G. Kenyon, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (London, 1933), p. 32.

dides, Babrius, Aristophanes, Philo, Hypereides, Lysias, Theocritus, Aeschines, Euclid, and Aristotle.

In the presence of this roll of thirty Greek writers whose writings were found in book copies at one town of Upper Egypt, it is impossible to deny that publication existed in the ancient Greek world and flourished in it.

It is said that at the suggestion of Callimachus Ptolemy undertook to secure a monopoly of the publishing business for Alexandria by forbidding the export of papyrus from Egypt. Varro says that when Eumenes II, King of Pergamum, 197–159 B.C., planned to create a great library there, Ptolemy prohibited the exportation of papyrus and so the resourceful Pergamenes developed the preparation of skins for writing to such a point that parchment (*pergamentum*) was produced.[8] There may be truth in these stories. But modern discoveries of parchment manuscripts, dated as early as 190 and 195 B.C., have shown that the manufacture of parchment was well advanced by the first years of Eumenes. Kenyon concludes that what Eumenes did was to apply this material to literary purposes.

The ancient book form was of course the roll or scroll, and the writing was often in rather narrow columns, like the columns of a modern newspaper. The

[8] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xiii, 11, 12; cf. Frederic G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (1932), p. 88.

regularity and beauty of the writing in these published books still commands the admiration of the book-lover. The ancient publisher gathered his scribes or copyists, perhaps twenty, thirty or forty of them, into a large room, seated them at desks or tables, and then as someone slowly read the text to be copied, each man wrote down what he heard. As errors of the ear might creep into the text in this way, all copies were afterward gone over by a corrector, who set such matters right.

The younger Pliny says in his first letter that his friend Septicius had often urged him to collect and publish his letters, *colligerem publicaremque.* It may be taken as established that the ancients were as familiar with published books as we are, even though their books were mostly in the form of rolls, and were written, not printed.

Yet a seasoned New Testament scholar recently stated before one of our learned societies that it would take more than this remark of Pliny to satisfy him that the ancients practiced publication, so it is in order to set forth the evidence somewhat specifically: [4]

1. There are the ancient libraries—Athens, Alexandria, Pergamum, Ephesus, Smyrna, Rome, and so on. It is said that 29 public libraries were founded in Rome between the reign of Augustus and that of Hadrian. The library of Alexandria is said by Josephus, *Antiqui-*

[4] Cf. also Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 1932).

ties, 12:2, to have contained 200,000 books (meaning separate rolls). Seneca, *De Tranquilitate Animi,* 9, says it contained 400,000; Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights,* 6:17, says it contained 700,000, a figure also given by Ammianus, 22:16. It was the policy of Augustus to establish libraries widely throughout the empire. All this certainly implies the existence of *books,* not amateur private copies but proper sales copies, produced by what may fairly be called publishers.

2. There are, further, the hundreds of actual copies of such ancient books, of course fragmentary, written in hands that are unmistakably professional; such copies as not one modern Greek scholar in a thousand could equal for precision, regularity and beauty. These ancient papyrus pieces are from every generation from the third century before Christ to the fifth after Christ, and prove that there was a professional class of book copiers throughout those centuries who wrote Greek manuscript copies of classical and other authors for sale. Ambrose hired such scribes to copy the writings of Origen [5] and Constantine mentions them.[6]

3. There is the case of Atticus, the friend of Cicero, who engaged in the publishing business. Atticus was a large employer of professional scribes and prided himself upon the accuracy of his editions. Cicero wrote to him, "You have done so well with my oration for Li-

[5] Eusebius, *Church History,* 6:23:2.
[6] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* 4:36.

garius that I propose hereafter to put the sale of anything I write in your hands." [7] Interesting items about corrections and new editions are found in Cicero's letters to him.

4. There were the Sosii, brothers who were famous *publishers* and booksellers in Rome in the time of Horace.[8] Their shop in Rome was in the Vicus Tuscus, near the entrance to the Temple of Janus.[9]

5. There is the remark of Pliny the Younger,[10] that his friend Septicius had often urged him to collect and publish his letters.

6. There are the references in Martial, for instance, to booksellers and publishers, and to publishing. Martial mentions four booksellers in Rome who handled his books, and some of these, perhaps all of them, were also publishers of them. They are Atrectus, Tryphon, Secundus, and Valerianus.

"All the light verse I penned once as a youth and boy, and my worthless efforts which not even I myself now recognize—these . . . reader, you can get from Pollius Quintus Valerianus. It is through him my trifles are not allowed to perish." [11]

"Yet that you may not fail to know where I am for sale, or wander aimlessly all over the town, if you accept my guidance, you will be sure. Seek out Secundus, the freedman of learned Lucensis, behind the entrance

[7] *Ad Atticum,* 13:12:2.
[8] *Ep.* 1:20:2, *Ars Poetica* 345.
[9] *Ep.* 1:19:19.
[10] *Letters* 1:1.
[11] *Epigr.* 1:113.

to the Temple of Peace, and the Forum of Pallas." [12]

To Lupercus who annoys him by borrowing his writings from him, Martial says:

"There is a shop opposite Cæsar's Forum with its door-posts from top to bottom bearing advertisements, so that you can in a moment read through the list of poets. Look for me in that quarter. No need to ask Atrectus (that is the name of the shopkeeper); out of the first or second pigeonhole he will offer you Martial, smoothed with pumice and smart with purple, for five denarii." [13]

"You press me to give you my books, Quintus. I haven't any, but bookseller Tryphon has." [14]

"The whole collection of Mottoes in this slender little volume will cost you to buy four sesterces. Is four too much? It can cost you two, and the bookseller Tryphon would make his profit." [15]

Martial speaks frequently about publication:

"So much for your bidding me publish my poems!" [16]

"Because scarcely one book of mine is published in a whole year, I am by you, learned Potitus, accused of laziness." [17]

"Although you don't publish your own, you carp at my poems, Laelius. Either do not carp at mine or publish your own." [18]

[12] 1:2. [13] 1:117. [14] 4:72. [15] 13:3. [16] 2:6. [17] 10:70. [18] 1:91.

"Although you possess bookcases crammed with books arduously compiled, why, Sosibianus, do you send forth nothing?" "My heirs," you say, "will publish my lays." [19]

7. It is apparent to any student of Greek civilization that its background was acquaintance with certain works of literature, especially Homer and Plato. This acquaintance could not have been effected in casual ways or by laborious private copying of their writings by interested individuals who might want copies. It was effected by the publication and sale of their books, just as it is today.

8. The use of Homer in education shows the same thing. A boy at school in Egypt in the second or third century is reported to his mother as reading "the sixth" (book of the Iliad).[20] No one supposes that the boy or his teacher had to travel to Alexandria and painfully copy the text of Homer for his study; of course they simply bought a copy from a local bookseller.

9. In the latter years of the republic, we are told, every large Roman house included a library among its rooms. The excavations at Herculaneum revealed such a library in the house of an Epicurean philosopher, with the charred remains of his books, the famous Herculanean Rolls.

10. The Acts declares [21] that magical books, of course rolls—the Greek word means papyri—worth $10,000 (50,000 pieces of silver) were burned at one

[19] 4:32. [20] *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 930. [21] 19:19.

time in Ephesus; several thousand books must have been destroyed on this occasion, and this gives us some faint idea of the number of them in existence, and the publishing activity employed upon this magical literature alone. The fact that Luke estimates their money value shows that these were not mere private scrawls but regular books that had been bought from such shops as Luke's contemporary Martial describes.

11. The extent to which Christians of the early third century made use of publication is clearly shown by what Eusebius has to say of Ambrose and his usefulness to Origen.[22]

"At that time Origen began his commentaries on the divine scriptures, being urged thereto by Ambrose, who employed innumerable incentives, not only exhorting him by word but also furnishing abundant means. For he dictated to more than seven amanuenses who relieved each other at appointed times. And he employed no fewer copyists, besides girls who were skilled in elegant writing. For all these Ambrose furnished the necessary expense in abundance. . . ."

It will be seen from this that Ambrose not only supplied Origen with stenographers (for the Greeks practiced shorthand) but with scribes enough to make salecopies of his works; Ambrose's interest in inducing Origen to write his commentaries was that they might be not simply preserved but published.

12. When Constantine's acceptance of Christianity

[22] *Church History*, 6:23:1, 2.

opened the way for it in the ancient world the publication of Christian books was carried on with renewed energy. Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine* quotes the emperor's instructions ordering that fifty copies of the Bible should be written for use in the churches, "on prepared parchment, in a legible manner and in a convenient portable form, by professional transcribers thoroughly practiced in their art." Eusebius goes on to say that the copies were immediately written and sent to the emperor in magnificent volumes elaborately bound. These were evidently meant to be placed on church lecterns for use in public worship.[33] In them the publication work of the ancient church may be said to reach a climax, but it was the climax of an activity that had been practised almost from the beginning, certainly from the time of the fall of Jerusalem, and the writing of the Gospel of Mark.

No historical fact is better established than that book-publication was widely practiced in the Graeco-Roman world, in the first, second, and third centuries after Christ. It was a familiar fact of common life. Recent discoveries have shown that the early Christians in the first and second centuries were fully abreast of their contemporaries in the matter of publication.

The books of the New Testament were written at the very time when the ancient world was beginning to pass from the old roll-form of book to the newly developed

[33] *Life of Constantine*, 4:36, 37.

leaf-book or codex. Our first glimpse of the transition is in a Priene inscription dated early in the first century before Christ, where the city praises one of its officials for having its records written on parchment as well as on papyrus, and Schubart is inclined to think the parchments were in leaf-book form. He has further pointed out that when the body of Publius Clodius was burned in the Curia in B.C. 52, the pyre was built of tables and chairs, and booksellers' codices (*codices librariorum*), showing that leaf-books already played a familiar part in publication.[24]

As recently as 1907 Professor Gregory, who had an immense acquaintance with manuscripts, thought the transition from rolls to leaf-books took place about the end of the third century, ca. 300.[25] But he added with his characteristic open-mindedness, "A new papyrus may tomorrow show that the change came earlier." The new papyri have indeed come, and shown that the change came a century and a half earlier. Not that rolls were not still written, even for Christian texts, but that the transition to leaf-books had definitely begun, especially for Christian texts, before the middle of the second century.

In his recent book, *The Story of the Bible,* Sir Frederic G. Kenyon has remarked that the Chester Beatty papyri have shown that the papyrus leaf-book intervened

[24] *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römer,* 1907, p. 104.
[25] *Canon and Text of the New Testament,* p. 322.

between the papyrus roll and the parchment codex. But Martial's reference to the publication of his Epigrams in small parchment codices, as well as rolls, shows that to some extent at least the parchment leaf-book and the papyrus one began together:

"You who wish my poems should be everywhere with you, and look to have them as companions on a long journey, buy these which the parchment (membrana) confines in small pages. Assign your book-boxes to the great; this copy of me one hand can grasp." [26]

Martial published his first book of epigrams in A.D. 84 or 85, so that the leaf-book seems to have been known in Rome by that time. But few specimens of Greek or Latin literary texts in that form have come to light from the early centuries. The Rylands Odyssey is a parchment codex of the third or fourth century, and in the same library there is a leaf of a third century papyrus codex of the Iliad.[27] But Martial's playful epigram shows that by A.D. 85 small parchment codices at least were already in use in Rome for literary purposes.

Early Christians are usually thought of as apocalyptic visionaries with little interest or capacity for the practical affairs of life. Yet it is a surprising fact that among them the newly invented codex or leaf-book seems to have met its warmest reception. They had of course a huge religious literature to circulate. They accepted the

[26] *Epigr.* 1:2.

[27] *Rylands Papyri*, nos. 53, 50.

Jewish scriptures almost from the first as their Bible. This attitude becomes explicit in II Tim. 3:16: "All scripture is divinely inspired and useful in teaching." It came to them in the Greek Septuagint version, which increased its amount by about one-fourth. Christian writings too were rapidly taking on a similar sanctity, and soon added another fourth to the size of the early Christian's Bible. In the ancient scroll or roll-form of book, this whole mass of writings would have required very nearly forty papyrus rolls of ordinary length to accommodate it. The oldest manuscript we possess of Deuteronomy is a part of a roll from the second century before Christ. Such rolls were called in Greek "biblia"—"papyrus rolls"—and the word came to be used to designate those papyrus rolls which contained the Old Testament.

But before the end of the first century a new form of book was being developed in the Graeco-Roman world. It was the codex, or leaf-book. It was twice as capacious as the roll, for it made use of both sides of the papyrus. It was more convenient to use and consult, and was not nearly so liable to accident, breakage, and mutilation. The first extant examples of it are Christian writings, and these copies go back almost to the time of Martial, who lived until ca. A.D. 103.

In his latest work, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (London, 1937), Sir Frederic G. Kenyon says, p. 18:

"It seems that this [the codex form, in papyrus] if

not actually the invention of the Christian community, was at any rate mainly employed by them, for whereas the roll continues in practically universal use for works of pagan literature all through the second and third centuries, the majority of Christian works are in codex form. The earliest examples known can be assigned with some confidence to the first half of the second century, and there are quite a number from the third, so that we are justified in concluding that it was a form in normal use."

The oldest is the Rylands Library fragment of the Gospel of John, which is older than A.D. 150 and may be from the reign of Hadrian, as Deissmann thinks. That the Gospel of John in codex form of such antiquity should appear in Upper Egypt is amazing. But it does not stand alone. The British Museum gospel fragment is also a part of a leaf-book, and the manuscript is assigned to the middle of the second century. That curious work is manifestly based on the four gospels, but it is not itself a part of Christian scripture. Still, it illustrates just as truly the practical use Christians were making of the new leaf-book form. These are the oldest examples of leaf-books that have been reported, and both are Christian texts.

The next is perhaps the Chester Beatty-Michigan codex of Paul, 86 leaves (172 pages) of which have been found. While Kenyon and Sanders date it about A.D. 250, Wilcken and Gerstinger put its date at about

A.D. 200. That is also the approximate date of the famous manuscript of the Sayings of Jesus found at Oxyrhynchus.

The Chester Beatty codex of the Gospels and Acts is referred to the first half of the third century, and the Chester Beatty Revelation to the latter half of the same century. The Michigan Hermas, a leaf-book in a single quire, was written probably about the middle of that century.

Of Old Testament manuscripts the Chester Beatty Numbers and Deuteronomy (portions of 55 leaves) is assigned to the second century. There is no reason to suppose it is a Jewish and not a Christian copy, as the Jews were very conservative in the forms in which they preserved their scriptures, and were already relinquishing the Septuagint version to the Christians and making other versions, like those of Aquila and Theodotion, for their own use. With it may be classed the Baden Exodus-Deuteronomy papyrus, also a leaf-book form from the second century.

Altogether it is plain that the Christians of the second and third centuries seized upon the leaf-book form as especially adapted to their purpose of publishing as widely as possible their extensive library of scripture. In fact they seem to have led the way in the adoption of the codex form in place of the old conventional roll form. We cannot match this array of New and Old Testament leaf-books from the second and third cen-

turies with an equal showing of such books of classical literature.

Sir Frederic G. Kenyon has compared the Christian and pagan use of rolls and codices in the Oxyrhynchus papyri published up to 1926. Of 106 manuscripts of pagan literature from the third century, 100 were rolls and 6 codices. Of 17 Christian manuscripts of the same century, 7 were rolls and 10 codices. Sir Frederic very kindly informs me by letter (May 15, 1937), that he considers it safe to say that in the third century "Christian texts are predominantly in codex form, and that the few that can be assigned to the second are all codices."

"If I am not mistaken," says Dr. H. I. Bell,[38] "every second-century Christian manuscript yet found . . . is a codex; and the fact is the more remarkable because second-century papyri of pagan literature are almost, perhaps entirely, without exception in roll form. It looks as if Christians were the most potent influence in the substitution, eventually in the case of all books, of the codex, whether vellum or papyrus, for the roll." [39]

The earliest Christian codices, though fragmentary, show that Christians had begun to employ that form almost as soon as it appeared, early in the second cen-

[38] *Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri*, 1937, p. 24.

[39] I am indebted to my colleague Professor B. L. Ullman, author of *Ancient Writing and Its Influence* (New York, 1932), for directing me to Dr. Bell's inaugural address. Professor Ullman agrees that New Testament codices preponderate over classical ones in the early period.

tury, for the Rylands Library John and the British Museum gospel are not later than A.D. 150. This is a striking illustration not only of the early adoption of publication by second century Christianity but of the newest and most practical forms of publication—the new-fashioned codex. It has long been recognized by authorities like Maunde Thompson that Christianity made great use of the codex in the fourth century, but it is only the developments of the last three years that have shown us at how early a date they adopted the improved book form. They were enterprising men who carried the gospel so swiftly over the Greek world and employed the latest improvements in book forms to do it.

These latest discoveries in early Christian literature have shown us more than the texts they comprise. The form in which those texts were presented is quite as eloquent. For the Christians who so readily adopted and applied the new codex form in their religious work were evidently no strangers to publication. The development of the book form found them already well embarked upon book publication. Only ten or twenty years before they had collected and put in circulation the four gospels, and some years before that, the letters of Paul. These collections were unquestionably made for publication, and can be understood only in the light of a Christian leadership very much alive to the possibilities of publication for Christian missionary and educational

work. That the Christian leaders at the beginning of the second century were alive to them is shown by these earliest Christian codices. These show that they were already alert, resourceful and progressive, ready to take full advantage of improved methods of publication.

If we now consider the character of the Revelation of John, in the light of these facts, it becomes clear that it was written not simply to the seven churches nor even to all the members of those churches but to the wider Christian public of the province of Asia. One of the churches addressed was located in Pergamum, where parchment was virtually invented, and books were common. Ephesus itself had its great library. In the neighboring city of Priene, a few miles south of Ephesus, parchment and papyrus had been used two centuries before for public records.

It is moreover an interesting fact that the prophet especially condemns any alteration of his work.[20] He is well aware that it will be copied and wishes it to be unaltered. No one must add anything to his words or take anything from them.

That the Revelation was published is shown by the response made to it in I Peter, which is addressed to the Christians of the five great provinces of Asia Minor, over which it is assumed the Revelation had gone. Certainly I Peter is meant for publication, for how else

[20] 22:18, 19.

could it be delivered to the Christians scattered over Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia?

The Pastoral letters, designed to affect Christian practice "everywhere," [21] must have been published as a supplement to a new edition of Paul's Letters. The Chester Beatty copy of them was written probably about fifty years after the composition of the Pastorals. In short the Christian literature of the second century was in general written for publication, and published as soon as written. This is a fact of very positive significance for the understanding of its origin and of its influence. Indeed, the Pastoral letters have given us a hint of the new era in publication in which they arose, in the injunction, "When you come, bring . . . the books (biblia) and especially the parchments" (membranas).[22]

[21] I Tim. 2:8.

[22] II Tim. 4:13.

CHAPTER II

THE PLACE OF EPHESUS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

EPHESUS has been called the second fulcrum of Christianity after Antioch. Antioch had been the cradle of the movement. It was there that it began to address itself directly to Greeks, among whom its future was so largely to lie. It was there it seems that its adherents began to be called Christians, and that the movement itself was first called Christianity, for *Christianismos* meets us first in letters of Ignatius of Antioch—Magnesians, Romans, Philadelphians. Certainly the Greek mission had its first conscious beginnings in Antioch.

It seems to have been in Antioch that the Gospel of Matthew was written. The same strong emphasis upon Christian behavior and conduct marks the teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Epistle of James and the Epistle of Barnabas, all probably products of Antioch.

But Antioch was at arm's length from the center of the Greek world. It was on the periphery. Ephesus was at the center; one of those old Ionian cities of immemorial antiquity, facing the Ægean, opposite Athens, and busy with commerce by land and sea.

It must not be forgotten that those old Ionian cities had their literary past. Miletus had been the home of the natural philosophers, Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes. Over against them stood, ca. 500 B.C., some thirty miles north of Miletus, Heraclitus of Ephesus, the pessimistic genius, who saw in life nothing but change; you could not step twice into the same river, for other waters would be flowing about your feet. He has been called the first Greek writer to express his personality in his prose style.

At Miletus again arose in his time Hecataeus the logographer, that independent soul: "Hecataeus of Miletus thus speaks: I write as I think true." And then a little later, forty miles further south, at Halicarnassus, Herodotus, the father of history. All this was of course long past, if not forgotten, in Ephesus and Asia, in the first century, but there was a rich literary soil there, as well as a rich religious one.

Into these old seats of Greek life and thought came the new religious movement heralded by Paul and Apollos, and there it developed one of its most significant phases. It was almost as though the first Christian Publication Society arose in Ephesus. But of course it had no organized existence. There must have been something in the atmosphere of Ephesus, or in the personalities that most influenced the Christian groups there, that made Ephesus so conspicuously important not only in the writing of Christian literature—letters,

gospels, epistles, apocalypses—but in the promotion and circulation of Christian writings. Ephesian Christianity seems almost from the first to have had a unique sense of the value of the written word for Christian life, and a very practical and competent concern for the use of Christian writings, that makes us think of Erasmus and the Revival of Learning, or even of our own day. It is a curious fact only just emerging out of the past that it was Christian needs and genius that seized upon the codex or leaf-book form early in the second century and applied it to Christian uses; the earliest papyrus leaf-books are Christian books. We must not therefore think of these Christian founders as visionary, impractical men; some of them were certainly the very opposite. We may well remember that it was in Pergamum, eighty miles north of Ephesus, that parchment was first perfected as a writing material, in the second century before Christ, and it was in Priene, twenty miles south of Ephesus, that we first learn of its use along with papyrus for the city records.

It is a familiar fact that I Corinthians was written in Ephesus, and probably the letter to Corinth that had preceded it as well as that harsh regretted letter that followed. Of Paul's four letters to Corinth, three were composed in Ephesus. But we have an earlier glimpse of Ephesus than this. For even before Paul began his long ministry there, Priscilla and Aquila were settled at Ephesus and met Apollos when he came there. They

continued his Christian education and when he went on to Corinth gave him a letter of introduction to the Christians of Corinth.[1]

Our next glimpse of Ephesus in the New Testament is in the last chapter of Romans. That much debated passage, introducing Phoebe of Cenchreae to a score of Paul's old friends, seems definitely detached from Romans by the Ann Arbor manuscript which places the great doxology at the end of Chapter 15, thus removing the last obstacle to the view that Chapter 16 is a separate letter, addressed to some other group, probably the church at Ephesus. For the people we know in the group were last at Ephesus—Aquila, Prisca, Epaenetus —and where else would Paul have so many friends to greet as in the church where according to the Acts he had just spent more than two years? Where else would he know so well their church and household groupings? Where else would he have so many gladly acknowledged obligations for personal help and religious cooperation? Where else would Phoebe be so likely to be going from Cenchreae, the port on the Ægean side of Corinth, and so right opposite the port of Ephesus?

If these considerations prevail, we are at the outset personally introduced by Paul to no less than twenty-four leading figures in the Ephesian church by name, beside Rufus' mother and Nereus' sister. And what could be more natural if Phoebe is just crossing to the

[1] Acts 18:27.

city which Paul has so lately left? The very slight amount of instruction contained in the note is also readily understood if Paul has spent the last two years preaching and talking to these very people; he can only urge them not to be drawn away from the instruction they have been given.[8] Paul has just skirted the Ægean, and can say to them after visiting the churches on its shores, "Everyone has heard of your obedience." [9] All in all, we have a very delightful and extremely personal picture of the Ephesian church in Paul's letter of introduction for Phoebe of Cenchreae. In those days Christian men or women visiting a strange and wicked city —and Ephesus with its sensual Artemis cult was notoriously that—needed introductions to decent Christian people who would take them in and entertain them. Paul's many personal messages in this letter have been much discussed, but of course in effect he was introducing Phoebe to every one of these people, to their homes and their good offices, and so he must have smoothed the way immensely for her in Ephesus, whatever her errand there may have been. This practical aspect of all these salutations is sometimes overlooked in dealing with this little *epistole systatike*—letter of introduction —of which there are so many in the papyri. III John is such a letter, introducing Demetrius to Gaius, and such a letter was written as we have seen by the Ephesian Christians for Apollos when he left Ephesus for Cor-

[8] Vs. 17. [9] Vs. 19.

inth.[4] "As he wanted to cross to Greece, the brothers wrote to the disciples there, urging them to welcome him." Ephesus there introduced Apollos to Corinth; Corinth here introduces Phoebe to Ephesus.

The place of origin of Luke-Acts is a matter of much debate among scholars, but I cannot doubt that it was written in Ephesus, which would mean that its writer was at the time at any rate an Ephesian and was writing primarily for Ephesian readers. Consider first, the amount of space devoted in his second volume, the Acts, to Ephesus. Luke gives Ephesus more space than any other Greek church receives, and further, Paul's only extended farewell to any of his churches is the one to the elders of Ephesus.[5] This would be a strange proceeding in a work written in Rome or Corinth.

But if Luke-Acts is written in Ephesus, soon after A.D. 90, with that one work one-fourth of the whole New Testament came into being there. Luke-Acts is the most spacious, broadly conceived book in it—in two volumes, with a preface, dedication, and statement of purpose; magnificent in its grasp and sweep, swift in its movement, and immensely rich and varied in striking scenes and dramatic situations. Such a book could hardly arise except in a city or a circle with some literary understanding and appreciation, where there was an atmosphere favorable to the literary expression of Christianity.

[4] Acts 18:27. [5] Acts 20:17–38.

It is a very striking fact that in spite of Luke's great interest in Paul, he shows no acquaintance with Paul's letters, or any of them. This ignorance of Paul's letters on the part of Mark in Rome, Matthew in Antioch, and Luke in Ephesus, can only mean that they had not been collected and published when the first gospels and Luke-Acts were written. But immediately after, the Revelation of John, another work of the Ephesian circle, is so much influenced by them that its portal is formed by a very artificial corpus of letters to seven churches, prefaced by a general letter to all seven and manifestly patterned on the Pauline corpus with its letters to seven churches probably prefaced by a general letter, known to us as Ephesians. I Clement a little later shows the influence of Pauline letters as does I Peter. But the most commanding testimony is that of Ephesians itself, which though not written by Paul, is one of the first letters reflected in Christian literature, being used in I Clement, as Lightfoot long ago perceived. It shows the influence of every one of the nine genuine Pauline letters and must have been written in the presence of them all. I must not here repeat that argument, which seems to me to establish the existence of a collection of nine genuine Pauline letters soon after A.D. 90, and the composition of Ephesians as an encyclical introduction to the collection, to introduce it to wider circles of Christians.* This is why Ephesians reads so much like

* Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago, 1933), pp. 82–165.

a summary of Pauline doctrine, an overture to the larger Pauline literature, while at the same time it dwells on the supreme worth of Christianity, just then in danger of being undervalued, as Hebrews and the Revelation show. And if Luke-Acts had just awakened Christians to the world-wide character of their fellowship, what more natural than for Ephesians to set up the doctrine of one universal spiritual church, especially in opposition to the rising sects?

But what evidence have we as to the place of origin of this great corpus of Paul's letters, which was destined to have such influence in after times? In the first place, the kernel of it seems to have been Colossians-Philemon (Laodiceans). For the writer of Ephesians, while he knows all the nine letters, knows Colossians best, and uses most of its materials. This points to an Asian origin, certainly for Ephesians, and if it is written with knowledge of all the nine letters, to an Asian origin for the whole collection; that is, it was probably made in Asia. Of course, taken by itself it would suggest a Colossian origin for it. But Colossians and Philemon, supposing it to be the letter from Laodicea mentioned in Col. 4:16, would naturally be preserved together, since Paul himself had there directed each church to provide itself with the other letter. An Asian possessed of Colossians would naturally have Philemon also. Now it is a curious fact that anyone possessed of these two letters and in them the germ and suggestion of a collection of Paul's letters, might be guided to the

others in the corpus by the information contained in the Acts. Moreover the striking picture of Paul and his significance for Greek Christianity which Acts gives, would bring Paul's memory forward very impressively, though he had been dead for thirty years.

It is natural to think that it was the revival of interest in Paul that Acts would occasion, that led someone already possessed of Colossians-Philemon to undertake to find other letters of Paul, among the churches mentioned in the Acts. This again points to Asia, if as we have reason to believe Luke-Acts was written in Ephesus.

At Ephesus too, would naturally survive that little letter of introduction Paul had written for Phoebe of Cenchreae.[7] It would hardly do to stand alone under the name of Ephesus, beside the great letters to Rome and Corinth, and yet it could not be neglected. It would naturally be added to some larger item in the collection, to preserve and circulate it.

Certainly it is at Ephesus that the new collection is first reflected, in the impressive use made of it in the whole façade of the Revelation of John, a book admittedly from the Ephesian circle. It reflects as in a mirror, the whole literary novelty; a corpus, of letters, to churches, seven in number. The Pauline corpus has always contained letters to seven churches, though they are not always the same seven. Moreover, the letter

[7] Rom. 16.

corpus in the Revelation is preceded by a general letter to all seven of the churches, just as the Pauline corpus was probably originally preceded by the encyclical known to us as Ephesians.

