

# SWEET GOSPEL HARMOONY PART # § IV

28

*The Gospel according to the Hebrews.*

EDWARD BYRON NICHOLSON

## II.

### THE FRAGMENTS.

NOTE.—I have arranged those Fragments which have canonical parallels so as to correspond with the order of the Gospel according to Matthew, inserting others at those points where they might be most easily dovetailed into the canonical narrative. I have broken them up into verses for more convenient comparison with the canonical texts. In translating, my aim has been to be as literal as possible, short of being grossly unidiomatical\*: *otherwise the translation would have been much closer than it is to the phraseology of the Authorized Version.*

Fragments from Epiphanius are indicated by (*Ebionite*), those from Jerome by (*Nazarene*), those from Codex Tischendorfianus III.—presumably taken from Jerome's translation—by (*Nazarene?*). A quotation of Origen's which seems to have been common to the Gospel according to Matthew and that of the 'Ebionites,' is not indicated as (*Ebionite*) because in writers before Epiphanius 'Ebionites' seems to include the Nazarenes, whom he is the first to mention under the latter name.

### FRAGMENTS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.

† 1. Preface.

(*Ebionite.*)

1. There was a certain man by name

\* In two passages I have however kept 'Lord' as the translation of Κύριε, where I should have liked 'Master' or 'Sir,' in order not to weaken the parallelism between those passages and others in the canonical books.

† Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13: (1) Ἐγένετο τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτός ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. (2) Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρσαοὺμ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε (3) Παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος ἐξελεξάμεν Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου,

Jesus, and he of ‡ about thirty years, who chose us out.

2. And when he had come to § Capharnaum he || entered into the house of Simon who was surnamed Peter, and opened his mouth, and said

3. ‘Passing by the ¶ lake of Tiberias I chose out\*\* John and James, sons of Zebedee,

καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην· (4) καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. (5) Ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι ἐκκαλεῖν ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

‡ Cf. Luke iii. 23. Hilgenfeld reads ὦν for ὡς, ‘being of thirty years,’ but gives no authority for doing so, and I believe it to be his own ill-advised conjecture: compare the ὡσεὶ of Luke, for which *Epiphanius* actually read ὡς, as do D and Hippolytus.

§ This (= *Caphar Nahum*, ‘Nahum’s village’) is the form of the name adopted in the New Testament by modern editors: of the earliest MSS. **s** B D (and now and then C) support it against A and (generally) C.

|| According to Mark iii. 19 Jesus and the Apostles went into a house immediately after the appointment of the Twelve. From Matt. viii. 14, Mark i. 29, and Luke iv. 38 we learn that Simon had a house at Capharnahum.

¶ Called ‘the sea of Tiberias’ in John xxi. 1 and ‘the sea of Galilee of Tiberias’ in John vi. 1. Matthew calls it ‘the sea of Galilee,’ iv. 18, xv. 29; Mark the same, i. 16, vii. 31; Luke ‘the lake of Gennesaret,’ v. 1. Luke always calls it ‘the lake,’ the others always ‘the sea.’ John, James, Simon, and Andrew were called on the shores of the lake (see Matt. iv. 18–24, Mark i. 16–20, Luke v. 10, 11). As there is a gap after the name of Andrew we do not know whether the Ebionite Gospel assigned the calling of all the other Apostles to the same neighbourhood, but *Epiphanius*’s omission is best accounted for by supposing that he had before him a mere row of names with connecting particles, unbroken by any new turn of the narrative.

\*\* This order is very remarkable. There are four lists of Apostles in the New Testament—Matt. x. 2, Mark iii. 16, Luke vi. 14, Acts i. 13. Matthew gives the order of the first four Apostles as *Simon, Andrew, James, and John*. Luke in his Gospel gives the same order, but in Acts alters it to *Simon, John, James, and Andrew*. Mark has *Simon, James, John, and Andrew*. I am unable to suggest any

and Simon, and Andrew,\* . . . and †Thaddaeus, and Simon the ‡ Zealot, and Judas § the Iscariot;

4. 'And thee || Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom I called, and thou didst follow me.

5. 'I will, therefor, that ye be twelve apostles for a testimony to Israel.'

reason why Simon should be put only third in the Ebionite Gospel unless it be that, the Apostles linked by the tie of brotherhood being mentioned by pairs, John and James were considered a more important *pair* than Simon and Andrew.

