

78 *The Gospel according to the Hebrews.*
EDWARD BYRON NICHOLSON

III.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE, AND GENERAL
CONCLUSIONS.

LET us now estimate the internal evidence afforded by the Fragments as to (i.) the character of this Gospel; (ii.) its relation to other works outside or inside of the canon.

(i.) The Gospel according to the Hebrews shows no approach to the character of the Apocryphal Gospels. Among *their* foremost features are Mariolatry, miracle-mongering, imaginative elaboration of incidents briefly sketched in the Canonical Gospels, and a free invention of other incidents out of canonical materials. Of the first two there is no trace in the Fragments, and of the third and fourth only a very slight suspicion. The mason's speech, the speech of Jesus to the rich man, and the appearance of Jesus to James, might at first seem to be mere elaborations of canonical incidents. The mason's speech, however, is very brief, and the plain form of address 'Jesus' hardly the most likely for a forger to adopt. The story of the rich man seems to be altogether independent of the canonical versions. The appearance of Jesus to James is told in language not less brief than beautiful, and the Pauline Epistles are not the source from which a Nazarene would be most likely to draw. There is better cause to regard the Preface as a mere compilation (and a very bald one) from canonical data: but we have to remember that it comes to us from an Ebionite copy and not a Nazarene one, and that, while we have good reason to charge the Ebionites with altering and interpolating, no similar evidence exists against the Nazarenes.

And here we come to the question whether the Gospel according to the Hebrews was heretical, or betrays a design to favour any peculiar views.

This must be fully admitted of Epiphanius's Ebionite copy. The first two chapters of Matthew were struck out

from it because they were not to be reconciled with Ebionite theories of the nature of Jesus. Nor can we doubt that the denunciation of sacrifices put into the mouth of Jesus (Fr. 33) is a pure forgery in support of their anti-sacrificial views. His professed *disinclination* (opposed to Luke xxii. 15) to eat 'this FLESH the passover' with his disciples looks like a wilful perversion to suit their own strict vegetarianism, and the non-mention of locusts as part of the Baptist's food becomes in this light very suspicious.

Nothing of this can be charged against Jerome's Nazarene copy, or, indeed, against the copies quoted by other Fathers. I have argued that Jerome's copy contained Matt. ii. 5, 15, 23. There are, however, a few of the Nazarene fragments which call for some remark.

In Fr. 6 Jesus, while asserting his sinlessness, is represented as qualifying this assertion with the words 'except perchance this very thing that I have said is ignorance.' The question whether Jesus, as man, *was able*, consciously or unconsciously, to sin is, I believe, one which has rarely been discussed, and never been pronounced on by the Church. That his knowledge, as man, increased with his years is said in Luke ii. 52, and in Mark xiii. 32 a certain limitation is assigned to it, such limitation, I may add, being recognised by so orthodox a doctrinal teacher as Canon Liddon (*Bampton Lectures*, 459, seqq.), who quotes on the same side Irenaeus, Cyril, Athanasius, and Gregory Nazianzen.

In Fr. 31 Jesus calls the Holy Spirit his mother, and Hilgenfeld remarks that Fr. 8, in which the Holy Spirit addresses him as 'my Son,' is analogous. This is sufficient to prove to M. de Pressensé that 'we have here that eternal female element which formed part of the primordial duality of the Elkasaites, and which* they likened to the Holy Spirit' (*Heresy and Christian Doctrine*, 1873 ed. 155). Mr. Baring Gould has similar observations, and says that 'the words "my mother" are, it can scarcely be doubted, a Gnostic interpolation' (*Lost and Hostile Gospels*, 130, 131).

* Making the Holy Spirit, however, not the mother of Jesus, but his sister: see Epiphanius, *Haer.* liii. καὶ εἶπαι τὸ "Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ" 'and that the Holy Spirit was his sister.'

Verily he must have a keen eye for heresy who can discover it here. Does not Matt. i. 18 say that Mary 'was found with child of the Holy Spirit,' and Matt. i. 20 that 'that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit'? Does not Luke i. 35 say 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefor also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God'? Is not the word 'Spirit' feminine in *Aramaic? And is it then a sign of heresy that Jesus who spoke of the First Person of the Trinity as his Father should be represented as speaking of the Holy Spirit as his Mother? 'We must not think,' says †Jerome (writing without any reference to the Gospel according to the Hebrews), 'that there is sex in the Powers of God, since even the Holy Spirit himself is spoken of according to the peculiarities of the Hebrew language in the feminine gender as *Ruha*; in Greek in the neuter, as τὸ Πνεῦμα; in Latin in the masculine, as *Spiritus*; whence we must understand, when there is discussion about those above, and anything is put in the masculine or feminine, that it is not so much sex that is signified as it is the idiom of the language that is being uttered. Since God himself, invisible and incorruptible, is spoken of in almost every language in the masculine gender, although sex does not apply to him.' But since Origen, ‡ who himself encountered and denounced

* *Rucha*. In Hebrew *Ruach*, which is sometimes masculine, but generally feminine.

† *Ep. ad Damasum, De Seraphin et Calculo* (Martianay's ed. iii. 523), 'Nec putandum sexum esse in Virtutibus Dei, quum etiam ipse Spiritus Sanctus secundum proprietates linguae Hebraeae feminino genere proferatur *Rucha*; Graece neutro τὸ Πνεῦμα; Latine masculino *Spiritus*. Ex quo intelligendum est, quando de superioribus disputatur et masculinum aliquid seu femininum ponitur, non tam sexum significari quam idioma sonare linguae. Siquidem ipse Dens invisibilis et incorruptibilis omnibus pene linguis profertur genere masculino, quum in eum non cadat sexus.' By 'Hebrew' Jerome means Aramaic, as in other places (see p. 1, note). Cf. to the same effect *Comm. in Isai.* xl. 11 (lib. xi.), where this fragment is also quoted.

‡ See the extract quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 38) from Origen's lost Homily on Ps. 82.

Elkesaism, adduces this fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews twice, taking the trouble to §justify it at some length, and Jerome also adduces it twice, I need not linger further in its defense.

Fr. 19 is decidedly remarkable. It lays down two propositions respecting the prophets, (1) that they were anointed by the Holy Spirit, (2) that nevertheless 'utterance of sin' is found in them.

To those who find in (2) a proof of heresy let me put three questions. Is the expression of sinful feelings 'utterance of sin'? If so, are feelings sinful which are diametrically opposed to the moral teaching of Jesus? If so, has any ingenuity of commentators || explained the 'cursing psalms' of the prophet David (see particularly Ps. cix. 6-20) into harmony with the precepts of Matt. v. 44, and Luke vi. 27-8?

The other proposition, (1) that the prophets were anointed by the Holy Ghost, is important as showing that the Nazarene Gospel was not tinged with that strong aversion to the prophets (later than Joshua) which the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. § 18) are said to have had. Nor is this the only passage in which the prophets are honourably noticed in the Nazarene Gospel. In Fr. 8 the Holy Spirit is represented as expressing in 'all the prophets' a yearning for the coming of Jesus, and in Fr. 20 the prophets are joined with the Law as standards of duty.

These are all the passages in the Nazarene Gospel against which any but the most finikin criticism can be directed. It would be easy to suggest that even these were interpolations, as M. Nicolas (*Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes*) and Mr. Baring Gould have already done. But I cannot consent to see an interpolation in everything which on first

§ *Hom. in Ioh.* iii. § 63, on the ground that even men who do the will of God are called by Jesus his mother and brethren.

|| 'The Speaker's Commentary,' I observe, practically abandons any such attempt. 'Is a Christian spirit,' it asks, 'to be expected always in the psalms? Would the words of Christ (Matt. v. 43, 44, &c.) have been uttered if the spirit which animated the Jewish people, and was exhibited, not unfrequently, in their annals, had been always that which He came to inculcate?' (vol. 4, 424).

hearing seems to jar a little with the expressions or tone of thought of the Canonical Gospels.

The Fathers of the Church, while the Gospel according to the Hebrews was yet extant in its entirety, referred to it always with respect, often with reverence: some of them unhesitatingly accepted it as being what tradition affirmed it to be—the work of Matthew—and even those who have not put on record their expression of this opinion have not questioned it. Is such an attitude consistent with the supposition that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was a work of heretical tendencies? This applies with tenfold force to Jerome. After copying it, would he, if he had seen heresy in it, have translated it for public dissemination into both Greek and Latin, and have continued to favour the tradition of its Matthaean authorship?

And Jerome, be it observed, not only quotes all three of these passages without disapprobation; he actually quotes two of them (Fr. 6 and Fr. 8) with approval. But, although Jerome has never been suspected of lenience to heresy, some of us must needs out-Jerome Jerome and demand uniformity where he tolerated variety. The truth is that in all these centuries the familiar moulds have sunk so deep into our own minds that we are maybe a little too ready to reject as spurious any fragment of early extra-canonical literature which does not bear the same exact impress.

We shall better be able to correct this tendency if we imagine for the moment that only three canonical Gospels had come down to us, that the fourth had only been preserved among the Nazarenes, and that only a few fragments of it were left.

Let us suppose that Matthew had been this lost Gospel, and that among the fragments left out of it were ii. 23 ‘that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by [through] the prophets He shall [that he should] be called a Nazarene’; v. 17 ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil’; x. 5, 6, ‘Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel’; xv. 24 ‘I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel’; xvi. 18, 19 ‘I say also

unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'

There is no need to look further through Matthew for passages on which, if they came to us as fragments from a Nazarene Gospel, we should not hesitate to fasten charges of heretical tendency. In ii. 23 we should at least see the use of an apocryphal book, even if we did not also perceive an intention to magnify the name of Nazarene. In v. 17, x. 5, 6, and xv. 24 we should find the extremest Judaizing views. And in xvi. 18, 19 we should see an impudent forgery of the ultra-Petrine school of Ebionites, directed, like other of their forgeries, against Paul and Pauline Christians.

Or let us suppose Mark to have been the Nazarene Gospel. From the fact that it began with the Baptism, we should forthwith conclude that it was designed to support the heresy that Jesus was mere man until the divine Christ descended into him in the shape of a dove. And for xiii. 32, 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,' we should have found no sufficient justification.

Similarly, if no account of the conception of Jesus had come to us except as a fragment of a Nazarene Gospel, and had such fragment said, as Matthew and Luke say, that he was conceived of the Holy Spirit, and, as Luke, that this was the reason why he was called the Son of God, should we not denounce this as the wildest heresy? Should we not ask where Jesus referred to the Holy Spirit as his father or mother, whether he did not rather imply that the Holy Spirit proceeded from himself, whether he was not called the Son of God because he was the Son of God the Father—whether in fine we were not confronted either by rank Elkesaism or by a heresy which confounded the Holy Spirit with God the Father?

I might isolate many more passages from the Canonical Gospels to show in what sort of spirit we should be tempted

to regard any one of those Gospels if it came to us only in fragments from an out of the way body of Christians not entering into relations with the Church at large and associated in our minds by local, national, and to a great extent ceremonial affinity with the anti-Catholic sect of the Ebionites proper.

So little has been written about the Nazarenes, and so few people, I imagine, have had occasion to study their history or doctrines, that I shall here quote what is said of them by two ecclesiastical historians of such eminence and unquestioned orthodoxy as Neander and the late Dean Mansel.

'After the destruction of Jerusalem,' writes Mansel (*Gnostic Heresies*, 125), 'this Jewish-Christian Church continued to exist in Pella and the neighbouring region beyond the Jordan, to which it had withdrawn during the siege,* and where it appears to have remained until the reign of Hadrian when, after the revolt and destruction of Bar-Cochab and his followers, the Roman city of Ælia Capitolina was founded on the ruins of the ancient Jerusalem.† In that city no Jew was permitted to dwell, and the prohibition would naturally extend to those Christians of Jewish origin who had not renounced the customs of their forefathers.‡ This circumstance led to a division in the Church, the Gentile members of it, together with the less rigid Jewish Christians, establishing

* 'Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 5.'

† 'Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6. In chapter 5 Eusebius gives a list of fifteen bishops of Jerusalem of Jewish race, down to the time of the revolt in Hadrian's reign; but these, though nominally bishops of Jerusalem, could hardly have resided in that city, which remained uninhabited except by a Roman garrison in its towers (Josephus, *B. J.* vii. 1), till Barcochab seized it and attempted to rebuild the temple. Neander (*Ch. Hist.* i. p. 475) says that the Church *is said* to have returned to Jerusalem, but gives no authority for the statement, and seems to doubt its truth (see p. 476). It is possible, however, as Milman supposes (*Hist. of Jews*, ii. p. 431), that some sort of rude town may have grown up on the wreck of the city; and, if so, it is possible that the Judaizing Christians may have gone back to Pella after the edict of Hadrian. Cf. Neander, *l. c.* p. 476; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 304.'

‡ 'Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 16. Cf. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. p. 475; Ritschl, *Entstehung der Altk. Kirche*, p. 257.'

themselves at Jerusalem under a succession of bishops of Gentile birth, § while the strict Judaizers remained at Pella, where after the departure of their brethren they would naturally enforce their own rites with greater strictness than ever. Under these circumstances the Jewish Christian settlement at Pella, retaining its old appellations of Nazarene and Ebionite, which from terms of reproach had probably become among themselves titles of honour, seems to have gradually relapsed still more into Judaism, retaining a certain kind of acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, but ceasing at last to acknowledge His Deity and pre-existence. These heretical views would naturally be developed into more consistency by some than by others, and thus gave rise to the two divisions of the Ebionites, of whom the less heterodox, or Nazarenes, were probably the earlier in point of time.' || Speaking of the Gospel according to the Hebrews he presently says (126) 'In the fourth century, if not earlier, there were two different recensions of it, one of which omitted, while the other retained, the first two chapters of St. Matthew. The former was used by the Ebionites proper, who denied the supernatural birth of our Lord. The latter was accepted by the more orthodox Nazarenes.' ¶

Let us now turn to Neander, the chief of ecclesiastical historians, who, curiously enough, was a Jew by birth and up to his eighteenth year by religion also. After dismissing the Ebionites, he says (*History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Eng. trans. ii. 18) 'In Jerome, on the contrary, under the name of *Nazarene* (the original name given to all Christians by the Jews, see Acts xxiv. 5), we find the descendants of those Jewish Christians of a ***genuine evangelic disposition*, who would not allow the existence of any contradiction between the apostles, the same people of whom we found the last trace in Justin Martyr (see above). They pointedly combated the regulations and the ceremonial

§ 'Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6.'

|| 'Cf. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, i. p. 191 (Eng. Tr.); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. p. 476.'

¶ 'Epiphan. *Haer.* xxix. 9, xxx. 14. Cf. Bleek, *Eintl.* p. 105; Mosheim, *De Rebus Chr. ante Const.* 328.'

** The italics are Neander's or his translator Mr. Rose's—not mine.

worship of the Pharisees; and, while they themselves observed the ceremonial law, they did not force it on the heathen. They acknowledged the apostle Paul as a teacher of Divine wisdom, whom God had peculiarly chosen for his instrument, for the purpose of bringing the tidings of salvation to the heathen nations. They lamented the unbelief of their own people, and longed for the time when they also should be converted to the Lord whom they had crucified, and renounce all their idols. Then nothing would be done by the power of man, but every thing which Satan set up in opposition to the kingdom of God would fall down by the power of God, and all who had hitherto pleased themselves, in the fancy of their own wisdom, would be converted to the Lord. They thought that they found this promise in the prophecies of Isaiah (xxxii. 7, 8*). The conclusion which we are entitled to draw clearly from all this is, that from the very times of the apostles various sorts of Jewish Christians spread themselves abroad, which people have been led into confusing with each other by the common names which were given to them.'

These are the people, heirs of the church of Peter and of James, from whom we have the most relics of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and whose history and character, I venture to think, furnish warrant in its favour rather than against it.

(ii.) We have now to inquire into the relations, if any, between the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other works (a) uncanonical, or (b) canonical.

(a) The uncanonical book with which it has most (two fragments) in common is that which was called † sometimes

* 'Hieronymi commentar. in Iesaiam, ed. Martianay, t. iii. p. 79, 83, 250, 261.'