It is tempting to reflect, as Dr. John Knox has done, in his *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul* (Chicago, 1935), on the possibility that it was that very Onesimus on whose behalf Paul had so courageously interfered in Philemon, who carried Colossians and Laodiceans (or Philemon) to Ephesus and later under the influence of the Acts made them the basis of the collection. Certainly what Paul really wanted of Philemon was to have him send Onesimus back to him to help him in his work, and this Philemon may have done. It is a curious fact that the bishop of Ephesus, of whom Ignatius says so much in his letter to the Ephesians, Chapters 1–6, is named Onesimus and that Ignatius plays upon this fact in writing to them. Paul's young friend would not be too old, as Lightfoot once thought, to be identified with this bishop, and Ignatius certainly speaks as though he were the same man. If so, and of course it is only a conjecture, he may very well have been the man who brought Colossians and Laodiceans to Ephesus. He is the likeliest man in Asia to have preserved them. These letters that had won him his freedom and his life work would have meant everything to him, and made him ready to respond to the suggestion Acts would bring him that among the other churches of Paul other letters

of his might remain. I have been tempted to suggest that Onesimus may even have been the author of Ephesians, though of course it must always remain a conjecture. Yet I am encouraged in it by the remark of Professor Burton Scott Easton that he has always felt that the writer of Ephesians must have had some direct personal contact with Paul.[8]

We have seen that the first New Testament pieces to emanate from Christian Ephesus were Paul's second and third letters to Corinth, known to us as I Corinthians and II Corinthians 10–13. In fact the first three of Paul's four known letters to Corinth were in all probability written in Ephesus. Our next glimpse of Ephesus is in Romans 16, the letter introducing Phoebe of Cenchreae to Paul's Ephesian friends. Our third is Luke-Acts, and our fourth the Pauline corpus. Our fifth is the great encyclical based upon it and written to introduce it, Ephesians.

The sixth is the Revelation of John, the work of the prophet of Ephesus, in exile on the Island of Patmos, off the Ionian coast. Its magnificent message of unfaltering faith in persecution is marred by the bitterness it manifests against the persecuting empire. "Gloat over her, heaven! and all you people of God." Ephesus was in danger of forgetting to love her enemies.

To this situation, with this unchristian attitude spread among the seven leading churches of the Roman prov-

[8] *Anglican Theological Review*, xvi (1934), p. 30.

ince of Asia, Rome replies with the nobly Christian message of I Peter, pointing a better way: "Love the brotherhood, be reverent to God, respect the emperor." The Revelation was the work of John, a Christian prophet, speaking on behalf of Christ himself. No wonder Rome in correcting John claims to be spokesman for Peter, the chief of the apostles. The letter is addressed to the Christians scattered over the five great provinces of Asia Minor, but we cannot doubt that Asia is the province chiefly before the writer's eye; indeed the whole comprehensive address may be no more than a not too pointed way of correcting Ephesus on a matter of vital importance, the Christian's attitude toward the Roman empire.

We are crediting Ephesus with great significance in those crucial times, but a strange circumstance early in the second century seems to clothe it with strong probability. It is the familiar story of Ignatius of Antioch, brought near there by his Roman guards who were taking him to Rome to suffer martyrdom in the Colosseum. He did not see Ephesus; his guards brought him first to Smyrna, some thirty-five miles north, where the bishop Polycarp did what he could for him, and representatives of the neighboring Christian churches came to greet the confessor on his way to death. From Smyrna he was soon taken on to Troas, where he disappears from our view.

But at Smyrna he wrote three letters to the churches

that had sent bishops or others to greet him, and one to Rome, and from Troas he wrote three others, two to churches and one to Polycarp at Smyrna. These seven letters are all we have from Ignatius. And is it not strange that he had written nothing before, while at peace in Antioch, and wrote nothing after on his further journey to Rome? From the great deep to the great deep he goes. It seems as though he came out of darkness suddenly into a white light in Asia, which he left just as suddenly when he left the shores of Asia behind. Why was Ignatius' literary activity confined to the few days, not over two or three weeks, he spent in the vicinity of Smyrna and Ephesus?

It cannot be doubted that he was moved to write by the Asian Christians who visited him, principally by Onesimus and Polycarp. We are confirmed in this impression by the fact that Polycarp himself immediately collected the letters and began to circulate them, our only piece from his own hand being his letter to the Philippians when he was sending Ignatius' letters on to them. There was evidently in the circle of Ephesus at that time a sense of the value of the written word that led them to demand of Ignatius these letters against docetism and for Christian unity, and then seized upon them and circulated them. It would even seem that Polycarp secured a copy of the letter to the Romans written while Ignatius was in Smyrna, for that letter seems to have formed part of the original collection,

not to have had an independent history.[9] Even if Ignatius wrote without Asian suggestion, it was certainly Asian Christianity that called forth his letters and Asian Christianity that collected and circulated them. That is, if any collecting was necessary. It is not at all impossible that Polycarp saw to it that copies were kept for him of the letters written in Smyrna; he probably had charge of the sending of them. Of the three written at Troas, two would come to him anyway, the one addressed to him and the one addressed to his church at Smyrna. Of the third, Philadelphians, he would probably secure a copy when it was sent from Troas; if not, he could easily get one from Philadelphia, which was only seventy miles east of Smyrna. The keen practical interest Polycarp took in the matter is shown by his own letter to the Philippians when he sent them copies of the Ignatian letters: "We send you as you asked the letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others which we had in our possession. They are appended to this letter." [10] The active cooperation of the churchmen of Smyrna and Troas is unmistakable in all this, for how else could a prisoner guarded by ten unfriendly Roman soldiers have accomplished the writing and despatching of these letters? The concern of Polycarp of Smyrna in this whole literary project cannot be questioned. His letter attests it, and itself forms an

[9] *Anglican Theological Review*, xii (1930), pp. 208–210.
[10] Pol. Phil. 13:2.

additional item in the Christian library which it is now evident church leaders in Asia were writing, assembling and circulating. We note that the Ignatian corpus was the third such collection Ephesus had produced.

The passage of Ignatius through Asia is set by Eusebius in A.D. 107, but modern scholars incline to put it somewhat later; 107 to 117 will certainly cover the time of it. In those very days the Christians of Ephesus were doing their supreme literary service to their religion; they were writing the Gospel of John. We must not pause to consider all that entered into the creation of that great work. It is enough to say that the writer of John was thoroughly at home in the Pauline literature; his is the one canonical gospel that shows the influence of Paul's writings. Dr. L. V. Moore's study [11] shows clear traces of the use of eight letters of Paul in the Gospel of John—all but Philemon, and one might detect a trace of Philemon in the words, "I do not call you slaves any longer . . . but friends," so reminiscent of Paul's words in Philemon, "That you might have him back forever, not as a slave any longer, but more than a slave, a dear brother."[12]

The marked literary interest and activity of Asian Christianity centering about Ephesus will help us to understand how such a gospel as John arose there, in an effort to restate Christian thought in terms that

[11] *The Use of Gospel Material in Early Christian Literature,* an unpublished dissertation.

[12] Vss. 15, 16, cf. John 15:15.

would be intelligible and acceptable to the Greek world. Christianity certainly had a rebirth in Ephesus. The author of John not only possessed the collected letters of Paul but he knew certainly two and perhaps three of the earlier gospels, that is, he made use of Mark and of Luke-Acts; as to his use of Matthew, scholars are less confident. And is it not time John was studied in the light of the Christian literary tradition and atmosphere of Ephesus?

To the same hand, and the same general period, ca. A.D. 110, belong also the letters of John. I John, it is true, has no epistolary salutations or farewells, but the frequent "I write" or "have written to you" (twelve times in all) shows its essential epistolary character, and its combination with II and III John, which are unmistakably letters, must always have marked it as a pastoral letter. For it is becoming clear that we must not approach the three Johannine letters, as we count them, atomistically but as a corpus, an epistolary unit. And how natural this would be, in a center like Ephesus which had already produced the Pauline collection of letters, the Revelation corpus of letters, and the Ignatian corpus of letters. There is no possible doubt of the Ephesian origin of the Johannine letter collection. Tradition has always recognized it as the work of John the Elder or presbyter of Ephesus, no doubt the famous one mentioned by Papias and after him by Eusebius. And at Ephesus certainly such a use of the letter-corpus form

would be altogether natural, as an additional device to resist the advance of docetism in Asia. We may remember that the letter corpus in Revelation is clearly an artificial one; no one supposes those letters to Ephesus, Smyrna, etc., had been really sent and had afterward to be collected from the several churches that received them. Each church received the other six letters, in fact the whole Apocalypse, with its own.

It is moreover most improbable that the tiny letters II and III John ever circulated by themselves; they are too slight in bulk and content. The curious fortunes of the "Epistle of John" in canon history are also significant here. It is a well-known fact that Irenaeus quotes I and II John as the Letter of John, which makes it very clear that he knew them as one, probably along with III John.

We have shown the part played by Ephesus and its near neighbor Smyrna, only some thirty-five miles away, in the development of early Christian literature to have been a very large and very significant one. We have seen that Phoebe's letter of introduction and the limited encyclical known to us as I Peter were addressed primarily to Ephesus; that at Ephesus, or in its circle, were written three out of four of Paul's letters to Corinth, Luke's two-volume work known to us as Luke and Acts, the encyclical letter we call Ephesians, the Revelation of John, the Seven Letters of Ignatius and the Letter of

Polycarp, and finally the Gospel and Epistles of John.

Just as striking is the contribution of Ephesus in the development of collections or corpuses of literature. The collected letters of Paul were soon followed by the letter collection of Revelation 1–3, and a few years later by the letter collection of Ignatius and the letter collection of John. It would seem that these were practical services to the Christian cause that could not be surpassed, and yet the final contribution of Ephesus was one that overshadowed not only any one of them but perhaps even all of them combined. It was the making of the Fourfold Gospel corpus, the grouping of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John into a single collection.

Here, it is true, we encounter stout resistance from no less an authority than Provost Streeter, who in his *Four Gospels* goes so far as to say, "The idea that the fourfold gospel canon arose in Asia . . . is one for which, so it seems to me, the evidence is non-existent" (p. 341).

Let us point out at the outset that it is difficult to find another early Christian circle in which such an act as the gathering of the four gospels into a group for publication and circulation together, would be as natural as the circle which had already done so much in that line and had such a record in the production of Christian literary collections. No such record can be made out for Rome, for example.

Let us observe, in the second place, that the motive of the collection seems clearly to have been not to provide a scripture of church authority for church use, but to win a wider hearing for the new Gospel of John, and such an effort is more naturally understood at Ephesus where that gospel had so recently been written than in other seats of Christianity like Rome, Corinth or Antioch. Concern for a wider hearing for the Gospel of John would be most natural in the city where John was written, where the circle that had witnessed its first publication ten or fifteen years before was still active. There we can understand the addition of the epilogue, Chapter 21, with its emphatic personal endorsement of the writer: "We know that his testimony is true." [18] To place the making of the collection anywhere else necessitates finding some other origin for the epilogue than the natural one, that it was added when the fourfold gospel was assembled. That is the real intimation of its last verse, declaring that if all the things Jesus did were written down, the world would not hold the books that would have to be written. That verse is really the finis of the Fourfold Gospel, not simply of the Gospel of John, which reached its proper finis in the last verse of Chapter 20, where the purpose of the writing of the Gospel is stated: "That you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life as his followers."

[18] 21:24.

But these are general considerations pointing to Ephesus as the birthplace of the Fourfold Gospel, and only serve to prepare the way for more definite and positive ones.

Let us offer as our first witness Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, who flourished in the province of Asia, in one of the three cities mentioned by Paul in Colossians 4:13—Colossae, Laodicea and Hierapolis. In the fragments of his *Interpretations of the Sayings of the Lord* preserved in Eusebius and others, Papias mentions Mark as the interpreter of Peter who had written up what he remembered from his discourses. It is generally admitted that he was referring to the Gospel of Mark. He also mentions Matthew, as composing (not necessarily writing) the Sayings in the Aramaic language which each one translated as well as he could. This difficult observation which I believe refers to the composing of the original oral gospel, nevertheless shows that Papias knew a gospel bearing the name of Matthew, although he also knew that what Matthew had really done was to compose the Oral Gospel that all Christians learned at conversion.

Papias is not only the first man to mention Mark and Matthew in connection with gospel making; he is the first man to do so before Irenaeus, ca. 180–189. That is, it is fifty years before any more definite information on this most vital matter comes to light in early Christian writing, and then what is said seems to depend chiefly

upon Papias. Papias' knowledge of Luke is revealed by his adoption of the Lucan account of the fate of Judas—that he swelled up after the manner of traitors and finally burst, like the villain Nadan in the Story of Ahiqar. Papias clearly understands Luke in this way; it is Luke's account he reflects, as given in Acts 1:18. Papias knew the famous daughters of Philip, who are mentioned in Acts 21:9, but that does not prove that he knew the Acts, for the daughters lived in Hierapolis. But his story about Barsabbas, also called Justus,[14] is a strong contact with Acts 1:23, where this man appears as an unsuccessful candidate for the vacant place among the apostles. Papias says that he drank a deadly poison and suffered no harm, which recalls the remark about drinking deadly poison which appears in the Long Conclusion of Mark, probably added to that gospel when it became a part of the Fourfold Gospel.

It is clear that Papias knew the Acts. He undoubtedly knew Luke too; the question is, did he know it as a part of the Fourfold Gospel? He seems to have known the Long Conclusion of Mark, and hence to have known Mark as a part of the Fourfold Gospel.

As to the Gospel of John, Papias is the original witness to John, the Presbyter of Ephesus, and may reasonably be assumed to have known the Ephesian gospel when he speaks so familiarly of the circle of original disciples there.

[14] Eusebius, *Church History*, 3:39:9.

Papias is certainly an Asian witness. Hierapolis, where he lived, was about one hundred and twenty miles east of Ephesus by road, and it must have been at Ephesus that he met most of the elder Christian disciples of whom he made so much. If John was written in Ephesus it cannot possibly have escaped his inquiring mind. In fact, tradition makes him a disciple of "John the evangelist, the theologian," and even the scribe to whom he dictated his gospel. This legend would not be worth mentioning, if it were not that Papias' work seems to be lost, and so everything tradition has to say about it assumes importance. It would seem that Papias must have made some pretty definite references to it to have given rise to such a tradition in a ninth century Vatican manuscript and the Greek Catena on John.[15] Philip of Side also says that Papias said that some held II and III John to be the work of the Elder, not the Evangelist, and that was why the ancients accepted only first John; showing that he knew the Johannine letters as well as the gospel.

Dr. Lloyd V. Moore in his unpublished dissertation, *The Use of Gospel Material in Early Christian Literature,* p. 263, holds it to be "quite certain that Papias had the fourfold gospel corpus."

These meager gleanings which have a strange way of always being on the verge of something very exact, definite, and portentous, make us wish more than ever

[15] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers,* pp. 524, 535.

that someone would find Papias' lost work, which was still extant at Stams and at Nimes in France in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In some corner of the East, it must still await the skilled eye of discovery in Greek or Latin, and what a contribution it will make when it is found to all this area of our knowledge, especially in this very immediate matter of the work of the circle of Ephesus to which Papias himself belonged, in the very days of Polycarp of Smyrna, who lived, it will be remembered, to be martyred in A.D. 155.

Another ancient witness to the Fourfold Gospel is the Gospel of Peter, known to us chiefly through the Akhmim fragment found by Bouriant in 1887 and published in 1892. This is a distinctly docetic document, the first one known, and docetism, so far as we know, appeared first in Asia, in the circle of Ephesus, in the first decade of the second century, for it is first reflected in the Gospel and Letters of John and in the Letters of Ignatius, which oppose the doctrine. So it is not unnatural to place the origin of the Gospel of Peter in Asia, and it becomes a second Asian witness to the Fourfold Gospel.

A third witness to the Fourfold Gospel is the Epistle of the Apostles, a work written about A.D. 150–160, the origin of which Carl Schmidt locates in Asia Minor, making it in the larger sense an Asian witness.

A fourth Asian witness is Justin Martyr. Justin was a native of Flavia Neapolis, the modern Nablous, in

Palestine. He visited various philosophical schools, but became a Christian about A.D. 133. He was at Ephesus about 135 and there is laid the scene of his debate with Trypho, which forms the subject of his famous Dialogue, written some twenty years later, at Rome. In his Apology, written at Rome soon after A.D. 150, he says that at Christian meetings, held on Sundays, the Memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read.[16] He elsewhere defines the Memoirs of the Apostles as gospels,[17] and says that they were composed by the apostles and those who followed them.[18] He makes unmistakable use of Mark when he speaks in Dialogue 106:3 of the change of one disciple's name to Peter, and of the conferring of the name Boanerges upon the sons of Zebedee—a fact reported only in Mark 3:16, 17. Indeed, Justin says this is recorded in "his," meaning Peter's, "Memoirs." Many other statements in Justin reflect the Gospel of Mark, but this one clear proof is enough.

Justin never mentions Mark, Matthew or Luke by name, or speaks of John as an evangelist. But he quotes Matthew 17:10–13 in Dialogue 49:5: "And it is written, 'Then the disciples understood that he spoke to them about John the Baptist.'" Equally convincing is the use of Matthew 11:12 in Dialogue 51:3; of Luke 20:35, 36, in Dialogue 81:4; of John 3:3, 5, in Apology 61:4; and of John 1:14 in Apology 63:15.

[16] Apol. 67:3. [17] Apol. 66:3. [18] Dial. 103:8.

As a matter of fact there is a mass of such evidence. The express mention of Mark under the name of "Peter's Memoirs," the quotation of Matthew as scripture (with the formula, "it is written"), the frequent references to the Logos, and to Jesus as Logos, combine with Justin's description of the gospels as composed by the apostles and those who followed them to show that he has the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The statement that the gospels (Memoirs of the Apostles) are read in church on Sundays, also shows unmistakably that a definite group of gospels was so employed.

It may be that Justin also knew the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Peter; there are slight traces of gospel material in his works that may be so explained. It is the slightness of these traces that is significant, compared with the quantity of material from Matthew, Mark, Luke and John that his works disclose. We may conclude that in Rome about A.D. 150, the Fourfold Gospel was already read in church. That this was Justin's Gospel corpus is confirmed by the fact that it was just these Four Gospels that his pupil Tatian twenty years later incorporated into his Syriac Diatessaron.

But obviously it must have taken some time, a dozen or twenty years, for this gospel collection to have made such a place for itself in Christian use. This would accord entirely with what we have already seen in Papias' use of the same group of gospels in Hierapolis in Asia

from ten to twenty years before. In fact the evidence of Papias, Justin, the Epistle of the Apostles, and the Gospel of Peter all points to the origin of the Fourfold Gospel in Asia not later than A.D. 125. Justin wrote at Rome but he came there from Ephesus and probably formed his Christian habits and his Christian library in the province of Asia where he was converted.

The early date of the gospel corpus has been strikingly confirmed by the recently discovered gospel fragment in the British Museum, a manuscript which its editor assigns to a date not later than A.D. 150. While he thought it might actually be a source of John, it has been recognized by New Testament scholars as simply another document based on the Fourfold Gospel. That gospel collection must therefore be pushed back to an origin long before A.D. 150, if this new gospel was based on the collection and copied into this manuscript by A.D. 150, the date assigned by papyrus palaeographers to the British Museum fragment.

These four witnesses to the Asian origin of the gospel collection of course find strong corroboration in the record of Ephesus as a maker of similar literary collections, as we have seen; and in its positive interest in the promotion of the Gospel of John, which was of Asian origin. The difficulty of explaining the Epilogue as written in any other Christian center is also obvious.

It may be regarded as a conservative judgment that

the Fourfold Gospel collection was formed in the circle of Ephesus and not later than A.D. 125, for the purpose of winning a wider hearing for the Fourth Gospel.

With it, the great contribution of Ephesus to Christian literature reaches its zenith. If this survey is sound, Ephesus and its circle had in a single generation produced or witnessed the production of three of the four letters to Corinth, Luke's two-volume work known to us as Luke-Acts, the Epistle to the Ephesians, the Revelation of John, prefaced by a collection of letters to the Seven Churches; the letters of Ignatius, the Letter of Polycarp, the Gospel of John; and the collection of the Pauline, Ignatian and Johannine letters, and of the Four Gospels—certainly a stupendous record. The works written in Ephesus or in the Ephesian circle, form more than half the New Testament, and of the contents of our New Testament, all but the pastoral letters to Timothy and Titus and the Catholic letters of James, Jude and Peter passed through these skilled Ephesian hands. With them seems to have originated the Christian fashion of publishing collections of writings—first letters, Paul's, John's, Ignatius', John's again —and finally, gospels. And it was these collections that paved the way for the making of the New Testament, half a century after the last Ephesian corpus was made. Ephesus did not make the New Testament: it was Rome that did that. But Ephesus wrote more than half its eventual contents, and it formed the great col-

lections of materials—letters and gospels—out of which it principally arose.

So for one momentous generation, Ephesus was the literary focus of early Christianity, and by its compositions—three letters to Corinth, Luke-Acts, Ephesians, Revelation, the Gospel of John, the letters of John; and by its compilations—the Pauline, Ignatian and Johannine letters and the four gospels—influenced Christianity more than Jerusalem, Antioch or Rome.

CHAPTER III

A NEW ORGANIZATION OF NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

WE HAVE traced the service done to the Christian movement by the circle of Ephesus in the writing of great books and not less in the forming and publishing of collections of such books, and the promotion of their influence among the churches. The first of these collections was that of the letters of Paul, a corpus which immediately began to exert a literary influence which has never since subsided. This collection was in sheer bulk longer than the Gospel of Matthew, and not much less than Luke's two volumes combined, and it grappled with the varied practical and intellectual problems of the young faith with an understanding and vigor that have never been surpassed. It was no wonder that it immediately made itself felt in Christian thinking, and began at once to influence Christian writers. This gives to the making and publishing of the collection the significance of a new work in the development of Christian literature, and demands for it a place in New Testament introduction. It would be difficult to name a book in the New Testament or anywhere else that has

had such striking and immediate literary effects as the published Pauline corpus.

For the separate letters of Paul seem to have had no literary influence at all; it was only in their collected and published form that they began to affect other Christian writings. This fact demands recognition for the *collection* as distinguished from the individual letters, in the study of early Christian literature, and in the science of New Testament introduction. Paul's personal influence had been great while he lived, and it continued after his death, though necessarily diluted and diffused as time went on. But with the publication of the Pauline corpus, he begins to exert a new influence directly upon Christian writers, through his assembled letters. With their publication a new force begins to operate just as really as though a new book had been written.

That genial historian, Professor Francis A. Christie, declares that when he took up his studies in the University of Berlin, many years ago, he attended the lectures of August Dillmann on Old Testament Introduction, *Anleitung in das Alte Testament,* and that for the first eight weeks Professor Dillmann lectured upon the question, *"Was ist Anleitung?"*

Introduction, first recognized by Michaelis a hundred and fifty years ago, has steadily claimed for itself more and more space from interpretation, until in modern commentaries it is not unusual to find more than half

the commentary volume devoted to it. In Mayor's *St. James,* there are 232 pages of introduction and 224 of commentary. So plain has it become that the determination of the occasion and purpose of the writing of the book is essential to its understanding.

The organization of the findings of introduction into volumes like Driver's on the Old Testament, and Holtzmann's and Jülicher's on the New, has developed a great and fruitful discipline. Let us survey some of these works, to learn upon what principles they have usually been planned and organized.

This may seem a dry and tedious procedure, and perhaps that is why we so seldom engage in it. Yet how otherwise can we form an impression as to the state of the science in this matter of organization, and satisfy ourselves that any improvement in that line is called for? So I ask you to run through with me briefly the plans followed in some few of the chief New Testament introductions since 1875, asking ourselves this question: What principle of organization has controlled the planning of the work? Let us take them up in the order of their publication, beginning with Hilgenfeld's introduction of 1875.

Hilgenfeld begins with 200 pages on the canon. He then takes up the letters of Paul, omitting II Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians. These are followed by Hebrews and Revelation. Then come Matthew, Mark, James, Luke, Acts; then I Peter, II Thessa-

lonians, Colossians and Ephesians; then the letters and the Gospel of John; and finally Jude, the Pastorals and II Peter. This is apparently meant for an arrangement based on chronological order of composition alone, a sound principle, certainly, though Hilgenfeld's application of it strikes the modern student with some surprise, as when he deals with Hebrews and the Revelation before Matthew, Mark, Luke and Acts.

Holtzmann's famous introduction (1885) begins with sixty pages on the text and about twice as much on the canon. After devoting two-fifths of his book to these two disciplines, he takes up the Pauline literature —Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, the Pastoral letters, and Hebrews. His second "chapter," is devoted to the historical books: the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, followed by Acts. Chapter 3 is entitled "The Johannine Literature," and treats Revelation, the Fourth Gospel, and the Johannine letters, but also the rest of the Catholic letters—James, I and II Peter and Jude. Chapter 4 deals with the New Testament Apocrypha—gospels, Acts, letters, apocalypses.

With all respect to the great master of Strassburg I must say this is a lumbering vehicle, however valuable the load it carries. It seems to set out to be chronological, with the Pauline letters first, but ceases to be so when it presents Hebrews and the Pastorals before the Synoptic Gospels, Acts and the Apocalypse.

Bernhard Weiss' introduction [1] consists of two parts and an "Anhang." Part I, of ninety pages, deals with the history of the Rise of the Canon; Part II with the history of the origin of the New Testament writings; and the "Anhang," of course is *Neutestamentliche Textgeschichte.* Disregarding Part I and the "Anhang," Part II begins with the Pauline letters—Thessalonians, Galatians, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Romans, Colossians (with Philemon thrown in), Ephesians, the Pastorals, and an "Anhang" on Hebrews. The second division treats the Revelation of John; the third, the seven Catholic letters; and the fourth, the historical books, Mark, Matthew, Luke, Acts, John.

How might these books be arranged? Canonically, for one way, the order of convenience of reference. But since that is abandoned, as not sufficiently scientific, something adequate should be devised and put in its place. One might proceed in a strict chronological order, the order of the writing of the books; or in the order of the subject matter, if it reveals one; or one might arrange the material in literary groups, letters, gospels, histories, epistles, homilies, apocalypses; or by writers, actual or reputed. Here is involved also the purpose of the book, whether it is to be read through continuously, or merely consulted on this or that item. But a principle of organization should be determined upon and consistently followed. Certainly any book,

[1] *Lehrbuch der Einleitung,* 1886.

not alphabetically organized, like a dictionary or an encyclopedia, ought to repay continuous reading from beginning to end; otherwise it becomes a mere miscellany.

Jülicher's work, first appearing in 1894 and often revised and reprinted, opens with the genuine epistles of Paul, Thessalonians to Ephesians; then takes up the Deutero-Pauline epistles, Hebrews and the Pastorals, then the Catholic epistles. Having thus disposed of the epistolary literature, he devotes Book II to the apocalyptic literature, the Revelation of John. Book III then deals with the historical books, first the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, in that order; then the Gospel of John; and then the Acts of the Apostles. A second part is devoted to the history of the canon, and a third to a history of the text. This arrangement cannot fail to strike the modern student as confused and disorganized. It is certainly not canonical, but is it historical? Is it chronological? A treatment that deals with the Revelation before it deals with the gospels, and treats Acts after John, certainly leaves much to be desired. It is not traditional, nor does it, on the other hand, profess to present the books in the order of their composition, though in treating Paul first it leans strongly in that direction. In fact it reflects no single definite principle of arrangement, faithfully followed through. It betrays, in short, that weakness in the organization of material that has affected so many Ger-

man works of great learning and in many respects of great value—such as for example Leipoldt's invaluable work on the canon.

Of course we all know perfectly well that the various books of the New Testament are rooted in one another; sometimes a book has roots in two or three or even nine, ten or eleven others. Is this then a matter of no concern to the introductionist and the interpreter? Of course it is of the utmost concern to them both; it is indispensable. Yet we go on treating these books in this mechanical atomistic fashion, as though it did not matter whether Acts came next to Luke, or Revelation before I Peter. Genetic relationships are disregarded.

Theodor Zahn in his massive introduction, published in 1899 (English from the third German edition, 1909), begins with James. Then follow the Pauline letters, from Galatians to Philippians (Galatians, Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians); then "the last three letters of Paul" (Timothy, Titus); then I, II Peter, Jude and Hebrews; then the first three gospels and the Acts, and finally the writings of John—Gospel, Epistles, Revelation. Of course it seems to me quite impossible to understand I Peter before Revelation and Hebrews. But the organization seems to be mainly chronological in intention, though with some regard to types of literature.

Professor Bacon's useful and stimulating introduc-

tion of 1900 begins with the Pauline letters, in the Baconian order, Galatians, Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, Philemon, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians. In the next chapter, the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews are treated. Next come four Catholic Epistles, I Peter, James, Jude, II Peter; then the historical books, Matthew, Mark, Luke-Acts; then the Revelation and the Letters of John, and finally the Gospel of John. One can only hope that no one will read the book in this order.

Von Soden's book on the writings of the New Testament (1904, English translation, 1906) falls into four main parts: St. Paul, the Gospel literature, the Post-Pauline literature, and the Johannine literature. The defects of this organization are evident at once. Under St. Paul, Soden treats eight letters which he accepts as Pauline, omitting II Thessalonians. Under the Gospel literature he treats Mark, Luke, and Matthew. Under the post-Pauline literature, he discusses the Acts, Hebrews, I Peter, Ephesians and the Pastorals, with an appendix on II Thessalonians; under the Johannine literature, the Revelation, II and III John, I John, and the Gospel of John. We glimpse a principle of arrangement here, though it is most imperfectly applied. It was right to begin with Paul and follow with the gospels of Mark, Luke, and Matthew, in what Von Soden considered their chronological order. But of course this severed Acts from Luke, leaving both more difficult to

explain or understand—while treating the Revelation after the Pastoral letters, Hebrews and I Peter was thoroughly artificial. The final appendix on James, Jude and II Peter fairly beggars explanation, except that Luther's Bible, we remember, puts James and Jude after Hebrews and before the Revelation, at the end of the New Testament as a kind of New Testament apocrypha. Any principle that may have guided Von Soden in arranging the first half of his book was certainly altogether abandoned in the second. He has neither been canonical, chronological (in subject matter), chronological (in composition), or literary—either in the sense of grouping the works of one writer together (such as Luke), as he does those of Paul, or in that of grouping examples of the same type of literature together. And though he treats Luke and Acts in different parts of his book, he frankly recognizes that they are simply two volumes of one larger work, which leaves us more befogged than ever.