\* An example of the carelessness of Epiphanius, who has only given us eight names, though the mention of 'twelve Apostles' in v. 5 shows that the names of four others were in the original.

† The name *Thaddaios*, 'Thaddaeus,' occurs in Mark iii. 18, where however D and the Old Latin read *Lebbaïos*, 'Lebbaeus,' which name (or *Iebes* or *Levis*) was also the reading of MSS. spoken of by Origen. In Matt. x. 3, *Thaddaios* is also read by B, by some MSS. of the old Latin, by the Vulgate, and by the Coptic versions: most MSS. also (C<sup>1</sup> is uncertain) read 'Lebbaeus that was surnamed Thaddaeus,' and so the Syriac versions (the Curetonian is deficient here) with the Aethiopic and Armenian; but D, with MSS. spoken of by Augustine, reads 'Lebbaeus' alone, and this was the reading of Origen's translator, of Rufinus (about A.D. 400) and Hesychius (6th cent.).

‡ 'The Cananaean' as he is called by Matt. and Mark (not 'Canaanite,' as the A. V.). 'Cananaean' (from *Kanean*) was the Aramaic name for that ultra-patriotic faction of Jews whom Josephus, writing in Greek, calls the *Zealots*. We find Luke (vi. 15 and Acts i. 13) using the Greek equivalent.

§ Τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, as the weight of MS. authority in Matt. x. 4, John xii. 4, xiv. 22. Ἰσκαριώτης and Ἰσκαριώθ (*Iskarioth*)—the latter of which is now the recognised reading in Mark iii. 19, xiv. 10, and Luke vi. 16—are the Graecized forms of *Ish K'rioth*, 'man of K'rioth,' a town in the south of the tribe of Judah, possibly the ruins called *Kuryetein*.

|| Matthew may *just possibly* be mentioned last as having been called under different circumstances from the rest; otherwise the position of his name must be taken to imply that he was the writer of the Gospel, whether its sole author or its editor on behalf of the Apostles collectively.

¶ 2. Matt. ii. 5.  
(Nazarene.)

Bethlehem of Judah.

\*\* 3. Matt. ii. 15.  
(Nazarene.)

Out of Egypt have I called my son.

¶ Jerome on Matt. ii. 5, *Librariorum hic error est. Putamus enim ab Evangelista primum editum, sicut in ipso Hebraico legimus Iudae, non Iudaeae*—‘Here is a mistake of the copyists. For we think that the Evangelist originally gave, as we read in the actual Hebrew, *of Judah*—not *of Judaea*.’ Hilgenfeld and some others hold that the Hebrew of the Old Testament is referred to. Now (i.) Jerome, who believed in the Matthæan origin of that Gospel, and had published his belief, would hardly have conched a reference to the Hebrew of the Old Testament in words which, as he would have seen, might be naturally taken as a reference to his Aramaic Gospel; (ii.) it is remarkable that Jerome suggests not ‘Bethleem Iuda’ as the original reading, but ‘Bethleem Iudæ,’ ‘or Judah.’ In every passage in the Old Testament where Bethlehem Judah is named, Jerome renders ‘Bethleem Iuda,’ and in the very verse of Matthew which he is commenting on he twice quotes the prophecy of Micah as ‘Et tu Bethleem terra Iuda.’ This solitary use of ‘Iudæ’ struck me as singular, and on enquiring from the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler, I learn that, whereas the Hebrew of the Old Testament always has ‘Bethlehem Yehudah,’ the Aramaic (in which the Gospel according to the Hebrews was written) would probably represent the name as ‘Bethlehem bi Yehudah,’ ‘Bethlehem of Judah,’ ‘Bethleem Iudæ.’ Jerome’s reason for writing ‘Iudæ’ in this solitary instance seems, therefor, to have been that he was speaking not of the *Hebrew* of the Old Testament but of the *Aramaic* Gospel according to the Hebrews. In Matth. ii. 1, 5, Cureton gives ‘of Juda’ as the reading of the Curetonian Syriac ‘with which the Peshito concurs.’ Tischendorf gives ‘Iuda’ (Bethlehem Iuda) as the reading of both. But a few minutes with a Syriac grammar shows me that Cureton is right at least as regards his own version, which has the preposition *di* in front of *Yuda*<sup>h</sup>. Some MSS. of the Old Latin and Vulgate also give Iudæ, ‘of Judah.’