† The identity of the works cited under the first two names is inferred from the fact that Lactantius (iv. 21) says 'The Master revealed to them all those things which Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and that preaching, written for remembrance, has survived' (Magister aperuit illis omnia quae Petrus et Paulus Romae praedicaverunt, et ea praedicatio in memoriam scripta permansit); and that the author of the treatise *De Rebaptismo*, the only person

the Preaching of Peter, sometimes *the Preaching of Paul*, sometimes *the Teaching of Peter*, and which professed to give an account of the joint preaching of those two apostles at Rome. It is first quoted by Heracleon, in a fragment of his preserved by Origen. The date of Heracleon has not been exactly determined, but it is fair to put him at 170 A.D. —he may in fact have been a little older or younger, but was at any rate contemporary with Hegesippus, the first writer whom we certainly know to have quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

The substance of Fr. 6 and Fr. 30 was, as we have seen, contained in this work, but if either borrowed from the other the author of *the Preaching of Peter* must have borrowed from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. His book was what its name implies—a didactic work, not an evangelic record, and the overwhelming presumption is that any evangelic incidents which it shares with early Gospels were borrowed from and not by them.

‡ *The Gospel according to Peter* is said by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* ii. 2 §) to have been used by the Nazarenes. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 12) preserves an account of it from

who cites a *Preaching of Paul*, says that it represents Peter and Paul as meeting for the first time in Rome.

That the *Teaching of Peter* was the same as the *Preaching of Peter* is inferred from the fact that neither Origen (who uses both names) nor any one else has stated that there were two distinct works with these respective titles.

If the three titles represent three works, or if the two *Preachings* are one work and the *Teaching* another, any suspicion of borrowing that attached to the Gospel according to the Hebrews would be further weakened. For in the first place there would no longer be the accumulative evidence of two Fragments agreeing with the same book; for it was in the *Preaching of Paul* that the substance of Fr. 6, and in the *Teaching of Peter* that the substance of Fr. 30 was to be found. And, as regards Fr. 6, if the *Preaching of Paul* be not the same as that of Peter, there is no evidence for its existence before the 4th cent.: while, as regards Fr. 30, there is no evidence for the existence of a *Teaching of Peter*, if it be not the same as his *Preaching*, before about 225 A.D.

‡ Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra Can. Rec.* iv. 39-41.

§ Τῷ καλουμένῳ κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίῳ κερημένῳ.

the pen of Serapion, Bp. of Antioch 191–213 A.D. Writing to the church of Rhossus in Cilicia, Serapion says * ‘For we, brethren, receive both Peter and the other Apostles † as we do Christ, but the writings falsely inscribed with their name we refuse from experience, knowing that such have not been delivered to us. For I when I was with you supposed that all were inclined to a right faith, and, not having gone through the Gospel produced by them in Peter’s name, I said “If this is all that seems to give you discouragement, let it be read.” But now, having learnt that their mind began to lurk in a certain heresy ‡ from what I had said, I will hasten to come again to you; so that, brethren, look for me speedily.’ Then follows a very corrupt sentence which may mean § ‘And you, brethren, after understanding of what

* ‘Ἡμεῖς γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. Ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμενος παρ’ ὑμῶν ὑπενόουν τοὺς πάντας ὀρθῇ πίστει προσφέρεισθαι, καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὀνόματι Πέτρον Εὐαγγέλιον εἶπον ὅτι ‘εἰ τοῦτό ἐστι μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω.’ Νῦν δὲ μαθὼν ὅτι αἵρεσει τιτὶ ὁ τοῦς αὐτῶν ἐνεφώλεεν ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι σπουδᾶσω πάλιν γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὥστε, ἀδελφοί, προσδεκᾶτέ με ἐν τάχει. Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, καταλαβόμενοι ὁποίας ἦν αἵρέσεως ὁ Μαρκαῖος, καὶ ἑαυτῶ ἡσαντιοῦτο μὴ τοῶν ἃ ἐλάλει μαθήσεσθε ἐξ ὧν ὑμῖν ἐγράφη. Ἐδυνήθημεν γὰρ παρ’ ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ταυτέστι τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ, οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν—τὰ γὰρ φρονήματα τὰ πλείονα ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας—χρησάμενοι παρ’ αὐτῶν διελθεῖν καὶ εὐρεῖν τὰ μὲν πλείονα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου τοῦ Σωτῆρος, τιτὰ δὲ προσδισταλμένα, ἃ καὶ ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν. Hilgenfeld makes no remark on the difficulties of this text.

† There is no need to change this, but in a passage part of which is certainly corrupt one naturally suspects a peculiar expression like ὡς Χριστόν ‘as we do Christ.’ Is it possible that we should read either ὡς Χριστοῦ ‘as Christ’s’ or ὡς χρηστοί—ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς χρηστοί ‘we receive in right-mindedness’ forming an antithesis to ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα ‘we refuse from experience’?

‡ Does he merely mean that the cheerfulness of his permission led them to set greater store by a heretical Gospel, or can it be that they fancied the words τὸ δοκοῦν in his answer were intended to convey covert approbation of its *Dohetic* principles?

§ I conjecture Ὑμεῖς for Ἡμεῖς, ὡς before καὶ, and probably ἡμῶν

heresy Marcianus was, will learn from what has been written for you [*or ? by us*] how he contradicted even himself, not knowing what he was saying.' Then Serapion says 'For from others of those who affected this same Gospel, that is from the successors of those who first employed it, whom we call Doketists (for the opinions are mainly of the school of those men), from them we borrowed it and were able to go through it and to find the larger part of its contents of the right word of the Saviour, but some things superadded, which we have also subjoined for your benefit.'

|| As to who the otherwise unknown Marcianus was, I can only conjecture, with the utmost diffidence, that the Gospel according to Peter professed to have been taken down from Peter's dictation—or translated from Peter's autograph—by a person of that name, whom Serapion believed to be the real author of the Gospel. The name is curiously like that of ¶ Mark (Marcus) whom early tradition represents as having been Peter's interpreter and as having written his Gospel from notes of what he had heard Peter say.**

for ἡμῶν. All three of the old readings look very like mistakes of the ear made by a person copying from dictation (maybe from the dictation of Eusebius himself to his clerk). Ὑμεῖς and Ἰημεῖς, ἡμῶν and ἡμῶν, were hardly to be distinguished by ear and are perpetually confounded in N. T. MSS. In modern Greek there is also the only slightest distinction of sound between ο and ω, the confusion of which is likewise common in N. T. MSS., and it was easy for a tired copyist to lose the sound of ως in the last syllable -ός of the preceding word, especially if (as also in modern Greek) the aspirate in ως was not sounded. I since find that Rufinus, who translated Eusebius about 408 A.D., renders as if he read ως καί.

|| See however *Addenda*.

¶ As are *Lucanus, Lucianus, Leucius*—the names of the assumed author or authors of apocryphal books—to *Luke*.

** In relation to this subject it is instructive to compare two passages in *Supernatural Religion*. In vol. i. 419 (4th ed.) the author aims at showing the antiquity of the *Gospel according to Peter* and the probability of Justin's having referred to it: he therefore says 'We learn from Eusebius that Serapion, who became Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190, composed a book on the "Gospel according to Peter" (*περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου*)

Eusebius himself (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3) mentions the Gospel according to Peter among several works attributed to Peter (including the Preaching) which 'we do not know to have been ever reckoned by tradition among catholic writings, since no ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern, has employed their testimony.'* In this, however, he is wrong, for Origen refers to it (*Hom. in Matt.* x. 17) as asserting that the brethren of Jesus were sons of Joseph by a former wife, a view of which he proceeds to declare himself a supporter.

It is unlucky that we have no further information about this Gospel and that no specimen has been preserved of what Serapion considered its Doketic interpolations—especially as we know, from charges of forging certain various readings brought against Marcion (see Prof. Westcott in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, ii. 507), that such suspicions might go too far. But, whatever its character, and whether or not it was used by the Nazarenes, there is not the remotest trace of any connexion between it and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

(b) We are now free to examine the relation (if any) of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to books inside the Canon of the New Testament. The only satisfactory way of conducting this examination is to analyse the internal

which he found in circulation in his diocese.' But in vol. ii. 167 he writes 'The fact that Serapion in the third century allowed the Gospel of Peter to be used in the church of Rhossus shows at the same time the consideration in which it was held and the incompleteness of the canonical position of the New Testament writings.' Note that when he wishes to exalt an uncanonical book it is 'Serapion, who became bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190,' but when his object is to show 'the incompleteness of the canonical position of the New Testament writings' it is 'Serapion in the third century': of course it is likely that the Gospel according to Peter was brought to Serapion at his *first* visitation of the church of Rhossus, and also that this visitation took place at any rate during the first nine years of his bishopric.

* Οὐδ' ὅλως ἐν καθολικαῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίας.

evidence afforded by each fragment in turn, and to tabulate and sum up our results, after which, but not before, we shall be entitled to draw conclusions.

Fr. 1 (Ebionite) has no evangelical parallel. It looks, as I have already said, like 'a mere compilation (and a very bald one) from canonical data.' The object of it—to attach to the Gospel the stamp of direct apostolic authority—is in any case suspicious. It agrees with the three Synoptics when it mentions the call of twelve apostles, the fact that Simon had a house at Capharnahum, and, if Levi and Matthew be one (which I greatly doubt), the call of Matthew (otherwise with Matthew only). With Matthew and John alone it calls Iscariot '*the Iscariot*' (unless the article be due to Epiphanius). With Mark alone it says that Jesus entered a house after ordaining the Twelve, and with him alone (probably) or with him and Matthew it gives the name of one of them as Thaddaeus. With Luke alone it states the age of Jesus, calls the sea of Galilee a '*lake*' and Simon the Cananaean '*the Zealot*': but in Aramaic one word represents *sea* and *lake*, and *Cananaean* means *Zealot*, so that the Aramaic original of the fragment (if it had one) would not show these two peculiarities of Luke's Gospel. Lastly, with John alone it attaches to the sea of Galilee the name of the town '*Tiberias*.' It is clear, therefor, that the author of this fragment has not borrowed specially from any one of our Gospels: but he is much to be suspected of having borrowed impartially from at least two.

Fr. 2 (Nazarene) is quoted by Jerome as = Matt. ii. 5, exactly as it stands in the Curetonian Syriac and other authorities: Bethlehem is called 'Bethlehem of Judaea' in Matthew only, and is not mentioned in Mark.

Fr. 3 (Nazarene) = Matt. ii. 15, verbatim: there is no parallel in the other Gospels.

Fr. 4 (Nazarene) = Matt. ii. 23, verbatim: there is no parallel in the other Gospels.

Fr. 5 (Ebionite) agrees generally in substance with the three Synoptics. V. (1) in the shortest version bears a slight trace of connexion with Matt. iii. 1 or its archetype, the two longer versions a much stronger one. The longest version also introduces mention, peculiar to Luke, of the parentage

of John the Baptist and the priesthood of 'Caiaphas.' Both the longer versions contain the phrase 'baptism of repentance,' found in Mark and Luke once, and twice in Acts, and one of them speaks of the 'river' Jordan, as does Mark i. 5. Again the words 'began baptizing' (ἤρξετο βαπτίζων) agree with the reading in Mark i. 4 which, though probably wrong, is that of the great majority of MSS. and versions. V. (2) = Matt. iii. 5, and Mark i. 5: the mention of 'Pharisees' = Matt. iii. 7, John i. 24, and 'all Jerusalem' is peculiar to Matthew, Mark having 'all they of Jerusalem.' V. (3) = Matt. iii. 4 and Mark i. 6, with the omission, possibly due to Ebionite vegetarianism, of 'locusts.' The prophecy inserted in Matt. iii. 3, Mark iii. 3, Luke iii. 4, John i. 23 is omitted, also possibly out of hostility to the prophets: yet there is no such reason why Matt. iii. 2 should have been left out, except maybe to agree with the form of Mark—an unwise aim in a professedly Matthaean Gospel.

It is difficult to make much out of all this. The outline of the passage according to the shortest copies agrees closely with Mark, vv. (1) (2) (3) exactly corresponding in order with Mark i. 4, 5, 6. V. (2) is much more like Matthew, from whom the beginning of v. (1) also seems to be abridged. Of Luke and John there is no separate trace in the shortest copies. In the longer version v. (1) contains traces of connexion with Matthew (*one*), Mark (*one*), Luke (*one*), and a phrase found in Mark and Luke's writings only.

Altogether we must, I think, take the fragment as allied more nearly to Matthew than to our other Gospels, and must assign its omissions and additions to dogmatic dishonesty on the part of the Ebionites, recognising the certainty that they used Luke or a similar Gospel, and the full possibility that they used Mark, for their purpose.

Fr. 6 (Nazarene) has no evangelical parallel. In v. (1) 'behold' is a word specially characteristic of Matthew and Luke; the title 'Lord' used in speaking of Jesus is almost though not quite peculiar to Luke and John; 'for remission of sins' is applied to John's baptism by Mark and Luke only, though Matthew says that those baptized confessed their sins; 'remission of sins' occurs eight times in the writings of Luke against seven times in all the other books of the N. T.

In v. (2) Jesus disclaiming sin reminds us of John viii. 46, and the admission of a possible limitation of his knowledge recalls Mark xiii. 32.

Altogether the verbal analysis suggests relations to Luke.

Fr. 7 (Ebionite) runs parallel to Matt. iii. 13-17, Mark i. 9-11, and Luke iii. 21, 22 (John i. 32, 33 being analogous but not parallel). V. (1) agrees very nearly with Luke iii. 21. V. (2) is far nearer to Matt. iii. 16 than to the other accounts, with the noticeable exception of the words '*in shape of a dove*,' which recall Luke. The important preposition '*into*' has also the strongest support (D and all the Latin versions) in Luke, but is also read by D and some other authorities in both Mark and Matthew. In v. (3) the words of the voice agree exactly with Luke alone, and the second utterance, '*I have this day begotten thee*,' answers to Justin's form '*Thou art my Son: I have this day begotten thee*,' which is also read in Luke by D, the Old Latin, Clement of Alexandria, &c. &c. V. (4) gives the story of the light in Jordan which is inserted by two Old Latin MSS. in Matt. iii. 15, and which Justin mentions not only as a fact but, if we accept Tischendorf's very slight emendation, as a fact related by the Apostles in their memoirs. The question '*Who art thou, [Lord]?*' following a voice from heaven and a great light, suggests that the language of Luke in his three accounts of the conversion of Paul was influenced by this or some similar account of the Baptism, or else that this account of the Baptism was influenced by Luke's account of the conversion of Paul—which seems less likely. V. (5) in repeating the voice gives the same words as Matthew. Vv. (6) and (7) answer to Matt. iii. 14, 15, but are placed after the Baptism instead of before it.

Here we have the most unmistakeable connexion both with Matthew and Luke, and with them only. Moreover, that form of the evangelical text with which the fragment has most in common is one which, whether correct or not, was certainly current as early as the first half of the second century.

Are we then to regard this fragment as a compilation from Matthew and Luke? It does indeed come to us from

an Ebionite source, and we have seen good reason to doubt the honesty of the Ebionite text; in Fr. 5, moreover, we detected in some of the Ebionite copies signs that Luke, or at least some kindred work to Luke, had been laid under contribution. But, on the other hand, none of the suspected Ebionite corruptions seem to have been made without an object, whereas it is difficult to see what end the reviser of a Matthaean ground-text had to gain by adopting Luke iii. 21 in preference to Matt. iii. 13, by transposing Matt. iii. 14, 15, or by introducing the question of John and the last voice from heaven. It was indeed necessary to transpose Matt. iii. 14, 15 if John's question and the heavenly answer were inserted, but *why* insert them?

Fr. 8 (Nazarene) has no evangelic parallel, but the resting of the Spirit (with the supernatural light of Fr. 7) may just possibly be alluded to in 1 Pet. iv. 14, while '*rested upon him*' is the reading of the Curetonian Syriac in Matt. iii. 16. A single phrase, '*that reignest for ever*,' has its analogy in Luke.

Fr. 9 (Nazarene?) = Matt. iv. 5 and Luke iv. 9, speaking of '*Jerusalem*' with the latter and not '*the holy city*' with the former. A Nazarene reviser of the canonical Matthew would surely have kept '*the holy city*.'

Fr. 10 (Nazarene) seems to = Matt. v. 22, and no other passage. The metaphorical use of '*brother*' is specially characteristic of Matthew, as regards the Gospels.

Fr. 11 (Nazarene) does not = any passage in the Gospels. The word *ἀγαπή*, which would represent *caritas* in Greek, is specially characteristic of John's Gospel, which also contains several injunctions to the disciples to love *each other*, but the tenor of the fragment is far more suggestive of Matthew (particularly) or Luke.

Fr. 12 (Nazarene) = Matt. vi. 11, Luke xi. 3, only.