Moffatt in his great introduction, first published twenty-five years ago, is a good deal more intelligible. He begins with the correspondence of Paul: Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians. Then comes the historical literature: Mark, Matthew, Luke and Acts. Chapter three is entitled Homilies and Pastorals—I Peter, Jude, II Peter, Ephesians, Timotheus and Titus, Hebrews, James, II and III John. Chapter four is the Apocalypse of John,

a good deal out of place chronologically, one would think, for it is more ancient than anything except Ephesians in Chapter three. For Chapter five even the resourceful Moffatt could think of no name, so it stands without one, dealing with the Fourth Gospel and I John. A good deal of what is included in Chapter three is, of course, later than either of these works, and the whole unmistakably exhibits the confusion incident to trying to present the material now in chronological order of composition, and now in quasi-literary groupings, guided by the type of literature to which the document belongs. The old German weakness of disorder seems in fact to have followed their science of introduction into the English world. Can it be escaped?

The best of the recent introductions is no doubt that of McNeile of Dublin, which appeared in 1927. He treats first the Synoptic Gospels—Mark, Matthew, Luke—and the Synoptic Problem; then the Acts; then the Epistles of St. Paul—Thessalonians I and II, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and finally Philippians. A chapter on the Pastorals follows. The General Epistles and Homilies come next—James, I Peter, Hebrews, Jude, II Peter, the Revelation. Finally the Johannine Gospel and Epistles are discussed. I pass over concluding chapters in this and some other introductions, on canon and text, as these are seldom adequate. Generally speaking it would be well for introductionists not to try to dispose of

intricate disciplines like text and canon so lightly, as appendices to their introductions, unless they are prepared to gird up their loins and go at the business with greater industry. It is hard to find a single, unifying principle of organization running through McNeile's often admirable book. He seems to have followed the English Bible for his main masses, from the gospels to the Revelation, trying to be chronological within his groups and in putting the Johannine literature last.

Professor Ernest F. Scott in his *Literature of the New Testament* (1932) does not undertake much grouping of the documents. His order of treatment is Mark, Matthew, Luke, Acts; then the letters of Paul—Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, Philippians. He gathers the Pastorals into one chapter. Then follow Hebrews, James, I Peter, Jude and II Peter; the Fourth Gospel, the Epistles of John and the Revelation. He is clearly following the canonical order in the main—Gospels, Acts, Paul, Pastorals, Catholics, Revelation—modifying it by chronology within the various groups, and transferring the Gospel of John to a position with the Johannine letters.

Dibelius' *Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (English translation, 1936), includes more than the New Testament of course, as its name implies: apocryphal gospels, acts, epistles, apocalypses. Apart from these the order is: Mark, Matthew,

Luke, John; the Revelation of John (accompanied by the Revelation of Peter and Hermas); then the Pauline letters—Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon (followed by Ignatius and Polycarp); then treatises, sermons and tractates: Ephesians, I Peter, I Clement, Hebrews, Barnabas; II Clement; Jude, II Peter, I, II and III John. James is treated with the Didache and the Twelve Commandments in Hermas. Last come the Acts, canonical and apocryphal.

This at least yields an intelligible principle; the arrangement is by types of literature—gospels, apocalypses, letters, treatises, exhortations, acts. It is unfortunate to separate Luke from its companion volume Acts, putting one volume in the first division and the other in the last, although they were unquestionably produced together. But an organization by types of literature is intelligible and helpful.

What we have shown for these excellent handbooks is true for practically all the others. But it is the purpose of this lecture not so much to lament this fact, as to inquire for a remedy. Does the literature of the New Testament reveal no clear pattern, no sweep of movement in its rise? Must its books be always so arbitrarily treated? Is there no broad literary principle that may reduce these reluctant units to a new and significant order?

I was long ago struck by the fact, which others had

observed and pointed out, that Mark, Matthew and Luke-Acts show no trace of acquaintance with the letters of Paul. Upon this fact New Testament scholars generally agree. Of course those letters were all written long before the first of our gospels was produced. How was it that they were unknown to the evangelists? Evidently because they had not been collected and published when Mark, Matthew, and Luke-Acts were written.

But immediately after the publication of the two-volume work known to us as Luke-Acts, all is changed; now everyone seems to know Paul's letters, and not just this one or that one but all the genuine ones we know, that is, the whole of the primary canon of them, from Thessalonians to Philippians and Colossians. The Revelation shows acquaintance with the whole corpus of letters to seven churches with an encyclical introduction, and actually imitates it, in Chapters 1–3. Hebrews palpably imitates the Pauline letter type so successfully that all the great Alexandrians thought it was actually written by Paul; I Peter is perplexingly Pauline, until we recognize that it was written in imitation of Paul; I Clement quotes Paul's leters explicitly, and shows acquaintance with at least four of them. Ignatius knows six, Polycarp knows six—but not the same six—and Ephesians, the only addition made by the collector-publisher, shows use of all the other nine.

The only natural and reasonable explanation of these

facts would seem to be that between the publication of Luke-Acts and the writing of the Revelation, the letters of Paul were collected and published.

Professor Easton, it is true, declares that "it is highly likely, to be sure, that any disciple of Paul's knew Romans, I and II Corinthians, and less probably Galatians." [2] But this conjures up a strange picture: all the disciples of Paul possessed of these three or four great letters but all absolutely mute about it, so that Mark, Matthew and Luke are all kept in ignorance of them and their contents. One would think a follower of Paul who had these three or four great letters, would have let their worth be known; the churches needed their message; and *how* a thousand or so of his followers could have kept the secret for thirty years, and kept it so well from Antioch to Rome, is almost as hard to understand as *why* they should have done so. The problem is much more difficult than most students of the New Testament realize. Certainly the old traditional idea that the Pauline letters leaked into gradual circulation is inexorably negatived by the ignorance of the Synoptists of any such literature, even in Ephesus as late as A.D. 90. The united testimony of Matthew, Mark and Luke puts the matter beyond peradventure; when they wrote, the letters of Paul had disappeared from Christian consciousness. Certainly some of them still existed, in old files, or church chests, but they were not

[2] *Anglican Theological Review* xvi, (1934), p. 31.

present to the current life and thought of the church from 65 to 90. They were forgotten.

Imagine a Christian of the Roman province of Asia, perhaps of Ephesus, reading with delight the newest Christian book, Luke's account of the beginnings of Christianity. Here is not only a new picture of Jesus, but the only account this man has ever read of the pioneer of the Greek mission, the apostle Paul. And much as we may criticize Luke's account of Paul, it remains the one ageless, inimitable, unforgettable story of the great apostle. However much we may pore over the Pauline letters, Paul is still for most of us the Paul of Acts; converting the jailer at Philippi, lecturing the Areopagus at Athens, threatened by the crowd at Ephesus, facing the mob at Jerusalem, reasoning before Agrippa at Caesarea, cheering his companions in shipwreck.

Consider the impression such a book must have made upon any Greek Christian who read it. And suppose one such reader had in his possession a letter or two by Paul, written long before to churches in Asia, Colossae and Laodicea, and brought together in the church chests of both places by Paul's express wish: "Have it [this letter] read to the church at Laodicea also, and see that you read the letter that is coming from there." [3]

Any of us today reading a great biography of some one whose life has in some way touched our own, might look up and say, "Isn't there an old letter of his up in

[3] Col. 4:16.

the attic?" In some such way an Asian reader of the Acts would think at once of these half-forgotten letters, Colossians and its little shadow, Laodiceans, which we call Philemon, and then think, "If Paul really went to all these places Luke tells about, he may have written them letters too; they may still have them. I will write and see!"

For it is a curious fact that a man possessed of Colossians and Philemon might have been guided to all the other letters in the Pauline corpus by the information contained in the Acts; but a Roman or Corinthian reader of Acts would never have been guided by that book to Colossae or Laodicea. Those places are never mentioned in it.

And once found, what a revelation they were! No wonder their finder burst forth into enthusiastic praise of Paul's insight into the secret of Christ, made known to him by revelation.[4] Of course it was revealed through holy apostles and prophets, like Paul. He must awaken the churches to the worth of these forgotten letters, and introduce them to Christians everywhere, so that all the churches may profit by the discovery of this great spiritual inheritance. So arose Ephesians, originally of course an encyclical letter to all Christians, showing them the values of these old letters, uniting them in a great spiritual fellowship, the church invisible, and urging them all in the consciousness of this unity

[4] Eph. 3:3, 4.

to maintain it against the encroachments of the sects.

It is interesting to note that the Ann Arbor papyrus of Ephesians, copied about the end of the second century, has no place-name in 1:1, confirming the testimony of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts that Ephesians was originally a general letter, to Christians everywhere. Jülicher has wondered in what circumstances such an encyclical in Paul's name can have been composed. But the evidence supplies the answer: it was composed when the Pauline letters were discovered, and was written on the basis of all of them, to introduce these special messages, written long before to local churches about personal problems, to the wider Christian public which might learn so much from them.

It is hardly too much to say that in the short interval between the publication of Luke-Acts and that of the Revelation, the Pauline letters were collected and published, and that whereas before no Christian writer seems to have known them, after that every Christian work that was written was written in their conscious presence. The making and publishing of this collection was for Christian literature an event as important as the *writing* of most books in the New Testament; it had a prodigious place and part in the development of that literature. Although most writers on introduction do not even observe it, it puts in their hands a most useful control, for it is difficult to know the Pauline letters

without showing it, and any document showing knowledge of them reveals its date as later than the making of the collection.

More than this; the literature that followed the Pauline corpus was mostly written actually in *imitation* of it, or reaction from it.

First as *letters:* Revelation, with seven letters to churches, Hebrews, I Clement, I Peter, Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas, Jude, II Peter, the letters of John, the Pastorals. Even James had to be made into a letter, to be suitable for circulation. A whole shower of "letters" was precipitated upon the early church in consequence of the appearance of the collected letters of Paul.

Of course these were not really letters at all; they were treatises, for immediately upon the great impression made by the Pauline letter type, a composite derived from the published corpus of his letters suddenly emerged as the ideal form of Christian instruction. Deissmann long ago pointed out that Paul's were really letters; these others were what we call epistles, written in imitation of Paul's letters. It is from his published letters that they derived their form. This suggestion first offered by Deissmann forty years ago has never been taken full account of by writers on New Testament introduction.

But the imitation goes further than the individual letter. The Pauline corpus suggested other corpuses. First, of course, the very strikingly imitative one that

begins the Revelation; a general letter to the seven churches, and then special messages to each of the seven.[5] Then the Ignatian corpus, of seven letters, plus Polycarp as a covering letter. Then the Johannine corpus, of three, one general, one to a church, and one to an individual. Then the Pastoral corpus, of three. Here are no less than four corpuses of Christian letters, to churches or individuals, all of them more or less influenced in thought or language or both, but above all in organization as a corpus, by the Pauline collection.

It will be seen at once that the importance of the Pauline collection for our approach to the New Testament books written after its appearance is enormous. They were all written in the presence of it and they must all be studied in the light of it.

It constitutes in the first place a control by which they can to a certain extent be dated; all the books that show Paul's literary influence are later, not simply than Paul, but than the publication of the Pauline corpus.

It constitutes a pattern which they more or less sought to follow. This explains why I Peter and Hebrews are so Pauline.

It corrects our atomistic approach and gives us the pattern for the letter-collections, which arose not by assembling originally scattered individual letters, but by being written as wholes, like all that have been men-

[5] Rev. 1–3.

tioned: Revelation, Ignatius, John, the Pastorals. Without the Pauline corpus for a model, these groups remain unexplained. After a certain point, the history of New Testament literature becomes a history not of units but of collections.

The gospel type, of course, has its followers, like the author of the Gospel of John. But it is of importance that it was not until the gospel type had been given a published pattern in the collected Fourfold Gospel, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, about A.D. 120–125, that gospels began to be numerous—Hebrews, Egyptians, Peter, James, Thomas, etc. The gospel-making movement ran a course similar to that which the epistle-making movement ran. Only when a collection of such documents was made and published did the gospel-type begin to develop rapidly and profusely. Even then, the gospels produced never equalled in number the letters and epistles produced and published.

It is strange that so little attention has been paid to the part played by publication in the life of the early church and the development of early Christian literature. But, as we have seen, books were published then just as they are now, and there was just about as much difference then as now between a private letter *written,* and such a letter *published.* Printing has greatly multiplied the copies circulated, that is all. Publication is not a modern but an ancient development, a fact that needs to be brought plainly before writers of New Testament

introduction, for the light it sheds on their field of inquiry.

In short, the collection and publication of the Pauline letters is a fact of independent importance for New Testament introduction, demanding a place and treatment in that discipline, as to a very large extent conditioning and shaping the literature that followed. Apart from this fact that literature cannot be fully understood and evaluated, or intelligently organized.

The later half of the New Testament and indeed the bulk of early Christian literature can be, to a large extent, genetically charted, as one book springs from or rests upon another. The early Christian world was, numerically speaking, a small world, kept in more or less close personal touch by its hopes and fears and its hospitalities. Its original literary poverty would lead to a rather general circulation of what few books it produced at first, so that we may expect these to operate upon those that followed them.

What then are the broad lines of early Christian literature's development? First, of course, in its non-literary period, when the end of the age was momentarily expected—no books at all, only the personal letters of one great missionary to his little churches. Like all real letters, these fell into the soil and disappeared. Presently came the first written gospel, written far away in Rome; soon followed by a fuller one, based upon it yet far surpassing it in religious usefulness, the Gospel of

Matthew. Strictly speaking, in Matthew the gospel-making movement reached its peak, for Luke and John are hardly gospels at all. Church history began soon after, with Luke's two-volume work in two *logoi,* or narratives. Its variation from the gospel type is obvious.

Almost at once, and I think in consequence of Luke-Acts, with its inimitable picture of Paul, the nine Pauline letters are assembled and published, prefaced with an encyclical introduction commending them to *all* the churches. A shower of letters to churches immediately follows—Revelation 1–3, Hebrews, I Peter, I Clement, written in greater or less degree in imitation of the Pauline letter type disclosed in the collection. All this literature is distinctly secondary in character; it is conditioned by the Pauline literature.

The recognition of the collection and publication of the Pauline letters (with the new Ephesians at their head), as a fact of early Christian literary history, at once clarifies its course and discloses the necessary literary background for the origin of those letter-epistles which are its chief problem. The approach to these epistles and epistle collections is greatly facilitated when it is recognized that the published Pauline corpus underlies them, and that they are in fact produced in imitation of it, whether as individual letters or as letter collections.

Such an approach introduces order into what we have shown is a most confused and unorganized field. The

broad lines of the literary development emerge as: first, the personal letters of Paul, then the gospels and gospel histories: Mark, Matthew and Luke-Acts. Only then are the Pauline letters assembled and published; to be followed by a considerable imitative literature of letter epistles, imitating the letter form and even the letter collection form. This imitative movement continued for half a century and is one of the commanding features of the literature. Men with a religious message instinctively cast it, for the most part, in letter form, or even in the form of a letter collection.

This was in face of the fact that Christianity had only just originated its characteristic literary type, the gospel, perhaps the most effective type of religious literature ever developed. Yet with this great new type before them, in the Gospel of Matthew, Christian writers turn sharply back to the letter form for the expression of their religious messages and continue to do this predominantly for half a century.

The Pauline corpus is thus the rooftree of New Testament literature. It is the watershed, the great divide, of the New Testament continent. New Testament introduction must be rewritten in the light of it. The Pauline literature (the primary canon of Paul's letters) definitely conditions the whole development of the Christian literature that followed its publication. The influence of that *published* literature can be traced in document after document, and—what is most impor-

tant—they cannot be fully understood without the recognition of that influence. It is not Paul that is the background of the letter of James, it is the published Pauline literature. It is not Paul that has so influenced I Peter, it is the published Pauline literature. This dependence becomes articulate in II Peter, where Paul is definitely recognized as the Pauline *letters,* and these are numerous enough to be spoken of as "all his letters," and venerable enough to rank with scripture.*

It is time an unquestioned literary factor of such proportions was taken account of by introductionists. It is one of the most massive facts of early Christian literature, affecting canonical and uncanonical writings alike—Revelation, Hebrews and the Catholics just as much as Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp. It is a recognized part of introduction to explore the sources and influences that conditioned the several New Testament writers, and the collected Pauline letters were emphatically such a source and influence.

These facts are of great significance for their bearing upon the origin and meaning of Ephesians, and upon what proved to be the germ of the New Testament. I review them here for another significance they possess, as putting into our hands a principle for a new and better organization of the field of early Christian literature and especially of the science of New Testament introduction.

* II Pet. 3:15, 16.

It will be seen that in the recognition of the Pauline letter corpus we have worked through to a new, clarifying, revitalizing organization of New Testament introduction, which promises to weave its materials into an intelligible and illuminating historical sequence.

Chapter IV

NEW TESTAMENT TRANSLATION AND MANUSCRIPT DISCOVERY

THE TRANSLATION of the Bible into English is one of the great features of the English Reformation. But other elements than the needs of religion entered into that great movement. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 had scattered Greek scholars into Italy and western Europe and so made it possible to learn Greek, as it had not been before. The same catastrophe had also scattered Greek manuscripts and many of these found their way into western hands. It was the spirit of the Renaissance to revive antiquity, especially by printing its classics, and so through the coming of Greek scholars and of Greek manuscripts to the west of Europe, acquaintance with the Greek New Testament was made possible. For it must not be forgotten that for centuries Greek had been indeed a dead language in the west; that is, nobody could read it. Greek was first regularly taught in Oxford in 1491, and the first permanent provision for teaching it there was made in 1516.

It is a striking fact that just as the finding of Greek

manuscripts stirred publishers and translators in the days of Erasmus and Luther, so from age to age translation has been conditioned and stimulated by fresh manuscript discoveries. From the old Latin vulgate level, Erasmus, with his eight mediæval Greek manuscripts and his editions of 1516, 1519, 1522, etc., carried his generation forward to acquaintance with the New Testament in the original Greek, and opened the way for Luther's German translation of 1522, and Tyndale's English version of 1525. The translation movement begun by Tyndale culminated in the King James version of 1611. But soon after its appearance, the Codex Alexandrinus was brought to England in 1628, and further manuscript finds and textual advances kept translation interest alive for generations. They reached a new culmination in the dramatic emergence in 1859 of the Sinaitic manuscript, showing the way to a sounder ancient text. The English revision of 1870–81 followed.

The manuscript discoveries have continued unabated, and now the Greek papyri have come upon the scene to show the colloquial character of New Testament Greek, introducing the era of the modern speech translations now so prevalent.

So at each new stage of the process, some dramatic manuscript discovery has precipitated a new step in the progress of New Testament translation, revitalizing the old message and clothing it in new and compelling forms for the new generation. With what interest these

new forms are received can be gathered from the familiar fact that when in May, 1881, the first copy of the Revised New Testament reached New York, its entire text was published the next morning in two Chicago newspapers, the *Times* and the *Tribune;* and more recently some of the modern speech translations have been republished serially in daily newspapers, such has been the interest in the light they throw upon the text.

The first impulse toward Reformation versions of the New Testament seems to have come from Erasmus. In the Latin preface of his first edition of the Greek Testament, 1516, he said: "I would wish all women even, to read the gospel and the letters of Paul. I wish they were translated into all languages of all peoples, that they might be read and known not only by the Scotch and Irish but by the Turks and Saracens.[1] I wish that the ploughman might sing parts of them at his plough, and the weaver at his shuttle, and that the traveller might beguile with their narration the weariness of his way."

Erasmus did not indeed undertake the task of translation into modern languages himself, but he did do something else quite as heroic, he retranslated the New Testament into Latin. In the face of the overwhelming prestige of the Latin vulgate, which had been the Bible of western Europe for a thousand years, that was a

[1] In the University of Chicago copy of Erasmus' first edition, opposite these two revolutionary sentences a sixteenth-century hand has written the word "Lutheranizat" which may be translated, "He is a heretic."

bold step. And he pointed the way to the translation of the New Testament into contemporary tongues, in the words just quoted.

I do not know how long Luther may have planned his German translation of 1522, but I cannot escape the conviction that it was this great plea for modern translations into contemporary European languages that precipitated his version. Certainly in making it he used Erasmus' published Greek text of the New Testament, in the edition of 1519. After him came Tyndale, with his English New Testament of 1525, based on Erasmus' third Greek edition of 1522, which was the beginning of the English Bible as we know it.

It must not be forgotten that Wyclif and Purvey had produced an English Bible from the Latin vulgate in 1382–88, or that a German Bible had been made in Bohemia from the Latin vulgate long before Luther, and had been printed at least fourteen times between 1466 and 1522. But these were versions made from versions, and seem to have had little influence on the new era inaugurated by Luther and Tyndale. Indeed, Purvey's New Testament was not printed until 1731, while Wyclif's did not appear in print until 1848.

Luther's New Testament of 1522 was simply the first instalment of his Bible, the rest of which followed at fairly regular intervals, the last one, comprising the Apocrypha, appearing in 1534, when his complete Bible made its appearance. Luther's Bible was so good that

with it German Bible translation came to a full stop. It marked an end. Only lately have a few modern retranslations of the New Testament made their appearance in German, although Weizsäcker in 1874 had made a beginning in that direction.

But Tyndale's work was the beginning of a long movement. It was carried over with his Pentateuch into Coverdale's Bible of 1535, which was followed by Thomas Matthew's of 1537, the first licensed English Bible. That in turn became the basis of Taverner's of 1539, and was also revised by Coverdale himself, under Cranmer's patronage, in the same year, into the Great Bible, the first Authorized English Bible, "appointed to the use of the churches," as the title page of the second edition put it. So the English Bible at last displaced the Latin Bible on the lecterns of English churches.

The Puritan refugees at Geneva in 1557 produced a revised New Testament and in 1560 a revised Bible, divided into verse paragraphs after the manner of Stephens' Greek Testament of 1551. The Great Bible was again revised in 1568 by a number of bishops and deans organized by Archbishop Parker, and this second authorized English Bible divided honors with the Geneva, or Breeches, Bible,[3] until in 1604 King James called a conference of high and low churchmen at Hampton Court to consider, as the call quaintly put it, "things pretended to be amiss in the church." The revision of

[3] Gen. 3:7.

the Bible was not on the agenda for that meeting, but in the course of it up rose a university professor, John Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and moved that they retranslate the Bible. The king, who was in the chair, welcomed the suggestion, and said it ought to be done by the best learned in both the universities. So the King James Version of 1611 came into being, as a conservative revision of the Bishops', which in turn was a conservative revision of the Great, which rested back upon Thomas Matthew's Bible of 1537, which in turn owed so much to Coverdale's first printed Bible of 1535. That Bible had been the beginning of this great movement for an English Bible and an ever better one.

Meantime a great change had come over English. When Tyndale and Coverdale were laying the foundations of the English Bible, English was little thought of as a means for literary expression. Cultivated Englishmen like Sir Thomas More wrote their best works in Latin, in which tongue they knew they could address all the cultivated people of Europe. Latin was the language of school, and everybody who was educated knew it. It was that public that Erasmus addressed in his almost annual collections of letters ending in the *Opus Epistolarum* (1527), and in such works as the *Encomium Moriae* written in Sir Thomas More's house at Chelsea. It is strange to read that More's *Utopia* was written in Latin, and published in Louvain in 1516,

not appearing in an English translation until 1551, sixteen years after More's death. There seemed then to be no worthwhile reading public for English. But before the century ended it had witnessed the whole Elizabethan movement in English literature. Never was there a more complete overturn. From being not fit for literary use, English in a lifetime became the playground of literature, and its possibilities were fully explored by William Shakespeare. To this prodigious development, for which I know no parallel, the English Bible contributed in two notable particulars. It showed the literary possibilities of English; for if what Job and Isaiah had to say could be expressed in English, it ought to be adequate for such thoughts as sixteenth century literary Englishmen had to express; and so it proved. Second, the English Bible created or helped materially to create an English reading public worth writing for. On the other hand, the English Bible in turn profited greatly by the development of English in that century; the English of King James is a much richer language that was that of Coverdale.

The King James Version of 1611 is now widely misunderstood. Most people think it the first form of the English Bible; many think it verbally inspired, and do not hesitate to say so; some otherwise intelligent people actually think it is the original Bible! All these regrettable and really dangerous errors would be removed if it were still accompanied by the great preface, "The

Translators to the Reader," written by Myles Smith, Bishop of Gloucester, and intended by the translators to accompany their version. For a hundred years this preface has, with only the rarest exceptions, been systematically omitted by the publishers of the King James Bible, on various grounds, in the face of repeated protests from churchmen and scholars. It is refreshing to note that this very year the Cambridge University Press has issued a small edition of King James, including the Preface, and we are promised—what none of us perhaps has ever seen except in the Oxford reprint of 1911—a complete manual edition including both the Preface and the Apocrypha.

The King James Version was the third authorized English Bible, that is, Bible that might be used in public worship in the English Church. It has been repeatedly and most systematically revised—1615, 1629, 1638, 1743, 1762, 1769—the last time by Benjamin Blayney of Oxford. These revisions, always tacit, made thousands of small changes, especially in the direction of keeping the spelling abreast of the changing English practice. In Tyndale's day there were twelve ways to spell "it," all equally correct. In those days one spelled as one felt. Words like "sith" and "fet" and many others passed out of use, and were very properly displaced. All modern printings of King James represent the revision of Benjamin Blayney, Oxford, 1769.

This great movement for Bible translation and re-

vision had hardly reached its climax, however, when new manuscript discoveries began to arrest the attention of scholars. Erasmus had had but eight manuscripts on which to base his Greek text. Two were of the gospels, one of the eleventh and one of the fifteenth century. He is said to have expedited his edition by sending the later one to the printer. He said himself that his first edition was *praecipitatum potius quam editum*—rushed through rather than edited.

But in 1562 someone gave Theodore Beza the sixth century manuscript that bears his name, the codex of Beza, and this he in turn presented to the University of Cambridge, in 1581. It contained the four gospels and the Acts, in a very unusual text, but attracted less attention than a more extensive one that came later.

For hardly had the King James Version appeared when, in 1628, Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, presented to the King of England through his ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, the magnificent pandect known as the Codex Alexandrinus. It was a Greek Bible, of the fifth century. It was placed in the royal library, and had an extraordinary effect upon English textual studies. What followed is a supreme example of the effect of manuscript materials upon textual work. For the new manuscript aroused great interest in the Greek text of the New Testament, of the Septuagint, and of the Apostolic Fathers, for it contained I and II Clement at the end of the New Testament; in fact,

these were immediately published for the first time by the King's librarian, Patrick Young.

These are well-known facts. It is less well known that the presence of the great codex in London also aroused independent and capable scholars, sensible of the wide difference between these manuscripts and the text back of the English Bible, to retranslate the New Testament. So began that stream of private translations or revisions, which has ever since continued, forming what may be called a forgotten chapter in the history of the English Bible.

The first of these was that of W. Mace, London, 1729, which described itself as containing "the original text corrected from the authority of the most authentic manuscripts." In 1745 came Mr. Whiston's *Primitive New Testament,* from the pen of the redoubtable William Whiston, professor of mathematics in Cambridge, the successor of Isaac Newton, and the translator of Josephus. It was like this original genius to translate directly from the texts of the three leading Greek manuscripts known in his day, Alexandrinus at London, Beza at Cambridge and Claromontanus at Paris. Whiston's free and original way of doing things finally cost him his professorship.

John Wesley in 1755 produced his *New Testament with Notes, for Plain Unlettered Men Who Know Only Their Mother Tongue.* In 1796 Archbishop Newcome published at Dublin the New Testament in two vol-

umes, which he described as "an attempt toward revising our English translation of the Greek scriptures." In 1808 Charles Thomson of Revolutionary fame, the secretary of the Continental Congress, produced the first and only English translation of the whole Bible from the Greek, the Old Testament being done from the Septuagint version.

In the nineteenth century, private translators were careful to follow such advances in knowledge of the Greek text as were available. Abner Kneeland in publishing his New Testament at Philadelphia in 1823, followed the Greek text of Griesbach; as did Palfrey at Boston in 1830, and Samuel Sharpe and Edgar Taylor, in their versions in London, in 1840. Granville Penn in London, 1836–37, described his version as made with the aid of the most ancient manuscripts, unknown to the age in which the English version "was last put forth authoritatively."

Meantime the true position of the Codex Vaticanus at Rome was becoming clear, and Herman Heinfetter (F. Parker) published in London, in 1854, "A literal translation of the New Testament . . . from the text of the Vatican manuscript."

Movings toward the use of the emerging better text for translation purposes found expression in the work of five young Church of England men, between 1857 and 1861, when Alford, Moberly, Humphrey, Ellicott and Barrow produced translations of the Gos-

pel of John and six Pauline Epistles, foreshadowing the great revision that was to begin ten years later. Dr. Thomas J. Conant, who taught Hebrew in Rochester Theological Seminary in the fifties, and Dr. Asahel C. Kendrick, who taught Greek in Rochester in the University and the Seminary, in the sixties, were both active in the translation movements of their day, which were so numerous as to be practically continuous, maintaining an average of one a year from 1812 to 1900. Dr. Kendrick edited a revised New Testament in 1842, and Dr. Conant guided the editions of the American Bible Union in 1860, 1863, and 1871.