\*\* Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccles.* under ‘Matthæus’; the passage is quoted and translated above, p. 18. Hilgenfeld and others, who believe that the Gospel according to the Hebrews did not contain Matt. i. 18–ii. 23, deny that the passage in Jerome proves that this and the next quotation were found in his copy of the Nazarene Gospel. The question hardly admits of argument, and I am quite content to leave its decision to the reader. Those who have no previous acquaintance with Jerome’s writings may indeed wonder why he directs special attention to the fact that the O. T. quotations in the

\* 4. Matt. ii. 23.  
(*Nazarene*.)

That he shall be called Nazarene.

Nazarene Gospel agree with the Hebrew, seeing that the two instances given occur in the canonical Matthew, where they agree equally with the Hebrew. Jerome, however, never loses an opportunity of arguing for the higher authority of the original Hebrew over the Septuagint version, and his object in the passage in question may very well be to show that not only the Greek translation of Matthew took its quotations from the Hebrew, but that so also did the original Aramaic. Hilgenfeld's 'elaborate review of the question,' as Dr. Sanday calls it (*Gospels*, 141), consists almost entirely of refutations to feeble arguments adduced by some of his opponents, whom he has no difficulty in vanquishing. But the only two which he brings forward on his own side afford them an equally easy victory. One is, that this part of Matthew was rejected by Kerinthus and Carpocrates, which would be a strong argument if we knew that these heresiarchs used the Nazarene edition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews: unhappily there is no evidence that they used any edition of it whatever (see *Appendix C*, 'The Gospel of Carpocrates and Kerinthus'). The other is that Epiphanius, when he confessed his ignorance, 'whether the Nazarenes have at the same time taken away the genealogies from Abraham to Christ,' has assumed that the rest of Matt. i. ii. was wanting from their Gospel. I merely ask the reader to turn to the passage (quoted above, p. 9), and remark in conclusion that, if my last note is well founded, Hilgenfeld's position breaks down altogether.

\* The Greek of Matt. ii. 23, rendered by Jerome in the same Latin by which he renders the parallel passage in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, needs not mean that there was any particular prophecy 'He shall be called Nazarene.' It is true that the Greek is 'that he *shall* be called' and not 'that he *should* be called,' but, if any Greek scholar thinks that the use of the indicative means that the actual words 'he shall be called' were found in the prophets, a reference to Madvig's *Syntax of the Greek Language*, Browne and Arnold's translation, 1873, p. 110, or to Winer's *Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Moulton's translation, 1877, p. 376, will yield him plain examples to the contrary.

The reference is to the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah respecting the BRANCH. In the most striking of these, Is. xi. 1, 'And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots,' the Hebrew word used for 'branch' is NĒTSEH, and the evangelic writer saw in this prophecy and those

†5. Matt. iii. 1-7.

1. And [<sup>†</sup>in those days?] John began

of Jeremiah and Zechariah (though they use a different Hebrew word) a foreshadowing of the residence at NAZARA, or looked on the residence at Nazara as a predestined coincidence with the prophecies.

It is generally held that there is a real etymological connexion between *Nazara* and *nētser*. But, if reason to the contrary can be shown, the following words of Farrar (*Life of Christ*, i. 64-5) will still hold good: 'The Old Testament is full of proofs that the Hebrews—who in philology accepted the views of the Analogists—attached immense and mystical importance to mere resemblances in the sound of words. To mention but one single instance, the first chapter of the prophet Micah turns almost entirely on such merely external similarities in what, for lack of a better term, I can only call the physiological quantity of sounds. St. Matthew, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, would without any hesitation have seen a prophetic fitness in Christ's residence at this town of Galilee, because its name recalled the title by which he was addressed in the prophecy of Isaiah.'

But I am inclined to go still farther and acknowledge in the words of our text a special reference also to Zech. vi. 12. The Greek of our text is 'Nazarene shall he be called': since we, or at least the evangelic writer, have connected *Nazara* with *nētser*, let us substitute 'Brancher'—'Brancher shall he be called.' Now compare with this the literal Hebrew of Zech. vi. 12—'Branch [shall be] his name.' Is the parallel accidental?

It is quite true that in Zech. vi. 12 the word is not *nētser* but *tsemach*. But the evangelic writer would not the less hold this prophecy fulfilled by the residence at Nazara. Hebrew, moreover, was a dead language even then, and that writer, if he knew Hebrew at all, was doubtless far more familiar with the Scriptures in his Targum (Aramaic paraphrase); which Targum (unfortunately lost) may have used the same word in Is. xi. 1 and Zech. vi. 12, just as our *Authorized Version* has done. In that case, if he knew that the original had *nētser* in the former place, he would naturally assume it to be the word used in the latter as well.