Fr. 13 (Ebionite) = Matt. x. 25, only.

Fr. 14 is quoted by Eusebius in reference to Matt. x. 34, Luke xii. 51. It has no evangelic parallel. '*Whom my Father in the heavens hath given me*' recalls John xvii. 6, '*the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me*,' spoken by Jesus to the '*Father*,' and *ib.* 9, '*I pray not for the world, but for them which*

thou hast given me.' But '*Father in the heavens*' points very strongly to Matthew, who is also more abundant than his fellow Evangelists in precepts of good will to others.

Fr. 15 (Nazarene) is an additional detail to a story told in Matt. xii. 9 seqq., Mark iii. 1 seqq., Luke vi. 6 seqq. *Victum* '*sustenance*' may answer to *βίον*, a word used never by Matthew or John, once by Mark, but four times by Luke; but it may also correspond to *τροφήν*. The simple address '*Jesus*' is only found in Luke xxiii. 42 (best reading); Jesus is addressed by name (with additional epithets) twice more in Luke, and thrice in Mark, but not at all in John or Matthew (according to the best reading of Matt. ix. 12). '*Shamefully beg for food*' recalls Luke xvi. 3, '*to beg I am ashamed.*' Altogether we have reason to suspect relations with Luke.

Fr. 16 (Ebionite) = Matt. xii. 47-50, Mark iii. 32-5, Luke viii. 20, 21. V. (1) agrees most nearly with Matthew, Luke not having the word '*behold,*' and Mark introducing the sisters of Jesus. V. (2) is a shade nearer to Mark than to Matthew; Luke omits the question. V. (3) does not point to any, but is a little nearer to Matthew than to the others. Altogether there is most trace of connexion with Matthew.

Fr. 17 = Matt. xv. 24 (verbatim), only.

Fr. 18 (Nazarene?) = Matt. xvi. 17, only.

Fr. 19 (Nazarene) = Matt. xviii. 21, 22, Luke xvii. 3, 4, and is much nearer the former. In v. (1) forgiveness is made dependent on the contrition of the offender, as in Luke. In v. (2) Peter is introduced as questioning Jesus on the subject: Luke omits all mention of him. Such a style as '*Simon his disciple*' is not found in our Gospels, but the word '*disciple*' is much more frequent in Matthew than in Luke (most frequent of all in John), while on the other hand Peter is spoken of or to as plain '*Simon*' only once in Matthew, but seven times in Mark and eight times in Luke (once only in John). In Acts (four times) the second name Peter is always added, as in 2 Pet. i. 1. In v. (3) the number '*seventy times seven*' is peculiar to Matthew; the latter part of the verse is not contained in either evangelist, but '*anointed by the Holy Spirit*' savours of Luke.

Fr. 20 (Nazarene) = with wide differences Matt. xix. 16-24, Mark x. 17-25, Luke xviii. 18-25. V. (1) shows that a conversation with some other rich man had gone before it, and suggests that the canonical accounts may have blended these two conversations. The two rich men, as Hilgenfeld says, recall Matthew's two demoniacs (viii. 28) and two blind men (xx. 30), where Mark and Luke only mention one; while, on the other hand, he speaks of only one angel at the sepulchre, but Luke and John of two. The absence of the epithet 'Good' in addressing Jesus agrees with the best reading of Matt. xix. 16. '*Live*' in the sense of 'have eternal life' is only found in Luke x. 28 among the Synoptics; there are more instances in John: but 'life' in the sense of 'eternal life' never occurs in Luke, but four times in Matthew, twice in Mark, and of course very often in John. '*Man*' in v. (2) is a form of address peculiar to Luke, the conjunction of the prophets with the law as a code of life is equally peculiar to Matthew. V. (4) is a little nearer to Luke, who however omits '*Go*,' than to the others. V. (5) retains the commandment '*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*,' omitted by Mark and Luke. '*Sons of Abraham*' = 'son of Abraham' Luke xix. 9 and 'daughter of Abraham,' xiii. 16, while 'seed of Abraham' occurs twice in John and 'children of Abraham' once. On '*Simon his disciple*,' v. (6), see my remarks on the last fragment; '*sitting by him*' is a detail recalling Matthew. Altogether that part of the fragment which corresponds with the canonical accounts agrees best with Matthew; so do two peculiarities of *matter*, but the peculiarities of *style* recall Luke and John.

Fr. 21 (Nazarene) = Matt. xxi. 9 and Mark xi. 10 verbatim; *substantial* parallels are also afforded by Luke xix. 38 and John xii. 13.

Fr. 22 (Nazarene?) may not be *verbally* represented by John vii. 53-viii. 11. But, if it is, v. (1) strikingly agrees with Luke xxi. 37 (substantially confirmed by Matthew), while v. (2) offers a still more remarkable parallel to Luke xxi. 38; the word '*dawn*,' *ὄρθρον*, is also peculiar to Luke; but '*having sat down*' is much more a trait of Matthew. In v. (3) '*the scribes and the Pharisees*' is also rather suggestive of Matthew. '*Teacher*,' v. (4), is a little more common in

Mark and Luke. 'Trying him,' v. (6), is more frequent in Matthew and Mark than in Luke, but the *form* of the words 'that they may have whereby to accuse him' is more like Luke. In v. (10) 'Mistress' is specially Johannine (five times); Luke has it twice to Matthew's once.

Fr. 23 (Nazarene) = Matt. xxiii. 35, Luke xi. 51, but the latter passage does not mention Zacharias's father. Here the Greek Matthew contains a palpable error, but the Nazarene Gospel keeps what must almost certainly have been the original reading.

Fr. 24 = Matt. xxv. 14-30, Luke xix. 11-27, with wide variation from both. We do not know that Eusebius has kept any part of the original wording; but with this reservation we may observe that 'the abandoned liver' and 'which devoured the substance with harlots' are very like phrases in Luke xv. 14, 30; and that 'accepted' or 'received' is a term common in both Matt. and Luke, but particularly the latter.

Fr. 25 (Ebionite) is very remarkable. V. (1) = Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xiv. 12, and is nearer to the former. Luke does not mention the question, but makes Jesus say to Peter and John 'Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat' (xxii. 8). V. (2) undoubtedly corresponds to Luke xxii. 15, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer,' but 'before I suffer' is omitted, 'this passover' becomes '*this flesh the passover*,' and the affirmation of Jesus is turned into a question expecting a negative answer. We have seen strong cause to suspect the verse of having been corrupted by the Ebionites, but the question remains an open one whether it was borrowed from Luke. Supposing that the verse formed no part of their original Gospel, it is quite easy to understand why the Ebionites should have thus borrowed it. The fact that Jesus ate of the paschal lamb might be turned against Ebionite vegetarianism: they therefor wished to represent that he did so with reluctance. This, however, was contradicted by Luke xxii. 15. What more simple than to introduce into Luke xxii. 15 the slight change needed to produce an entirely opposite sense, and then to incorporate it into their Gospel, retorting upon Luke any charge of corruption which might be brought against them by the orthodox? This is very

possible, but it is equally possible that the verse in Luke's form may have been contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews before the Ebionites corrupted it.

Fr. 26 (Nazarene?) = Matt. xxvi. 74, Mark xiv. 71, with little variation. The incident of which it is a detail is also related by Luke and John.

Fr. 27 (Nazarene) is part of a verse corresponding to Matt. xxvii. 16, Mark xv. 7, Luke xxiii. 18, John xviii. 40. As the name 'Barabbas' is here distinctly treated as a surname, the circumcision-name may also have been given, in which case there is a probability of connexion with that form of Matthew's text which assigned to Barabbas the circumcision-name 'Jesus.' If the words 'who had been condemned on account of sedition and murder' are part of Jerome's quotation—which, however, I do not believe—they are closely parallel to Luke xxiii. 19.

Fr. 28 (Nazarene) differs from Matt. xxvii. 51, Mark xv. 38, Luke xxiii. 45, but is part of a verse answering to them.

Fr. 29 (Nazarene) has no evangelic parallel, but almost undoubtedly represents the story alluded to by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 7. V. (1) alludes to a fact mentioned by all four evangelists, that the dead body of Jesus was wrapped in linen: all of them, moreover, speak of 'the' servant of the high-priest in connexion with the apprehension of Jesus.

Fr. 30 (Nazarene) = Luke xxiv. 39, substantially.

Fr. 31 (Nazarene) has no evangelic parallel. The relation assigned to Jesus and the Holy Spirit reminds us somewhat of Matt. i. 18 and Luke i. 35.

Fr. 32 has no evangelic parallel. The spiritual use of the word 'rest' is confined to Matthew.

Fr. 33 (Ebionite) has no evangelic parallel, but suggests that the Ebionite Gospel contained a passage corresponding to Luke xiii. 1-3, in which this fragment occupied the place of Luke xiii. 3. '*The wrath*' suggests Luke or Matthew.

Now let us tabulate our results:—

(i.) Out of 33 Fragments the following 10 are entirely independent of the canonical narratives—nos. 1, 6, 8, 11, 14, 22, 29, 31, 32, 33. Of these 5 come to us from a Nazarene source (6, 8, 11, 29, 31), 2 (both very suspicious) from an

Ebionite source (1, 33), and 3 from a source undetermined (14, 22, 32)—one of which (22) is probably Nazarene.

So large a proportion of peculiarities is remarkable if we compare the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew or Mark, but not if we compare it with Luke, who has about 82 sections in common with them, but 37 peculiar to himself.

The fragments above specified do not, taken together, give convincing evidence of a connexion with any of the canonical Gospels. But of the 5 Nazarene Fragments 2 (6, 8) present verbal analogies to Luke, and 2 others (11, 31) some little substantial analogies to both Matthew and Luke. Of the 2 Ebionite Fragments 1 suggests relation to Luke (33), but one word at the least is spurious; the other (1) is almost equally suspicious, and may be a compound from our Gospels. Of the 3 neutral fragments, Fr. 14 seems to have been connected with Matthew and Luke, and is analogous to passages in Matthew and John; Fr. 22 (if we have the right text) most nearly approaches Luke, and next to him Matthew; and Fr. 32 suggests Matthew.

First Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter entirely independent of the canonical narratives. The proportion of this matter would be nearly $\frac{1}{3}$, if it were the same throughout the Gospel as in the Fragments.

Second Deduction. The independent fragments show parallels of thought and expression to the canonical narratives, more especially those of Matthew and Luke.

(ii.) Out of the remaining 23 Fragments 2 only (Nazarene, 21 and 27) are parallel to passages contained in all four of our Gospels, or to passages contained in John. The former fragment is so very short that we cannot tell to which evangelist it came nearest, but there is reason to suspect that it was akin to one form of Matthew's text, and if the words included by Hilgenfeld should be admitted—which is most doubtful—a decided parallel to Luke is established. The other fragment agrees verbatim with Matthew and Mark, only partially with Luke and John.

Six fragments (5, 7, 15, 16, 20, 28) are parallel to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Of these 5, 7, 16 are Ebionite,

the other three Nazarene. Fr. 5 in its shortest form is apparently allied to Matthew: in its longer forms it almost proves that the Ebionites were capable of interpolating from Luke or documents used by or derived from him, and suggests the use of Mark also. Fr. 7 is closely allied to both Matthew and Luke, and especially to second century texts of these Gospels: it also contains an extraordinary parallel to an incident thrice told in Acts. In Fr. 16 there is most likeness to Matthew. In the Nazarene Fr. 15, which has no corresponding verse in our Gospels, there is a likeness to Luke's phrasology. Fr. 20, where it runs parallel to the canonical accounts, agrees best with Matthew, but in style is nearer to Luke and John. Fr. 28 yields no evidence.

Third Deduction. There is no evidence that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to or derived from John.

Fourth Deduction. It contained matter substantially common to the three Synoptists, the passages including this matter forming about $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Fragments.

Fifth Deduction. Such passages taken altogether show special likeness to Matthew and Luke.

One fragment (26, Nazarene) is parallel to Matthew and Mark only, and is equally near to each. Half of another fragment (25, Ebionite) is also parallel to these two alone, and is nearer to Matthew.

Sixth Deduction. There is no evidence that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained any matter peculiar to, or derived from, Mark, except, maybe, in the interpolated Ebionite Fr. 5.

Five fragments (9, 12, 19, 23, 24) are parallel to Matthew and Luke only. All these are Nazarene, except the last—of which the source is undetermined. Fr. 9 is nearer to Luke, but no stress can be laid on the one word '*Jerusalem.*' Fr. 12 is identical with both. Fr. 19 is nearer to Matthew, but with distinct points of resemblance to Luke. Fr. 23 shows greater affinity to Matthew, and is free from the mistake of the Greek. Fr. 24 points decidedly to Luke *if* Eusebius has kept the wording of his original.

Seventh Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to Matthew and Luke, the passages

containing such matter forming between $\frac{1}{6}$ and $\frac{1}{7}$ of the Fragments.

Eighth Deduction. Such matter, if borrowed at all, was not borrowed from either exclusively.

Seven fragments (2, 3, 4, 10, 13, 17, 18) are parallel to Matthew only. Of these 2, 3, 4, 10 are from a Nazarene source; so probably is 18: 13 is Ebionite; 17 is of undetermined origin. Fr. 10 agrees substantially with Matthew and has one of his favourite words. The others agree very closely indeed with Matthew, most of them verbatim.

Ninth Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to Matthew, the passages containing such matter forming a little more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Fragments.

One fragment (30, Nazarene) is parallel to Luke only. So is one half (suspicious) of another (25, Ebionite).

Tenth Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to Luke, the passages containing such matter forming hardly $\frac{1}{10}$ of the Fragments.

We arrive then at a Gospel (*a*) in great part independent of the extant text of our Gospels, and (*b*) showing no signs of relationship to Mark or John, but (*c*) bearing a very marked affinity to Matthew, and (*d*) a less constant but still obvious affinity to Luke.

We have now to enquire whether the matter allied to Matthew and Luke was derived from the Greek Matthew (or an Aramaic Matthew of which the Greek was only a translation) and Luke.

Those who hold this theory are compelled, by the great preponderance of Matthew in the Fragments, supplemented by the unanimity of tradition with regard to the Matthaean character of the Gospel, to suppose that our present Matthew formed the groundwork of it, and that the non-Matthaean portions were merely incorporated into that groundwork.

We shall, however, find that this theory, which for shortness I call the 'compilation-theory,' fails to explain many of the phenomena of the Fragments. In Fr. 5, which seems to be allied to Matthew, it does not very well solve the omission of Matt. iii. 2, the transposition of Matt. iii. 5, or

the alteration of that verse and Matt. iii. 1. In Fr. 7 we fail to see why Matt. iii. 13 was discarded in favour of Luke iii. 21; why John's question and the second heavenly voice are brought in; why the position of Matt. iii. 14, 15 is altered. It was, indeed, needful to shift these last verses if John's question and the heavenly answer were inserted, but to what end is this insertion? Again, as regards Luke, the light on Jordan and John's question are so strikingly like the light at Paul's conversion and *his* question that there seems to be something more than mere coincidence between the accounts. It appears, however, infinitely more probable that the language of Luke should have been influenced by his recollection of a similar *previous* incident in the life of Jesus than that the supposed compiler of the Gospel according to the Hebrews should have copied Luke's description of a similar *subsequent* incident in the life of Paul. In Fr. 9 why is Matthew's 'holy city' (which in a Jewish Gospel we should certainly expect to be kept) altered to 'Jerusalem'? If Fr. 10 answer textually, as it does in substance, to Matt. v. 22, why the change of form? if, on the other hand, the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained another passage corresponding textually to Matt. v. 22, why was Fr. 10, a mere repetition of it in substance, inserted at all? In Fr. 16 we might conjecture that the omission of the words 'desiring to speak with thee' was due to Epiphanius's compressed relation of the incident, but why the departure from Matthew xii. 50? In Fr. 19 why does the conversation on forgiveness begin with a remark from Jesus instead of (as in Matthew) a question from Peter? And, if Fr. 30 be borrowed from Luke, why is not Luke's text followed?

To these questions the compilation-theory cannot, I think, give answers: I might have asked more, but I have excluded all to which even any sort of answer might be given.

Nor does the compilation-theory explain why, as we find from the Stichometry of Nikephorus (see *Addenda*), the Gospel according to the Hebrews was shorter than Luke or Matthew. We know from the Fragments that our supposed compiler sometimes recounted incidents at greater length than either, and that he incorporated a large amount of

independent matter. We should have expected his compilation to be longer than either; why is it shorter? He must have omitted considerable portions of his groundwork; yet we see that he did not object to miracles, or parables, or other discourses—what are we to suppose that he omitted, and what were his motives for omission?