Tischendorf's discovery of the great Sinaitic manuscript in St. Catharine's convent in 1859 dramatized the whole matter of the new manuscript light on the true text, and this at once gave fresh stimulus to revision and retranslation. Tischendorf's published text was the basis of new translations by Robert Ainslee, London, 1869, G. R. Noyes, Boston, 1869, and Samuel Davidson, London, 1875, while Joseph B. Rotherham made his version from the text of Tregelles, London, 1872. The concern of these translators was clearly to keep the English version abreast of advances in textual study. In the same spirit, John Bowes in 1870 published at Dundee, Scotland, The New Testament, "translated from the purest Greek." It was the new wealth of manuscript evidence for the New Testament that was producing these new versions.

In 1870 Henry Alford published his revision of the New Testament, evidently as an experiment looking toward a full revision of the authorized King James Version. At the meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury, the southern province of the Church of England, in 1870, it was moved that they undertake the revision of the New Testament. The motion was amended to include also the Old Testament, and so the revision of 1881–85 began. It was largely a textual matter, for no one even thought of modernizing the phraseology. It was the new-found manuscript material reflected in new critical texts, Tischendorf and Tregelles, that had made revision inevitable. These had shown the wide deviation of the Erasmian text that lay back of the King James Version from the ancient text revealed in fourth and fifth century manuscripts and versions.

The strongly conservative attitude of the time to any modernization of Biblical language is revealed in the second of the principles of revision adopted by the sponsors of the undertaking. Their first principle, like that of the King James revisers, was to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version, consistent with faithfulness; the second was to limit their alterations as far as possible to the language of the King James and earlier versions. This necessarily made their English more antique than that of the version they were revising. But it was for the third principle that the revision was made: it was that

the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating. This was the forward step for which the private translations had so long been preparing the way and on which the American Committee went so much further than the English. Revisers had gone.

While Westcott and Hort were on the English New Testament Committee and faithfully submitted proof-sheets of their revised Greek text for the several books to the revisers, the Committee as a whole was far from accepting their text. Yet many classical and Semitic scholars unmistakably suppose that the Revised Version represents the Westcott and Hort text. As a matter of fact, the Revised New Testament came out a few weeks before the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament made its appearance, in 1881. And it cannot be too emphatically said that the Revised Version does not represent Westcott and Hort. That is an illusion comparable only to that other textual illusion that Westcott and Hort simply bowed down to the text of Codex Vaticanus and printed it; or as one classical scholar has recently put it, "Among the thousands of New Testament manuscripts they found but two that had preserved a relatively pure text . . . to defend two against two thousand is not only unscholarly but borders on the ridiculous." [8] This will strike anyone

[8] Henry A. Sanders in *Anglican Theological Review*, xvi (1934), p. 267.

familiar with Dr. Hort's discussion of textual method and history as a somewhat inadequate statement of his position and procedure. As a matter of fact, modern critical learning definitely declares Vaticanus better than he believed it; for example, in Acts 19:34 Lake accepts the repetition in Vaticanus of the cry of the Ephesians in the amphitheater, "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians, Great is Artemis of the Ephesians." [4] Dr. Hort dismissed the repetition as a mere dittography. And in James 1:17 the reading of Vaticanus-Sinaiticus, which Hort rejected as a scribal error, Ropes accepts as the true reading, and most scholars follow his judgment. In this important reading, which Hort singled out as the one unmistakable scribal error common to both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, there now seems to have been no error at all.

As a matter of fact, the Westcott and Hort text departs from that of Vaticanus in seven hundred readings in the gospels alone. Dr. Hort's favorable judgment of Vaticanus was not an irrational emotion but a deliberate decision based upon an extended comparison of its readings with others. Such a comparison led him to so good a judgment of that document that he felt increased confidence in its individual readings, especially when they were supported by some good uncial or version. Yet in many cases Weiss went beyond Hort in his esteem for the readings of Vaticanus. So it comes

[4] *Beginnings of Christianity*, IV, p. 249.

about that Nestle's text is not infrequently found following Vaticanus where Hort departs from it.

The position of Dr. Hort must also be defended from the representation of it given by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, that "it was the emphatic opinion of Hort that B had suffered no material contamination, whether by stylistic revision, or assimilation between parallel texts, or incorporation of extraneous matter." [5] But one of Dr. Hort's leading positions is that the text of Aleph and B both underwent precisely such incorporation of extraneous matter, in a whole series of interpolations, from which only the Western text remained free—the famous Western non-interpolations. So far was Dr. Hort from holding the extreme views as to Codex Vaticanus with which some distinguished textual authorities credit him. He believed it to be to an appreciable extent an interpolated text, definitely characterized by assimilation between parallel texts and incorporation of extraneous matter, such as: Mt. 27:49; Lk. 22:19, 20; 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52. His impressive list of Western non-interpolations, especially in the closing chapters of Luke, sufficiently acquits Dr. Hort of any such unreasoning devotion to Vaticanus as has been charged against him. Some also quite fail to report the enormous support Dr. Hort finds for his text in the evidence of groups of documents, so that Aleph-B are

[5] *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (Schweich Lectures for 1933), p. 82.

seldom left standing alone in support of a reading; and where they were so in Dr. Hort's day, the appearance of other ancient witnesses unknown to him have again and again given them strong support unsuspected by Hort, for which he could only have hoped.

"It must not, of course, be assumed to follow," says Dr. Hort, "that B has remained unaffected by sporadic corruption independent of the three great lines, Western, Alexandrian and Syrian. In the Gospel of Matthew, for instance, it has occasionally admitted widely spread readings of very doubtful genuineness." [6]

We have seen that Erasmus with his printed text of the Greek Testament gave the first impulse to New Testament translation from the original Greek, and that the notable manuscript discoveries of the nineteenth century so improved the knowledge of the more ancient text that the Revised Version was necessitated. Such discoveries did not by any means cease with 1881. In the fifty years that have since elapsed, scores of new witnesses to the ancient text have come to light, ancient versions—Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Armenian—have been more fully and critically edited and studied, and conjectural emendation, formerly denied any place in New Testament textual study, has been allowed a limited propriety.

In 1892 Mrs. Lewis found in the Convent of St. Catharine on Mt. Sinai, a manuscript of the Old Syriac

[6] *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, II, p. 150.

Gospels which gave us important light on the early history of the Syriac text. In 1906 Mr. Charles L. Freer of Detroit found in Cairo a fourth or fifth century manuscript of the Greek gospels, and a dilapidated manuscript of Paul almost as ancient. They were published by Professor Henry A. Sanders, and deposited in the Freer Gallery in Washington.

An amazing discovery of Coptic manuscripts—the Hamouli library—was made in 1910, when from various Arabs there came into the hands of dealers more than fifty Coptic codices, evidently all from the same find. These were reassembled as far as possible and fifty of them were secured by Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. Four have been identified in the Cairo Museum. Ten of them are Biblical texts, containing the first complete texts of some New Testament books that have come to light in the Sahidic, the oldest Coptic version. There are copies of the four gospels, the letters of Paul and the Catholic epistles. Altogether this Hamouli library promises to add much to our knowledge of the chief Coptic versions, the Sahidic and the Bohairic. A Sahidic manuscript of Acts, in the Chester Beatty collection in London, from about A.D. 300, was published in 1912, and a Gospel of John of the fourth century, in Akhmimic-Sahidic, was published in 1924.

Even these remarkable finds were eclipsed, however, in 1931, when Mr. A. Chester Beatty secured eleven Greek Biblical manuscripts on papyrus, of very early

date. The discoveries of Greek papyri in Egypt had already brought with them a considerable quantity of New Testament Greek manuscripts, mostly very fragmentary, but of very early date, ranging from the third to the seventh centuries. But the Chester Beatty manuscripts completely overshadowed these earlier discoveries in both age and amount.

Three were of the New Testament; a gospel and Acts codex, of thirty leaves, from the middle of the third century; ten leaves of the Letters of Paul, also of the third century; and ten leaves of the Revelation of John, from the later years of the same century. The other manuscripts, too, were mostly from the third century, though some were from the second, and some from the fourth.

Hardly had Sir Frederic G. Kenyon in 1934 published the ten leaves of Paul when Professor Sanders of Michigan in 1935 countered with thirty more from the same manuscript, which Michigan had secured. Meantime Gerstinger of Vienna and Ulrich Wilcken, the dean of continental papyrologists, declared their belief that the manuscript was older than its editors supposed, and came from about A.D. 200; Gerstinger thought it might even be from the closing years of the second century. The climax seemed to be reached when to the forty leaves already published Mr. Beatty was able to add forty-six more, and the whole was published together, in 1936.

While the editors of the manuscript modestly disclaim anything very startling in its text, it is difficult for me to imagine any readings more remarkable than the transposition of the great doxology from the end of Romans to the end of Chapter 15, which solves one of the major problems of Romans; the absence of the word "love" from Eph. 1:15 (with Aleph*ABP), or the omission of "in Ephesus" from Eph. 1:1, signally confirming that omission in the first hand of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, showing unmistakably that the phrase came into the text from the title, not, as some have thought, into the title from the text, and fairly establishing the encyclical character of Ephesians. These are findings of the utmost importance for the understanding of these two great letters.

The sensational progress of manuscript discovery reached a dramatic climax when Roberts, working over a mass of papyrus fragments secured by Bernard P. Grenfell in 1920 for the John Rylands Library of Manchester, found a small piece from a papyrus leaf-book, containing five verses of the eighteenth chapter of the Gospel of John, written before the middle of the second century, or within a generation of the actual composition of that gospel. Kenyon and Bell of the British Museum and Schubart of Berlin concur in this date, and Deissmann has not hesitated to describe the fragment as from the time of Hadrian, or as early as A.D. 138. In any case it is our oldest bit of evidence, in docu-

ments or literature, of the existence of the Gospel of John.

Only last summer, Mr. Roberts again amazed us all by publishing from the same hoard a Greek papyrus fragment of a roll of Deuteronomy, from the second century before Christ, which must therefore have been written within a century of the traditional date of the origin of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch. That does not belong to New Testament study, but it shows what amazing controls the papyri are beginning to supply for our historical and philological research in the field of Biblical Greek.

But it is not these discoveries of Biblical papyri, however dazzling, that have had most to do with the development of New Testament translation. It is the Greek papyrus documents, the humble, insignificant remains of ancient everyday life, the deeds, leases, contracts, petitions, reports, accounts, lists, letters, invitations—every kind of personal or business paper one can think of and scores of others one could never think of—these have come flooding in upon us from the sands of Egypt, from digging, authorized or unauthorized, ever since 1778, or for just one hundred and fifty years. Of course they became more systematic and satisfactory with the advent of Petrie at Gurob in 1889–90 and Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus in 1897, when the discovery of the first fragment of Sayings of Jesus electrified the learned and indeed the religious world and

gave to Grenfell and Hunt, two young Oxford men in their twenties, a celebrity they fully merited.

It was Deissmann who first realized the meaning of such materials for New Testament Greek. One day, when he was a young pastor at Marburg, he was browsing about the library at Heidelberg, and came across one of the fasciculi of the Berlin *Urkunden*—papyrus documents transcribed by various scholars, each of whom signs his transcript. The name of an old friend caught his eye and he paused to read the simple little Greek text above it. He said to himself, "Why, this is like the Greek of the New Testament!" He pursued the idea and gradually became convinced that this was the key to the peculiar genius of New Testament Greek, so unlike classical Greek, or Septuagint Greek, or the literary Greek of New Testament times. Indeed, one German scholar went so far as to declare that the Greek of the New Testament was a miracle language, devised by divine providence for the purposes of revelation; a language of the Holy Ghost.

The papyri have shown that New Testament Greek owes its peculiar quality to the fact that it is in the main the vernacular, the idiom of everyday speech. Wellhausen and Renan had long since perceived that the gospels were the first books written in popular Greek, and the great translators from Tyndale to the scholars of King James were conscious that they were working for the common man, to reach the plow boy,

as Tyndale said, and the very vulgar, to quote the Preface to King James.

This discovery, which has proved convincing to New Testament philologists of every school, is also quite in line with what the New Testament itself has to say. The Corinthians complained that Paul was rude in speech, and he did not deny the charge, but admitted it, and declared he would never change to a more literary style, lest his diction should come to overshadow his message and the cross of Christ become an empty thing. The general character of the public first addressed by the early Christian movement confirms this impression.

The effect of this discovery upon New Testament translation was immediate and striking. The modern speech translations began. A Catholic, Father Spencer, immediately translated the four gospels into familiar modern English in 1898. As Cardinal Gibbons put it in the preface, he "endeavored to represent our Lord and the Apostles as speaking, not in an antique style, but in the language they would speak if they lived among us now." In 1899 Frank Schell Ballentine produced in New York his translation of the gospels as parts of what he called *A Modern American Bible.* It is described in the printing of 1902 as "the books of the Bible in Modern English for American Readers." Mr. Ballentine grasped the idea that a vernacular New Testament must be one thing in the United States and another thing in England and Scotland, since vernacu-

lar English differs so much between the two countries. The first complete New Testament translated from the new point of view was the *Twentieth Century,* 1899–1900. My colleague, Dr. James M. Stifler, once asked its publisher, Mr. Fleming H. Revell, who had prepared the translation, and Mr. Revell declined to tell. But light has now been thrown upon the matter by Dr. P. Marion Simms in his recent book, *The Bible in America,* 1936. It seems that in 1890 a farmer in the lake district in England, said to Mrs. Mary Higgs, "Why is not the Bible written so that we can understand it? . . . Why does not someone translate it into English again?" Mrs. Higgs wrote to Mr. W. T. Stead, then editor of the *Review of Reviews.* In 1891 a young engineer named Malan wrote to Mr. Stead in the same vein. He found difficulty in reading the Bible to his children, and pointed out that he found La Serre's *Four Gospels* in modern French much more intelligible than the English versions. Mr. Stead put Mr. Malan and Mrs. Higgs in touch with each other. Mrs. Higgs was a graduate of Girton College, Cambridge, and had married a Congregational minister. The undertaking grew until a score of people were at work upon it, and so arose *The Twentieth Century New Testament,* one of the best of the modern speech versions.

The vernacular character of New Testament Greek was increasingly confirmed by New Testament philology, as the Greek papyrus documents supplying ma-

terial for comparison increased. Not a year passes that items of New Testament language do not receive new illumination from our advancing knowledge of papyrus materials.

Meantime the impulse given by Deissmann's keen observation continues to control New Testament translators of almost every school. Even those who approach the task from the Aramaic angle, while denying the pertinence of the papyrus evidence and claiming to ignore it altogether, nevertheless fall into line with its colloquial bent and wholly abandon the stiff archaic forms of sixteenth century English. The translations of Weymouth (1903) and of James Moffatt (1913) were of especial worth. Many modern speech translations followed. Since 1900 there has been an average of one a year, in this country or in England. In 1923, President Ballantyne, formerly of Oberlin, published his *Riverside New Testament,* I produced *The New Testament, an American Translation,* and Mrs. Montgomery issued the first volume of her *Centenary Translation,* completed the following year, celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the American Baptist Publication Society.

On the Catholic side, the Jesuit scholars of Westminster have completed their Westminster Version of the New Testament, and are now at work upon the Old. Theirs is not, however, a vernacular translation, though it is based not on the Latin vulgate but on the

original Greek. Professor James A. Kleist, a Jesuit scholar of St. Louis University, has published a translation of Mark in the familiar style, and the vernacular translation begun by Father Spencer with his *Four Gospels* in 1898 has been completed and is appearing this year.[7]

Such is the influence that manuscript discovery has had from time to time upon New Testament translation. First upon Erasmus when the coming of Greek manuscripts into western Europe after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 brought in their wake a desire to learn Greek and read these mysterious works of the older learning. After him and through him, in the religious zeal of the Reformation, upon Luther and Tyndale, and their successors. Then upon the private translators who followed the appearance of the King James Version, and who felt the growing gap between the text they knew and the emerging Greek uncial codices, Alexandrinus, Beza, Claromontanus and the rest. Then with the better understanding of the value of Vaticanus and with the appearance of Sinaiticus, a new wave of concern for revision swept English Christianity. And then again, the Greek papyrus discoveries of the 1890's revealed the true character of New Testament Greek and brought on the present era of modern speech translations, which have brought the New

[7] *The New Testament,* Translated from the Original Greek by Very Rev. F. A. Spencer, O.P. Edited by C. J. Callan, O.P., and J. A. McHugh, O.P., New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937.

Testament message home to thousands with a new vitality and vigor.

The attitude of the modern translators is well put in the well-nigh forgotten words of the great King James Preface: "If we building on their foundation that went before us and being holpen by their labours do strive to make that better which they left so good, no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they themselves, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us."

Strangely enough, the individual character of these modern efforts has not interfered with their wide use. It is well that they are numerous, for to quote the great Preface once more, "Is the kingdom of God become words and syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them when we may be free?"

CHAPTER V

WHY TRANSLATE THE NEW TESTAMENT?

FOUR hundred years ago the Bible of western Europe and of the English people was the Latin vulgate. Few people read it; the people were not expected or encouraged to read it. Only the educated could understand it when they heard it read in church. But a young Oxford man, William Tyndale, determined to translate it from the original into the plain spoken English of his day, and published the New Testament in English at Worms in 1525.

Since Tyndale's translation the New Testament has been revised or retranslated into English more than a hundred and fifty times.[1] Especially since 1800 translators have been very active, and translations and revisions have averaged at least one a year. Every Christian denomination has participated. A Catholic scholar, Father Spencer, began the modern movement with his translation of the four gospels, in 1898, and his completed New Testament is just appearing, almost forty years later.

What is the explanation? What is the justification

[1] Cf. John V. Madison, "English Versions of the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xliv (1925), pp. 261–88.

of this widespread impulse to do again what was so well done, so long ago? Let us seek the answer to this question.

1. In the first place, it cannot be doubted that we now possess a much sounder Greek text to translate than was known to Tyndale or to the scholars of King James.

What text had Tyndale on which to base his translation? He had Erasmus' third edition of the Greek Testament, dated 1522. The Greek New Testament was first printed in the fifth volume of the Complutensian Polyglot, dated 1514. But that volume was not published and offered for sale until the other volumes were ready and certain Catholic publication formalities were gone through with, and in the meantime Froben prevailed upon Erasmus to come to Basel and undertake to edit a Greek Testament for him to print. Erasmus' first edition appeared in 1516. In his preface he told of his interest in the translation of the New Testament into modern languages, and expressed the hope that this would be done. Luther based his famous translation of 1522 upon Erasmus' second edition, of 1519, and Tyndale based his upon Erasmus' third edition, of 1522. This version of Tyndale's, as we have seen, reappeared in Coverdale's Bible of 1535, in John Rogers' ("Thomas Matthew's") Bible of 1537, and with some revision, in the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva of 1560, the Bishops' of 1568, and the King

James, of 1611. So slight was the revision to which Tyndale's work was subjected by all these hands, that it has been calculated that ninety-two per cent of the King James New Testament reproduces Tyndale's translation of 1525. The scholars of King James had recourse at times to the recent New Testament editions of Theodore Beza, but these in turn rested for the most part upon the editions of Erasmus. The whole fabric of the English New Testament, from Tyndale to King James, may be said to be based upon his editions.

This fact is definitely established by the presence of I John 5:7 in all these English translations. This interpolation was not in Erasmus' first and second editions, but as it was in the Latin vulgate and had appeared in the Complutensian New Testament of 1514, Catholic scholars called upon Erasmus to include it. It is the verse about the Three Heavenly Witnesses. He replied that he would admit it to his text if they would show him a Greek manuscript that contained it. They did so, producing a contemporary manuscript, now generally believed to have been copied for the purpose, and Erasmus, true to his word, inserted the verse in his edition of 1522, from which it passed into the stream of English translation. It has found a place in the vast majority of English Bibles ever since. But only one other Greek manuscript has ever been found containing it, and it is absent from all the really ancient versions.

Erasmus had only eight manuscripts on which to base his edition and none of these was a complete New Testament. Of Revelation he had a single defective manuscript, which lacked a few verses at the end. There Erasmus simply retranslated from the Latin vulgate into Greek, thus completing his text. In this way some phrases never in the Greek have found their way into the English Bible, where they still stand, in the King James Version. These items fully establish the dependence of the English New Testament from 1525 to 1880 upon Erasmus' third edition of 1522.

Over against these eight late Greek manuscripts, modern learning has 4,000 Greek manuscripts, including lectionaries, of the New Testament to grapple with, the earliest of which go back to the beginning of the third century. One fragment of the Gospel of John, as we have seen, is earlier than A.D. 150. We now have a wealth of textual evidence in Greek manuscripts of the third and fourth centuries, so that we can push our knowledge back a thousand years beyond that of Erasmus.

There are, moreover, the ancient versions, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and so on, some of which are preserved in manuscripts almost as ancient and numerous as the Greek text itself. There are two Latin versions, the Vulgate preserved in thousands of manuscripts; four Syriac versions, four Coptic, and most of these are now available in modern critical editions. Their testimony

and that of the manuscripts have been patiently worked over in a series of careful editions of the Greek text. Tischendorf devoted his life to the Greek text of the New Testament, and Westcott and Hort's edition of 1881 was the result of twenty-eight years of labor. Thanks to the work of such scholars, we now know better what the evangelists and apostles wrote than has been possible in any century since the fourth.

The question is, are we to take advantage of this amazing wealth of new knowledge about the New Testament or are we not? Is it to be neglected? Or is it to be brought to bear upon the better understanding of the New Testament? Many people are insisting that no attention is to be paid to it, and that it adds nothing worth mentioning to our knowledge of the New Testament. Certainly this is not the view of New Testament scholars.

2. In the second place, it must be recognized that Greek is much better understood today than it was in Tyndale's time or in that of the scholars of King James. Greek was little studied in English universities when Tyndale was in Oxford. We have seen that Greek had long been a dead language in England; no one could read it. The first competent instruction in Greek in Oxford was given in 1491—about the time of the discovery of America, and the first permanent chair in Greek was established there in 1516, the year after Tyndale left Oxford. Yet in a time when it must

have been difficult to find good instruction in Greek, Tyndale took pains to learn it, in order to translate the New Testament.

The situation is very different today. For one thing, in the nineteenth century, the method of Comparative Philology was discovered, and the study of language was transformed. That new science did most perhaps for Greek, for by its aid, one can focus on a page of Greek, the light of Sanskrit from before and of Modern Greek from afterward. Certainly knowledge of Greek was immensely improved by the results of philology. It became a new study.

More than that, in recent years—since 1910—there have been such advances in New Testament lexicography that a whole series of new dictionaries have appeared, in France, Germany, England, America, which greatly facilitate New Testament study. I have listed elsewhere in this volume the new works of Preuschen (1910), Zorell (1911), Ebeling (1913), Souter (1916), Abbott-Smith (1922), Moulton and Milligan (1930), Bauer's revision of Preuschen, 1928, 1937, Kittel's Wörterbuch, in progress, and the revised Liddell and Scott, nearing completion. All but the last of these deal solely or principally with the New Testament, and they constitute a testimony to the march of modern learning about the New Testament that is most eloquent. New Testament philology is making great progress. Shall the English New Testament keep

pace with this advance, or shall our American Christianity be kept in ignorance of it? There can be but one answer to this question. If there is advance in our knowledge of Greek, it must be shared with the Christian public.

3. The third reason for retranslation is the discovery of the Greek papyri. In 1863 when Lightfoot was a young teacher in Cambridge he said to his class, "If we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without any thought of being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the New Testament generally." [3] Just such aids as Lightfoot then desired have since come to our hands in great quantities. Deeds, leases, accounts, reports, notices, contracts, invitations, memoranda, invitations, and letters have been unearthed among the papyri found in recent years in Egypt, and proved that Lightfoot was entirely right in his judgment of them, and of their bearing upon the understanding of the New Testament.

These papyrus documents of everyday life have shown us the colloquial, vernacular Greek that was spoken among ordinary Greeks who could read and write, as they talked and wrote the common dialect in Egypt and presumably elsewhere about the Mediterranean in the centuries before and after Christ. We have known the Greeks for the most part through their fin-

[3] Cf. James Hope Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh, 2d ed., 1906), I, p. 242.

ished literary productions—their plays, orations, poems, treatises, histories; but now in the papyri they appear to us as they were, in informal daily intercourse; business, travel, agriculture, entertainment, hospitality, amusement, sport, crime—the whole gamut of life as it appears in any morning paper. The papyri have revealed to us the colloquial Greek of the time, as we had never beheld it before.

And to our amazement, this vernacular Greek is the very Greek in which the New Testament is written.[8] This has been a great surprise to everybody, yet it should have surprised no one. The first public of the early Christian mission was peasants and fishermen, and in the Greek world, not many of its converts were what the world calls rich, intelligent or high born. Moreover, Paul himself in I Corinthians, shows that he was much criticized in Corinth for his informal style of speaking and writing. They said he was "rude in speech," and he did not deny it; he admitted it, and declared that he would not change and adopt a more literary style, lest if he did his diction might come to overshadow his message, and so the cross would be made of no effect. Paul has really been telling us all the time in I Cor. 1–4 just what the papyri have risen from the sands of Egypt to establish; that he used the familiar language of everyday life.

The great translators perceived this instinctively, and

[8] Cf. George Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri* (London, 1922), pp. 57, 58.

in times when contemporary English was not thought good enough to translate the Bible, nevertheless put the Bible into the language of the common people. Tyndale once said to a priest that he would enable even the plow-boy to know more of the Bible than the priests did, and the King James translators in their great Preface, so generally forgotten, expressed their desire that the Scripture "may be understood even of the very vulgar." Nineteenth century scholars perceived and affirmed that the gospels were the first books written in popular Greek. But it remained for the papyri to establish the fact that the New Testament was written not in the literary style, nor in philosophical language, but in the vernacular Greek of its day—in the plainest, most direct and intelligible terms developed in everyday use.

This conclusion has been steadily strengthened by the increasing masses of Greek papyrus documents, numbering tens of thousands, that have been found and published since it was first reached. No one who has made even a slight examination of them has any doubt of its truth. And it puts the matter of New Testament translation in a new perspective.

For if the New Testament was written in the familiar, colloquial style, it should be translated in that style. Of course it was translated in that way by its first translators, but their translations have by the lapse of time and the dignity of their formal use in church,

come to seem much more literary than they are. What was plain speech in 1525 has in four hundred years changed to rhetoric or even poetry. Many people find in the King James Version poetic values which were not in that version in 1611, but have arisen as time has removed the old familiar idiom further and further from common use.

The observations of Thomas Hardy upon this point are of great interest. He wrote in his journal, of April 30, 1918:

"By the will of God some men are born poetical. Of these some make themselves practical poets, others are made poets by lapse of time who were hardly recognized as such. Particularly has this been the case with the translators of the Bible. They translated into the language of their age; then the years began to corrupt the language as spoken, and to add grey lichen to the translation; until the moderns who use the corrupted tongue marvel at the poetry of the old words. When new they were not more than half so poetical. So that Coverdale, Tyndale and the rest of them are as ghosts what they never were in flesh." [4]

This is the explanation of the flood of modern speech translations that have sprung up since 1895—Father Spencer's *Four Gospels, The Twentieth Century New Testament,* Dr. Weymouth's *New Testament*

[4] *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy,* p. 186. I am indebted to Dr. William H. Allison, of the Library of Congress, for this illuminating reference.

in Modern Speech, and so on—all so admirable in many ways. It seemed to me, however, that if we were to make earnest with the colloquial character of the New Testament and produce a truly modern colloquial translation of it, it must be one thing in the British Isles and another thing in the United States. For while our literary language may be the same, our familiar spoken idiom is very different.[5]

It is hardly necessary to illustrate this. An English professor addressing a Chicago student audience many years ago said he was glad to see so many young women present, for they added so much homeliness to the occasion. Of course he used the word in a very different sense from ours. A house-wrecker in England puts the word "house-breaker" over his office door; an English boy sent by his mother to buy a reel of cotton, perplexes all the clerks in the store until one of them has an inspiration and supplies him with a spool of thread. A wrench is a spanner, mucilage is gum, railroad switches are points, and the rails are lines.

And why should we forever seek to impose the sterling currency upon the New Testament—pounds, shillings, pence and farthings? Unless we propose to limit its use to those readers who have visited England. That currency has no more to do with the world of

[5] The legitimacy of American English idiom is now fully recognized in the publication of *A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles,* edited by Sir William Craigie and James R. Hulbert (Chicago, 1936–).

Jesus and the apostles than dollars and cents have. Yet some earnest people will declare that to speak of dollars and cents in the New Testament is an "anachronism" all unconscious that pounds, shillings, pence and farthings are equally anachronistic there.

If the purpose of New Testament translation is to bring what the New Testament writers meant to convey directly and vividly before the modern American reader, then it should not be necessary for him to detour through a course in sixteenth century English, such as is necessary for the understanding of even the simpler parts of the New Testament. There are more readers of the English Bible in America than in any other country in the world, and there is room for a translation made in their own vernacular.

So it seemed to me that we might with entire propriety undertake an American translation of the New Testament, directly from the original Greek, into the familiar spoken idiom of our own country. Consider the position. We possess a sounder Greek text to translate, a better knowledge of Greek to apply to it, a new understanding of the colloquial character of New Testament language, and all the wealth of modern colloquial American English, as legitimate a phase of the development of that noble speech as any in its long history; what is to be done with all this material? There can be but one answer: Use it, for an American translation of the New Testament.

A sense of the obscurity of the standard versions led Dr. Ernest A. Bell, minister of the Night Church in Chicago, to ask two scholars of his acquaintance to make a translation of the Gospel of John that his humble parishioners could understand, and when they excused themselves, he finally did it himself.