† The text outside the brackets represents the passage quoted by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 13)—(1) Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, (2) Καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱερουσόλυμα. (3) Καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ—φησί—μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἢ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάρτυρα, ὡς ἐγκρίεις ἐν ἐλαίῳ. The con-

<sup>†</sup> For note see next page.

Mark i. 4-6.  
 Luke iii. 2, 3.  
 (Ebionite.)

baptizing [\* a baptism of repentance in the Jordan river??].

2. † And there came out unto him Pharisees and were baptized, and all Jerusalem.

3. And John had raiment of camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his food [was] [§ locusts and?] wild

jectural insertions in brackets will be explained one by one. Epiphanius also gives two other versions of (1) (quoted above, pp. 14, 15), widely different, and bearing strong evidence of corruption.

‡ I have already remarked (p. 15) that the copy from which the other Ebionite versions were altered seems to have contained the words 'in those days' of Matt. iii. 1.

\* So the longer Ebionite versions. 'Baptism of repentance' occurs in Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, Acts xiii. 24, xix. 4. But the shorter reading is more likely to be the true one.

† Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 15) charges the Ebionites with rejecting all the prophets after Joshua, and with altering the book called *Journeys of Peter* (*Περίοδοι Πέτρου*) so as to suppress all favourable mention of them. Had their Gospel originally some passage answering to Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 3, Luke iii. 4, and did they for the same reason suppress it?

§ The Ebionite Gospel makes no mention of the *locusts* of Matt. iii. 4. Epiphanius so clearly and so often says that the Ebionites kept from animal food that we cannot refuse to believe him. He charges them with introducing two words into Fr. 25 (corresponding with Luke xxii. 15) so as to fix on Jesus the same antipathy to it. He also says that, among other tamperings with the book called 'Journeys of Peter,' they represented Peter as 'keeping from living things and meats, like themselves also, and from every other food made from flesh, since Ebion himself also and Ebionites keep from these altogether' (*Haer.* xxx. 15, ἐμψύχων τε τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ κρεῶν, ὡς καὶ αὐτοί, καὶ πάσης ἄλλης ἐδωδῆς τῆς ἀπὸ σαρκῶν πεποιημένης λέγουσιν, ἐπειδὴ περ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἐβίων καὶ Ἐβιωνῖται παντελῶς τούτων ἀπέχονται).

We have seen that some at least of the Ebionites tampered with this very fragment (see above, p. 15), and also that the absence of the quotation from Isaiah found in the Synoptics is suspicious. There is therefore strong ground for conjecturing that they had 'locusts' in their Gospel, and designedly struck it out. But of this it is nevertheless quite impossible to be certain.

honey, whereof the taste|| was of the manna, ¶like a cake [made] with oil [honey?].

|| The oldest MS. of Epiphanius, Dindorf's V, reads *ἡ* for *ἡν*—‘whereof the taste [was] that of manna.’ Either reading might arise (through the medium of *ἡ*) out of the other, but the simpler hypothesis is that *ἡ* is a mistake for *ἡν*—such mistakes being frequent in this MS. I have therefor, though with some doubts, placed in the text the reading of the four later MSS.

¶ Cf. the LXX version of Num. xi. 8, where it is said of manna—*καὶ ἦν ἡ ἡδονὴ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ γεῦμα ἐγκρὶς ἐξ ἐλαίου*, and the pleasure of it was as it were in taste a cake [made] of oil.’ The Hebrew text is uncertain, and the Jerusalem Targum and some other ancient authorities give ‘cakes [made] of honey.’ Now it is noticeable that Epiphanius in his remarks on the passage (quoted above, p. 13) accuses the Ebionites of substituting ‘cakes [made] with honey’ for the ‘locusts’ of the canonical Gospel. It is true that honey did enter into the making of the particular kind of cake called *ἐγκρὶς*, still the mention of it does not seem relevant. One is strongly tempted to think that the Ebionite MSS. exhibited the different readings of Num. xi. 8, and that Epiphanius, halting between the two, followed one reading in his text and another in his note. This would be quite in Epiphanius’s loose way: we have already seen that he gives two widely different versions of verse (1) of this fragment, and even quotes one of those versions a second time with further variations—seemingly without knowing what he is doing, at any rate without any explanation to his puzzled reader.