The compilation-theory must therefor, I think, be dismissed, and we must seek some other explanation of the agreement of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew and Luke.

Some one may possibly think that he finds that explanation in the counter hypothesis that Matthew and Luke have borrowed from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. But, if so, why have they omitted matter for the most part entirely unobjectionable and some of it (e.g. Fr. 8, Fr. 11, and Fr. 29) quite equal in beauty to anything which they retained? Why did they leave out those additional details which the Gospel according to the Hebrews often supplies to their narratives? Why does one evangelist sometimes adopt its version, while the other passes it by for a less minute and picturesque account from another source? This theory, like the former, must therefor be abandoned.

It is true that by supposing Matthew, Luke, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews (or at least two of them) to have undergone a long series of alterations and additions, we might manipulate the existing facts so as to suit either of the above theories—or indeed any theory whatsoever. This style of criticism has, moreover, some distinguished precedents in its favour. But for my own part I prefer to wait, if need be, for the solution of a difficulty rather than to evolve from my own consciousness a number of various editions of which absolutely no record can be found.

I now come to my own hypothesis. And, since so little is known, so much debated, respecting the sources and composition of the canonical Gospels, let me say beforehand that it requires only one assumption, namely—that whenever, wherever, and by whomsoever the canonical Gospel according to Matthew was written, however varied may have been the oral or documentary sources from which it was composed or compiled, and whether it was first written in Greek or

Aramaic, it shows the special handiwork of one particular man. This much, I think, no one will dispute, and if I agree not to assume that he was an Apostle, or that his name really *was* Matthew, perhaps I may be allowed for convenience's sake to call him 'Matthew.'

My hypothesis, then, is that Matthew wrote *at different times* the canonical Gospel and 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or at least that large part of the latter which runs parallel to the former.

The hypothesis will not appear absurd to anyone who reads it by the light of everyday facts in authorship. Modern writers put forth new editions of their works, often adding much, omitting much, varying much: sometimes even a book is entirely rewritten. There is no reason why we should refuse to believe that ancient authors exercised the same liberty. Bishop Lightfoot, indeed, suggests (*Revision*, 29) that Luke wrote two slightly different copies of his Gospel; and, whether this be so or not, it is at least certain that the Ascension as told in Acts is a complete rewriting of the same event as told in his Gospel.

And in the case of Matthew many peculiar considerations render such alterations both possible and probable. If he had dreamt that 1800 years later a very partially Christianized world and a very divided Christianity would have no other knowledge of the life of Jesus than what they had gathered from himself and three of his contemporaries, he would have written something more than a sketch which (to compare it with a modern biography) fills only about thirty-five ordinary octavo pages. Matthew expected that in his own lifetime, or at least his own generation, all the tribes of the earth should see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, that angels with a great sound of a trumpet should gather the elect from the four winds, and that heaven and earth should pass away. Meanwhile there were many witnesses of the life of Jesus still living and communicating the history of his life to the converted and the unconverted alike. It was an age too in which 'many took in hand' to put that history in writing; nor were their narratives fantastic apocrypha—they were accounts of 'the things most surely believed' among Chris-

tians, derived from 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,' and the other evangelist who tells us this wrote not to supersede but to confirm them. Moreover a missionary preacher can nearly always spread what he has to say wider and faster than a writer; and in the days of Aramaic and uncial Greek manuscripts this was still more true than it is in these days of printing-presses. And so, probably, Matthew never thought of composing a full biography that should last for all time, but merely wrote a brief sketch, perhaps for the information of some private friend, as did Luke, or at the request of some particular community. By and by, possibly, another friend or another community desired an account from him: perchance he had kept no copy of the former one, or only rough notes—hence omissions, variations, additions: perchance also he purposely varied the contents somewhat, whether of his own fancy, or according to the character of the persons for whom he was writing, or with reference to the contents of other Gospels.

But, some one may say, we are told * that Mark's Gospel is a collection of notes of Peter's lectures. May not Matthew have been merely an oral teacher, and may not the Gospel bearing his name be a collection of notes made by one or more of his hearers,† and not actually *written* by him at all? Then, I reply, the Gospel according to the Hebrews might be another such collection made by other hearers, and probably at another time.

The relationship between the Gospel according to the Hebrews and Luke is less hard of definition. We have nothing like the same quantity or quality of coincidence, material or verbal, to account for. Casual agreement of detail might be explained by supposing that either of the two writers was influenced by *recollections* of the other: for we have seen that neither can have written with the other's work actually before him. We have strong reason to suspect such recollection in Luke's accounts of the conversion of Paul, and it is also worth notice that Paul, who seems to

* By Papias (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39).

† Papias expressly refers to Matthew as a source of oral tradition (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 38). The passage is quoted and translated in *Appendix B*.

have got his version of the Last Supper from his companion Luke, mentions an appearance of Jesus to James after the Resurrection. It is, however, quite needless to suppose that either Luke or the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews had ever seen the other's work. Each may have derived the corresponding matter from oral tradition or from other of the 'many' written Gospels in circulation. Coincidences of vocabulary admit the same easy explanation on either hypothesis. All we can safely say is that many details and phrases in the Gospel according to the Hebrews which are not found in the Greek Matthew are at least in their ultimate source coeval with Luke.

I have not yet touched the difficult question of priority between the canonical Matthew and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The fact that the latter twice speaks of 'the Lord' is perhaps a sign of its later date: see note on Fr. 6. If, however, the term 'Lord' be used in its strict original sense 'master,' that would suggest that the Gospel was written by a personal follower of Jesus. A later date is also possibly indicated by the fresh incidents and additional details which it supplies. It may, indeed, be urged that Matthew's memory would be more complete when he wrote his first work: on the other hand, the longer he lived the more his recollection would be revived, or the fuller information he would gain, by the publication of other men's Gospels, or the communication of their oral tradition. Again the fact that the Greek Gospel does not contain a few words and conspicuous phrases found in the Aramaic Gospel seems to afford a slight additional argument for the priority of the former: yet, if the Gospel according to the Hebrews were recovered entire, we might find peculiarities in the canonical Gospel to balance these. Applying the test of length, we are inclined to regard the Aramaic Gospel as the earlier, it being the shorter. Nevertheless, wherever we can compare its relation of events with that of the Greek we find it fuller and are led to suspect that it was shorter only through the omission of parables or long discourses. In this case its preference for incident would tend to show a later date: the further men got from the days of Jesus the more they demanded that information about the facts of his life which

was gradually passing out of their reach—I have little doubt that if two lost but genuine Gospels were at this date recovered, the one homiletic, the other narrative, the most devotional Christian would set greater store by the latter.

Altogether, then, I think there is a slight amount of presumption in favour of the priority of the canonical Gospel, but some of the counter arguments given above, together with the less stereotyped character of the Aramaic Gospel, disincline me from expressing a decided opinion.

The question whether the Greek Gospel is translated from an Aramaic original remains, as far as my theory is concerned. But, if it was first written in Aramaic, then the fact that Matthew did actually compose in that language makes his authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews the more probable. And, if the Greek Gospel be not a translation,* may not the Gospel according to the Hebrews

* Papias's statement can hardly be a mere guess. But I put the case thus interrogatively because a third theory is possible—that the Greek Matthew had been translated into Aramaic and that Papias mistook this translation for an original. To render this in the least degree probable one must suppose that no other evangelist had at that time been translated into Aramaic. Now in the Curetonian Syriac, a version in Western Aramaic probably as old as the 2nd cent., 'the Gospel of St. Matthew differs in mode of expression and various other particulars from what we find in the rest'—according to Tregelles (*Smith's Bib. Dic.* iii. 1634). Again, the title of that particular Gospel, and that only, contains a word which Tregelles and others take to mean 'made clear,' and which they suppose to indicate a rendering from a less popular dialect into the vernacular. If, however, it should denote a rendering into Western Aramaic not from Eastern Aramaic but from Greek, then in the use of the word at the heading of this one Gospel, and in the idiosyncrasies of the translation, we may see an evidence that Matthew was translated at a different time from the other evangelists, and since he is the most Hebraistic he would naturally be translated first.

Cureton and Tregelles insist that the Curetonian Syriac is virtually a translation of an original Matthew in Eastern Aramaic. If they are right, my conclusions are not affected one whit. But whether they are right or wrong, the Curetonian Syriac does show several approximations to the text of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thereby lends it evidence, if not of correctness, at

have been Papias's Aramaic original?—in which case we should have the evidence of a man born in the Apostolic age for the fact, or at least the tradition, of its Matthaean authorship.

We must not forget that the above conclusions have been arrived at solely from internal evidence; we have yet to compare them with the external evidence. That has been summed up already at the end of Part I., but I may with advantage, for our present purpose, abstract it a little further and say that it tends to show

- (i.) that Matthew wrote a Gospel in Aramaic;
- (ii.) that the Greek Matthew is a translation from the Aramaic Matthew;
- (iii.) that Matthew wrote the Gospel according to the Hebrews;
- (iv.) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the Aramaic original of the Greek Matthew.

The conclusions I have deduced from internal evidence agree with (i.) and (iii.), they are equally consistent with the correctness or incorrectness of (ii.); they disagree with (iv.) only. But here *res ipsa loquitur*: the Fragments speak for themselves. The Greek Matthew, as it stands, and as it stood in the second century, is not a translation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews as *it* stood either in the days of Epiphanius and Jerome or some two centuries earlier. If the opinion of Epiphanius and Jerome be true, either the Greek or the Aramaic work or both must have undergone any number of additions, omissions, and alterations. To maintain their opinion it was necessary for them to give some evidence as to why, when, or by whom these changes were effected. Their silence shows pretty clearly that they had no such evidence to offer, and I think we may assume without hesitation that, believing in an Aramaic original of the Greek Matthew and finding an Aramaic Gospel (ascribed to him by the tradition of centuries) bearing much substantial and even verbal agreement with the

least of correspondence with an extremely *ancient* form of the canonical Matthew's text.

Greek Gospel, they over hastily jumped to the conclusion that the Aramaic must be *somehow* the original of the Greek.

And here I might say farewell to my readers, but that I wish to add a few short remarks as to the position of this Gospel in the second century. In reviewing the external evidence, we only traced the use of it as far back as to Hegesippus, writing perhaps about 160 A.D., though we also found that Papias narrated a story which he *might* have borrowed from it. We have since seen that one of the fragments is identical with a quotation in one of the Ignatian epistles, which, taking it for genuine, must be as early as 115 A.D., and if spurious would scarcely be later than the* middle of the same century. It is true that part of the quotation was certainly to be found in †‘the Teaching of Peter,’ and, of course, even otherwise we cannot *prove* that it was made from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Similarly we have found Justin twice out of accord with the established text of the canonical Gospels, but in accord with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Here, however, Justin is supported by a few early copies of Matthew and Luke, and even if he were not we cannot *prove* that he used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Still these things, together with the ‡ story told by Papias, are worth mentioning in arrest of judgement, if any one should allege that our Aramaic Gospel was not used by writers of the earlier half of the second century; and they at least afford as early confirmation of its credibility. It is further to be remarked that where the Gospel according to the Hebrews differs from the established text of our Matthew it is often supported to some extent by Codex Bezae, the Old Latin, or the Curetonian Syriac, all of them undoubtedly sprung from second century MSS. Now, if the peculiar readings of these three authorities are right, the text of our Aramaic Gospel gains in credibility; if they are wrong, the question arises

* See Bishop Lightfoot’s article in the *Contemporary Review* for Feb. 1875.

† See pp. 71–3, and also p. 87.

‡ The story of the ‘woman accused of many sins before the Lord.’

whether they may not have been introduced from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and in that case whether the persons who introduced them must not have regarded that Gospel as both authoritative and Matthaean.

The reader who has not studied the history of the Canon will nevertheless assume that far more ancient witness can be brought for the authority and authorship of the canonical Gospels than for the authority and authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He will make a great mistake. It is true that no writer before Irenaeus (about 180-190 A.D.) speaks of our Aramaic Gospel as the work of Matthew, nor does any writer before his older contemporary Hegesippus, who probably wrote a little earlier, mention its existence. But neither is the authorship or the existence of the Gospels according to John and Luke mentioned by any writer* certainly earlier than these.† The same might be said of the other two canonical Gospels but that Papias (who can hardly have written later than 140 A.D., and may have written a good deal earlier) affirms that Matthew and Mark wrote Gospels, and, as he says that Matthew's Gospel was first written by him in Hebrew, and as we know him to have told a story which was found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it becomes a question whether he was not also an authority for our Aramaic Gospel.

But, some one will say, are there not in writers earlier than Irenaeus‡ a large number of seeming, though anony-

* The other writers in my mind are the author of the Canon Muratorianus and Heracleon. But I regard it as morally certain that Tatian, who was earlier than any of these, compiled his Diatessaron from at least three of our Canonical Gospels, with either the Canonical Matthew or the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the fourth.

† There is no proof that the mention of Matthew's Gospel by Apollinaris is earlier. The Canon Muratorianus is defective at the beginning, but, as it speaks of Luke's and John's Gospels as the third and fourth, it is morally certain that the other two which it comprehended were Matthew and Mark.

‡ If any reader should have been misled by the author of *Supernatural Religion* into denying or doubting this, I beg him to read Bishop Lightfoot's articles in the *Contemporary Review*, beginning

mous, quotations from and references to the canonical Gospels? Granting the likelihood (and you barely claim as much) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews is quoted or referred to by Papias, Justin, and the author of a probably genuine Ignatian epistle, you need far more to convince us that your Aramaic Gospel can have been generally looked upon as an Apostolic or even an authoritative writing.

To this I might reply by admitting that there are no more quotations from or references to it, but pointing out

in Dec. 1874, and Dr. Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*. Those on the other hand who have not read the book may like to know what is the author's way of dealing with such early quotations. First of all he brands the works containing them as spurious, whenever he can find a good or a bad pretext for so doing: but in any case he assigns to them the latest conceivable date. With these reservations he proceeds to discuss the supposed quotations. If they are at all free, he carefully abstains from enquiring whether the works containing them show the same looseness in quoting from the *Old Testament*; he equally neglects the analogies presented by *Old Testament* quotations in the New, and by acknowledged loose quotations from the Gospels in later writers; and dismissing as absurd the idea of 'quotation from memory' he pronounces them to have been taken from some lost Gospel. If on the other hand the quotations are exact or very close, he will try to prove either that they are interpolations or that the corresponding texts in our Gospels have been interpolated. Or he will say that as the text occurs in more than one of our Gospels it was evidently part of the common stock of Gospel-writers, and may just as well have been in lost Gospels also. Or he will urge that some apocryphal book quoted elsewhere by the writer who is under consideration may have furnished it. Having got rid of all quotations before Irenaeus (180-190 A.D.) by one or more of these methods, and having pronounced that the Gospels quoted by earlier writers and read (as we know from Justin) in the weekly assemblies of Christians were uncanonical, he does not explain when, why, or how these old and *then* canonical Scriptures were degraded and the present Gospels (before unknown) substituted—so suddenly and with such general agreement that from Irenaeus onward we find them (except among heretical sects) in almost absolute possession of the field, and no other Gospel named in any subsequent list of canonical books. But the writer does not perceive that he has achieved nothing beyond a *reductio ad absurdum* of his own argument.

that it was written in Aramaic, that there is not the least proof that it had been translated, that most of the writers alluded to did not know Aramaic, and that in any case they would probably avoid quoting a Gospel which those whom they were addressing had not read and were not able to read.

But there is another answer. Had any one of the canonical Gospels been lost, or preserved only to the extent of a few fragments, we should have been unable to detect all these early references to it. In some cases we should have treated what we now recognise to be a distinct reference to that particular Gospel as a loose reference from memory to a parallel passage in one of the three Gospels which alone would have been preserved to us; and where no such parallel existed we should have found ourselves at the end of our tether. Now what might have happened to any one of the canonical Gospels is precisely what has happened to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There are many yet untraced quotations and traditions, all of which *may*, and some of which probably do belong to it. Of course, every one of these *may* be taken from some other of the many lost Gospels: still, not one of those Gospels held in the estimation of the Fathers a place approaching that of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, nor are the known quotations from any one of them to be compared in number with the known quotations from our Aramaic Gospel. Again, many of the apparent references to our Gospels are decidedly loose. This looseness is exactly paralleled by the looseness with which the Old Testament is often quoted by the same writers (and in the New Testament), and with which the New Testament itself is often quoted by later writers.* Still, in some at least of these cases the reference really *may* be to

* It must be clearly understood that wherever the parallels of thought and language are fairly near I admit probability to be on the side of the Canonical Gospels against *all* lost Gospels, but if the quotations in question be not from the Canonical Gospels, probability is, I think, in each case in favour of the Gospel according to the Hebrews against *all other* lost Gospels. I should not have ventured the above suggestion at all if we did not know that the Aramaic Gospel had strong canonical affinities.

the Gospel according to the Hebrews, especially where the connexion seems to be with Matthew.