That the standard versions are obscure no one can deny. The third horseman of the Apocalypse is the angel of famine, and the Greek indicates this fact unmistakably when a voice is heard proclaiming famine prices of wheat and even of barley. No one could possibly gather this idea from the standard versions, in none of which does the utterance of the voice convey any meaning whatever. It is plain that those who still defend such versions care little for what the New Testament means; their whole concern is for its sound, its form of words; what they mistakenly call its "poetry."

This is well illustrated by the protest against translating the Greek word "lamps" literally, instead of following William Tyndale and rendering it "candles." Of course there is not one mention of a candle anywhere in the New Testament. Yet a leading New York newspaper editorially condemns the use of "lamp" in the New Testament, dismissing it with contempt as a futile effort at modernization.* It is of course quite the opposite. Many visitors to the Mediterranean

* *The New York Times*, August 27, 1923, editorial page.

bring back little pottery lamps from Graeco-Roman times; no antique souvenir is more common. But in Tyndale's day, the English were using candles, and in an effort to modernize the New Testament he rendered the word "lamp" by "candle." It is interesting that the New York editor should have inverted this, supposing a lamp to be a modern invention. Of course the word "candle" completely spoils the figure and obscures the meaning.

The greatest difficulty in the New Testament, however, is met in the epistles, especially those by Paul. Here advocates of the traditional versions themselves freely confess that the case is hopeless. No one they declare, can understand Paul and there is no use trying. Again and again this position is taken in newspaper editorials. Of course this means only that they cannot understand the current versions, and assume that where these have failed no other can succeed. This admission, which is very generally made, opens the way for modern translations. With a better text to translate, a better knowledge of Greek, a clearer sense of the informal character of New Testament style, and a consciousness that it is the translator's business to keep hold of the line of thought, a great deal can be done with Paul. In fact the chief difficulties about understanding Paul are not in the Greek but in the standard English versions, which definitely confuse and obscure what he has to say.

The modern translator is usually regarded by his critics as a mere reviser of the King James Bible. Of course he never looks at the King James Bible. He respects it for its sixteenth and seventeenth century diction, and for all that it has meant and done, but as an aid to the modern understanding of the Bible he never consults it.

Instead, he takes the soundest Greek text that patient, international scholarship has determined for the New Testament, and with the aid of all the best modern translations, lexicons, grammars, commentaries, and special monographs he can command, he undertakes to understand just what each sentence of the Greek New Testament was intended by its author to mean. He looks at each sentence just as objectively as a chemist looks at a test tube, or a biologist at a slide under his microscope, seeking not to shape it to his own tastes and convictions, but to gather from it what it was originally meant to convey.

Then when he has understood it, he sets himself to cast it in such modern English as he would use if he had thought of it himself; English that shall not sound like translation at all; English so smooth, natural and easy that the reader will forget he is reading a translation and be led on and on by the sheer ease of the style until he has read a whole gospel or a whole epistle at a sitting, as their writers meant them to be read, and comes at length to realize that the New Testament is

not a mass of chapters and verses, but a library of powerful, coherent pamphlets. The modern speech versions have beyond all question recovered for the New Testament what the standard versions have cost it, the quality of continuous readability. The longest book in the New Testament can be easily read in two hours; the longest letter of Paul, in one. It was for such reading that they were written. Their writers never dreamed of their being broken into two hundred and sixty chapters and 7959 verse-paragraphs. It is partly that division and partly the obscurity of the old English that retards and discourages the reading of the New Testament.

We may add that the forms in which the standard versions of the New Testament are offered to the modern reader are enough to complete its eclipse. In the latest edition of the King James Version [r] in one of the most dramatic situations which even Luke records —Paul before the bloodthirsty mob, shouting for his death—we read:

And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, saying,

CHAPTER 22

Could anything be more absolutely mechanical than this? The edition proceeds utterly regardless of its contents, with the meaningless record of Stephen Lang-

[r] Cambridge, 1937.

ton's chapter division, made in the Middle Ages, completely destroying the magnificent dramatic effect designed by the historian. And yet professors of English literature loudly defend this version against all comers for its literary worth. But what of its literary obtuseness?

The time has come for an intelligent modern paragraphing and punctuating of the New Testament. After all, the Greeks invented both. Why should they be withheld from one of the great monuments of the Greek genius? Properly paragraphed, the Gospel of John at once becomes more interesting, attractive and intelligible. More than this, it immediately reveals what the standard forms of its text conceal—its dialogue character; it is largely conversation, debate, discussion, and a strong and sudden light is thus thrown upon its literary affinities; they are with the Greek dialogue. No one would ever gather this from the standard versions, yet we are constantly told of their superior literary value.*

But the great fault of the standard versions is that they make the whole New Testament sound alike, and never exhibit the variety of literary style in it, because they plaster it all over thickly with the idiom of the

* The unreality of this "literary use" of the King James Version by students is shown conclusively by the fact that there is no faithful edition of it, including its important preface and its full contents, and acknowledging the tacit revisions it has sustained, anywhere available for students.

sixteenth century. So true is this that we sometimes actually hear people talk of the "biblical style." Of course there is no such thing. It is simply a mask which makes the writings of the New Testament seem something they are not. To treat them as works of the "high" style when they are in reality for the most part cast in the simplest, most direct language their writers could command, is to disguise and misrepresent them, and to limit their full influence to a very small, select few who understand sixteenth century English, and are able to push through the obscurity of the old versions to some intelligible sense.

Modern translations are sometimes charged with being "interpretations." Of course they are. Any translation is an interpretation. The criticism is a most revealing one however, for it shows that its makers think the Bible can be translated without being interpreted. No one thinks this of any other book or literature. But from the past there has come down to us the strange idea that in dealing with the Bible, one could translate a Greek word into English, and then another Greek word into English, and then another, and the completed English product would mean what the Greek sentence had been intended to convey, without having had to pass through the mind of the translator at all. Of course this is simply a superstitious delusion. But it is at the bottom of much of the obscurity of the old versions; their makers really and honestly did not think

they had to understand what they were translating, in order to translate it, and a great many times they did not understand it. The best Old Testament example of this vice is in Ecclesiastes 12:11: "The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd." The whole picture of a shepherd distributing nails to masters of assemblies is grotesque and meaningless, and cries out for explanation. The translator did not think it was necessary for him to understand what he was translating.

It was George Eliot, I believe, who said that you could not examine middle-aged people. She was mistaken. For if you will publish a translation of the New Testament, you will at once be flooded with editorials, articles, and letters, which are in effect the involuntary examination papers of a host of middle-aged editors, professors, ministers, and laymen upon no less a matter than the English Bible.

It has long been thought a proper course to take such utterances from classes of defenceless undergraduates and analyze and generalize upon them for the delectation of the middle-aged. What then could be fairer, once possessed of this novel material, than to analyze and generalize upon it for the common entertainment and it may be for the common good? In attempting to do this, there have been thrust upon me, to my great surprise, three widespread confusions of

thought as to the Bible, which many of our most accomplished essayists, novelists, and journalists, and possibly not a few others less gifted, have not escaped.

1. One gifted individual, in great demand as a lecturer and after-dinner speaker, was protesting to me his thorough acquaintance with the Bible. "Why," said he, "when I was eleven years old, I could repeat twenty-seven hundred verses of it! Of course I know the Bible."

The sad part of it is that most intelligent people will think he was right. What more is there to know about the Bible? So strongly do people hold this view that most people are outraged at the mere suggestion that there is anything more for them to learn about the Bible than they learned at their mother's knee, and regard such an idea as a grave reflection not only upon piety and religion but upon their mother herself. Upon other subjects they may consent to let their subsequent education carry them beyond what she there imparted to them, but upon the Bible, never! What they there learned about it was full and final, never to be altered, save by the gentle natural process of forgetfulness.

Of course this condemns the Bible forever to the nursery. It assumes that it is a child's book and that only. And from this nursery conception of it, it is an easy step to the notion that it is in words of one syllable—an idea fortunately not borne out by the facts. That it was written by great men, grappling with eter-

nal problems of duty and destiny is unthought of. Enough for it to have its disconnected fragments memorized like proverbs by children too young to know what most of it is about.

I would not be misunderstood. I owe almost as much to such early memorizings as did my learned friend, and I most emphatically prize it. It is not that children should learn less of the Bible but that grown people should learn more. For to suppose that all that is worth knowing about the Bible can be learned in babyhood is a mistake. It is like having one's mind filled with tags from Shakespeare and supposing that is all there is to be known of him. The New Testament does not consist of detached verses, and beyond this Golden Text acquaintance there is a knowledge of the Bible worthy the powers of grown men and women.

With all the virtues of the old version, its supreme vice is this, that instead of lighting people through these great labyrinths of Biblical literature, it has involved them in such obscurity that most of us never do more than glance in and pass on. This is the sufficient answer for the claims made for the old version: If it be so readable, why does nobody read it? For dipping into it here and there for a verse or two, cannot be dignified as grown-up reading. What manner of achievement is this, for people who can dispatch a whole novel in a night?

This is not strange. Most of the New Testament

in the King James or the Revised Versions, was written by William Tyndale more than four hundred years ago. Very little of it sounds natural and straightforward to the modern ear. Instead of smoothing the reader's way to the fullest understanding of the New Testament, it strews his path with every kind of obstacle—strange words, vague elusive phrases, sentences without emphasis so that he cannot keep the writer's line of thought—all things well enough in an old piece of English literature, but intolerable if one really prizes and pursues the thought of the New Testament.

The idea that this gnarled, unnatural language, so alien to the colloquial style of the New Testament, is an aid to the understanding or even the reading of it, can only be described as a literary superstition, prevalent among those who have not reflected very deeply upon the matter. The bald fact is that it is the greatest bar to both.

Criticism itself never sanctioned such a wholesale dismemberment of the New Testament as the verse division, invented in 1551, and followed in King James, which tears the books of the New Testament into thousands of fragments and offers them to the reader in place of the coherent originals. And these broken bits of the New Testament are thought by some to contribute more to liberal education than the continuous, intelligible presentation of the books as they were written. Certainly, most people never see the

books of the New Testament but only the verses, and very few of them. They cannot see the wood for the trees.

2. An intelligent woman once said to me:

"Why do you say we do not understand the King James Version? I have no trouble in understanding it."

"Then," said I, "what does this mean: 'In his humiliation his judgment was taken away'?"

She was evidently perplexed and left me. Half an hour later, she came back and said,

"I think I know what that verse means. Can't you imagine a person being so humiliated as to lose his judgment?"

Of course nothing can be further from what Luke meant than the idea that Jesus was so humiliated that he lost his judgment! Yet that was all the King James Version could give this patient reader of it.

This may illustrate a second confusion of thought about the Bible; the confusion of Familiarity with Comprehension.

Dallas Lore Sharp once told me that his nephews, who are engineers, said to him:

"Uncle, you are a professor of English and you may understand the King James Bible; we are just university graduates in engineering and we do not."

This was a sound observation, from educated men. They knew the difference between familiarity and com-

prehension. Childhood memories and scripture reading in church have made many parts of the Bible familiar to our ears. Much of it lingers in the mind as sentences not understood but so familiar that we are not even aware of their obscurity. "Jots and tittles," "a horn of salvation," "the besom of destruction," "the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity"—everybody is familiar with these expressions but how many have any clear idea what they mean?

Some candid spirits readily admit that much of the Bible conveys very little meaning to them and solace themselves with the reflection that it is not necessary to understand all of it. We may hasten to agree that no one is in any danger of understanding all of it, but that does not excuse us from making some effort to understand as much of it as we can. But the mind does not always stop at not understanding; often it moves instinctively on to invest what is not understood with some vague, shadowy occult meaning of its own. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico.*

3. A third confusion of thought is that between the Bible as English literature and the Bible as religious literature. The King James Version is an English classic, and should be treated as such—shelved with Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Dryden and the rest. And here our critics, essayists, novelists, and editors wish to stop. What more is there to be said? As though the New Testament were chiefly remarkable as a piece of

quaint old English style. It is also a classic of Coptic literature, and of Syriac literature, both of which it helped to shape; does anyone really think these literary laurels the supreme thing about the New Testament? Such judgments do not honor the New Testament; they only show that upon some very cultivated minds its real worth and dignity have never impinged. It is not as English literature, but as religious literature that the New Testament is supreme.

It is by this canon that the forms of it must finally be judged: Do they give to its unique religious genius the fullest possible expression? Paul did not write to amuse the Corinthians and Romans, or even to help on their liberal education. He had in view a vastly more serious purpose, which the modern world has not outgrown.

We have had altogether too much of this confusion of New Testament values, and from people of whom we had reason to expect closer analysis. It is not its literary worth that has given the New Testament its place in modern life. It is something far deeper and more momentous than that, and of far wider appeal. To forget this in admiration for Tyndale's quaint old English is to have an inverted view of New Testament values. It did not need the English of Tyndale or anyone else to make it great and influential. For above all its versions stands the New Testament itself, the world's masterpiece—not of English, that would be a trifle, but of what matters vastly more—of religion.

Chapter VI

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is a familiar fact that there are more manuscripts of the Greek New Testament or parts of it than of any other work of literature in the world. More than four thousand of them have been recorded and described. A few years ago a graduate of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Dr. Kenneth W. Clark, undertook to locate and report all of them that could be found on this continent. His researches, just concluded, have disclosed more than two hundred and twenty-five such Greek manuscripts in America—many of them previously unreported and unknown to learning—more than three times as many as the most sanguine of us supposed; and the American Council of Learned Societies has made a generous grant of money to enable him to publish his catalogue.

There are, besides, the even more numerous manuscripts of the many versions anciently made from the original Greek. The manuscripts of the Latin vulgate alone are said to number more than ten thousand. But through its first extended period of growth, Chris-

tianity moved along Greek lines and followed Greek channels. In one of Harnack's golden sentences, it remained a Greek movement almost to the end of the second century.

Almost from the beginning it was building into itself elements of Greek philosophy, religion and culture. We observe this even in its earliest documents, the letters of Paul. It becomes increasingly apparent in the rising gospels. It was the *Greek* world that first welcomed and understood it, and that adopted it and set it on its way. Its use of the Greek language was only a symbol of a far deeper affinity. Yet the question of the language in which the several books of the New Testament were originally written has lately become a matter of lively interest and debate.

It would seem to be an obvious fact that the New Testament was written in Greek, but in accord with that spirit of our age which challenges every inherited position, this one too has been subjected to wide attack. A candidate for the doctor's degree at a neighboring university has made his thesis that the Revelation of John, as we have it, is a translation from the Hebrew. A well-known professor of Arabic at Yale has divided the Acts of the Apostles in twain, declaring that 1:1–15:35 or "I Acts" was composed in Aramaic in Palestine about A.D. 50. An Oxford professor has affirmed that John was written in Aramaic. The Yale Arabist has extended the Aramaic predicate to the four

gospels, while a Syrian Christian has affirmed that they were all really written in Syriac, which he prefers to call Aramaic.

I. *I Peter.* But, after all, there is nothing so very modern about all this, for St. Jerome, fifteen hundred years ago, affirmed that the First Epistle of Peter was originally written in Aramaic. Indeed, it is probably most unjust to charge this whole Semitic attitude to the modern spirit. It may be quite the opposite. For it is plain that Jerome proceeded from the notion of the authenticity of I Peter as the work of the apostle Peter who would naturally express himself in Aramaic, therefore the Epistle must have been written in Aramaic and our form of it is but a translation.[1]

II. *James.* Not so long ago a distinguished textual scholar, Bishop Wordsworth, in his study of Codex Corbeiensis, argued that the Epistle of James was written in Aramaic. His argument has been conveniently summarized by Mayor, in his commentary on the epistle. He reasoned thus:

1. Aramaic was the language usually spoken by our Lord.

2. Aramaic was used by St. Paul in his address to the mob at Jerusalem.

3. Papias gives us to understand that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Aramaic.

4. Mark and, according to Clement of Alexandria,

[1] *Ad Hedib.*, 150.

Glaucias were Peter's scribes, and the use by Peter of different interpreters explains the difference in language between I and II Peter.

5. Some fathers think Hebrews was written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and Josephus says that he wrote his *War* in Aramaic.[3]

This seems to cover every avenue of approach, neglecting only the character of the language in the Epistle itself.

It might seem that even these views, ancient and modern, hardly suffice to shake the place of the books in question as monuments of vernacular Greek, were it not for the following they have attained, the zeal with which they have been pushed, and the support some of them have been given in print. The advocates of the Aramaic and Syriac origins of the gospels have themselves poured forth volume after volume in support of their positions, and university men like Montgomery of Pennsylvania, Burrows of Yale, Knopf of Southern California, Spencer of New York, W. L. Phelps of Yale, Anson Phelps Stokes of Washington, have given some of them strong indorsement in print. They hail the Aramaic discoveries as "epoch-making," and their leading spirit as a modern Erasmus. In the presence of such a campaign on the part of professors of Semitics, Classics and English, perhaps specialists in New Testament Greek may be permitted to take a

[3] Cf. J. B. Mayor, *St. James*, ccv.

hand, more especially as it is the Greek New Testament, after all, that is under discussion.

III. *The Revelation.* There is for example Dr. Robert B. Y. Scott's argument that the Revelation of John was originally written in Hebrew.[8] We may begin by asking what was being done in the way of Hebrew literary production in the times when the gospels, the Acts, the Revelation and the epistles were appearing.

Some students of the Apocrypha hold that the Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Assumption of Moses, and II Baruch were written in Hebrew in the first century. It seems strange that anyone should have written at that time in Hebrew, since the Jews were even then translating their Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic, to make them intelligible to their own people. Hebrew was no longer popularly understood. Just why, therefore, anyone, especially in Ephesus in the days of Domitian, should have written a Christian apocalypse in Hebrew is difficult to understand. Certainly not one Ephesian in a thousand could have understood it, and as there were not many hundred Christians in Ephesus at the time, it must have been produced by a most unusual individual for a public of not over a dozen or twenty readers. Certainly it never had any significance for Christianity until it was translated into Greek, as it

[8] Robert Balgarnie Young Scott, *The Original Language of the Apocalypse.* Toronto, 1928.

evidently fortunately and immediately must have been. Supposing there was in Ephesus a Christian capable of composing the work in Hebrew, already a dead language, no longer understood by the Jews themselves, except a select few, one wonders why he should have composed it? It seems intended to stiffen the Christians of Asia in their resistance to the demands of emperor worship, and as 99.9 per cent of the members of the Seven Churches did not know Hebrew it seems unaccountable that anyone should have addressed them in that unknown tongue.

Dr. Scott approaches the matter from the philological side, however. The first sentence in his work proving its Hebrew origin is: "The Greek of the Apocalypse is notoriously difficult" (p. 5). This is a singular remark; my own impression is very different. I read the Revelation through in Greek for the first time in about four hours just before I went back to college for my senior year. I have always retained the impression that it is the easiest Greek in the New Testament, or anywhere else, unless of course we are to assume that all Greek is difficult. But even so, the Greek of the Revelation must be rated on the lowest level of difficulty.

Of course Dr. Scott must mean not that the Revelation is difficult to read, but that it contains some very eccentric Greek, which is quite true. It is, moreover, full, as he says, of constructions we naturally associate

with Hebrew. He mentions the frequency of "Behold," as evidence of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) origin. But I turn to a random page in the Book of Mormon and find seven occurrences of "Behold" on it; the word occurs only twenty-six times in the Revelation in twenty-eight pages of text. That is, it is seven times as frequent in the Book of Mormon, at least as far as I have looked. It would seem that if the Revelation was written in Hebrew, it is seven times as probable that the Book of Mormon was. But of course such things are simply imitations of Old Testament phraseology, as known through the Septuagint or King James. For that matter, Epictetus does not hesitate to say "Behold" when he chooses.

It cannot be denied that we possess no ancient Hebrew text of the Revelation, while a complete Greek text is extant in many manuscripts, and from it numerous versions have been made. The Greek text, therefore, has a presumption in its favor, and in any sound study, Greek parallels as well as Hebrew ones should be sought out and weighed against each other. But this is not attempted. Thus we are told that *aphiemi* does not mean "leave" in the papyri; but it often does, as Moulton and Milligan show. *Mousikoi* in 18:22 is interpreted as "songs" and hence declared corrupt for "singers"; but it is used quite regularly in the papyri for "singers"; why twist it into "songs"? The non-literary *kategor* for *kategoros* is similarly treated with-

out benefit of Moulton and Milligan, who show the way clearly enough.

This large mistake in method, which generally pervades the whole movement under discussion, is one that simply must be remedied if we are to give any credence whatever to such findings as Dr. Scott's. But it does not stand alone. We must seriously ask for what Hebrew-reading public in the churches of Asia in Domitian's time, the Revelation was written. Of course we know of no such groups, and the writer of the discussion in question makes no effort to establish them for us. Yet it cannot be too often insisted that for any document that is postulated in early Christianity, an occasion, a public and an author of reasonable probability must be established. The Semitic school makes no effort in these directions; their approach is purely philological and always entirely negligent of Greek philology at that.

Yet no serious student of the New Testament can doubt that every one of these Greek expressions claimed for Hebrew must also be examined in the light of all the Greek evidence before any individual conclusion can be reached. And again and again when this is done, the need of having recourse to Hebrew originals vanishes away.

But the problem is not wholly philological nor introductional. Much is said of sources and apocalyptic in the Hebrew camp. But nothing is said of the strik-

ing debt of the Greek Apocalypse to contemporary Greek dramatic art; these scenes, choruses, arias, antiphonies, orchestras, so magnificently cosmic—harps and trumpets, but also thunders, hail, and earthquakes —the chorus of twenty-four—just the number in the chorus of the late Greek comedy; all this is completely neglected.

And above all, the portal of the Apocalypse—a *corpus,* of *letters,* to *churches, seven* in number, introduced by an opening letter to all seven—this most commanding and obvious feature of the Greek Apocalypse—is unnoticed. It must be apparent that this whole façade of the book—this artificial corpus of letters (which obviously were not separately sent and hence did not have to be collected) is the reflection of an actual corpus, of letters, to Christian churches, seven in number—the Pauline corpus, in short.

Three elements must be considered in dealing with the Revelation: its debt to Jewish apocalyptic, to contemporary Greek dramatic art, and to the Pauline letter collection, which had just been published. To see only the apocalyptic side is a grave defect of method.

In the presence of these oversights we may still cling to the Greek original of the Apocalypse as the most natural explanation of its literary and linguistic features, large and small, and of its historical origin.

IV. *The Acts.* The idea that the book of Acts, the second volume of Luke's work on the beginnings of

the Christian movement, falls into two parts, 1:1-15:35, and 15:36 to the end, is supported by the detection of a number of expressions in the first part, called I Acts, which are said to be best explained as the result of translation from an Aramaic document. It is inferred that I Acts was composed in Aramaic.[4]

Here again the method is not to exhaust Greek materials for possible parallels to these expressions, but sedulously avoiding all Greek expressions and parallels, to confine one's research to Semitic sources. We cannot say Aramaic sources, for they are notoriously meager, amounting in all to only twenty-eight or thirty pages of literary composition, beside the Elephantine documents of the fifth century before Christ, the scripture translations and the numerous inscriptions. The Aramaists constantly assume difficulties in Greek which a wider acquaintance with that language easily relieves. Perhaps it will suffice to say that there are other ways to translate such difficulties as the Acts presents than the Revised Version affords; modern New Testament research is provided with an admirable apparatus of lexicons and grammars. In dealing with a work in a foreign tongue, moreover, it is obviously wise to exhaust all available lexical and literary aids in that particular tongue before exploring remote corners of other languages for light.

Thus the idea that the expression *prenes genomenos,*

[4] C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts,* Cambridge, 1916.

Acts 1:18 (E.R.V. "falling headlong"), reflects an Aramaic *n'phal*—"he fell"—does not get us very far, for we all fall, but few of us commit suicide, and yet that is what we are told the Aramaic *n'phal* would mean. But that leaves the gushing bowels of Judas mere crude horror, whereas we know that the whole picture, a man swelling up until he burst, was the traditional fate of traitors, like Ahiqar's betrayer Nadan. The expression really means "swelling up" as Souter shows.[5] The Aramaic improvement leaves the story pointless; Judas falls and bursts open. Papias is of course the key to this rival and legendary story of Luke's of the fate of Judas.

But the fatal blow to all this ex parte way of dealing with Luke-Acts is that in matters of information and attitude, I Acts and Luke agree so strangely. We are told that I Acts was written in Aramaic in Palestine about A.D. 50 by some unknown hand, and that Luke about 60 wrote his gospel, in entire ignorance of it. In fact he never saw it until 62, when he came across it in Rome. The two works were thus altogether independent in origin. Yet they exhibit astonishing agreements in ideas and in details of fact, in many of which they stand apart from the rest of the New Testament. I have counted thirty-five of these, but a closer examination would probably considerably increase that number. Enough for our present purpose is the surprising

[5] *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, s. v.

fact that I Acts begins exactly where the Gospel of Luke leaves off. To most of us this suggests that one was written to go with the other. Certainly they cannot have been written independently of each other, for one of the first things recorded in Acts is the coming of the Spirit in 2:1–4, which the Gospel of Luke foretells in its closing lines, 24:49.

Let us briefly review the position. It is impossible to point to a single written Aramaic work of literature. Part of Daniel and part of Ezra are in Aramaic, but the rest of these books are in Hebrew. The Aramaic Ahiqar is believed to be a translation. The only literary composition in Aramaic of which there is even any record is Josephus' Aramaic edition of his *Jewish War* which he says he prepared for the Jewish population about Babylon and the Upper Tigris. He says the Greek form of his *War* was translated from this, but this the Aramaists themselves deny.

The fact is, the Jewish inhabitants of Palestine had a strong repugnance to written composition. They were putting their Hebrew commentary on the Law and their Aramaic translation of the scriptures, into oral, not written form. In fact the question of an Aramaic reading public in Palestine is a very real one. What would it read? Not the Aramaic Targums of the Law and prophets; they were not written, only memorized. Not Josephus' Aramaic *War;* it was not written until a generation after the period in question—

and then for a distant public. One can only point to the Aramaic parts of Daniel and Ezra, truly a meager literature on which to develop an Aramaic reading public.

In this whole discussion, we must carefully distinguish between

translation and *composition;*

oral transmission and *written* transmission; and

literary use of a language and *vernacular* use of it.

That Aramaic was widely used in the first century in daily life is not enough to establish its use for literary purposes and creative writing. These are two very different things and must not be confused. That it was used for translating the Hebrew scriptures into versions intelligible to the common people, does not at all make it a literary language. Biblical translation has often been a step toward the literary development of a language, but it is not always or even generally so. The Bible, or parts of it, have been translated into some nine hundred languages, but there are not nine hundred literatures. To speak, therefore, of the rise of the Aramaic Targums as though they were creative literature is quite misleading. Translating a text from one language into another is one thing; composing an original work in a language is a very different thing, and calls for an altogether different attitude of mind and scale of effort. That pens and words are used in both operations is only a superficial resemblance.

But when the translation was not even written but religiously exempted from being written, and committed to memory instead of to writing, even this superficial resemblance disappears. There is a wide difference between oral and written transmission. The former exists only in the mind, not on paper, and is in every way far from suggesting original composition in writing. It represents in fact an aversion to it. These distinctions must be carefully made and scrupulously regarded, for they are an essential part of the Palestinian-Jewish picture in the first half of the first century.

We must also distinguish between Hebrew, the dead, sacred, literary, classical language, and the vernacular Aramaic. Even the scribal interpretation of the Law, oral though it was, had to be in Hebrew, not Aramaic. So far was Aramaic from being recognized by the Jews as a literary vehicle.

Finally, why anyone should have written of the Greek mission for Aramaic-speaking Jews who did not approve of it, and do so while it was still in the experimental stage (it had not gotten beyond Galatia), and had only reached the point of toleration on certain conditions, has never been explained. In short the supposed Aramaic document lacks an occasion, a purpose and a public. Divorced from the Gospel of Luke and the rest of Acts, it lacks an author. And when we remember the absolute void in Palestine at that period, in Aramaic written composition, and the resolute

Jewish policy of the time to write nothing, but only to remember, while the Christians there were even less literary, being absorbed in apocalyptic hopes and messianic expectations, the theory of an Aramaic I Acts is revealed as the very height of literary and historical improbability.[6]

V. In 1933 Professor Torrey published *The Four Gospels, a New Translation,* with an essay on the origin of the gospels. The substance of his position is that "the material of our Four Gospels is all Palestinian, and the language in which it was originally written is Aramaic, then the principal language of the land; with the exception of the first two chapters of Lk., which were composed in Hebrew. Each of the first two Gospels, Mk. and Mt., was rendered into Greek very soon after it was put forth. The Gospel of Jn. was translated considerably later, probably at Ephesus. (The translator added, in Greek, chap. 21) Lk. made in Palestine, very likely during the two years of Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea (Acts 24:27), a collection of Semitic documents relating to the life and work of Jesus, arranged them very skilfully, and then rendered the whole into the Grk. which is our Third Gospel." [7]

All the gospel material, we are told, is distinctly early. "The multifarious reports of what had been heard or seen or told, were collected and written down

[6] Cf. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 65–103.
[7] *Our Translated Gospels* (1936), p. ix.

in various parts of Palestine. This written interpretation must have been given shape almost immediately after the death of Jesus. It could not possibly have waited." [8]

This is doubly strange when we remember that the Aramaic translation of the Law waited for generations after A.D. 50 before being committed to writing, being carried all that time in memory, as oral tradition. There is no support in first century Jewish practice for the sudden activity in Aramaic literary composition that is here so lightly assumed. No one so far as can be learned had up to that time ever written a book in Aramaic. Yet now of a sudden, they all take to writing.

"The Aramaic idiom," we are told,[9] "is everywhere present in the Gospels," except in Luke, Chapters 1, 2 and John, Chapter 21. "It makes no difference which evangelist is translating. The Greek of the Gospels has all of the characteristics of the language of the Septuagint; there is no other parallel. The attempt to show something similar in the papyri utterly fails; nothing at all comparable to the language of the Four Gospels has been or can be produced. . . . The comparison with the Greek of the vulgar papyri is merely ridiculous." [10]

But has anyone ever assembled the characteristics of

[8] *The Four Gospels, A New Translation* (1933), p. 255.
[9] *The Four Gospels,* p. 267.
[10] *Our Translated Gospels,* pp. liii, liv.

the language of the Septuagint—its translation phenomena? I am glad to be able to say that minute and thoroughgoing studies to that end are now being organized by my colleagues Drs. Riddle and Colwell, and the results thus far attained do not encourage the position so boldly conjectured above.[11]

As to New Testament Greek and the Septuagint, a veteran classical scholar, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, once uttered this important judgment: [12]

"Now the New Testament, if not Greek of the best type, is still Greek. That it is true Greek, and not Shemitic Greek merely, is shown more clearly by comparison with the Septuagint, which is closely modelled on the Hebrew." Then after a résumé of the study of the use of the participle, he continues, "This is enough to show that New Testament Greek, so far as the participle is concerned, cannot be said to be entirely swayed out of the lines of true Greek by Shemitic influence." No, one thing was established fifty years ago, and that was, the New Testament is not written in Septuagint Greek.

That Aramaic original narratives lie back of the Synoptic gospels is a position that periodically appears upon the New Testament horizon. My colleague Dr. Riddle has traced the course of such views from the time of Eichhorn, 1794, and Herbert Marsh of Cam-

[11] Cf. D. W. Riddle, "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, li (1932), pp. 13–30.

[12] *American Journal of Philology* (1888), pp. 153, 155.

bridge, 1801.[18] Eichhorn identified forty-two sections of gospel material which he believed were originally composed in Aramaic, and Marsh maintained that Matthew, Mark and Luke were all derived from one original Aramaic document which he called "Aleph." In the early nineties, an English Semitist, J. T. Marshall, elaborated a similar scheme in the *Expositor*. He decided that an original Aramaic document lay back of the three Synoptists.

The historical understanding of the gospels, however, has proceeded in practical independence of these erratic views. All New Testament introductions have found origins for the gospels very different from those implied in these theories, and the whole modern Form-criticism movement is alien to it. In fact no New Testament specialists have accepted such positions, and the Aramaic school on its part has rejected the entire fabric of New Testament and historical criticism, as developed by a century of study. In particular, the conviction that New Testament Greek is really the vernacular Greek of its day, and closely allied with that of the Greek documentary papyri, a view widely held by Greek New Testament scholars of every school, is abjured by the Aramaic group. They describe it as "merely ridiculous."

This is not because there is not abundant Greek philological material to explore. There is a vast and

[18] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv (1935), p. 127.

ever increasing amount of it. The papyri discovered in Egypt especially in the last half century, have shown us the Greeks of New Testament times as assiduous readers. Greek settlers in Egypt and their descendants had the Greek classics that have come down to us, and much more. From copies used and cherished in Upper Egypt far from the culture of Alexandria, we now know that common people had Homer and the poets, the orators, the plays, and much that we had supposed lost and gone forever. They are proved to have been a reading people, fond of their books.

They were also a writing people. In a dark shop in Cairo years ago I found, in a mass of papyrus scraps, a dozen fragments in a capital or literary—an uncial—hand. I carried them away, supposing them to be Homer, as such things usually are. They proved to be fragments of a Greek poem, previously unknown, of the Ptolemaic time, full of curious traits and reflections of the age and taste of Theocritus. It was no great matter; such things happen now and again. For that was a writing world, a world of literary composition and of literary enjoyment. Just the kind of world in which the New Testament with all its varied literary types, letter, homily, epistle, gospel, history, apocalypse, might so naturally arise.

Nor was this all. These Greeks were literate; they wrote letters upon all occasions. The documents of their common life are simply voluminous. Very often

they are dated, in the regnal years of the emperors, as Luke dates the appearance of John the Baptist, in Lk. 3:1. It occurred to me some time ago that it would be interesting to see how far published and dated Greek papyri could be found from the several years of the first century. I spent a couple of hours in my own library and found I had all but twenty-three of them represented; an hour or two more in the classical library finished the tale, and I was able to say that we possess dated Greek papyrus documents from every single year of the first century after Christ.[14] What an indication of the abundance of our philological material in vernacular Greek from the very times in which the gospels were written.

At the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in New York City, in December, 1934, I exhibited and discussed an ordinary Greek papyrus document from my own collection, dated in the seventh year of Antoninus (A.D. 143), which in twenty-two lines contains twenty occurrences of Greek idioms familiar in the New Testament. Five of these idioms are definitely not also Semitic. Here is that very *to epiballon meros* of the Prodigal's story, coupled with the very *ousia*—property—which he wished to have divided, and is here being divided. Here is the expression "to know one's letters," familiar in hundreds of

[14] Edgar J. Goodspeed, "The Original Language of the Gospels," *The Atlantic Monthly*, 154 (1934), p. 478.

papyrus documents and used of Jesus in John 7:15. The translator of the supposed Aramaic understands it to mean "to be a man of letters," but of course it only means to be able to read and write. It also explains the later insertion in this chapter of John in the sixth century of the section about the adulterous woman, in order to show that Jesus could write.

Thousands of such Greek papyrus documents have already been published. As a matter of fact, the documentary papyri are rising like a flood higher and higher every year, each year engulfing some of the remaining Semitisms in the New Testament. One of the most recent and most instructive to topple into the flood was the mysterious *Racha* of Matt. 5:22: "Anyone who says to his brother Raca will have to answer to the great council."

This word *raca* (or *racha* as Sinaiticus, Beza, Washington, and the O. L. have it; Alex. is wanting for this part of Matthew) has never been found in Aramaic or Hebrew (although the root RAQ does occur), but is generally treated as Semitic. As such it yields a very weak sense, "empty fellow." It is a definite relief that the Greek word sought in vain for centuries turned up three years ago in a Zeno papyrus, a letter of B.C. 257, with exactly the form and spelling of the majority of the ancient uncials. It was evidently a foul name, which the Christian must never take upon his lips, and we should probably translate "Anyone who calls his

brother a foul name will have to answer to the great council." This accusative "rachan" fully explains Matthew's form "racha," which is a weak declension vocative.[18]

But we must not linger over details, alluring as the exploration of them would be. Let us try to deal broadly with the whole problem. Jesus spoke in Aramaic. All his words have come to us from that language. The first stories of his life and death were told in it. This no serious student of the gospels any longer denies. Most of the genuine Semitisms of the gospels are thus fully and naturally explained. Sound Semitic study, of which I am as fond as anyone, and which I long eagerly pursued, throws a helpful light upon many a line of the Synoptic gospels. For example, *akouein akoueto* in Mark is a manifest Greek imitation of the intensive use of the infinitve absolute construction; I should accordingly translate it, "Let him who has ears be sure to listen!" It is a striking fact that Matthew who takes this item over from Mark no less than four times invariably omits the superfluous infinitive. Yet the Aramaic school of translation seems to miss the Semitism altogether and reads Mark just as did the English Revised Version fifty years ago: "Who has ears to hear, let him hear."

The Aramaic approach to the subject, moreover, in-

[18] Colwell, E. C., "Has Raka a Parallel in the Papyri?" *Journal of Biblical Literature,* liii (1934), pp. 351–54.

stead of giving us a version of increased vigor and picturesqueness, as it would certainly do if it were sound —a more gigantesque diction, to use Chesterton's admirable phrase for the style of Jesus—gives us instead a tamer, milder message. Instead of a cross, we have only a yoke to bear, and instead of being "perfect" like our Father in heaven we have only to be "warm-hearted" like him. The whole process is one of liquidation; of English, of diction, of text, of history, of criticism, of figures and ideas. There are improvements in New Testament renderings which vindicate themselves as true by their sheer convincing vigor. But those of the Aramaic school never have this result.

The Aramaic scholars' characterizations of the Greek of the Synoptists are shockingly unfavorable; the Greek of the gospel writers, we are told, is hideous, uncouth, muddy, incredible, intolerable, distressing, mere nonsense, what no sane man would say. It would be difficult, one goes on, to find a genuine Greek idiom, not also Semitic, anywhere in the gospels.

Before proceeding to the consideration of this astonishing statement, let us pause to ask one or two more general questions, suggested by these large claims. What effect did these supposed Aramaic gospels produce? Did they convert the Jewish people, among whom they are supposed to have arisen? Did they even perpetuate themselves for as much as one single generation? It would certainly seem that a public signifi-

cant enough to have called them into being could have maintained them that long. No, on any basis the Aramaic gospels were total failures, while the uncouth, hideous Greek gospels were the most conspicuous literary successes the world has witnessed.

The idea that it would be difficult to find a specifically Greek idiom not also Semitic anywhere in the Greek gospels,[16] can only awaken surprise in those who are familiar with the three elements involved; Greek idiom, the Greek gospels, and Semitic idiom. It is very difficult for me to believe that anyone who had gone through the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, line by line, patiently translating the Greek of the four gospels, could make such a statement. He must in that task have encountered at least one hundred and thirty-two different times the genitive absolute, certainly a Greek idiom not also Semitic; he must have seen upon a single page of Luke seventy-four instances of the genitive article in the sense of "the son of," an idiom certainly not Semitic, and not susceptible of imitation in Semitic. He must have seen numerous references to the third hour, the sixth hour, the ninth hour, the eleventh hour —Greek ways of fixing time, never found in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha, which, moreover, meet us at every turn in the Greek papyri. Of course the gospels are simply full of Greek idiom, and distinctively Greek idiom at that.

[16] *The Four Gospels*, p. 268.

Equally out of place in a Palestinian work is the "fourth watch of the night," Mark 6:48, Matthew 14:25. The Jews divided the night into three watches, the Greeks into four. There was no fourth watch in the Palestinian night. And while it is hardly an idiom, one is reminded that the interest-paying bank of Luke 19:23 is a very curious thing to find calmly accepted in Aramaic Palestine, though the Law and the Talmud alike forbade the taking of interest.

In Luke 3:23, *archomenos,* we are told, is "worse than superfluous." Of course it is, if one starts with the King James rendering, "Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age." But William Tyndale and all the modern translators know better than that. There is no difficulty with *archomenos* here; it is not a predicate participle with "he was," but an adverbial participle, meaning "when he began." The verb is used in the middle voice just as it is in *protes phulakes archomenes,*[17] "when the first watch began," or *cheimonos archomenou,* "when winter begins."

Such revisions, in the light of a broader Greek horizon, might be recited indefinitely, but they are unnecessary. These loose vague claims, without any adequate support, must fall of their own weight.

It is more serious, however, to describe as "mere nonsense" from the Greek of the gospels,[18] passages

[17] Petrie Papyri, II, 48, B. C. 246.
[18] *The Four Gospels,* pp. 272–3.

not in the Greek at all, but drawn simply from the English Revised Version. "This was he of whom I said" does not stand in John 1:15 in the text of Westcott and Hort, which is said on p. xi to be the Greek text used; no such words stand in the text which is declared to be the basis of the translation. Similarly the words "who is in heaven," credited to the Greek text of John 3:13, and gravely included in a two-page list of "mere nonsense," are not in the text of Westcott and Hort. One cannot escape the conclusion that the translator, like many classical and Semitic scholars, supposed the English Revised Version to rest upon the text of Westcott and Hort and to represent it faithfully. This is a grave misunderstanding which explains many things about this new translation of the four gospels.[19]

The oft-repeated claim[20] that no passage in the gospels reveals a date later than A.D. 50, betrays a grave ignorance of the contents of the gospels. Luke 21:20 is such a passage, "But when you see Jerusalem being surrounded by armies, then you must understand that her devastation is at hand." Of vs. 24, Montefiore says,[21] "The calamities of the Jews are described in detail by one who witnessed them." These words are later than A.D. 70. Yet we are told (p. 256),

[19] Thus the Greek idiom *eis ta idia* "to his home" is properly translated (with E. R. V.) in John 19:27, but (again with E. R. V.) not in John 1:11.

[20] *Our Translated Gospels*, p. x.

[21] *The Synoptic Gospels*, II, p. 580.

"In none of the gospels is there the slightest allusion to the Fall of Jerusalem before Titus." We may also cite Matthew's words, 23:35: "that on your heads may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the upright to the blood of Zechariah, Barachiah's son, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar." They refer to the awful carnage attending the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, in which Josephus says more than a million people perished. The man whose murder is mentioned as the last one before the catastrophe is that Zechariah son of Baruch who was murdered by two Zealots in A.D. 67 or 68, "in the midst of the Temple" [Josepheus, *War*, 4:5:4.] This is the explanation of the incident given by Wellhausen and Meyer, and clearly favored by Montefiore, II, p. 304. The Zechariah of II Chron. 24:20 was not the son of Barachiah, nor was he killed within the temple, but in the court of it.

The statement in John 17:14 that the world had come to hate the disciples points to a time long after A.D. 50—the time of attacks by the empire, under Nero and Domitian. It cannot be reconciled with a date before A.D. 50. The persistence with which the Aramaic school clings to a position, no matter how clear the case against them, is well illustrated in the translation "Bow" for the Greek word *prumne* in Mark 4:38. This word has been steadily used in Greek from Homer down for the stern of a boat, *prora* being the bow. But

having once been wrongly rendered "bow" in the *Four Gospels, A New Translation,* p. 77, it has not been altered in subsequent editions, nor does the later work, *Our Translated Gospels,* 1936, contain any modification of the position. No Semitic argument has been advanced for the translation. It is of course just an error and should have been at once corrected, if the aim is to give a correct version of the meaning of the gospels, with all the aids learning can provide.[22]

The Aramaic school claims that because Aramaic was a widespread speech, it was also a widespread literature. "There was," we are told, "a pre-Christian Aramaic literature[23] which must have been very extensive, rich in every field." But no evidence is offered for this sweeping statement, and as a matter of fact, there is not the slightest ground for the supposition. There are next to no remains of such a literature nor any references to its existence in other literatures. All the evidence points to the view that Aramaic was, like most languages, a non-literary speech, a vernacular and nothing more. Much is also said of classical Aramaic. But as a matter of fact, there was no classical Aramaic. The classical language was Hebrew. Aramaic was the spoken language. That Ezra at 4:7 and 5:3 and Daniel at 2:4 lapse into Aramaic, is quite in line with this.

[22] This error was pointed out by Professor Cadbury before the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in New York, in December, 1934.

[23] *The Four Gospels,* p. 252.

The normal Jewish attitude in the first century was altogether non-literary. The Jews were developing their oral translation of the Law in Aramaic, but they sedulously refrained from writing it; they preserved it orally; Gamaliel I, about A.D. 50, finding an Aramaic manuscript of the targum of Job, destroyed it forthwith. The whole Hebrew commentary upon the Law was also preserved orally, so as not to seem to rival in sanctity that which was written—the Scripture itself. The Jewish atmosphere in Palestine was altogether unfavorable to Aramaic literary production.

Among Christians there, it was of course doubly so. They had an immediate apocalyptic expectation that must have been most unconducive to literary endeavor. They were not in the first place a group likely to produce literary men—they were simple Galilean fishermen and artisans, with one tax-collector. The whole current of their environment and of their own lives was non-literary. They maintained their memories of Jesus in their preaching, and presently produced, after the Jewish manner, an oral statement about him, which they passed on, like the Jews they were, in oral form. Paul reflects it, and so do Luke, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp. My own feeling is that it was probably those very Sayings of Jesus which Papias says Matthew composed in the Aramaic language and each one translated as best he could—of course when he carried the message over among the Greeks.

As Professor George A. Barton put it at the close of his admirable critique in *The Journal of Theological Studies,* xxxvi, 1935, p. 372: "Torrey has failed to prove his case as to the origin of the Gospels because he has relied on one factor only (and that a highly debatable one)—a factor, too, that is incapable of explaining all the phenomena which have to be taken into account."

The Aramaic school of gospel origins thus exhibits twelve general defects of method.

1. It disregards all the results of New Testament study in the fields of text, canon, literature, history, introduction, and criticism, dismissing them without examination as worthless.

2. It fails to establish any such literary activity in Aramaic in the period in question, as it assumes.

3. It offers no contemporary literary or other Semitic material by which to establish the Hebrew or Aramaic usages it claims.

4. It supplies few specific references to Semitic sources to satisfy scholars of the existence of the various words and forms it posits.

5. It omits from consideration all the Greek papyrus material, declaring it without examination to be of no significance.

6. It makes sweeping and unsupported assertions as to the Greek of the New Testament, and when these are challenged and disproved, with accompanying evidence, gives no heed.

7. It fails to distinguish between oral and written composition.

8. It does not clearly distinguish translational from creative literary activity.

9. It weaves together items of various Semitic tongues—Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, etc., to produce the words and forms it then argues from as recognized and established Aramaic usage.

10. It resorts to elaborate and remote Semitic explanations of words which are in ordinary use in the Greek papyri.

11. It does not scruple to present rejected Greek readings [24] where they serve its turn, at the same time claiming to use the critical text of Westcott and Hort.[25]

12. While distinctly declaring its repudiation of modern colloquial idiom in principle,[26] it employs it in the text in almost every line.

It is impossible that sound results can be secured by these methods.

The weakness of the Aramaic method is shown by its treatment of the word *pygme,* "with the fist," in Mark 7:3. This is explained as due to a misreading of the expression *ligmār,* "at all," which by the way is Syriac, not Aramaic. The Aramaic school describes this as an "amusing mistranslation." [27]

But this passage is manifestly one of the "parentheti-

[24] *The Four Gospels,* pp. 272–3, 307; Lk. 6:1.
[25] P. xi.
[26] *The Four Gospels,* p. x.
[27] *Our Translated Gospels,* p. 92.

As Professor George A. Barton put it at the close of his admirable critique in *The Journal of Theological Studies,* xxxvi, 1935, p. 372: "Torrey has failed to prove his case as to the origin of the Gospels because he has relied on one factor only (and that a highly debatable one)—a factor, too, that is incapable of explaining all the phenomena which have to be taken into account."

The Aramaic school of gospel origins thus exhibits twelve general defects of method.

1. It disregards all the results of New Testament study in the fields of text, canon, literature, history, introduction, and criticism, dismissing them without examination as worthless.

2. It fails to establish any such literary activity in Aramaic in the period in question, as it assumes.

3. It offers no contemporary literary or other Semitic material by which to establish the Hebrew or Aramaic usages it claims.

4. It supplies few specific references to Semitic sources to satisfy scholars of the existence of the various words and forms it posits.

5. It omits from consideration all the Greek papyrus material, declaring it without examination to be of no significance.

6. It makes sweeping and unsupported assertions as to the Greek of the New Testament, and when these are challenged and disproved, with accompanying evidence, gives no heed.

7. It fails to distinguish between oral and written composition.

8. It does not clearly distinguish translational from creative literary activity.

9. It weaves together items of various Semitic tongues—Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, etc., to produce the words and forms it then argues from as recognized and established Aramaic usage.

10. It resorts to elaborate and remote Semitic explanations of words which are in ordinary use in the Greek papyri.

11. It does not scruple to present rejected Greek readings [24] where they serve its turn, at the same time claiming to use the critical text of Westcott and Hort.[25]

12. While distinctly declaring its repudiation of modern colloquial idiom in principle,[26] it employs it in the text in almost every line.

It is impossible that sound results can be secured by these methods.

The weakness of the Aramaic method is shown by its treatment of the word *pygme,* "with the fist," in Mark 7:3. This is explained as due to a misreading of the expression *ligmār,* "at all," which by the way is Syriac, not Aramaic. The Aramaic school describes this as an "amusing mistranslation." [27]

But this passage is manifestly one of the "parentheti-

[24] *The Four Gospels,* pp. 272–3, 307; Lk. 6:1.
[25] P. xi.
[26] *The Four Gospels,* p. x.
[27] *Our Translated Gospels,* p. 92.

cal explanations of Semitic words and Jewish customs for the benefit of Gentile readers," which are said [28] to be found in all four gospels, and to have been provided by the Greek translators. In fact it is the longest and most unmistakable of them. As such, by hypothesis, it was composed in Greek, not Aramaic. And yet it yields just as readily to retranslation into Aramaic as any part of the Gospels. No demonstration could more completely show that the method has no objective validity, for it works just as well on original Greek as on "translation" Greek.

If, however, it be claimed that this parenthesis is not supplied by the translator but is a part of the original Aramaic gospel, then another more important position taken by the Aramaic school must be abandoned, namely that "Each of the four (gospels) is plainly written at least primarily for Jewish readers; no one of them steps out of the atmosphere of Palestine even for a moment." [29] If Mark 7:3, 4 is part of the Aramaic gospel, its author certainly very definitely steps out of Palestine, and wrote outside it. If it is not part of the Aramaic gospel, but inserted by the Greek translator, and yet its difficulties are easily explained as due to mistranslation from the Aramaic, then such explanations are robbed of all significance, for they work just as well on original Greek as on "translation" Greek. This demonstrates the futility of the method; it works

[28] *The Four Gospels*, p. 254. [29] *The Four Gospels*, p. 254.

just the same way on what is translated from the Aramaic and what is not.

The Aramaic school cannot take this passage both ways. Either it proves that their method is invalid, or that the Gospel of Mark was written outside of Palestine. It does not matter much which horn of the dilemma they take; the effect is the same—the overthrow of their position.

VI. The philological arguments of Burney, Montgomery and others for an Aramaic origin for the Gospel of John, have been fully met by my colleague Dr. Colwell, in his book, *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel* (Chicago, 1931).[20] It is, of course, almost incredible that anyone could think the extremely crisp and lucid Greek of John a translation. But it is even more incredible that anyone could suppose such a picture of Jesus could have arisen in Palestine by the year 50. One hardly knows where to begin in pointing out the complete unsuitableness of such an origin for such a book, so thoroughly Greek in every fiber of thought, situation and language. The development of Christian thought implied in John can hardly be imagined before the early years of the second century. One can have penetrated but little into the real meaning of the book to entertain such notions of it as the Aramaic origin of it implies.

[20] C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, 1922); J. A. Montgomery, *The Origin of the Gospel of St. John* (Philadelphia, 1923).

As a matter of fact, the Gospel of John shows the use of all the primary canon of Paul's letters, from Romans to Philemon, which were written in Greek to western churches between A.D. 50 and 62. In the presence of this fact it is idle to continue to say there is nothing in the gospels giving clear evidence of a date later than A.D. 50 or of origin outside of Palestine.[21] And if one gives any English version of John a modern paragraphing, its affinity with the Greek dialogue at once strikes the eye.

"The Jews" are spoken of sixty times in John in contrast with Jesus and his followers, who were of course just as much Jews as the scribes and Pharisees. This use of the phrase "the Jews" shows unmistakably that the Gospel of John belongs to a time when Christians were sharply distinguished from Jews. The church now stands over against the synagogue. It also stands over against the sects, Johannine and Docetic. None of these things was possible in Jerusalem in the forties, and it is only by shutting our eyes to them that John can be pushed back so far. Of course the whole literary, historical and intellectual fabric of the Gospel of John are entirely out of keeping with such an origin.[22]

VII. The translation of the four gospels by Mr.

[21] *Our Translated Gospels*, p. x.

[22] Professor C. H. Dodd has recently remarked that the view of Burney and Torrey that the Gospel of John as a whole is a translation of an Aramaic original, is in his opinion almost demonstrably false, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxi (1937), p. 138.

George Lamsa is described on the title page as from the Aramaic. It made its appearance in 1933, simultaneously with *The Four Gospels, A New Translation.* It too has had wide publicity, and some of its characteristic readings have been much admired: Mark 15:34: "My God, my God! for this I was kept!" and Matt. 19:24: "It is easier for a rope to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

What Mr. Lamsa has done is simply to translate the Peshitto Syriac version of the gospels, which modern learning under the leadership of Burkitt has dated about A.D. 411. They had previously been translated by J. W. Etheridge, London, 1846 (the rest of the New Testament following in 1849), and by J. Murdock, New York, 1851. Its text is far from primitive, being strongly characterized by conflation, that is, the combination of variant readings drawn from different earlier types of text. It is also rich in interpolation and accretion; so that it is difficult to see how anyone can suppose it original. But the matter is further illuminated by the fact that the Syriac fathers of the fourth century —Efrem, Afraates—know no such text, in fact they show that the Diatessaron was still the dominant form of the Syriac gospels in their day. The finding by Dr. Cureton and Mrs. Lewis of manuscripts of the Old Syriac text of the gospels, in the nineteenth century, is further proof that the separate Syriac gos-

pels of the third and fourth centuries, in so far as they had any currency, did not exhibit the Peshitto text.

Yet Mr. Lamsa puts forth his translation with great confidence as though the gospels had had a continuous existence in Syriac or, as he calls it, Galilean Aramaic, from the time of their original composition down. This position is quite at variance with the Syriac evidence of the period before 400, with the Greek evidence, where the Greek gospels are richly attested from A.D. 125 on; with the textual history, with the history of the canon, and with the whole testimony of introduction, which reveals intelligible situations, often supported by tradition, for the origins of the several Greek gospels. Moreover, the presence of so many Greek words in the Syriac gospels seems strange if they were originally written in Syriac. In general, New Testament scholars have given little credence to Mr. Lamsa's contention. It has been difficult to learn from him upon what he based his translation; his preface does not state, and in answer to personal inquires he refers vaguely to fourth century manuscripts in Baghdad. Of course, if there are such manuscripts in Baghdad, none of us could possibly be better occupied than by going thither at once and bringing them back or at least obtaining photographic copies of them, for they would completely revise our understanding of the history of the Syriac versions. I have so advised Mr. Lamsa and urged him to secure us

copies of such manuscripts if they are really to be found.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lamsa's Syriac text is a poor representative even of the Peshitto, for he translates the pericope about the Adulterous Woman, which is absent from the best Peshitto manuscripts, and from Gwilliam and Pusey's critical edition of the Peshitto. This fact stamps the text on which his translation is based as not ancient but definitely mediæval.

VIII. *The Pauline Letters.* Even Paul's letters are in peril. A lady from Philadelphia writes:

"Are we sure about the language in which Paul wrote? Was it Aramaic or Greek? I was interested in the Riddle-Torrey controversy about it.[88] Our Dr. Montgomery at U. of P. says that Torrey is about 80 per cent right. Dr. Gehman, Professor of Old Testament at Princeton, says that he is sure the New Testament was written in Aramaic and that as soon as he translates the Greek into Aramaic all the difficulties in the Greek are smoothed out. Gehman is a specialist in Oriental languages and an authority in his field. Who is right?"

I have not consulted Professor Gehman or Professor Montgomery as to this statement of their views, but it is clear that great uncertainty is being created in the popular mind by the books we have already quoted, and it is not strange that it should gradually involve all the rest of the New Testament.

[88] In *The Christian Century*, July 18, October 24, 31, 1934.

These various efforts cannot be said to have shaken the conviction of New Testament specialists that the Gospels, the Acts, the Revelation, and in fact the whole New Testament was originally written in Greek. Not only are the Greek New Testament texts being strongly attested by successive discoveries of earlier and earlier Greek manuscripts, reaching back now into the second quarter of the second century, but a closer study of early Christian literature reveals more and more clearly the early use of these writings in the Greek world.

The ancient materials for the support of the Aramaic theories are very meager, indeed the last ones that can have been written before the supposed outburst of Aramaic literary activity all over Palestine toward A.D. 50, were written two hundred years before. All told the pre-Christian Aramaic literature amounted to less than thirty pages of text. Holders of these views of Aramaic origins have, therefore, to resort to Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic and other Semitic roots and forms, for which, however, they give no references or sources, so that verification or control is impossible. As a matter of fact it is clear that they are often freely composed by the translator by a synthesis of roots and forms from any and all Semitic sources, sometimes five hundred years earlier than the period in question, sometimes five hundred years later. We cannot deem this a sound scientific way to proceed. So good an Aramaist as Ralph

Marcus of Columbia has carefully examined its results and rejected them.[84]

If there is any slightest probability of Aramaic written gospels or gospel sources having existed, there is a perfectly sound, serious and unobjectionable way of approaching the problem. We should first inquire what materials there are for a study of first century literary Palestinian Aramaic, what public there was for such works, what literary works there are now in existence from that place and period, and in that tongue; what evidence there is of the practice of creative Aramaic literary writing there and then. Every serious Greek student of the gospels uses precisely these methods. Moulton and Milligan supply six columns of references to published collections of Greek papyri and ostraca at the beginning of their *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.* The advocates of the Aramaic school offer none at all. They give us no list of Aramaic works created in Palestine in the first half of the first century.[85] There is no record of any written composition in Aramaic at that time. The Aramaic targums or translations of the Law were explicitly oral, not written.

[84] "Notes on Torrey's Translations of the Gospels," *Harvard Theological Review,* xxvii (1934), pp. 211–39.

[85] Professor Millar Burrows states that "the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha likewise include works which are regarded by their modern editors as having been composed in Hebrew or Aramaic during the period with which we are concerned," but the list he goes on to give contains no Aramaic works at all, *Journal of Biblical Literature,* liii (1934), p. 17. It cannot be too often insisted that Hebrew must be distinguished from Aramaic, oral composition from written, and translation from creative writing, in this discussion.