And now at last, having examined every aspect of my subject which has suggested itself to me, I may close an investigation which will not have been undertaken in vain if this Gospel should really be a work coeval with the canonical records of the life of Jesus. If on the other hand my deductions have been wrong and my conjectures groundless, I shall, at least, have the satisfaction of furnishing to some more sagacious critic that armoury of facts wherewith saving Truth alive he is welcome to kill my theories.

ADDENDA.

P. 5. The following are the passages of Irenaeus and Eusebius to be compared:—

IRENÆUS, *Adv. Haer.* i. 26 § 2 (extant in the old Latin translation only), Solo autem eo quod est secundum Matthaeum Evangelio utuntur, et Apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum Legis dicentes—‘They use that Gospel only which is according to Matthew, and refuse the Apostle Paul, calling him an apostate from the Law.’

EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 27, Τοῦ μὲν Ἀποστόλου πάσας τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀρνητέας ἡγοῦντο εἶναι δεῖν, ἀποστάτην ἀποκαλοῦντες τοῦ Νόμου. Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ’ Ἑβραίους λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ἐποιοῦντο λόγον—‘They held that all the epistles of the Apostle ought to be refused, calling him an apostate from the Law: and, using that Gospel alone which is called *according to the Hebrews*, they took small account of the rest.’

P. 26. From p. 243 of Volkmar’s edition (1860) of Credner’s *Kanon*, I find that a later Nikephorus, Nikephorus Callistus, a Byzantine monk who wrote about 1330 A.D., puts the Gospel according to the Hebrews among spurious books. His list is, however, a mere paraphrase, with slight variations, of the list of Eusebius.

The passage referring to the Gospel according to the Hebrews runs thus: 'And nowadays let *the Gospel according to the Hebrews* also be numbered among these [spurious books], which they out of the Hebrews who came to Christ loved with joyfulness beyond any other' ('Ἡδὴ δ' ἐν τούτοις καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίων Εὐαγγέλιον ἀριθμείσθω, ᾧ μάλιστα οἱ ἐξ Ἑβραίων Χριστῷ προσιόντες ἔχαιρον ἀσμενίζοντες.—*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 46).

The reader who compares this with my first quotation from Eusebius on p. 5 will be amused, and will agree that the opinion of Nikephorus Callistus (who lived about 900 years after Theodoret, the last independent writer who mentions this Gospel, and about 500 years after the copyist of Codex Tischendorfianus III., in which is found the last trace of its existence) has not even a feather's weight in the balance of evidence.

P. 51, note on Fr. 21. The following considerations make me more doubtful. In the letter to Hedybia, § 4, Jerome writes: 'And the Evangelist Matthew, who composed the Gospel in the Hebrew speech, seems to me to have said [in xxvii. 1] not so much *in the evening* as *late*, and he who translated—deceived by the ambiguity of the word—to have translated not *late* but *in the evening*. Although the custom of men's speech holds, that *late* signifies not evening but *after delay*' (Mihique videtur Evangelistam Matthaeum, qui Evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam *vespere* dixisse quam *sero*, et eum qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non *sero* interpretatum esse, sed *vespere*. Quamquam consuetudo humani sermonis teneat, *sero* non *vesperum* significare sed *tarde*). Now, if the Gospel according to the Hebrews had *late* why did not Jerome quote it? It seems to me, therefore, that as regards Matt. xxvii. 1 he conjectures that Matthew wrote in Aramaic something which was not in the Nazarene Gospel—perhaps assuming a double Aramaic edition. He may have done so equally as regards Matt. xxi. 9, and *barrama* may be merely what he thought a safe guess at the original—introduced to show off his learning to his patron the Pope.

P. 60, 4th note. I have forgotten to fulfil the promise

given on p. 14 to quote the words in which Epiphanius 'accuses the Ebionites of having interpolated in a certain verse not only the word $\mu\lambda$, but the two letters μ and η .'

After the first passage quoted from him on p. 60 he goes on thus: Πόθεν δὲ οὐ φωραθήσεται ἡ αὐτῶν ῥαδιουργία, τῆς ἀκολουθίας κραζούσης ὅτι τὸ $\mu\delta$ καὶ τὸ $\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ἐστὶ προσθετά;—
'But how shall their fraudulence scape detection, when the context cries out that the μ and the η are tacked on?'

Pp. 88-9. I should like for *Μαρκιανός*, καὶ to read *Μαρκίων*, ὡς καὶ. The difference in sound, setting aside accent, would be expressed by *Markiahnoos* and *Markiawn(h)awss*, which a tired copyist from dictation might easily confound.

Marcion was a Docketist; his orthodox opponents insisted that his opinions were contradicted by his own Gospel; and he was accused of interpolating Luke as well as mutilating him. The charge of mutilation was, indeed, the chief indictment; yet so long as Serapion's flock read the original Luke as well as Marcion's Luke that bishop might think the interpolations alone dangerous.

But Marcion's Gospel, which he called only 'the Gospel,' was thoroughly anti-Judaistic, and he almost seems to have repudiated all Apostles but Paul. And, though Eastern Marcionites of a later date might just conceivably supply the unhappy want of an author's name to this Gospel by giving it the name of Peter (although we should have expected that of Paul, whom Marcion declared to have used it), yet a Gospel which, so far as we know, was only a mutilated Luke can hardly have included the statement which Origen seems to attribute to the Gospel according to Peter.

Still it is possible that the Gospel according to Peter was in use among Syriac Marcionites (of whom we hear as late as Theodoret) and that it bore some ascription which connected it or its transcriber with Marcion.

Lardner (*History of Heretics*, bk. ii. 11, § 6) supposes Lucanus, Lucianus, or Leucius—the asserted forger of Apocrypha—to have written the Gospel according to Peter, he being a Marcionite, and Lardner taking *Μαρκιανός* to mean Marcion. And after τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ Lardner writes *Μαρκιανοῦ* in brackets, construing, I

suppose, 'the succession of teachers who began with him.' But *κατάρχεσθαι τινος* seems to mean only 'to begin,' not 'to begin with;' and, though I do not like my own rendering of the passage, Liddell and Scott and Sophocles offer me no alternative.

I may add that, if the Gospel according to Peter did contain the statement spoken of by Origen, that statement seems intended to support the theory of Mary's perpetual virginity—a very odd intention in a Docketist book, though we do hear from Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* i. 30, § 12) that Docketist Ophites held Jesus to have been born of a virgin.

P. 102. According to Credner (*Kanon*, 120) Nikephorus (the earlier) states that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained βς', i.e. 2,006 *στίχοι*. And Volkmar (*Kanon*, 243) says that so Credner has written in the MS. of his work. But all the MSS. of the Latin translation of the ninth century agree in reading 2,200, and so Volkmar is almost certainly right in saying that we ought to read βς', i.e. 2,200.

In either case the Gospel according to the Hebrews would be shorter than those according to Matthew and Luke, to the former of which Nikephorus gives 2,500, and to the latter 2,600 *στίχοι*.

APPENDICES.

A. PROF. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENT OF THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

I SHALL first copy Prof. Westcott's statement (*Canon of the New Testament*, ed. 1875, p. 510) and make my remarks on it as I go.

'One passage which occurred in the Gospel according to the Hebrews is found in a letter of Ignatius, who does not however quote the words as written, but only on traditional authority.'

Any reader might think that Ignatius gave tradition as his authority; it is, however, only Prof. Westcott's inference that he *must* have quoted from tradition. I will add that it is a very bad inference, for the form of Ignatius's words (see my first note to Fr. 30) makes it all but certain that he was quoting a written document—a conclusion strengthened by the fact that he goes on to speak upon the same subject in words plainly adapted from Acts.

'Papias again related a story "of a woman accused of many crimes before our Lord, which was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews," but the words of Eusebius seem to imply that he did not refer to that book as the source of the narrative.'

Quite fairly stated.

'The evangelic quotations of Justin Martyr offer no support to the notion that he used it as a coordinate authority with the Canonical Gospels, but on the contrary distinguish a detail which it contained from that which was written in the Apostolic memoirs.'

I cannot dispute Prof. Westcott's right to put the case thus—though see my note on Fr. 7—and it is just to add that he gives a foot-reference to a passage where he deals with the point more fully.

'Hegesippus is the first author who was certainly acquainted

with it; but there is nothing to show that he attributed to it any peculiar authority.'

Quite fairly stated.

'Clement of Alexandria and Origen both quote the book, but both distinctly affirm that the four Canonical Gospels stood alone as acknowledged records of the Lord's life.'

No notice is taken of Irenaeus.

We are not told that Clement quotes it with the words 'it is written.'

Prof. Westcott leaves out of sight the fact that it was held by Irenaeus (seemingly), Epiphanius, Jerome, and Theodoret (seemingly), as well as by popular opinion among those who used it, to be a mere Aramaic edition of a Canonical Gospel. If Clement and Origen thought the same, they of course included it when they spoke of the four Canonical Gospels.

'Epiphanius regarded the "Hebrew Gospel" as a heretical work based on St. Matthew.'

No notice is taken of Eusebius, who twice quotes the Gospel according to the Hebrews—once directly attributing the quoted words to Jesus himself—and who implies that it was anciently held canonical and that its canonicity was only beginning to be denied.

Speaking of the Ebionite 'Hebrew Gospel,' Epiphanius once calls it the Gospel according to Matthew, and once says that it was 'named according to Matthew' and that they did not use it 'in complete entirety, but corrupted and mutilated.' Now, *is* the meaning of Epiphanius fairly given in the words 'based on St. Matthew'?

Before speaking of the Ebionite Gospel Epiphanius says of the *Nazarenes* that 'they have the Gospel according to Matthew most complete in Hebrew. For assuredly this is still kept among them, according as it was at outset written, in Hebrew letters.'

'Jerome has referred to it several times, and he translated it into Latin, but he nowhere attributes to it any peculiar authority, and calls St. John expressly the fourth and last Evangelist.'

In a foot-note Prof. Westcott gives references to nine, and speaks of 'the remaining passages.' Still I think for 'several' he might have written 'thirteen.'

Jerome also translated it into Greek.

Jerome not only records twice over, without demur, the common belief in its Matthaean authorship, but once distinctly states that it was the original of the Greek Matthew.

This being so, it cannot be of the slightest significance that he 'calls St. John expressly the fourth and last Evangelist.'

'Yet the fact that he appealed to that book as giving the testimony of antiquity furnished occasion for an adversary to charge him with making "a fifth Gospel;" and at a later time, in deference to Jerome's judgment, Bede reckoned it among the "ecclesiastical" rather than the "Apocryphal writings."'

No notice is taken of Theodoret.

Bede, after speaking of Apocryphal Gospels, says 'Here it is to be noted that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as it is called, is not to be counted among apocryphal but among ecclesiastical histories: for it seemed good even to the very translator of Holy Scripture, Jerome, to use many evidences from it, and to translate it into the Latin and Greek language.' I think Prof. Westcott makes Bede seem more doubtful than do Bede's own words, but I do not press this.

No notice is taken of Nikephorus.

If I were now to ask Prof. Westcott's most partial friend 'Is not this statement of the external evidence hopelessly unfair?' I should expect him to answer 'Well, if he did not know of more evidence for it, how was he to give more evidence? Remember that while you have professedly made a special study of this Gospel, he has not.' I might simply reply that, if Prof. Westcott had only looked out his own foot-references to Ignatius and Jerome it was impossible for him, judging and writing fairly, to represent their evidence as he has done. But I find that the edition of Prof. Westcott's book which I have quoted is not only 'revised,' and might therefor have been expected to derive some benefit from Hilgenfeld's edition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews published no fewer than eight years before, but it is revised, as the author says, partly by the help of the adverse criticism of *Supernatural Religion*. Prof. Westcott expresses himself much indebted to this criticism: he seems to have read the book through: he gives nearly 40 pp. of Preface to it: and of this number he gives nearly two pages to criticizing some statements respecting the Gospel according to the Hebrews many of which were indeed quite unfounded. Now, the writer of *Supernatural Religion* puts forward the claims of, and his own undue pretensions for, the Gospel according to the Hebrews more fully in vol. i. pp. 420-6 than elsewhere, and a statement about it on one of those pages Prof. Westcott quotes at length. If Prof. Westcott read those pages and either took on trust (which he would hardly do) the statements there made as to the evidence of

Irenaeus, Clement, Jerome, Theodoret, and Nikephorus, or looked at the passages referred to in the foot-notes in support of those statements, it was impossible for him, judging and writing fairly, to misrepresent some of that evidence and leave out the rest.

As regards Nikephorus I may add that Prof. Westcott in his own book prints Nikephorus's canon and stichometry in full.

Not even yet, however, are we in a position to pronounce on Prof. Westcott's statement the opinion that ought to be pronounced. I invite the reader's careful attention to the following amazing facts:—

The editions of Prof. Westcott's work on the Canon bear date 1855, 1860 ('the whole essay has been carefully revised'), 1870 ('carefully revised throughout'), 1875 ('revised').

The editions of Prof. Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* bear date 1860, 1867, 1872, 1875.

The latter work contains an Appendix—Appendix D—'On some of the Apocryphal Gospels.' The first two sections are given to 'The Gospel according to the Hebrews' and 'The Gospel of the Ebionites.' These sections fill rather more than five pages, pp. 462–7 of the 1875 edition, and consist chiefly of a translation of Fragments, with notes: in the notes the originals are given. Beyond a few words stating that Papias needs not have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews and that a certain quotation from Hegesippus and certain words of Jerome are not to be referred to it (in all of which views he is quite right), with 6½ lines relating to the witness of Epiphanius, Prof. Westcott says nothing about the external evidence.

I have not compared all this word by word with the edition of 1860, and so, though I at a general glance see no change, there may be some. I pledge myself, however, that all the statements which I am now going to extract from the 1875 edition are word for word in the edition of 1860. The small capitals are mine.

(1) On p. 462 we are referred to p. 457 for a Fragment. It is the fragment from the *Theophania* of Eusebius, and the important parts are thus rendered by Prof. Westcott: '[CHRIST] HIMSELF taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said.' In a note the reference to Eusebius is given, and Prof. Westcott, by saying 'this quotation seems to have been unnoticed,' must himself have been the discoverer of it.

(2) On p. 463 Prof. Westcott translates thus from Jerome: 'The Gospel entitled *according to the Hebrews*, WHICH I LATELY TRANSLATED INTO GREEK and Latin.' He gives in a note the reference and the original.

(3) On p. 464 he translates thus from Jerome: 'In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, WHICH I LATELY TRANSLATED FROM THE HEBREW INTO GREEK.' In a note he gives the reference and original.

(4) On p. 465, in the second section, headed 'The Gospel of the Ebionites,' he says 'Epiphanius speaks of the Nazarenes as "HAVING THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW IN A MOST COMPLETE FORM* IN HEBREW," though he immediately adds that he does not know whether † "they removed the genealogies from Abraham to Christ."' In a note he gives the reference and original, *including the original of the following sentence, which he does not allude to in his text*, 'For assuredly this is still kept among them, according as it was at outset written, in Hebrew letters.'

(5) He then adds in his text 'IN CONTRAST WITH THIS STATEMENT he says that the Ebionites had a Gospel called the Gospel according to Matthew, not entire and perfectly complete, but falsified and mutilated, which they call the Hebrew Gospel.'

We see from (1) that in 1860 he knew that Eusebius had quoted words from the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the words of '[Christ] Himself.'

We see from (2) and (3) that in 1860 he knew that Jerome had translated that Gospel into Greek as well as Latin.

We see from (4) that in 1860 ‡ he knew the passage in which Epiphanius practically says that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the original of the Greek Matthew.

Yet, although these are points of moment—the first and last of the highest moment—in favour of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, he made no mention of one of them in the connected statement of the external evidence which he published in his other book in 1866, 1870, and 1875. The entire § text of that statement remains exactly as it was printed in 1855.