There is no first century literary Aramaic to build on, to create a literary probability for us, or to compare with. What there was in contemporary Aramaic seems to have been altogether translational; not creatively composed; even these translations, which had the very just purpose of putting the scriptures into the vernacular, so that ordinary people could understand them, were not committed to writing but to memory. A more unpromising soil for the rise and swift development of the new and brilliant gospel type of literature can hardly be imagined.

Over against this loose vague method of conjecture and surmise the Greek interpreters of the New Testament find themselves in a peculiarly happy and favorable position. The patient researches of three generations of New Testament scholars in text, introduction, history and philology have worked out a sketch of the rise of New Testament and early Christian literature that is highly convincing. New discoveries of more and more ancient manuscripts supply welcome material for textual reconstruction. Above all, the ever enlarging field of Greek papyrus documents is constantly throwing fresh light upon New Testament syntax and lexicography. Some years ago, Professor Milligan of Glasgow and Professor James Hope Moulton of Manchester, in conversation became aware that each of them had been in the habit of writing into his copy of Thayer's lexicon references to significant parallels in

the papyri, inscriptions, or Epictetus. They resolved to pool these accumulations, build them up still further and publish them. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* was the result. It forms a valuable supplement to the New Testament lexicons.

These for their part are greatly improved. To the dictionaries of Preuschen, 1910, Zorell, 1911, Ebeling, 1913, Souter, 1916, and Abbott-Smith, 1922, we may now add Walter Bauer's thorough revision and enlargement of Preuschen, 1928, itself now just completed in a further revision, 1937; Kittel's revision of Cremer's *Griechisches Theologisches Wörterbuch,* carried out with the aid of fifty-five other scholars, the tenth instalment of which has just appeared; and the greatly improved Liddell and Scott, which now lacks only one part to make it complete.

For the papyri, specifically, we have the monumental dictionaries of Friedrich Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischer Papyrus Urkunden,* 1927, his *Fachwörterbuch,* 1915, and his *Namenbuch,* 1922. This intense lexical activity has greatly lightened the task of the modern translator and interpreter. We feel that we are moving forward with a sound method and an increasing wealth of documentary material.

New Testament philology, so long a debatable land between classical and Semitic realms, which made occasional raids upon it, but no complete survey of it, has emerged, by reason of the papyri, as a relatively inde-

pendent discipline, dealing with the rise of a great popular religious Greek literature in the spoken language, which it employed for literary purposes with all the vivacity of the old Greek genius directed to new and nobler ends.

Chapter VII

PSEUDONYMITY AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHY IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Pseudonymity is one of the most serious problems in the study of early Christian literature. How far does it exist, what was the occasion for it and what its purpose?

Its background is, of course, in part that late Jewish literature which arose in the times after Ezra, when according to Jewish ways of thinking, the prophetic period was over and God had finished speaking to men. The consequence of this doctrine was the apocalyptic literature, which claimed for its authors the names of ancient worthies before the time of Ezra, and thus met or at least evaded the implications of the doctrine. In the second half of the Book of Daniel, Chapters 7–12, Daniel speaks in the first person throughout, and in the Book of Enoch, Enoch, "in the seventh generation from Adam," Jude, vs. 14, speaks in the first person; "And I, Enoch, blessed the Lord of Majesty and the King of the Ages." [1] It was the art of apocalyptic that it expressed a contemporary message under an ancient name. What Enoch heard was "not for this generation, but for a remote one which is for to come." [2]

[1] 12:3. [2] 1:2.

Christian apocalyptic arose in quite another atmosphere. The Christian belief was that the days had come when the Lord was pouring out his spirit upon all flesh and their sons and daughters might well be expected to prophesy.[3] They did not need to assume the names of ancient worthies or disguise themselves. So prophets—persons with the prophetic gifts—appeared frequently among them, like Agabus,[4] and the four daughters of Philip.[5] There were prophets in the church at Antioch,[6] and in the church at Corinth.[7] This is why the writer of the Revelation can frankly call himself John,[8] at the same time that he calls his book a prophecy.[9] There was no occasion for him to put forth his work under the name of some other man, for the era of the prophets had returned.

Paul speaks of the visions and revelations that had been given him by the Lord.[10] Eusebius says that just before the Romans encircled Jerusalem, in the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70, the Christians there were warned by a revelation to leave the doomed city, and move to the city of Pella, in Perea. His *Church History* reads (3:5:3):

"But the people of the church in Jerusalem had been commanded by a revelation, vouchsafed to approved men there before the war, to leave the city and dwell in a certain town of Perea called Pella."

[3] Acts 2:17; Joel 2:28, 29.
[4] Acts 21:10.
[5] Acts 21:9.
[6] Acts 13:1.
[7] I Cor. 14:1.
[8] Rev. 1:1–3.
[9] Cf. 22:18.
[10] II Cor. 12:1.

There is nothing to suggest that the revelation was reported anonymously; it was evidently given to well-known members of the Christian church in Jerusalem. It is natural to connect this revelation with that in Mark, Chapter 13, which contains a similar warning: "those who are in Judea must fly to the hills"; a man on the housetop must not even go down into his house to get anything to take with him, and a man in the fields about the city must not even turn back to get his coat from the corner of the field where he has left it.

If these Christian prophets needed a great name under which to shelter their prophecy, they took the name of Jesus. The Revelation of John begins, "A revelation made by Jesus Christ which God gave him to disclose to his slaves of what must very soon happen. He sent and communicated it by his angel to his slave John, who testifies to what he saw." [11]

But Hermas, who wrote his revelation in Rome perhaps ten years after John, did not hesitate to write his "Visions" and "Apocalypse" under his own name, and hardly mentions Jesus in the whole course of that extended work, the longest Christian writing that had been produced up to that time. A generation later, pseudonymity begins to affect Christian apocalyptic in the Apocalypse of Peter, written in the name of Peter in the second quarter of the second century, when pseudonymity had become an established Christian literary practice.

[11] Rev. 1:1, 2.

It is clear that pseudonymity did not enter Christian literary life by the way of apocalyptic; Christian apocalyptic had at the beginning no need or use for pseudonymity. Jewish precedent does not help us here. Yet it did enter and play an active part in Christian writing, from an early date. How did it come to do this? Few scholars nowadays will deny that Jude and II Peter, are pseudonymous. II Peter shows acquaintance with the collected letters of Paul, and these are already being twisted and distorted by some Christian group, evidently sectarian.[13] Its author also knows the gospels, and is aware that Peter is supposed to be sponsor for one of them.[14] He refers to the prediction of Peter's death contained in the epilogue of John, 21:18.[14] He knows Jude, for he quotes it freely and largely in Chapter 2, and he also knows I Peter, 3:1, and perhaps the Epistle of Barnabas, 3:8. That the apostle Peter could have possessed such a Christian library is out of the question.

The question of pseudonymity is not only acutely raised by II Peter and Jude, but is presented almost as sharply by I Peter and the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. It is evident that this whole literature must be studied together from the point of view of its pseudonymous character, if we are to escape the fatal fault of atomism in our treatment of these documents. For if they are treated separately, the problem of pseu-

[13] 3:15, 16. [14] 1:15, 16. [14] Cf. II Peter 1:14.

donymity is extremely difficult and baffling, but taken together they may throw much needed light on what has long been their most difficult feature.

For a disciple to put forth his interpretation or restatement of his master's teaching under that master's name was a practice not unknown in antiquity; the later followers of Pythagoras we are told used to do this. Moffatt has expressed their frame of mind: "Conscious of the master's influence, disciples viewed their own writings as an extension of his spirit. . . . Hence it became a point of unselfish piety to give up all claims to personal glory and attribute their writings to the master himself." [15]

These observations are an admirable introduction to the problem as it presents itself in Ephesians. That epistle upon examination proves to be written not to the Ephesians but as the oldest manuscripts of it—Vatican, Sinaitic, Ann Arbor—show, to Christians, especially Greek Christians, in general. Paul could not have said to the Ephesians, "If at least you have heard how I dealt with the mercy of God that was given me for you," [16] for he had spent more than two years among them and they did not have to hear about his work, they knew it as well as anyone did. The first name applied to Ephesians so far as we know, was Laodiceans, which was what Marcion called it, ca.

[15] *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (New York, 1911), p. 41.
[16] Eph. 3:2.

A.D. 140. He seems to have removed it from its place at the head of Paul's letters to put Galatians first, putting Ephesians in Galatians' place.[17]

Ephesians was the first general letter, or encyclical. While it speaks in the name of Paul, and is full of Pauline expressions, almost every consideration of style and matter point to some other writer than Paul.[18] It reflects no immediate local situation, as Paul's letters invariably do, and its bold generalization of Pauline doctrine is more like an interpreter of Paul than like Paul himself. Its description of the church as founded on the apostles and prophets, 2:20 (so like Rev. 21:14) and of the holy apostles and prophets as the mediums of revelation, 3:5, can hardly be supposed to have come from Paul, but is most natural in an admirer of Paul, writing in a day when time had revealed the true significance of Paul's activity.

The very fact that Ephesians is so general as to defy connection with any local church, is the evidence that it is the work of a Paulinist seeking to show the general values that his writings possessed, in spite of the fact that each of them was addressed to some local church in some very pressing immediate local situation, now long past. The general character of the epistle, so impossible for Paul, becomes natural and even in-

[17] John Knox, *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* (Chicago, 1935), p. 41.

[18] Edgar J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago, 1937), pp. 231–37.

evitable, if the epistle was written in an effort to show the permanent religious values of Paul's letters by extracting their general religious teachings. The wholly general character of Ephesians is in the fullest agreement with its address to Christians generally, and the greeting to all Christians with which it ends.

We may think of Ephesians as an encyclical, written in the name of Paul to all Christians, with the purpose of awakening them to the religious values to be found in Paul's letters. It was written to form the introduction to the letters of Paul, now collected and published for the first time. More than this, it was cast in forms of speech almost wholly drawn from the nine genuine letters, as a tabulation of its phraseology side by side with the parallels in the genuine letters abundantly shows.[19] Even this is not all. The nine letters, Romans to Philemon, actually satisfy everything in the language of Ephesians, except a few expressions from Luke-Acts and the Greek version of the Old Testament. It is this singular fact that binds Ephesians inextricably to the nine letters. It shows the literary influence of them all.

How could a man who had written such an introduction to the collected Pauline letters, commending them to Christians everywhere, and composed it so entirely of materials drawn from the genuine letters, put any

[19] Cf. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago, 1933), pp. 82–165.

name but Paul's at the head of it? If he had put his own name there, we should brand him as a rank plagiarist, claiming as his own hundreds of things he had appropriated from Paul. He could hardly have wished to use his own name; who was he, to assume to address the whole Christian church? But he considered himself simply as the mouthpiece of Paul, reviving Paul's message, with the necessary modernization of course, for a generation that had forgotten his letters. (That it had done so is proved by the fact that Matthew and Luke had no knowledge of them.)

He might have put forth the letter with no name at all at its head, but then he would have had to give up the letter form, for it was the essence of an ancient letter that it began with the name of its writer followed by that of its recipient. But he was committed to the letter form, since it was the letters of Paul that he was proposing to introduce and circulate. He wished to gather into a sort of composite Pauline letter, a characteristic group of the values he had found in the letters themselves. His encyclical must be a letter.

We must remember too that he wrote in an age when men saw little difference between composing a speech in the name of Paul or Peter, like the speeches in the Acts, and composing a letter in his name. The difference may seem to us great; it did not seem so to them. Stephen's speech in Acts 7:2–53 is almost half as long as Ephesians, and the collected Pauline speeches

in Acts (13:16–41; 17:22–31; 20:18–35; 22:3–21; 24:10–21; 26:2–23, are the principal ones) taken together practically equal Ephesians in length. Few people suppose that Luke had accurate reports of any of these speeches, though he may have had his own recollections of some of them. But these recollections and reports would no more make the speeches really Paul's than the use of Paul's letters made Ephesians; in fact, Ephesians is more truly Pauline than Paul's speeches in the Acts.

That was an age, too, when John of Ephesus, in writing his Revelation, did not hesitate to describe himself as the amanuensis of Jesus himself.[20] All these precedents lie back of the evident pseudonymity of Ephesians. Yet various elements entered into the writing of that work—the use of the newly published Pauline corpus of letters to seven churches, the influence of contemporary Greek dramatic art, familiarity with Jewish apocalyptic writings, especially Daniel, horror of the rising sects, resentment of the religious oppression of the Roman empire. But John does not scruple to claim for the product of these forces, and for every word of his book, the sublime authority of Jesus himself; no one must alter the prophecy.[21]

To the interval between the publication of Luke-Acts and the writing of the Revelation, Ephesians belongs, and we may expect it to reflect the literary habits

[20] Rev. 1:1, 2, 11. [21] 22:18, 19.

and attitudes of that day. It was clearly a day when just such things were being done, at least in the circle of Ephesus; Luke, with his long speeches of Paul in the Acts, and John, with his exalted claim of divine revelation for his Apocalypse. Surely it was in such an age no great matter to preface Paul's collected letters with an encyclical drawn almost entirely from them, and given the name of Paul.

We would have done differently, we think. Yet ten years ago there appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* "The Epistle of Kallikrates," ostensibly an answer to I Corinthians.[22] There was nothing in its publication to suggest that it was the work of a modern Scottish minister, but one could not read a page of it without perceiving that it reflected a modern, not an ancient attitude. Why did this excellent clergyman write it under the guise of an ancient letter newly discovered? Because he wished to secure a hearing for what he had to say. He succeeded. There was nothing wrong in that. He assumed that anyone who read the article would at once see that the article was a modern, not an ancient discussion.

We may not say this of Ephesians; some ancient pseudonymity was of that kind; some of it was not. The explanation of Ephesians is rather that a writer seeking to revive Paul as a literary and religious force through his newly discovered letters, generalizes their religious message, in an introductory letter made up

[22] March, 1928.

almost wholly out of materials drawn from Paul, and puts it forth under his name. It is Paul's doctrine (as he understands it, of course) that he is seeking to present, in Paul's language, to introduce and popularize Paul's letters, and it would have defeated his purpose to put any name but Paul's at the head of what he intends as an overture to Paul.

The Pauline letter-collection, with what we know as Ephesians at its head, was an immediate success. That Paul later fell into neglect for a time because Marcion sought to monopolize him, must not blind us to the fact that the collected Pauline letters were at first enthusiastically received. Revelation, Hebrews, I Peter and I Clement show the use of them almost immediately.

For I Peter, too, must be recognized as pseudonymous. Two elements enter into its composition. Hebrews had called upon the Roman church to teach the churches: "For although from the length of your Christian experience you ought to be teaching others, you actually need someone to teach you over again the very elements of Christian truth, and you have come to need milk instead of solid food." [22] Stung by this rebuke, the Roman church looked about for churches that needed teaching. Corinth was not accepting the presbyteral authority as it should, and to Corinth Rome despatched a long letter which we know as I Clement, dealing with that subject. The letter is full of the influ-

[22] 5:12.

ence of Hebrews, and no wonder, for it was written in response to the challenge Hebrews had given the church at Rome. There was no occasion for pseudepigraphy in writing it; it is "the church of God that sojourns in Rome" that sends greeting "to the church of God that sojourns in Corinth," in the salutation.

But at the same time another error had appeared among the churches which the challenge of Hebrews caused the church at Rome to undertake to correct. It was among the churches of Asia, where the Revelation of John had just been written. With all its heroism and bold refusal to yield to the persecution that threatened, and the noble faith in the final triumph of the Kingdom of God which is its chief message, Revelation does not escape the ever-present danger of hating its enemies, but like some of the old Jewish prophets denounces them with real bitterness: "Pay her back in her own coin, and give her double for what she has done. In the cup she mixed for others, mix her a double draught. . . . Gloat over her, heaven! and all you people of God, apostles and prophets, for God has avenged you upon her!" [24]

The attitude of Revelation toward the empire's demand of emperor worship was a disloyal, seditious attitude and if adopted by Christians generally would have made the church a great hostile force within the empire, plotting its overthrow. Worse than this, it would

[24] Rev. 18:6, 20.

have developed an attitude of hatred for one's enemies that would have been a canker at the very heart of Christian morality and done the new religion a mortal injury.

It was no small service to Christianity that the church at Rome did when it produced what we know as the First Epistle of Peter. It was naturally sent to the circle to which the Revelation had been addressed—the churches of the Roman province of Asia; and to the wider circle that bordered upon it, to which the influence of the Revelation might be expected to extend—Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia.[25] So to the seven churches that had received the letter of the Revelation, and to those of the adjoining provinces, Rome sent a message counselling loyalty to the empire combined with faithfulness even unto death. "Love the brotherhood, be reverent to God, respect the emperor." [26]

This matter of the occasion of I Peter is intimately tied up with its pseudonymous character. If it was intended to correct a teaching just put forth by a prophet of Ephesus speaking in the name of Christ himself, it would hardly do to indite it like I Clement from "the church of God that sojourns in Rome." A higher authority must be claimed to win the necessary attention for so serious a message. The churches were reading with the utmost interest the newly published letters of

[25] I Peter 1:1. [26] 2:17; cf. 2:13, 14.

Paul. Paul and Peter were and still are the great apostolic patrons of the church at Rome, the "Santi Apostoli." I Clement names and praises them together.[27] The Roman church like other ancient churches felt that it was the representative and spokesman of the martyr apostles whose graves were in its keeping. It was natural for Rome to speak in the name of Peter, and (in the presence of the new and powerful Pauline corpus) through a letter. This is the meaning of the pseudepigraphy of I Peter. It is tied up with I Clement, written from the same church and at the same time, by its strange representation of Peter as not only an apostle,[28] but a Christian elder,[29] for the main interest in I Clement was to recover for the elders (presbyters) of Corinth the respect and authority Rome thought was due them. Now that message is reinforced in writing to the Christians of Asia Minor, just across the Ægean from Corinth, by speaking of Peter as a "brother-elder."

We cannot say that the pseudonymity of "Ephesians" suggested that of I Peter; it may or may not have been apparent to the Roman authors of I Clement and I Peter. But the necessity of meeting the great claims of the Revelation with a great Christian authority goes far to explain the writing of I Peter in the name of the chief of the apostles, for whom the Roman church felt it had a right to speak, since he had suffered martyr-

[27] Chapter 5. [28] 1:1. [29] 5:1.

dom in Rome and the church there was the custodian of his tomb and memory.

So began the writing of that literature in the name of Peter which eventually reached such large proportions. There came to be a Gospel of Peter, Acts of Peter, the Preaching (Kerugma) of Peter, perhaps also the Teaching (Doctrina) of Peter, certainly two Epistles of Peter, and the Revelation of Peter. Of all this the First Epistle was the beginning.

While Peter is obviously the hero, not the author, of the Acts of Peter, the Gospel of Peter was written in the first person, as the closing lines of the Akhmim fragment show:

"But I Simon Peter and Andrew my brother took our nets and went to the sea. . . ." The gospel is plainly docetic and was doubtless meant to claim the support of Peter for such views.

The Second Epistle, on the other hand, was designed to represent him as a strong supporter of the Second Coming, and so to strengthen that doctrine among the churches. The epistle refers explicitly to the first epistle.[80] "This is the second letter, dear friends, that I have now written to you." It thus assumes that it is addressed to the same circle as the first epistle, though as a matter of fact it is an encyclical, and evidently looks back upon a series of Christian encyclicals, Ephesians, I John, James, Jude, Barnabas, as well as

[80] 3:1.

upon a series of pseudo-Petrine writings—I Peter, the Preaching of Peter (an early apology), the Gospel of Peter, and the Revelation of Peter, all of which are definitely earlier than II Peter.

But the Epistle of Jude is clearly older than II Peter, for much of II Peter, Chapter 2, is taken from Jude. Jude is an encyclical, written to condemn the practical aspects of Docetism. Its writer's name may indeed have been Judas or Jude, and there may be no real pseudonymity about his little tract, except that some later hand seems to have added "the brother of James" to his name, in the effort to identify him with the Judas or Jude of Mark 6:3, where Jesus is spoken of "as the brother of James, Joses, Judas and Simon." [31] We can hardly suppose a Greek would make the mistake Beza made of understanding Judas (the son) of James in Luke 6:16 as Judas the brother of James.

The Epistle of James is a Christian sermon, written early in the second century, which was later published in the form of an epistle; an encyclical, addressed to the Christian dispersion, "the twelve tribes that are scattered over the world." [32] The name of James was perhaps suggested by the writer's apparent opposition to Paul's doctrine of faith, as known through his letters.[33] Paul in Gal. 2:12 speaks of James as though he were the leader of the opposition to his views about faith and freedom from the law. The pseudepigraphy

[31] Cf. Matt. 13:55. [32] Cf. I Peter 1:1. [33] 2:14–26.

of James may therefore be regarded as an incident of its publication, for of course the only way to deliver a letter from James to the Christians scattered over the world would be to publish it. That it was thought necessary to put it in the form of a letter in order to publish it is probably due to the success the Pauline letters had achieved.

The Epistles of Timothy and Titus were written as a group to rescue Paul from the Marcionites, who had appropriated him and threatened to monopolize him and his writings. They also sought to regulate church officers and organization, to discourage sectarian tendencies, Gnostic and Marcionite, and reëstablish the Jewish scriptures as the Bible of the church. Paul was being exploited by the Marcionites and he must himself disown them. This he does in the Pastorals, almost by name. "Keep away from the worldly empty phrases and contradictions (Antitheses) of what they falsely call knowledge (Gnosis)." [84] The Antitheses, or Contradictions was the name of Marcion's book, and Gnosis was the prevailing heresy of the middle years of the second century.

These three letters, or epistles, were clearly intended to form a supplement to the collected Pauline letters, as they did, and give the collection a definitely antiheretical tone. Their adoption of the name of Paul was in order to recover the Pauline literature from the

[84] I Tim. 6:20.

clutches of the Marcionites. Only in the name of Paul himself, it was felt, could Paul's writings be rescued from Marcion's misuse of them.

New light has been thrown upon ancient pseudonymity by Dr. Alfred E. Haefner, through his publication of a defense of the practice by one who practiced it and was detected.[35] He relates that about A.D. 440 an encyclical letter from Timothy appeared, condemning the avarice and luxury that were permeating the church. It seemed to be the work of Salvian of Marseilles. At any rate he was called upon by the bishop, Salonius, to explain. This he does in his ninth letter. He does not for a moment admit that he wrote the Letter of Timothy, but speaks of its author in the third person, and undertakes to answer the question, "Why the pamphlet which someone of our day has written to the church, was published under the name of Timothy." Salonius had declared that unless this could be satisfactorily explained, the letter would have to be classed among the Apocrypha.

Salvian first points out that it is really the contents of a book that matters, not the name it bears. "If the book is profitable reading and offers something to edify the reader, what does it matter whether or not it happens to satisfy someone's curiosity about the name of the author? We might well quote the angel's answer

[35] "A unique Source for the Study of Ancient Pseudonymity," *Anglican Theological Review*, xvi (1934), 8–15.

to his inquisitive companion, 'Seekest thou a tribe and a family, or a hired man?' [86] Since the name is immaterial, there is no use in asking about the author's name, so long as the reader profits from the book itself."

Salvian does not leave the matter here. He faces the question, Why does the author not use his own name in the title of his book? His first reason is, "that we are urged by scripture to avoid every pretense of earthly vainglory"; we must not be covetous of man's praise. As we must give our alms in secret, we should bestow the fruits of our literary labors in secret, too. Our work is more likely to please God if what we do for his glory is known to him alone.

The main reason, he goes on to say, is the writer's sense of his own insignificance; he does not wish his obscurity to detract from the influence of his book. People are more interested in an author's reputation than in the force and vigor of what they are reading. Of course this reveals more than it conveys; it really means that the writer wants a name that shall command for his work an attention his own name could not. But he proceeds to explain that he chose the name of Timothy ("the honor of God," as he translates it) because he wrote his pamphlet for the honor of God. This is hardly candid, for Timothy would at once suggest to the ordinary mind the disciple of Paul.

And yet is not this almost exactly like the background

[86] Tobit 5:11.

of the Epistle of Kallikrates in the *Atlantic Monthly?* The name will attract attention, and the reader will find out as he proceeds that the name is a transparent disguise, but by that time the message of the actual writer will have reached him, for what it is worth. So Salvian seems to have thought.

Tertullian at the beginning of the third century, shows what was generally thought about pseudepigraphy in antiquity, by a remark in his work *Against Marcion,* iv, 5, which Dr. Haefner quotes: "(The gospel) which was published by Mark may also be maintained to be Peter's whose interpreter Mark was; for the narrative of Luke also is generally ascribed to Paul; since it is allowable that that which pupils publish should be regarded as their master's work." So thought the later Pythagoreans and it is not strange if some early Christians thought the same.

Chapter VIII

MODERN APOCRYPHA

Ministers of the gospel and New Testament professors are frequently asked about the authenticity of various curious writings relating to the gospel history that seem to supplement what the New Testament contains. A Russian war-correspondent once published what he called *The Unknown Life of Jesus Christ,* supposedly from manuscripts he claimed to have found in Tibet. His story was completely demolished by F. Max Müller and by the testimony of actual visitors to Tibet, such as the Reverend Ahmad Shah.[1] Thirty-two years later, however, it was reprinted and widely hailed by the press as a new discovery.

In good bookstores there is offered for sale *The Aquarian Gospel,* a fanciful blending of the four gospels, the Gospel of James (the so-called Protevangelium) and the *Unknown Life,* written by Dr. Levi H. Dowling and published in Los Angeles in 1911.

A country preacher in Missouri in 1879 published what he called the *Acts of Pilate,* and this ignorant and fantastic work found such a welcome from the religious

[1] *Four Years in Tibet,* Benares, 1906.

public that he afterward developed it into a whole volume of such crude vulgar fancies under the appalling title, *The Archaeological and Historical Writings of the Sanhedrin and Talmuds of the Jews* (1884). This book has been repeatedly exposed as a childish fraud, but is still printed and sold in this country.

The *Confession of Pontius Pilate,* the *Letter of Benan the Egyptian Physician,* and the British Israelite *Twenty-Ninth Chapter of Acts,* are similar modern fictions masquerading as ancient religious texts. In general, scholarship has turned away in disgust from these pieces, considering them unworthy of serious attention. And so they are, except that so many well-meaning people who lack critical training are taken in by them. To protect such people, Carl Schmidt showed the falsity of the claims made by its author for *Der Benanbrief,* the *Letter of Benan the Egyptian Physician.*[2]

The Crucifixion of Jesus, by an Eye-witness, has also found many readers in German, Swedish and English. It came into English from the Swedish version, but it was written in German and published in 1847.[3] It

[2] Carl Schmidt, *Der Benanbrief, eine moderne Leben-Jeus-Fälschung,* Leipzig, 1921.

[3] Martin Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament,* New York, 1936, p. 93. This carries the origin of the work much further back than I was able to do in *Strange New Gospels* (1931), pp. 38, 39. The first Swedish edition, Harald Holmberg of the Royal Library of Stockholm informs me, appeared in Stockholm in 1851. Dr. William H. Allison of the Library of Congress kindly informs me of a French translation of which the third edition was published in Paris in 1863, under the title, *Le Mort de Jésus.*

claims to be translated from an ancient Latin manuscript found in Alexandria but Dibelius has shown that it is taken bodily from K. H. Venturini's *Natural History of the Great Prophet of Nazareth,* 1800–1802, what the original writer meant as a romantic reconstruction being made to masquerade as a contemporary historical document. It seeks to show that Jesus was an Essene, and to rationalize the supernatural elements in the narrative.

I. The Letter from Heaven

My first acquaintance with a complete text of the *Letter from Heaven,* in its modern form, was when a negro came down our street peddling copies at fifteen cents each. I am sure he was never so welcomed in his life as he was at my door, for I had been looking for a complete text of that curious work for years. In *Strange New Gospels* (Chicago, 1931) I printed the English text as best I could from three mostly imperfect printings; these I exhibited in parallel columns in the *Anglican Theological Review,* xv (1933), pp. 105–114, as an example of the meaningless and purposeless variations into which a religious text will wander, when its transmission is left to ignorant, superstitious people.

Much light has been thrown upon the early history of the letter by researches into its longer mediæval Latin forms, and upon its more modern English career, which proves to be much longer than I had supposed.

The late Professor Robert Priebsch, of London, has explored its origin.[4] It seems to have appeared first in Latin toward the end of the sixth century, in Ebusa, the smallest of the Balearic Islands, where the bishop Vincentius accepted it and made it known to his people. But when he sent a copy of it to Licinianus, bishop of Carthagena, the latter denounced it most severely. It is his letter to Vincentius condemning the letter, written probably before A.D. 584, that gives us our first glimpse of the existence of such a thing, unless we are to connect it with a still more ancient Elkesaite document mentioned by Hippolytus, *Refutation,* 9:8, as having been revealed by a huge angel. This effort to connect the *Letter from Heaven* with the book mentioned by Hippolytus seems to have little to commend it, however.

Though disapproved by Licinianus the *Letter from Heaven* reappears at intervals through the centuries, being often denounced by churchmen. It appeared in the twelfth century in the cathedral library in Tarragona, and Priebsch suggests that Vincentius may have obtained his copy of it from that place. St. Boniface, the apostle to Germany, appeals to the Pope against it, in the eighth century, and Pope Zacharias held a synod in the Lateran to deal with Aldebert, bishop of Verdun, who was circulating it (745). Later in the same century (789) Charlemagne condemned it, and his son

[4] Robert Priebsch, *Letter from Heaven on the Observance of the Lord's Day,* Oxford, 1936.

Louis the Pious was later reproached with having rejected it. It had reached England by the eleventh century, and spread to Ireland and Iceland.