* The 1860 ed. has a comma after 'form.'

† The 1860 ed. has the mark of quotation before 'removed.'

‡ Nay, in 1851. For on p. 240 of his *Elements of the Gospel Harmony* published in that year he says 'Jerome, who translated into Greek and Latin a copy of this Gospel.'

§ There is one addition in a foot-note. The statement about Bede has, and had in the first edition, this note:—

'Bede, *Comm. in Luc. init.* quoted on Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2.'

Prof. Westcott has himself in a former note quoted 'Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2,' but has not quoted Bede. As the note first stood one would therefor suppose that he was referring to Credner, from whom he confessedly took his references to Jerome.

To this note are now added the words 'See *Introduction to the Study of the*

On the other hand we see from (5) that Prof. Westcott had between 1855 and 1860 come to look on the Ebionite Gospel of Epiphanius as distinct from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Yet in the editions of his other book published in 1866, 1870, and 1875 he still (as in 1855) applies to the latter Gospel the damaging statement made by Epiphanius with reference to the former only.

And now what does Prof. Westcott's most partial friend say?

B. PAPIAS AND MATTHEW.

I have not discussed whether the Papiasts are right in affirming or the Erasmians in denying an Aramaic original of the Canonical Gospel according to Matthew, and I have admitted that the Aramaic Gospel spoken of by Papias *may* have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

But I do not see how we can refuse to believe that Matthew wrote *some* Aramaic Gospel. Independently of the mere antiquity of Papias, Eusebius has preserved another passage from his work which makes it very difficult to suppose that he was mistaken altogether on this point.

In the prospectus of this work which I sent out I stated that I had 'amended the translation of an important fragment of Papias bearing on this question,' meaning the passage which I am now going to translate. I have since convinced myself that my correction of the printed text was needless; but—as at the place in point Prof. Westcott has not translated rightly; and as he, the writer of *Supernatural Religion*, and, to my surprise, Bishop Lightfoot, have all missed the meaning of one interesting expression—I shall still translate the passage and say what I have to say on it:—

* 'And I shall not hesitate to range for thee by the side of my

Gospels, App. D.' On looking there we find 'Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2' again quoted, but no Bede. I presume, therefore, that this addition is a curiously disguised direction to the reader to see the Appendix in question on the Gospel according to the Hebrews generally—a very perfect instance of literary suicide.

Prof. Westcott in the Appendix in question not only separates the Nazarene and the Ebionite Gospels, but says of 'several passages professedly taken from' the latter by Epiphanius that 'they present so many inconsistencies that they cannot have belonged originally to the same book.' Let me deal with Prof. Westcott's writings as Epiphanius and time have dealt with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the few fragments that I will leave shall carry overwhelming conviction to Macaulay's New Zealander that the *History of the Canon of the New Testament* and the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* cannot have belonged to the same writer.

* Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔραβον καὶ καλῶς

interpretations all moreover that from time to time I carefully learnt from the elders and carefully committed to memory, and to confirm truth † as their proxy. For I did not take pleasure, as the vulgar do, in those who were full of talk, but in those who taught the truth; nor in those who repeated the commandments of others, but in those who repeated the commandments which the Lord delivered to faith, and of which the source was truth itself. And if perchance there came any one who had been in the following of the elders, I enquired the elders' words—what Andrew, or what Peter had said; or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James; or what John or MATTHEW or any other one of the Lord's disciples; ‡ and

ἐμνημόνευσα συγκατατάξαι ταῖς ἐρμηνείαις, διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον, ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰ ληθῆ διδάσκουσιν· οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινόμενας τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρακολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας, ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν· ἢ τί Φίλιππος· ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος· ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον ὥσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39).

† ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Not 'that it is true,' as Prof. Westcott (*Canon*, 70), or 'its truth,' as the author of *Supernatural Religion* (i. 445), or 'their truth,' as Bishop Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1875).

‡ Prof. Westcott here renders 'as what' (*Canon*, 69). He clearly had before him an edition of Eusebius in which, as in that before me now, ἃ τε is run into ἃτε; and not being able to make anything of this he conjectured that a following τι was lost or was at least to be understood.

The writer of *Supernatural Religion* and Bishop Lightfoot, whichever reading they had, construe rightly from ἃ τε, and this is Harnack's reading in the edition (1878) of the Fragments of Papias before me; it was also the reading of Rufinus (for he renders *quære*), who translated Eusebius only about eighty years after Eusebius wrote.

My difficulty with the text was that I did not believe in ἃ being used where one would look for τίνα. Harnack refers to 2 Clem. i. 2, where we have οὐκ εἰδότες πάθεν ἐκλήθημεν καὶ ὑπὸ τίνος καὶ εἰς ὃν τόπον, καὶ θσα ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς παθεῖν ἕνεκα ἡμῶν. Here one might conjecture οἶον or explain εἰς ὃν τόπον as = τὸν τόπον εἰς ὃν. Madvig (*Gr. Syntax*, Browne and Arnold's translation, 1873, p. 187) gives Θεμιστοκλῆς φράζει τῷ ναυκλήρῳ ὅστις ἐστὶ καὶ δι' ἃ φεύγει (Thuc. i. 137), but there one might render 'and the reasons for which'; he also gives Δι' ἃς αἰτίας τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀκοὴν ξυμβαίνει παθήματα, λεπτέρον (Pl., *Tim.* 67), but there one might explain δι' ἃς αἰτίας as = τὰς αἰτίας δι' ἃς. But in Soph. *Aj.* 1259 (μαθὼν δς εἰ φύσω) δς = οἶος, and the case before us seems essentially parallel—besides which we may render, not 'and what,' but 'and the things which,' as I have preferred to do. At the same time I think no one will deny that, if the meaning of Papias be what it has hitherto been taken to be, καὶ τι or τι δὲ or ἢ τι would have been more natural.

My correction was, reading ἃτε, to put from that to Κυρίου in brackets—rendering 'or what John or Matthew or any other one of the Lord's disciples (as Aristion

the things that Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not suppose that what was out of the books was of so much benefit to me as what came from a living and abiding voice.'

May not the 'books' be Gospels by anonymous authors or authors who were not Apostles or companions of Jesus?

'Each interpreted them as he was able' seems to imply that when Papias wrote there was a single accepted version.

Yet Papias may never have seen the Aramaic Gospel (? the Gospel according to the Hebrews) and Matthew may have written another in Greek, which Papias mistook for a translation of the former.

C. THE GOSPEL OF CARPOCRATES AND KERINTHUS.

Hilgenfeld and the author of *Supernatural Religion* (i. 421) say that the heretics Carpocrates and Kerinthus used the Ebionite Gospel, on the faith of the following passage of Epiphanius:—

'But see how their [the Ebionites'] doctrine has been corrupted at every point, how everything is halting and crooked and has no rightness. For Kerinthus and Carpocras, using forsooth the same Gospel that they have, wish to show from the beginning of the Gospel according to Matthew that the Christ is of the seed of Joseph and Mary. But these are of another sort of mind. For having cut away the genealogies in Matthew they begin by way of commencement, as I have previously said, with the statement that "It came to pass" etc.*

If this passage proved that Carpocrates and Kerinthus used the Ebionite Gospel it would be a most important witness for the

and the Elder John, the disciple of the Lord) say.' The objection to this is not so much that λέγουσιν, 'say,' ought to be λέγει, 'says'—for it might be influenced by the plural 'disciples,' an inadvertence of which Shakspere and our everyday talk yield many instances—but that 'the disciples of the Lord' would be an altogether useless repetition.

The correction, had it been sound, would have been most important, because it would then have been implied (by the use of the present tense) that not only Aristion and the Elder John but John the Apostle and Matthew were still alive when Papias was making his enquiries.

* *Haer.* xxx. 14. "Ὅρα δὲ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς παρασκευασμένην πανταχόθεν διδασκαλίαν, πῶς πάντα χωλά, λοξά, καὶ οὐδεμίαν ὀρθότητα ἔχοντα. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κήρινθος καὶ Καρποκράτης, τῷ αὐτῷ χρώμενοι παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου βούλονται παριστᾶν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίας εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὗτοι δὲ ἄλλα τιὰ διανοοῦνται. Παρακόψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας ἀρχοῦνται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὥς προείπον, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγένετο—the quotation is given above, p. 15.

antiquity of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, since Kerinthus is reported to have been a contemporary of the Apostle John, while † ‘the Fathers in general place Carpocrates before Cerinthus,’ ‘Irenaeus seems to speak of his followers as the first who assumed the name of *Gnostics*,’ and ‘he is said, in conjunction with his son Epiphanes, to have carried his heresy to its height in the reign of Hadrian,’ ‡ i.e. between 117 and 138 A.D.

But the words of Epiphanius do not seem to me to justify the conclusion that these two early heretics used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. In a former part of his work (*Haer.* xxviii. 5) he has said that the school of Kerinthus ‘use the Gospel according to Matthew, in part and not entire, but for the sake of the genealogy in the flesh.’§ He calls it simply the Gospel according to Matthew, without saying that it was called, or was, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or that it was written in Hebrew characters. Again, he has before told us that the Ebionites too ‘receive the Gospel according to Matthew; for this they too, as also the Kerinthians and Merinthians, use to the exclusion of the rest. And they call it “according to the Hebrews.”’|| From this we learn nothing more than that the Kerinthians used the Gospel according to Matthew. And in the passage before us the argument of Epiphanius may be paraphrased as follows:—‘See how perversely the Ebionites have dealt with the text of Matthew. For such heretics as the Kerinthians who use the same Gospel of Matthew have still left the genealogies, which they submit as evidence of the human birth of Christ. The Ebionites might have done the same had they chosen, but such half measures are not to their taste—they have cut away the genealogies altogether.’ He has already told us that the Kerinthians use only Matthew, and that the Ebionites use only Matthew; now that for the purpose of strengthening his strictures against the latter for their corruption of Matthew’s text he holds up to them the contrary example (in this particular case) of the

† These quotations are from Mansel’s *Gnostic Heresies*, 117, 118.

‡ Taking 127 A.D. as the mean, and concluding that Epiphanes, who died at the age of 17, must have been at least 15 before he became a sectarian leader, we get 112 A.D. as the approximate date of the birth of Epiphanes. At that time Carpocrates may have been 20 or he may have been 60; taking 30 as a reasonable age, we should carry back his birth to 82 A.D. But all that we can say is that Carpocrates was almost certainly born not later than 100 A.D., and may have been born as early as 50 A.D.

§ Χρῶνται γὰρ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀπὸ μέρους καὶ οὐχὶ ὅλῳ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν γενεαλογίαν τὴν ἐνσαρκον (*Haer.* xxviii. 5).

|| Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί, ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ Κήρινθον καὶ Μήρινθον, χρῶνται μόνῳ. Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ ‘κατὰ Ἑβραίουσ’ (*Haer.* xxx. 3).

Kerinthians, who use 'the same Gospel,' is it not straining the meaning of words to infer that the Kerinthian Matthew followed in all other respects the peculiarities of the Ebionite text?

D. TATIAN'S DIATHESSARON.

We have seen that the Gospel according to the Hebrews cannot have been composed by Tatian. But the writer of *Supernatural Religion* maintains that Tatian 'did not actually compose any Harmony at all, but simply made use of the same Gospel as his master Justin, namely the Gospel according to the Hebrews' (ii. 159). Let us examine the statements of other early writers besides Epiphanius, and with them the theory built on them in *Supernatural Religion*.

Eusebius, then, tells us that 'Tatian having put together a certain [*or*, a sort of] connexion and combination [*or*, condensation], I know not how, of the Gospels, named this the "Dia tessaron": and it is current among some up to the present day.'* The writer of *Supernatural Religion* says 'It is clear that this information is not to be relied on, for not only is it based upon mere hearsay, but it is altogether indefinite as to the character of the contents, and the writer admits his own ignorance (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως) regarding them' (ii. 154).

Now, (i.) there is not a particle of evidence that Eusebius's statement is based upon mere hearsay, and that he had never seen the Diatessaron. Indeed, probability runs very strongly in the other direction. Eusebius was bishop of Caesarea, and, even if the library of Pamphilus at that place contained no copy of the Diatessaron†, he can hardly have failed to see elsewhere a book so popular in parts at least of Syria that (as we shall presently learn) more than a hundred years later Theodoret found upwards of 200 copies current among the churches of his own diocese. (ii.) Eusebius tells us quite clearly that Tatian dovetailed the narratives of the Gospels into each other, forming out of them one combined history; and not even the author of *Supernatural Religion* will deny that by 'the Gospels' Eusebius means Matthew (possibly including the Gospel according to the Hebrews), Mark, Luke, and John. His information is therefor anything but 'altogether indefinite as to the character of its contents.' (iii.) As to the assertion that Eusebius admits his 'own ignorance (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως) regarding them,' it should be observed that he does not say 'I do not know of what kind'—

* 'Ο Τατιανὸς συνάψειν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν Εὐαγγελίων συνθεὶς τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν· ὃ καὶ παρὰ τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 29).

† Which from the fact mentioned by Theodoret seems very unlikely.

referring to the character of the contents—but ‘I do not know how,’ referring to the way in which Tatian ‘put together’ his materials. We do not know how perplexing Tatian’s method of compilation may have been. He may have adopted as the base of his narrative sometimes the account of one evangelist, sometimes that of another, where the character of the accounts afforded no explanation of such varying preference: his work may have been deficient in chronological system: and finally he may have omitted salient portions of the Gospels which he professed to combine—a charge which, with whatever justice, was (as we shall presently see) actually brought against him.

Theodoret ‡ is, after Epiphanius, the next writer who mentions the Diatessaron. ‘He also,’ says Theodoret, ‘put together the so-called “Gospel through Four,” after having cut away the genealogies and everything else that shows the Lord to have been born of the seed of David according to the flesh. And this was used, not only by those of his company, but also by those who followed the doctrines of the Apostles, not perceiving the knavery of the compilation, but in their simplicity having taken the book into use because it was concise. And I myself also found more than 200 such books held in honour in the churches among us, and having gathered them all together I put them away and introduced in their stead the Gospels of the four Evangelists.’ §

Upon this the writer of *Supernatural Religion* remarks ‘Theodoret . . . not only does not say that it is based upon our four Gospels, but, on the contrary, points out that Tatian’s Gospel did not contain the genealogies and passages tracing the descent of Jesus through the race of David, which our Synoptics possess, and he so much condemned the mischievous design of the work that he confiscated the copies in circulation in his diocese as heretical. Canon Westcott’s assertion that Theodoret regarded it as a compilation of our four Gospels is most unfounded and arbitrary. Omissions, as he himself points out, are natural to a Harmony, and conciseness certainly would be the last quality for which it could

† Bishop of Kyrus or Kyrrhus, in Syria. The passage quoted was written between 451 and 458 A.D.

‡ Οὗτος καὶ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν Εὐαγγέλιον, τὰς γενεαλογίας περικόψας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα γεγενημένον τὸν Κύριον δείκνυσιν. Ἐχρήσαντο δὲ τούτῳ οὐ μόνον οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου συμμορίας ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τοῖς Ἀποστολικοῖς ἐπόμενοι δόγμασι, τὴν τῆς συνθήκης κακουργίαν οὐκ ἐγνωκότες, ἀλλ’ ἁπλοῦστερον ὡς συντόμῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ χρησάμενοι. Εἶρον δὲ καὶ γὰρ πλείους ἢ διακοσίας βίβλους τοιαύτας ἐν ταῖς παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαις τετιμημένας· καὶ πάσας συναγαγὼν ἀπεθέμην καὶ τὰ τῶν τεττάρων Εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεισήγαγον Εὐαγγέλια (*Haer. Fab.* i. 20).

have been so highly prized, if every part of the four Gospels had been retained. The omission of the parts referred to, which are equally omitted from the canonical fourth Gospel, could not have been sufficient to merit the condemnation of the work as heretical, and had Tatian's Gospel not been different in various respects from our four Gospels, such treatment would have been totally unwarrantable. The statement, moreover, that in place of Tatian's Gospel Theodoret "introduced the Gospels of the four Evangelists," seems to indicate clearly that the displaced Gospel was not a compilation from them, but different' (ii. 157).