It dealt chiefly with Sabbath observance, transferring the Jewish ideal of the Sabbath to the Christian Sunday, and insisting also upon church attendance and pious behavior throughout the day. It threatened those who disobeyed these commands with dire disasters.

This is just the attitude of the modern English form of the letter, which while a good deal simplified, evidently owes much to the old mediæval text, in one or other of its developed forms. New light has been thrown upon the English letter by the discovery in London of an old eighteenth century "broadside" of it, evidently meant to be framed and hung up in the house; in fact some modern possessors of such broadsides refuse to part with them, for fear of losing the blessings the *Letter* promises those who keep it in their houses, and also through fear of incurring the punishments it threatens.

One of the texts from which I reconstructed the text of the *Letter from Heaven* in 1931, was copied for me from one of these old cherished broadsides, so valued by its possessors that they would not consent to part with it. Another such broadside has since come to light in the possession of the Reverend Desmond Morse-Boycott, in London. The Morse-Boycott copy also contains the correspondence of Jesus with Abgar king of

Edessa ("Agbarus") familiar from Eusebius.[5] This is followed by the Letter of Lentulus describing the personal appearance of Jesus, now generally regarded as a modern work. Both these items were present in the broadside I used in publishing the *Letter from Heaven* in 1927. The Morse-Boycott broadside has been generally dated soon after 1700. Its printers were Howard and Evans, 42 Long Lane, West Smithfield, London. The broadside from a copy of which I published the text in 1931 was press-marked "Pitts. . . . Great St. Andrews St. Seven Dials.—One Penny."

I did not see this broadside—only a copy of its text —or I might have perceived that it proved the *Letter* much older than I gathered from its contents. Certainly if it was of the type of the London copy, and it probably was, it would have revealed that it belonged to the eighteenth century. For a third broadside has now appeared, this time in Albert Lea, Minnesota, which is more than a century old.

It was brought to my attention by the Reverend Charles J. Gunnell, rector of Christ Church, Albert Lea, who very kindly secured a photograph of it for me, and when I visited Albert Lea, brought it to show me. From its type, my colleague, Professor Pierce Butler, judges it not earlier than 1800, although the illustration of the Crucifixion may be older.

The preliminary matter in all three seems very much

[5] *Church History*, 1:13:6–9.

the same; in the Albert Lea broadside, it reads: "A Copy of a Letter written by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and found eighteen miles from Iconiam fifty three years after our Blessed Saviour's Crucsfixion.

"Transmitted from the Holy City by a converted Jew.

"Faithfully translated from the original Hebrew Copy now in the possession of the Lady Cuba's family at Mesopotamia.

"This Letter was written by JESUS CHRIST, and found under a great stone round and large at the foot of the Cross. Upon the stone was engraved, 'Blessed are they that shalt turn me over.' All people that saw it prayed to God earnestly, desiring that he would make this writing known unto them, and that they might not attempt in vain to turn it over. In the meantime there came out a little child about six or seven years of age, and turned it over without assistance, to the admiration of all who was standing by. It was carried to the City of Iconiam and published by a person belonging to the Lady Cuba.

"On the letter was written the commandments of Jesus Christ.

"Signed by the Angel Gabriel, seventy-four years after our Saviour's birth."

The text of the *Letter* in both the London and the Albert Lea broadsides is substantially that printed in *Strange New Gospels,* pp. 103–105.

The effect of these newly discovered broadsides is to

push the existence of the English form of the *Letter* back to the beginning of the eighteenth century at any rate, while the researches of Priebsch in the mediæval forms lying back of the English letter carry such a *Letter from Heaven* back almost to the middle of the sixth century. The English form of it must have been widely used in the eighteenth century, being framed and hung on the wall by superstitious people, as a protection against misfortune.

II. The Gospel of Josephus

In January, 1927, the discovery of an ancient manuscript of a new Greek gospel was reported from Cerignola, Italy. Various statements about it appeared in the newspapers; that the manuscript was a parchment of the third or fourth century; that the work was composed by one Josephus of Jerusalem; that it had been found by a Signor Luigi Moccia under the false bottom of a wrought-iron chest or casket he had bought in an antique shop in Rome; that Mr. Henry Ford had offered a large sum for it; and finally that Moccia had admitted it was a hoax, designed he said to stimulate faith, but others said to advertise a novel he was about to produce.

I knew no more than this when early in 1931 Mr. Salvatore Riggi of Schenectady, New York, wrote me that he had seven sheets of the manuscript, and had translated the whole into Italian, for use in mission

work among the Italians there. I spent an hour or so with him in Schenectady, and he very kindly placed the manuscripts, together with a complete copy of the Greek text and his printed Italian translation of it, in my hands for examination.

The parchments were certainly impressive pieces. They were evidently old. Five measured 11 to 11¼ inches in height by 7⅜ to 7¾ inches in width. The writing was in single columns, with from 44 to 47 lines to a column, and covered the whole sheet, leaving only the scantiest margins. Two smaller sheets, containing statements from Josephus and Zosimus, measured 9¾ by 6¾ inches, and 8¾ by 7½ inches, respectively. The remaining sheets, making thirty-one in all in Greek, besides the one in Latin, were not in Mr. Riggi's hands at the time.

The form of the manuscript—loose sheets, written on one side only—at once aroused suspicion, which was confirmed by the fact that the Greek was carefully separated into words and paragraphs, and equipped with accents, breathings and modern punctuation, with capitals at the beginnings of proper names and sentences, and iota-subscripts carefully supplied. These features showed at once that the writing was not ancient or even mediæval but distinctly modern in period.

The sheets were evidently from neither a roll nor a leaf-book. They seemed to have been taken from the fly leaves of old manuscripts, and quite recently written

upon. They had afterward been carefully antiqued, so that the writing appeared blurred and faded. Photostats of them were more legible than the parchments themselves.

The text that had been copied upon them was simply an interweaving of our four gospels, with a little elaboration about Jesus' studious and obedient youth, the trades or professions of the apostles, and the like.

With the sheets of the gospel was a letter in Greek, from Josephus to his Christian brothers, meaning Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, written when he was at the point of death, just after the fall of Jerusalem, in A.D. 70, apparently in transmitting his gospel to them. The other accompanying document, in Latin, is also an endorsement of the Gospel, by Zosimus, librarian of Alexandria. It is headed "L. E. D. Ar. Hist.," which perplexed even Signor Moccia himself, and declares these thirty-one leaves to have been written in Greek by Josephus of Jerusalem, for his disciples, and found by Helena the mother of Constantine in a house near the Temple in Jerusalem. They had been sold without her knowledge to some Hebrews who had sold them to the Library of Alexandria. Two short lines of four words each at the bottom of the sheet are probably meant to look like Hebrew but are really meaningless scrawls. Three expert Semitic paleographers have examined them for me and declare them neither Hebrew, Aramaic nor Syriac. The purpose of the letter and note is evi-

dently to account for the origin of the manuscript, its relation to the four gospels and its preservation until the fourth century.

The intention of the whole thing is to present this gospel as the source out of which all four of the canonical gospels were made, and it hardly needed the paleographical argument to disclose the absurdity of such an explanation of their origins. There have been many efforts to weave together the four gospels in ancient, mediæval and modern times, for practical religious purposes. But nothing could be more improbable than that our four gospels arose by taking to pieces such a work as Signor Moccia has put forth as the original gospel. The whole story of the Moccia Gospel forms one of the most elaborate and absurd of these periodic attempts to impose upon religious people by professed discoveries of ancient Christian documents.

For the protection of lovers of Christian literature against imposture, it is necessary to describe this fictitious gospel definitely, so that it may be recognized for what it is, a twentieth century interweaving of our familiar gospels, and in a late and uncritical Greek text, for the section about the Adulterous Woman is included, although it has never been found in a Greek manuscript earlier than the sixth century.

Signor Moccia's introduction to the Italian translation states that the parchment leaves were given to him

by an aged Hebrew for whom he had done some great service.

The work itself is entitled *Concerning the Life of Jesus of Nazareth,"* and translated into plain English, begins:

"Joseph of Jerusalem, the disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, to all the brothers who live in the communion of possessions and of faith, in Judea, Syria, Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus and Phrygia, . . . grace and peace be multiplied from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.

"Since many have undertaken inaccurately to draw up an account of the matters that have taken place among us," etc. . . .

After the substance of Luke 1:1–4, this second paragraph concludes thus:

"Fearing that this writing may be destroyed or altered by some of our opponents, I have delivered four copies to our most excellent brothers, Matthew of Capernaum, Mark of Jerusalem, Luke of Antioch, and John of Bethsaida. They will know how to spread the gospel of Jesus not only by word and example but by writing."

The text continues:

"In the days of Archelaus ethnarch of Judea and son of Herod, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth," etc.

The text ends with the substance of the last verse of the Long Conclusion of Mark, 16:20. As published in

the Italian translation, it is followed by the Letter of the dying Josephus beginning, "My beloved brothers, on this last day of my life," and ending, l. 17, "The grace of the Lord be with you."

While Moccia is said to have admitted that the work was a creation of his own, some sincere but uninformed people have welcomed the new gospel as a genuine discovery and find it useful in practical religious work. And of course, its contents are of the utmost religious value, being drawn with slight amplifications from the familiar gospels. It is to the claims and pretensions of the work that objection must be made. It is simply one more interweaving of the four gospels, by a modern hand, neither competent nor scrupulous.

III. The Book of Jasher

The Old Testament twice mentions a Book of Jashar or, as the King James Version has it, Jasher; once after quoting Joshua's cry to the sun and moon to stand still, "Is this not written in the Book of Jashar? [6] and once in II Samuel 1:18 where David's lament over Saul and Jonathan is described as "written in the Book of Jashar to instruct the Judeans." [7] There is no other mention of a man named Jashar or Jasher in the Old Testament, though a Jesher is mentioned among the sons of Caleb, I Chronicles 2:18. But these mentions of the Book of

[6] Joshua 10:13.
[7] Moffatt translates in both places "The Book of Heroes."

Jashar (Jasher) have tempted a number of individuals in mediæval and modern times to undertake to supply the missing document.

It is appropriate to recall these efforts to put an imitation Book of Jasher into circulation, because in 1934 an old English fiction under that name was revived, with such success that the Boston *Christian Leader* for November 30, 1935, has devoted six columns to an account of it, evidently accepting it at its face value. It is usually the case with these curious frauds that when they first appear they are promptly unmasked, but a generation or a century later they are revived by somebody and make a fresh bid for acceptance, long after their exposure has been forgotten.

But there were three mediæval efforts in this direction, made by Jews, and in Hebrew. They are reported in the older Bible dictionaries like Jackson's *Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge.* One is a moral treatise, composed by Rabbi Shabbatai Carmuz Levita, in 1391, and preserved in a Vatican manuscript. An earlier one, in the form of an introduction to the Hexateuch, written probably by a Spanish Jew in the thirteenth century, was published in Venice in 1625. This seems to be the work published in New York in 1840, in an English version probably made by a Mr. Samuel of Liverpool. A third, written by Rabbi Tham, who died in 1171, was a treatise on Jewish ritual, and was first printed in Italy in 1544.

The fourth is the one that has so recently been revived among us, by the Rosicrucian Order in San Jose, California, in a very handsome photographic reproduction of the Book as printed at Bristol, England, in 1829.

The title page describes the Book of Jasher as "translated into English by Flaccus Albinus Alcuinus, of Britain, Abbot of Canterbury, who went on a pilgrimage into the Holy Land, and Persia, where he discovered this volume, in the city of Gazna." A preface ("Advertisement") declares that the translation was discovered by a gentleman on a journey through the North of England, in 1721. The manuscript had an endorsement by no less a person than Wickliffe, who had written on it, "I have read the Book of Jasher twice over; and I much approve of it, as a piece of great antiquity and curiosity; but I cannot assert that it should be made a part of the canon of scripture," and signed the statement.

Even more astonishing is the introductory statement of Alcuin, relating how he went on a pilgrimage to Rome and Jerusalem, and continuing to Baghdad and Casbin, he was there told by a recluse or ascetic that a manuscript of the Book of Jasher existed at Gazna. He continued his journey to that place, found it "in the library," in the form of a roll of white paper, an eighth of an inch thick, nine feet long, and two feet three inches high, and was allowed to translate the Hebrew into English. After three years in Gazna, he

returned to Rome and then to Bristol, after an absence of seven years. Alcuin learned from the manuscript that Jasher, the son of Caleb, was the "virger" of Moses, and bore the rod before him and Aaron; that he wrote his Book and put it into an ark, and that in the time of the Captivity the ark containing Jasher's book was taken to Babylonia, and so passed later into the hands of the Persians, where Alcuin found it. He and his learned companions were not allowed to carry away a copy of the Hebrew text however.

The Book of Jasher as produced in Bristol in 1829 is a very fine, stately piece of printing; in the modern reproduction, the page is eight inches wide by ten and three-quarters high—almost the proportions of a pulpit Bible. The text is broken into thirty-seven chapters of from six to fifty verses each, the chapters are prefaced with brief summaries and the verses are separate paragraphs as in English Bibles, from the Geneva Bible of 1560 down. The text begins:

"Whilst it was the beginning, darkness overspread the face of nature. And the ether moved upon the surface of the chaos." It ends,

"And Jazer builded an ark of Gopher-wood, and he brought it unto his father, and Jasher put therein the book, which he had written. And Jazer laid it up in the city of Jezer." *

While the book begins with the Creation, the story

* 37:31, 32.

is principally concerned with the Exodus and the Conquest, down to the times of the judges Caleb, Jasher and Othniel. It is gathered from all parts of the Hexateuch, Judges and Joshua. It does not seem to have been written for any particular doctrinal purpose; immortality is taught, but the supernatural element is toned down in places; the water does not gush from the smitten rock, but oozes from the ground. It seems to have been written just because a book of that name was mentioned in the Bible, and had never been found.

It does not require any great critical faculty to undermine this quaint little book. Alcuin probably did go to Rome in early life, in search of manuscripts. But that he reached Persia is most unlikely, in view of the Moslem control of those regions, from A.D. 650 on. It is most unlikely that he knew Hebrew, and utterly impossible that he wrote English, particularly the Elizabethan English of this book. Bristol was not settled until about A.D. 1000, and hardly the place to sail from or return to, in the latter half of the eighth century. The book is nothing but a condensation of sections of the first seven books of the Old Testament, and does not even contain David's Dirge over Saul and Jonathan, which should be in it, according to II Samuel, 1:18. One hardly sees how it could contain it, as Jasher died long before David was born.

It is easy to see how this eighteenth century Jasher

came to leave out David's Dirge, however, for the King James Version does not say that it was in the Book of Jasher. It only says in II Samuel 1:18: "Also he bade them teach the children of Judah *the use of* the bow: behold, *it is* written in the book of Jasher." The Dirge immediately follows.

This was the current understanding of this passage in 1750, and explains why the Book of Jasher declares that Caleb invented the bow:

"Caleb, the son of Hezron, invented the bow; for he was a mighty man, and a man of renown. He taught the children of Jacob to shoot with the bow: he learnt his brethren to prepare themselves for the battle." [9]

Caleb appears again and again as a leader of bowmen.[10] Caleb's son Jesher,[11] is identified with Jasher, and becomes the writer of the book, which tells of the use of the bow, and how Caleb introduced it to the Hebrews.

Modern learning (since de Wette), however, understands II Samuel 1:18 to refer not to the use of the bow but to the song of the Bow, that is, the dirge that follows, and translates, "and he bade them teach the children of Judah *the song of* the bow: behold it is written in the book of Jasher." [12] That is, the dirge was called the Bow, from the mention of Jonathan's bow, vs. 22. More modern translators go still further:

[9] 6:12, 13. [10] 9:5, 7, 26. [11] I Chronicles 2:18.
[12] English Revised Version, American Standard Version.

"(Behold, it is written in the Book of Jashar to instruct the Judeans), and he said." [13]

" (It is written in the Book of Heroes), he said." [14]

This leaves Caleb's invention and his efforts to "learn his brethren" the use of the bow, 6:13, quite out of date.

The other passage quoted in the Old Testament from the Book of Jasher (or Jashar), Joshua's appeal to sun and moon to stand still, Joshua, 10:13, appears thus in the Book, 30:11:

"Sun, be thou silent upon Gibeon, and thou, moon, shine thou on the valley of Ajalon."

This seems to lose most of the vigor and imagination of the familiar form, and makes no particular sense.

Dates from the creation are conveniently given in the margins, after the fashion of the Ussher chronology, contained in printings of the King James Bible from 1701 on. The first printing of the Book of Jasher is said to have been in 1751. The Bristol edition of 1829 was a reprinting of this, slightly revised, but in a larger form.

Eighteenth century scholarship was not slow in finding the flaws in the Book of Jasher. It was soon shown to have been the work of a certain Jacob Ilive, a type founder and printer of London, where he was in business from 1730 to 1763. This strange individual

[13] American Translation. [14] Moffatt's translation.

seems [15] to have become a public teacher of infidelity, hiring Carpenters' Hall for his addresses.

The book having appeared in November, 1751, was immediately declared a fraud, in the *Monthly Review* for December of the same year. But the work was revived in Bristol in 1829, and so many people were led to purchase it that Thomas Hartwell Horne was moved to expose it again as an imposture in his *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.*[16] This work thoroughly examines the two editions of the book and concludes that it is "a shameless literary forgery." [17] Dr. John Kitto, in his famous *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature,* states that the fraud was again exposed in the Dublin *Christian Examiner* of 1831, and again in the *British Critic* for January, 1834.

As to the endorsement by John Wickliffe, anyone familiar with the English style of his translation of the Bible will feel the enormous gap between it and that of his supposed endorsement of the Book of Jasher.

There is perhaps a touch of humor in Jasher, when it declares that when the Hebrews left Egypt, the Egyptians cried unto Pharaoh and said, "The Hebrews have sold unto us more in number of their flocks and their herds, and their possessions than they had." And Pharoah said, "Arise, let us pursue after them." [18]

Mr. Ilive was unfortunate in his first edition in saying

[15] Chalmers' *Biographical Dictionary,* vol. xix, p. 228.
[16] 11th ed., London, 1860.
[17] Vol. IV, pp. 741–47.
[18] 10:3, 4.

that Alcuin and his two companions had "learned in the University of Oxford all those languages which the people of the east speak," [19] when as a matter of fact that institution was not founded until more than eighty years after Alcuin's death: he died in 804 and Oxford was founded supposedly by Alfred in A.D. 886. This remark was accordingly omitted from the edition of 1829.

But Mr. Ilive was more fortunate when he stated that the book was written on paper, and the objections levelled as this remark will not hold. Horne maintained that paper was unknown in the times of Alcuin, and so it was, in Europe, but not in the Far East. The discoveries of Sir Aurel Stein have brought to light magnificent Chinese paper rolls as old as the beginning of the Christian era, and as far as knowledge of paper in Persia is concerned, it was precisely through the capture of Samarcand by the Arabs in A.D. 712 that paper began to become known to the West. Gazna is not really in Persia, of course, but paper may well have been known there in the days of Alcuin, though whether a Hebrew would have written the Book of Jasher on paper, when the Jews so long preferred skins for their scrolls, may be doubted. We may, in fairness, concede Mr. Ilive his paper scroll, but that is far from enough to save his Book of Jasher from exposure as a careless literary hoax.

The indignant questions of the Rosicrucian pub-

[19] P. iv.

lishers of the Book of Jasher, "By what right has man been denied the words of the prophets? Who has dared expunge from the Bible one of its inspired messages?" may therefore be set at rest. The Book of Jasher as they have published it is not older than 1750.

IV. The Lost Books of the Bible

Anyone in contact with modern church life on its Biblical side must often have been questioned about "The Lost Books of the Bible." Under this bold provocative title the Alpha Publishing Company produced in 1926, what had been often produced before, a reprint of William Hone's *Apocryphal New Testament,* first printed in London in 1820.

Hone's book was itself copied from two earlier ones. Jeremiah Jones' *New and Full Method for Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament,* published in 1736, supplied the New Testament Apocrypha which form the first part, and an edition of the Apostolic Fathers published by William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1737, formed the second. Hone's materials were thus eighty-five years old when he published them. How much they are worth today, two full centuries after they were written, can be imagined.

It would be difficult to name a field of learning in which more advance has been made since the days of William Hone than the field of early Christian liter-

ature. New manuscripts have been found, new relations discovered, new origins determined. The work of scholars like Harnack, Stählin, Lightfoot and M. R. James have transformed our knowledge in these matters. The Letters of Clement of Rome are now known in a complete Greek text, besides some complete versions; Hone and Wake (and *The Lost Books of the Bible,* of course) know only the incomplete forms of the two letters as they appeared in the Codex Alexandrinus, where several chapters are missing from each of them. Hone and Wake could not know that Tischendorf was to discover on Mt. Sinai in 1859 the complete Greek text of the Letter of Barnabas, or that Bryennius would find another in 1875; but *The Lost Books of the Bible* might have known it, if its solicitude about early Christian literature was as great as its publishers represented.

To republish this two hundred year old edition of the Apostolic Fathers is doubly unfortunate when it is remembered that upon them the best learning of German and British scholars has been lavished in recent years; Lightfoot devoted five volumes of excellent work to Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp, producing what Harnack called the best edition we have of any Christian fathers, and Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn edited the whole collection of Apostolic Fathers in three volumes. Lightfoot and Harmer also published a one-volume edition of Greek texts with introductions and

translations, and Lake has published a useful translation in the Loeb Library, 1912. None of this work is taken account of at all in *The Lost Books of the Bible.*

Many Greek papyri have come to light of late years with parts of the text of the Shepherd of Hermas, helping us in some degree to complete that text. These are, of course, unnoticed in *The Lost Books of the Bible,* since it confines itself to what was known two hundred years ago about this ancient literature. The publishers assumed that nothing worth knowing had been found out about the Apostolic Fathers in two hundred years, and that was a great mistake.

The first part of the book (copied from Jeremiah Jones, 1736) contains four Infancy gospels—the Birth of Mary, which is a late Latin form of the Protevangelium of James; then the Protevangelium, which was written about the middle of the second century; then the First Gospel of the Infancy, which may be as old as A.D. 400; then the Second Gospel of the Infancy, which turns out to be a small fragment of the well-known Gospel of Thomas, written about the middle of the second century. None of these works was ever thought of as a part of any New Testament or New Testament list. To speak of them as though they had once been in the Bible and had somehow been left out is either gross ignorance or gross deception. With proper historical introductions, written in the light of modern knowledge, they are interesting and significant writings for

different periods of Christian thought and history, but they were never thought of by anybody as belonging or deserving to belong to the Bible. This is a simple matter of historical fact.

The next item in the book is the Letter of Abgar, king of Edessa, to Jesus, and Jesus' letter written in reply. These works, derived by Jeremiah Jones from the *Church History* of Eusebius, were written in the third century to prove the antiquity of the Syriac church. They were never in any Bible, nor did anyone before these modern republishers of them ever think of such a thing. Next comes the Gospel of Nicodemus, better known as the Acts of Pilate, which was really written in the fourth or fifth century, and could not possibly have been lost from the New Testament, which was formed long before these Acts were written.

The Apostles' Creed and the spurious letter from Paul to the Laodiceans follow. The Letter to the Laodiceans, an incoherent jumble of scraps from Paul's authentic letters, known only in Latin, not in Greek, does occur in some Latin manuscripts of the Bible, and in printed German Bibles before Luther. We cannot be sure the letter is even as old as the fourth century, however.[20] It was not written until after the contents of the New Testament were fairly settled. Then come the letters supposed to have been exchanged between Paul

[20] Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur, Chronologie*, I, (Leipzig, 1897), p. 702.

and Seneca. These last are first heard of in the fourth century. They were, of course, never thought of for inclusion in any New Testament in any language anywhere.

The last work of this first part of *The Lost Books* is entitled the "Acts of Paul and Thecla." It is the romantic story of the conversion of Thecla of Iconium to Christianity. But we now know that it is only one chapter of the book anciently known as the Acts of Paul. A large part of those Acts was discovered in 1897 by Carl Schmidt in a Coptic version, and he has just published the Greek text of most of the work from a papyrus manuscript recently found in Egypt. Paul and Thecla is simply the most popular chapter of the whole long romance.

For this book, as a whole (not in the fragment offered by *The Lost Books of the Bible*), some claims to a place in the Bible were anciently made. The list of scriptural books that has been written into the Codex Claromontanus contains the Acts of Paul along with the Revelation of Peter, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Letter of Barnabas. This list probably represents the usage in Christian Egypt about A.D. 300. A quarter of a century later, the Acts of Paul was listed by Eusebius as among the "disputed" books which he rejected —the Shepherd, the Letter of Barnabas, the Revelation of Peter, and the Teaching of the Apostles. It was only in Egypt and Caesarea that the Acts of Paul gained even this much approval, although Hippolytus at Rome

early in the third century knew it and quoted it, but not as scripture.

So much for the contribution of Jeremiah Jones in 1736 to *The Lost Books of the Bible.* As for that of William Wake, it is no reflection upon him that we, two hundred years later, know more than he did about these ancient works of Christian literature. But it is a reflection upon those who put these antiquated editions with their obsolete introductions before the public as "the testimony of such men as Nicodemus or Barnabas," as the circulation manager of the *World's Work* describes it. Of course no serious student of early Christian Literature has any idea that Barnabas or Nicodemus had anything to do with the so-called Letter of Barnabas (written about A.D. 130), or the Gospel of Nicodemus, written in the fourth or fifth century after Christ.

Of the second half of the book, three or four items were sometimes included in ancient New Testaments, here and there. The two Letters that bear the name of Clement of Rome stand at the end of the New Testament in the Codex Alexandrinus of the Greek Bible, written in the fifth century, and in one Syriac manuscript of the New Testament. The Letter of Barnabas and the beginning of the Shepherd of Hermas, Tischendorf found at the end of the New Testament in the Codex Sinaiticus, and sat up all that night to copy the text of Barnabas, so that he could carry it back to

Europe. Both these works were in the list of Scripture in the Codex Claromontanus and were included by Eusebius among the "disputed books" which he rejected.

To describe these books as "Outlawed Scriptures," and as "barred forever from the Bible," or as "suppressed writings" as though churchmen had made a campaign against them and were trying to hush them up may be good salesmanship but hardly corresponds with the facts. Certainly Bishop Lightfoot, like Archbishop Wake long before, did all he could to promote the reading and study of the Apostolic Fathers, even arranging in his will for the continuation of his published books upon them. And in ancient times, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, at the end of his famous list of books of scripture, recommends the reading of the Teaching of the Apostles and the Shepherd of Hermas.[21] So far was he from barring the Shepherd or wishing it to be outlawed or suppressed.

To *The Lost Books* is sometimes added a group of writings not in Jones, Wake or Hone—the Letters of Pilate and Herod. They are probably not earlier than the Middle Ages, and how anyone can think they might or should have found a place in the New Testament it is difficult to imagine. Sometimes the fragment of the second century Gospel of Peter found at Akhmim in Egypt in 1887 is added to the book. That gospel was a document of the Docetic sect and is based on the gos-

[21] In his Easter letter of A.D. 367.

pels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. It was never a part of any New Testament.

We have seen that *The Lost Books of the Bible* has no pretensions to information or learning of any kind; that most of the documents it prints never had a place in any New Testament or Bible; that no one has made any attempt to outlaw, suppress or lose them, but on the contrary churchmen and scholars have made great efforts to find complete ancient manuscripts of them and give them wide circulation. The publishers of *The Lost Books* have not bothered to find out that a complete Greek text has been found for I Clement, besides complete Coptic, Syriac and Latin versions of it, while *The Lost Books* only knows the form of it discovered in 1628, which lacks seven chapters. We now have the complete Greek text of II Clement, but *The Lost Books* ignores the last eight chapters; it does not know they have been found, not only in Greek but in Syriac. It describes these works as "translated from the original tongues" (title page), but its translation of Barnabas is based solely on the Latin version, not on the original Greek at all. In fact, considerable parts of some of these books have never been found in their "original tongues." In justice to William Hone, it must be said that this statement does not occur on his title page but is added by the modern publishers to make the title page sound more like the King James Bible. The further statement of the title page that here are all the gos-

pels, epistles, and other pieces now extant attributed in the first four centuries to Jesus Christ, his apostles and their companions, not included in the New Testament, is very wide of the mark. Where is the Teaching of the Apostles, found in 1875? Where is the Epistle of the Apostles, published practically entire in 1919? Where is III Corinthians, long honored as a letter of Paul in Syrian Christianity? Where is the Revelation of Peter, found with the fragment of the Gospel of Peter in 1887? Where is the Acts of Paul, found by Schmidt in 1897 and since published in both Coptic and Greek? If we are to include the Acts of Paul (and Thecla) why not the contemporary Acts of John?

Even what is published is most carelessly reprinted. Whole lines are omitted. Most serious of all, Hone's frank acknowledgment that he is using Archbishop Wake's edition of the Apostolic Fathers is omitted from the Table of Contents, nor is there any intimation anywhere in the book that it represents a stage of Christian learning two hundred years behind the times. It is hard to believe that a reputable modern publisher would have adopted and circulated such a palpable deception among the truth-seeking religious public.

Anyone who wishes to read these and similar early Christian texts should obtain *The Apocryphal New Testament* published by a great modern scholar and man of letters, Dr. Montague R. James, late provost of

Eton College.[22] There modern discovery and study have been intelligently taken advantage of, and Dr. James has provided brief introductions embodying the findings of sound modern historical and literary study of these interesting writings. Such canonical pretensions as a few of them have had I have discussed in Chapter XVII of "The Formation of the New Testament." [23]

[22] Oxford, 1924.

[23] Chicago, 1926.

INDEX