The above argument is one mere tissue of fallacies. Theodoret says that Tatian 'cut away' the genealogies, and other passages. From what does Theodoret mean, if not from our Gospels? Why, our author himself, two pages further on, tells us that 'although Theodoret, writing in the fifth century, says in the usual arbitrary manner of early Christian writers, that Tatian "excised" from his Gospel the genealogies and certain passages found in the Synoptics, he offers no proof of his assertion, and the utmost that can be received is that Tatian's Gospel did not contain them.' Here the author clearly admits by inadvertence what he had previously denied. For, if Theodoret charges Tatian with excising passages from our Gospels, it is evident that he means his readers to understand that they formed the base of Tatian's work; otherwise there would be no ground for the charge.

Secondly, as Theodoret only brings this one accusation against Tatian's work, it is natural to suppose that this was the sole, or at any rate the chief, reason why he condemned it.

Thirdly, Canon Westcott does *not* point out that 'omissions are natural to a Harmony' in the abstract way implied. He *does* say that Theodoret 'speaks of omissions which were at least in part natural in a Harmony,' meaning, I suppose, that Tatian might leave out the genealogies if he found himself unable to harmonize the versions of Matthew and Luke satisfactorily.

Fourthly, no one, I imagine, has ever supposed that in Tatian's work 'every part of the four Gospels' was retained, if by this phrase is meant the entire text of each of the four Gospels. Where an incident was described by several evangelists, the 'Gospel through Four' would give a text compounded from each, but not the full text of each separately. Such a combined narrative, though it would be longer than any two of our Gospels, would be much more concise than all four together.

Fifthly, there is not the slightest analogy between omissions in the fourth Gospel and Tatian's 'Gospel through Four.' The writer of the former had a perfect right to limit the range of his

narrative as he chose; the writer of the latter, if he professed to connect and combine the Gospels, as Eusebius says he did, had no such liberty. If he left out material texts respecting the person of Jesus, he suppressed them, and, if he suppressed, denied or questioned them.

Sixthly, 'the statement that in place of Tatian's Gospel Theodoret "introduced the Gospels of the four Evangelists"' does not indicate in the least that Tatian's Gospel was not a compilation from them. Theodoret simply tells us that he substituted the Gospels of the four Evangelists for the Gospel of Tatian, i.e. the original Gospels of the Four for their mutilated summary, the Gospel through Four.

We have not, however, yet done with our author, who goes on to declare that 'the name Diatessaron was not only not given by Tatian himself to the work, but was merely the usual foregone conclusion of the Christians of the third and fourth centuries, that everything in the shape of evangelical literature must be dependent on the Gospels adopted by the Church. Those, however, who called the Gospel used by Tatian the Gospel according to the Hebrews, must have read the work The work was in point of fact found in wide circulation precisely in the places in which, earlier, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was more particularly current' (ii. 158).

Of course the assertion that the name of the work was not conferred on it by Tatian himself is in flat contradiction to the words of Eusebius. Our author claims, indeed, the support of Epiphanius. 'It must be observed,' he writes, 'that it is not said that Tatian himself gave this Gospel the name of Diatessaron, but, on the contrary, the expression of Epiphanius implies that he did not do so' (ii. 155). Our author's nose for implications, so dull when the implications are inconvenient to his theories, is here exquisitely fine. The words of Epiphanius are: 'And the "Gospel through Four" is said to have been made by him, which some call "according to the Hebrews." '*

I am at a loss to know to what our author's sneer about 'the usual foregone conclusion of the Christians of the third and fourth centuries' refers, unless it be to their belief, shared by most recent critics, that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated Luke. But the only writers of those centuries who mention what we *know* to have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews never call it 'the Gospel

* Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ὅπερ κατὰ Ἑβραίους τινὲς καλοῦσι (Hær. xlv. 1).

through Four' or ascribe it to Tatian, but call it * 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews,' † 'the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language,' ‡ 'the Gospel which has come to us in Hebrew characters,' § 'the Gospel according to Matthew,' || 'the Hebrew Gospel,' ‡ 'the Gospel which is written in Hebrew letters,' ¶ 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews . . . according to the Apostles, or, as very many [*or, most*] deem, according to Matthew,' ** 'the Gospel which is written in Hebrew and read by the Nazarenes,' †† 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use,' ‡‡ 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes use.' Strange that if the Gospel according to the Hebrews were by some ascribed to Tatian and called the Gospel through Four, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, who so often refer to it, should either not know this fact or omit to mention it. Strange that Christians of the third and the fourth centuries should give the Gospel according to the Hebrews a title and ascribe to it an origin totally different from the title given and the origin ascribed by their own literary leaders. Strange that they should cast about for a canonical relationship for it, when it was already ascribed to Matthew §§ in the previous century, and in doing so should invest a noted heretic with its authorship, while they gave to a work which was apparently only a variant Matthew, with here and there an affinity to Luke, and ||| which was not as long as either of them, a title implying that it was an amalgamation of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John!

The assertion that 'those . . . who called the Gospel used by Tatian the Gospel according to the Hebrews must have read the work' is, of course, purely arbitrary. The statement, too, that it was 'found in wide circulation precisely in the places in which, earlier, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was more particularly current,' seems to have no more ground than is afforded by the fact that ¶¶ Jerome was allowed to copy the Gospel according to the Hebrews by the Nazarenes in Beroea, who were in the habit of using it. Now Beroea (Aleppo) was forty miles south of Theodoret's

* Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius (4 times), Epiphanius, Jerome (5 times).

† Eusebius.

‡ Eusebius.

§ Epiphanius (twice). Jerome says, 'which is called by very many [*or, most*] people the original of Matthew.'

|| Epiphanius, Jerome.

¶ Jerome.

** Jerome.

†† Jerome.

‡‡ Jerome.

§§ By Irenaeus.

||| In the Sticheometry of Nikephorus (see p. 116) Luke contained 2,600 στίχοι, Matthew 2,600, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, 2,200.

¶¶ *Catal. Script. Eccles.* under 'Matthaeus.' I have quoted and translated the text on p. 18.

cathedral town, and was not included in his diocese, having a bishop of its own. I do not mean to say that the Nazarene Gospel might not also have been used by some people twenty miles or so further north, within the limits of Theodoret's diocese; but I do very strongly object to the statement that the work mentioned by Theodoret was found 'precisely in the places' where the Gospel according to the Hebrews had been 'more particularly current.' The fact of Jerome's having copied that Gospel at Beroea does not even prove that it was 'more particularly current' there; Beroea may have been only the first town where he had the opportunity of copying it. For immediately after arriving in the East he retired for four years to the desert of Chalcis, on the north side of which Beroea was situated, at a distance of only twelve miles from Chalcis itself.

The explanation of the fact that some people called Tatian's Gospel through Four the Gospel according to the Hebrews is obviously that given by Professor Westcott (*Canon*, 319, note):— 'Both books were current in the same countries, and differed from the Canonical Gospels *** by the omission of the genealogies. Few writers out of Palestine could compare the books so as to determine their real differences.' To this let me add that Tatian ††† may even have preferred to use the Aramaic 'Matthew,' the Gospel according to the Hebrews, rather than the Greek one, for his compilation, or ††† he may have used MSS. nearer to it than those on which we now base our text. Upon either view the confusion of his work with the Gospel according to the Hebrews becomes still more easy to understand and excuse.

Before closing this examination it is necessary just to notice a statement by §§§ Victor of Capua that Tatian called his Gospel 'through Five' (*Diapente*). The passage runs as follows:—|||| 'From his [Eusebius's] history, too, I have found that Tatian, a most learned man and orator of that time, compiled one Gospel out of

*** I only admit this of the Ebionite edition.

††† Especially if he compiled his work after his migration from Rome to Syria.

††† Even some of our extant MSS., as will be seen in the notes to the Fragments, present one or two striking resemblances to the text of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Tatian, moreover, was the pupil of Justin, whose coincidences with that Gospel will also be noticed, and who certainly used our Gospels, although he may have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews as well. See *Appendix E*. 'Justin's "memoirs of the Apostles."'

§§§ Writing about 550 A.D.

|||| Ex historia quoque eius comperi quod Tatianus, vir eruditissimus et orator illius temporis, unum ex quatuor compaginaverit Evangelium, cui titulum Diapente imposuit (*Praef. ad Anon. Harm. Evang.*).

four, to which he put the title *Diapente*.' Never has so puzzling an assertion been more recklessly commented on.

First, Professor Westcott (*Canon*, 321, note) says 'If there be no error in his statement that Tatian's Harmony was called *Diapente*, the fifth Gospel alluded to in the name was probably that according to the Hebrews, and the title was given in consequence of the confusion already noticed.' Westcott *seems* to have seen the original passage of Victor of Capua in Credner's *Beiträge*, but he does not quote it, and argues as if he had *not* seen it. For Victor does not say that Tatian's work 'was called' *Diapente*, 'through Five,' but that Tatian himself gave it this title, which quite disposes of the suggestion that 'the title was given' by others 'in consequence of the confusion already noticed' between his work and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Secondly, the writer of *Supernatural Religion* (ii. 153) says 'Tatian's Gospel, however, was not only called *Diatessaron*, but, according to Victor of Capua, it was also called *Diapente* (διὰ πέντε) "by five," a complication which shows the incorrectness of the ecclesiastical theory of its composition'; and again (ii. 161) 'We have seen that in the sixth century it was described by Victor of Capua as *Diapente*, "by five," instead of "by four." He also does not quote the Latin, makes Victor say merely that it 'was called' *Diapente*, and in the second reference insinuates that it is 'described' as a compilation of five Gospels, by Victor—who on the contrary says that it was a compilation of four.

Thirdly, Dr. Sanday has taken on trust the statement in *Supernatural Religion* (which he gives as his authority), and boldly tells us (*Gospels*, 240) that 'Victor of Capua in the sixth century speaks of Tatian's work as a "*Diapente*" rather than a "*Diatessaron*" . . . (p. 242) 'The fifth work, alluded to by Victor of Capua, may possibly have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews.' This is the consequence of not looking out references; it would be difficult to mislead the reader more completely as to what Victor *does* say.

I am surprised that no one has perceived that Victor's title '*Diapente*' 'through Five' *must* be a mere slip of the pen. From his own express words we know that he was acquainted with the existence and character of Tatian's work from Eusebius, and seemingly (as he gives no other authority) him alone, and from Eusebius's account he distinctly describes it as a combination of *four* Gospels. Eusebius says that Tatian called his work '*Dia-tessaron*' 'through Four,' and Victor, copying him, must have intended to say the same. No doubt* when he took down the words of Eu-

* Or, which comes to the same thing, his MS. of Eusebius may have had the

sebius he wrote διὰ δ' for διὰ τεσσάρων, and when working from his own notes translated δ' into πέντε, as if it were the letter for 5 instead of 4. Every one must be aware of making slips of this kind now and then : I can give from my own experience a curiously similar example. In rendering into English verse *Odyss.* v. 70—

Κρήναι δ' ἐξέλης πύσσυες ῥέον ὕδατι λευκῷ

Fountains four

In order ranged with sparkling water flowed—

I inadvertently translated 'Fountains *five*,' and the mistake not only slipped me in MS. but through the printer's proofs. Had Victor of Capua made this particular blunder, no doubt unsuspecting critics would point out that his MS. of Homer must have read not πύσσυες ῥέον but πέντ' ἱρῶρον.

E. JUSTIN'S 'MEMOIRS OF THE APOSTLES.'

The passage of Jerome quoted on p. 21 has been urged in favour of a theory that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the same with Justin's 'memoirs of the Apostles.'

I reject this theory, in the first place because I am convinced that Justin used our existing Gospels, whether (as has been suggested) in the form of a harmony or not, and whether (as I am inclined to think) he used any further record or not. I would willingly discuss this subject, but, as it occupies nearly 150 pp. of *Supernatural Religion*, more than 80 in Prof. Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, and 50 in Dr. Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*, the discussion would seriously delay the present work, besides taking up a most disproportionate amount of its space. I recommend any one who wishes to master the question to read first *Supernatural Religion*, then Prof. Westcott, then *Supernatural Religion* again, and lastly Dr. Sanday.

But, whether or not Justin used our Gospels, I should hold that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not the same with (though it might be included in) Justin's 'memoirs of the Apostles.'

The crucial proof of this is a passage† in which Justin, after mentioning the 'memoirs of the Apostles,' adds, 'which are called Gospels,' showing that he grouped several evangelic works under this designation. 'This clause,' as Dr. Sanday happily expresses it, 'has met with the usual fate of parenthetic statements which do

short form διὰ δ'. And for that matter the slip of the pen may have been in the MS. itself, which may have given διὰ ε' for διὰ δ'.

† Οἱ γὰρ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια.—*Apol.* i. 66.

not quite fall in with preconceived opinions, and is dismissed * as a 'manifest interpolation, a gloss having crept into the text from the margin.' When a MS. is found that does not contain the words 'which are called Gospels,' the gloss-theory will deserve respect: till then it has not a rag of reason to hide its nakedness.

The writer of *Supernatural Religion* does indeed argue as follows (i. 294):—'If Justin really stated that the Memoirs were called Gospels, it seems incomprehensible that he should never call them so himself. In no other place in his writings does he apply the plural to them, but, on the contrary, we find Trypho referring to the "so-called Gospel," which he states that he has carefully read, and which, of course, can only be Justin's "Memoirs;" and again, in another part of the same dialogue Justin quotes passages which are written "in the Gospel" (*ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται*). The term "Gospel" is nowhere else used by Justin in reference to a written record.'

The explanation is not, however, far to find for any one who will seek it. The entire body of facts known and recorded concerning Jesus was spoken of as 'the Gospel'; the particular writings which contained portions of it had only lately come to be called 'the Gospel according to' such and such a writer. Papias, for instance, in speaking of works which he says Mark and Matthew wrote, does not employ the word; to Mark's book he gives no particular name, but he calls Matthew's book 'oracles.' He himself wrote a book called 'Exposition of Dominical Oracles' (*Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις*), which, with Bishop Lightfoot (*Cont. Rev.* for Aug. 1875), I believe to mean 'Exposition of sacred books about the Lord.' When people spoke of the body of facts narrated in the sacred records, they called it 'the Gospel,' when of the records themselves they used the word 'Oracles' as Papias, or 'Memoirs' as Justin, or some other. But in course of time they got to call them by the name of 'Gospels,' and Justin alludes to this growing custom: but for all that he himself preferred to use his own old-fashioned term.

There is, I may add, no reason to suppose that the authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews was attributed to the Apostles generally in the 2nd or even 3rd cent. Irenaeus calls it simply 'that Gospel which is according to Matthew,' and he wrote

* By the writer of *Supernatural Religion*:—'The last expression ἀ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, as many scholars have declared, is a manifest interpolation. It is, in all probability, a gloss on the margin of some old MS. which some copyist afterwards inserted in the text.' *Scholar* is an unfortunate substitute for *critic*, as it conveys the idea that the words are faulty from the point of view of pure 'scholarship.'

less than 50 years, perhaps only 40, after Justin. Are we to believe that he would have so described a work which in his boyhood † was read on Sundays in Christian assemblies as 'the Memoirs of the Apostles'?

There are no proofs that Justin used the Gospel according to the Hebrews at all: in two cases he accords with it in certain peculiarities, but these same peculiarities are also found in MSS. of Matthew and Luke which we know to represent a 2nd cent. type of text. In neither of these cases is his agreement with the Gospel according to the Hebrews exact, while in one he does agree verbatim with the MSS. in question. I am not disputing that he may have employed this Gospel among others, but I do say that, with no evidence that he used it at all, it is childish to hold that he used it to their exclusion.

F. ANALYSIS OF THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR AND AGAINST THE GENUINENESS OF JOHN vii. 53-viii. 11.

(i.) EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. (a) *Text of Extant MSS.*

John vii. 53-viii. 11 is contained 'without trace of suspicion' (Scrivener) in 7 uncials, DEGHKUT, and 318 cursives, to which may be added the first hands of 3 and the second hands of 9 cursives.

It is omitted by 8 uncials, NBACTLX†Δ, and 57 cursives, while 4 other cursives (including Cod. 237, mentioned again below) omit viii. 3-11.

It is 'obelized,' i.e. marked as doubtful, in 3 uncials, MSA, and 42 cursives (including Cod. 33 and ev-y), and by the second hands of 3 other cursives; while parts of it are so marked in 2 uncials, E (viii. 2-11) and Π (viii. 3-11), and 2 cursives (viii. 4-11). In one cursive which contains the passage viii. 12 is also written after vii. 52.

It is written at the end of the Gospel in Cod. 1 and 11 other cursives (including Cod. 237, mentioned above), and part of it (viii. 3-11) is so appended in 4 cursives (including one which had previously omitted the *entire* passage).

It is inserted after vii. 36 in one cursive, and at the end of Luke xxi. by 4 cursives (including Cod. 13 and Cod. 69).

Thus of 459 later authorities (cursive) no less than 129 omit,

† Τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρι ἐγχωρεῖ.—*Apol.* i. 67.

‡ X, however, is said by Dr. Burgon to be a mere commentary (with accompanying text) on the Gospels as *publicly read*.

transfer, or obelize the passage, and among these are the 5 exceedingly important cursives 1, 13, 33, 69 and ev-y.

Of the 20 earlier MSS. (uncial) no less than 13 omit or obelize it. Among these are the 5 most ancient ones, **NB** of the 4th cent., and **ACT** of the 5th cent.; **D**, the oldest MS. which contains it (5th or 6th cent.), is celebrated for curious additions. The next oldest MS., **E** (7th or 8th cent.), obelizes part of the passage, and the next, **L** (8th cent.), omits all of it. The rest are all of the 9th or 10th cent.

(b) *Text of Versions.*

The passage is contained in the Vulgate, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Aethiopic, and later MSS. of the Armenian. The MSS. of the Old Latin are divided, but the evidence for the passage overweighs.

It is omitted by the Italian Recension (i.e. *f* and *g*), Cureton's Syriac,* the Peshittā, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Gothic, and earlier MSS. of the Armenian. The earlier (against the later) Memphitic MSS. are said to want it, and Mr. McClellan (*New Test.*, 720) allows this, but I do not know where the statement is established and prefer to regard the evidence of the Memphitic as uncertain.

The Latin versions, therefor, taken apart from the rest, tell for the passage, the Syriac against it, the Egyptian against it, and the residue against it. The balance of the combined evidence is against.

(c) *Evidence of Early Writers.*

Among the Latin Fathers Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome support it. Ambrose quotes or refers to it 4 times, clearly without any doubt. Augustine does so 6 times, once mentioning it as a peculiarity of John's Gospel, once expounding it verse by verse in his Commentary on John, and once stating that 'some of little

* This version, as published by Cureton, was wanting between John vii. 37 and xiv. 10. But in the autumn of 1870 three more fragments were found, one of which most happily comprises John vii. 37-viii. 19: it leaves out the entire passage before us. The discovery happened after the publication of Tischendorf's last edition (1869), and, strangely enough, Dr. Scrivener was unaware of it when in 1874 he published the 2nd ed. of his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. Mr. Hammond also, in 1876, distinctly states that the Curetonian is defective here. Let me, therefor, say that the two other fragments found are Luke xv. 22-xvi. 12, xvii. 1-23; that in 1872 Prof. W. Wright of Cambridge printed, privately, 100 copies of the Syriac text, one of which is in the British Museum; and that a translation into N. T. Greek will be found in Pt. ii. of Mr. Crowfoot's *Fragmenta Evangelica*. The fact that the Curetonian is not defective here, but nevertheless leaves out the passage, is the more important because it is opposed to its allies **D** and the Old Latin: we should have supposed *a priori* that the Curetonian would contain the story.

faith, or rather enemies to true faith—I imagine out of fear that impunity of sin was granted to their wives—removed from their MSS. that which the Lord did respecting the forgiveness of the adulteress.’ And Jerome, besides inserting it in the Vulgate, says that it was found ‘in many both Greek and Latin manuscripts.’ Of these, however, Augustine, who was a poor Greek scholar, is probably only a witness to the reading of the Latin copies: in which case his words confirm my belief that the Old Latin had the passage but that the Italian Recension had not. And the words of Jerome imply that the passage was wanting in *most* MSS.

On the other hand, Juvenius in his metrical paraphrase of the Gospel history omits it. Tertullian does not mention it in his treatise *De Pudicitia*, where it is said he must have referred to it had he known it as a genuine portion of the text. Tischendorf adds that Cyprian and Hilary had good occasion to allude to it, had they chosen.

As for the Greek fathers, not one of them before Euthymius (12th century) mentions these verses, and he says that ‘in the accurate copies they are either not found or are marked doubtful, wherefor they seem to be an interpolation and addition.’ Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theophylact pass over them in their commentaries, the first three closely connecting viii. 12 with vii. 53. Nonnius omits the story in his poem, and Cosmas does not mention it in the list of incidents peculiar to John. *The Apostolic Constitutions* do refer to it, but without stating its source. Tischendorf calls attention to the fact that Basil, who might well have quoted it, has not done so.

The evidence of the Latin fathers is therefor doubtfully favourable, that of the Greek fathers overwhelmingly opposed to the genuineness of the passage.

(d) *Evidence of the Lectionaries.*

Ambrose speaks of it as a ‘Gospel-lesson.’ There is evidence of its use in the Greek servicebook as early as the beginning of the 9th century; in no Greek lectionary, however, does it stand as part of the lesson for Pentecost, being always read on the festival of some female saint of doubtful antecedents. The great majority of the Greek lectionaries contain it.†

The evidence from lectionaries is therefor decidedly in favour

† The Jerusalem Syriac lectionary has already been reckoned among the versions. It continues the Pentecostal lesson to viii. 2, but assigns viii. 3–11 to St. Euphemia’s day.

of the genuineness of the passage. But this evidence is much later than that to be derived from MSS. versions and fathers; and the singular appropriateness of the story to the history of certain female saints easily accounts for its introduction into the services of the Church.

(e) *Evidence of Scholia.*

A note in the margin of A (9th or perhaps 8th cent.), and a great many cursives, runs thus:—‘The verses marked doubtful are not contained in some copies nor in Apollinarius, but are contained entire in the ancient ones.’ Two other scholiasts say the verses ‘are found in ancient copies’ and that they ‘are not contained in the majority of copies, but are found in the more ancient.’

One scribe (of the 9th cent.) says the passage is ‘not contained in the copies of the present day,’ another that it ‘is found in some copies.’

Two scholiasts pronounce against it, one because it ‘is not found in the more accurate of the copies,’ the other because it is ‘not contained in the majority of copies, nor mentioned by the divine fathers that have written commentaries—I mean John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria—nor yet by Theodore of Mopsuestia and the rest.’

The evidence to be derived from scholia is therefor divided, but may be thought to tell rather in favour of the passage.

(ii.) INTERNAL EVIDENCE. I feel bound to admit that the force of the internal evidence has been greatly overrated. The following are Alford’s specifications:—

(a) *That John nowhere else mentions the Mt. of Olives.* McClellan (*New Testament*, 724) answers that each of the Synoptists mentions Gennesaret only once. There is no proof, however, that they had due occasion for naming it more frequently, whereas we should certainly have expected to find the Mt. of Olives named in John xii. or xviii., as Matthew and Mark each mention it 3 times and Luke 4 times. Still it may be thought less unlikely that John should name it here only than that he should never name it at all.

(b) *That, when John introduces a new place, it is his habit to give explanations.* McClellan answers that in xviii. 1 the brook Kedron is introduced without explanation, and that in any case the Mt. of Olives was too well known to need it. McClellan’s instance is not conclusive, since ‘the winter-torrent Kedron’ is itself merely mentioned to explain the situation of the garden to which Jesus

withdrew: and 'the sea of Galilee' ought not to have needed the addition (vi. 1) of the words 'which is the sea of Tiberias.'

(c) That 'πορεύομαι with εἰς is not found elsewhere in John.' This is not the fact: it is so found in vii. 35, only 18 verses before.

(d) That ὄρθρον is not found elsewhere in John. But it is only found once in Luke's Gospel, once in Acts, and nowhere else in the N. T., and is a word which one would not expect to find more than once in so short a book.

(e) That παραγίνομαι with εἰς is not found elsewhere in John. Imagine one giving as evidence against the genuineness of an English paragraph the fact that it contained the construction 'came into,' whereas in the rest of the author's book no example occurred of 'came into,' but only of 'came' and 'came to'! Cf. Matt., who has this construction only once, and Luke, who has it not once in his Gospel and yet 3 times in Acts.

(f) That John uses λαός elsewhere in a different sense, and would have used ὄχλος here. But, as John only uses λαός in two other places, it is not just to attribute to him alone among the evangelists an exclusively narrow sense of the word. And in the second place ὄχλος in John never means more than 'crowd,' whereas here he may be describing the united impulse of all the people gathered together at the feast of tabernacles. Lastly, 3 uncials and 20 cursives actually read ὄχλος and not λαός, while 7 cursives omit the entire sentence.

(g) That such an expression as καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς is not found elsewhere in John. True. But it is found (without αὐτούς) only once in Luke, and McClellan reasonably asks, supposing that Jesus did on occasions sit down and teach, whether it is 'any more inconsistent with S. John's style than with S. Luke's or with any other writer's once to say so.' Let me add that D and 7 cursives omit the clause.

(h) That 'it is not in John's manner to relate that Jesus taught them, without relating what He taught.' But there is a marked instance of his doing so in the previous chapter, vii. 14, 'Jesus went up into the Temple, and taught.'

(i) That 'John does not usually connect with δέ.' But McClellan has shown from other parts of John the complete fallacy of this argument, and has observed that δέ occurs 204 times in the Gospel as against οὐν 206 times.

(j) That John never mentions οἱ γραμματεῖς elsewhere, but usually calls the opponents of Jesus οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι or οἱ ἄρχοντες. It certainly is remarkable that the name Scribes occurs nowhere else in this Gospel. McClellan, who paraphrases it by 'Doctors of the Law,'

says 'But the question was one of the Law.' This answer seems at first fairly satisfactory, but becomes less so when we observe (i.) that there was no dispute about the Law at all: the question was not what the Law, but what Jesus prescribed; (ii.) that in cases where the legality of the acts of Jesus is questioned (v. 10-16, ix. 13-16) the Scribes are not mentioned by John, who speaks of 'the Jews' and 'the Pharisees.' It is true that three cursives, with Coptic and Armenian MSS., read 'the CHIEF-PRIESTS and the Pharisees,' and we cannot prove that this, which admirably suits John's usage, was not the original reading. But the authority for it is slender, and the fact of its being thoroughly Johannine will explain its introduction: that 'chief-priests' was, on the other hand, corrupted into 'scribes' is the less likely because in passages of John where the 'chief-priests' are mentioned 'scribes' is never found as a various reading.

(k) *That 'λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ἐκπειράζοντες αὐτόν savours much more of the synoptic Gospels than of John.'* Clearly, because they contain more incidents which admit of such an expression. The use of the word *πειράζω* is not alien to John, who describes Jesus as *πειράζων*, trying, Philip with a question (vi. 6).

(l) *That 'the very fact of their questioning thus, "Moses commanded, . . . but what sayest Thou?" belongs to the last days of the Lord's ministry, and cannot well be introduced chronologically where it here stands.'* John, however, clothes the figure of Jesus at Jerusalem at this stage of his career with as much public importance as the Synoptists do in the week previous to his death. And would not the same objection apply equally to iii. 13-17, the account of the cleansing of the Temple?

(m) *That John nowhere introduces 'these questions between the law of Moses and Jesus; but the synoptic Gospels often do.'* The same might be said of the miracle at Cana (c. ii.) and that of the nobleman's son (c. iv.): miracles which do not serve as the occasion for discourses are quite foreign to the general scope of the Gospel.

(n) *That 'πλήρ is only found here in John, Gosp. and Epp.'* True, but it is also found once, and once only, in Mark. And it is only found once in the Apocalypse—which, if the Apocalypse was written by the writer of the Gospel, is likewise a proof of its being one of his words.

(o) *That 'κατακρίω also is not found elsewhere in John, who uses κρίνω in its strict sense for it.'* Equally true, but here again we have a parallel in Luke, who also uses *κατακρίω* in two consecutive verses (xi. 31, 32) but nowhere else.

Reviewing these 15 items of the indictment, we find that 3 of them (*e h i*) must be given up as against fact; that 5 (*d e g n o*) are exactly applicable to other Gospels (*e* and *g* are otherwise weak); and that 4 (*f k l m*) are untenable for various reasons. Only 3 are left (*a b j*). I think that these (particularly the last) do afford a presumption against Johannine authorship, though to each of them there is some sort of answer not altogether beneath notice.

To sum up—the external evidence must be held fatal to the genuineness of the passage: the internal evidence, while insufficient of itself to establish the same conclusion, must be taken to confirm it.

G. JESUS BAR-ABBA.

In Matt. xxvii. 16, 17 five cursive MSS. and the Jerusalem Syriac and Armenian versions exhibit the reading 'Jesus Barabbas' instead of 'Barabbas.' And 21 MSS. contain the following marginal note, variously ascribed to Chrysostom (who, however, is silent on the subject in his Commentary) and Anastasius of Sinai (who flourished toward the end of the 6th cent.):—'In some very ancient MSS. which I came across I found Barabbas himself also called Jesus, so that in these the question of Pilate ran thus—“Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?” For, as it seems, Barabbas, which is interpreted “teacher’s son,” was the robber’s sire-name—(Παλαιῶς πάντῳ ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυχὼν εἶρον καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Βαραββᾶν Ἰησοῦν λεγόμενον. Οὕτως γοῦν εἶχεν ἡ τοῦ Πιλάτου πεῦσις ἐκεῖ—‘Τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν’; Ὡς γὰρ ἔοικεν πατρωνυμία τοῦ ληστοῦ ἦν ὁ Βαραββᾶς, ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται διδασκάλου νιώς).

But the heaviest external evidence in favour of this reading is furnished by the fact that Origen, according to the Latin of a passage now lost in the Greek, states that 'In many MSS. it is not contained that Barabbas was also called Jesus, and perhaps rightly, so that the name Jesus would not belong to any sinner' (In multis exemplaribus non continetur quod Barabbas etiam Iesus dicebatur, et forsitan recte, ut ne nomen Iesu conveniat alieni iniquorum)—*Comm. in Matt.* This of course implies that 'Jesus Barabbas' was at that time the reading of most MSS.

The internal evidence in Matthew is to my mind very decidedly in favour of 'Jesus Barabbas.' If 'Barabbas' alone were the

original reading, why was 'Jesus' inserted—a name that would naturally be avoided above all others? Tregelles thinks that in Matt. xxvii. 17 YMIN was accidentally written YMININ and that another copyist mistook the second IN for $\overline{\text{IN}}$, i.e. Ἰησοῦν , 'Jesus.' Now (1) the argument might be retorted on him that the original reading was YMIN $\overline{\text{IN}}$, then YMININ, and that finally the second IN was treated as an accidental repetition and left out; (2) the reading 'Jesus Barabbas' first occurs in v. 16, where no such mistake as Tregelles supposes was possible; (3) surely a copyist who had read v. 16 without the word 'Jesus' would not have changed IN to $\overline{\text{IN}}$ in v. 17 and then altered v. 16, to suit it, but would have seen at once that the two superfluous letters were an accidental repetition and would have struck them out altogether.

There is every reason, on the other hand, why, if 'Jesus Barabbas' be the true reading, 'Jesus' should have been omitted. The piety of early Christians—ignorant for the most part how common that name formerly was among the Jews—supposed it impossible for 'a murderer, a revolter, and a robber' to have had the same circumcision-name as the Saviour: compare the above-quoted words of Origen. In the second place, 'Barabbas' might itself be mistaken for a circumcision-name by any one ignorant of Aramaic, and then 'Jesus' would be struck out as a supposed accidental insertion. In the third place, 'Jesus' might be omitted because absent from other evangelists.

It is true that for a moment Matt. xxvii. 20 ('But the chief-priests and the elders persuaded the crowds that they should ask Barabbas but destroy Jesus') seems to militate against the theory that Barabbas also bore the name 'Jesus.' That verse, however, is not a quotation of words used, but merely the evangelist's account to his readers.

Note too, from vv. 17, 22, that Pilate says 'Jesus which is called Christ,' almost as if there were another Jesus from whom it was needful to distinguish him.

Lastly, if Bar-Abba was *not* named 'Jesus,' why do Mark, Luke, and John exhibit so singular an unanimity in withholding his *real* circumcision-name? But, if that name was identical with that of their Master, we can well understand why they withheld it.

Of course the name 'Jesus' *may* have been brought in from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, supposing it to have been found there: but two out of the three allies of that Gospel, namely Codex Bezae and the Old Latin, have no trace of it—the third, Cureton's Syriac, is deficient in this part. Anyhow, if the same man wrote Fr. 27 and Matt. xxvii. 16, 17, he would probably write 'Jesus Barabbas' in both places if at all.