The common explanation of ‘wild honey’ is ‘honey made by wild bees.’ There have not, however, been wanting those who have explained it as meaning that exudation from the leaves of trees and shrubs, so common in Oriental countries (including the Jordan valley), which is gathered and used as we use butter or honey, and which is called by the Arabs ‘manna.’ A passage of Diodorus Siculus, who wrote about 8 B.C., seems to give the precise name *μέλι ἄγριον*, ‘wild honey,’ to this exudation: writing of the Nabataean Arabs he says—*αὐτοὶ δὲ χρῶνται τροφῇ κρέασι καὶ γάλακτι, καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς φρομένων τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύουσιν· φυέται γὰρ παρ’ αὐτοῖς τὸ πέπερι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνὲδρων, καὶ μέλι πολὺ τὸ καλούμενον ἄγριον, ᾧ χρῶνται ποτῶ μεθ’ ὕδατος* (xix. 731)—‘And they use for food flesh and milk, and the provisions afforded by what grows from the earth: for the pepper grows among them from the trees, and much honey, the same that is called wild honey, which they use for a drink with water.’ Here, even if we render *φύεται* ‘is produced,’ one gets an



\*6. Matt. iii.

(Nazarene.)

1. [And?] †<sup>1</sup> behold the mother of the  
‡<sup>1</sup> Lord and his brethren said to him 'John

impression that a vegetable honey is meant, and the fact that Diodorus does not speak of it as merely 'wild,' but 'the same that is called wild,' tends to show that it was something quite different from ordinary wild honey. This is the view also of Wesseling, Diodorus's editor, who moreover identifies the 'wild honey' of Matthew with that of his author. Suidas (about 1100 A.D.) in his Lexicon writes without any hesitation—'Ακρίς. Εἶδος ζωῦφλου. "Ποθιε δὲ ἀκρίδας ὁ Πρόδρομος, καὶ μέλι ἄγριον, ὅπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδρῶν ἐπισυναγόμενον Μάννα τοῖς πολλοῖς προσαγορεύεται—'Locust. A kind of tiny animal. The Forerunner also ate locusts and wild honey, which is gathered together from the trees and is commonly called Manna.' So Reland, the Orientalist, writes in his *Palæstina Illustrata*, i. 59, 'Mel copiosum hic provenit, præter illud quod apes elaborant, in sylvis et manat ex arboribus'—'Here honey, besides that which the bees make, is produced in large quantity in the woods and oozes from trees,' and quotes to that effect Dioscorides (i. 37) and Pliny (xv. 7, xxiii. 4) as well as Diodorus, proceeding to identify with this vegetable honey that eaten by John the Baptist.

The concurrence of the Ebionite Gospel makes it probable that this is the true view. Suppose the crucial words in that Gospel to be a mere forgery of the very year in which Epiphanius copied them, and they would still show the meaning put upon the words 'wild honey' by natives of Palestine in 376 A.D. The fact that this meaning is not the obvious one is only another point in its favour: it would not have been put forward except on good grounds when there was so much simpler an explanation ready to hand.

\* Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* iii., Ecce mater Domini et fratres eius dicebant ei 'Ioannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum: eamus et baptizemur ab eo.' Dixit autem eis 'Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est.' A like account was contained in a work entitled the Preaching of Paul, and is thus referred to by the author of the *Tractatus de Rebaptismate*, printed among Cyprian's works (Venet. 1728, p. 743):—'Est autem adulterini huius, immo internecini baptismatis si quis alius auctor, tum etiam quidam ab iisdem ipsis hæreticis propter eundem errorem confictus liber qui inscribitur *Pauli Prædicatio*, in quo libro contra omnes Scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Ioannis baptismata paene invitum a matre sua Maria

<sup>1</sup> For notes see next page.

the Baptist baptizeth § for remission of sins: let us go and be baptized by him.'

2. But he said to them ||<sup>1</sup> 'Wherein

esse compulsus; item cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum'—'This counterfeit and actually internecine baptism has been promulgated in particular by a book forged by the same heretics in order to spread the same error: this book is entitled *the Preaching of Paul*, and in it, in opposition to all the Scriptures, you will find Christ, the only man who was altogether without fault, both making confession respecting his own sin, and that he was driven by his mother Mary almost against his will to receive the baptism of John; also that when he was baptized fire was seen upon the water, which is not written in any Gospel.' We shall see that the incident of the fire at the Baptism was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and it is natural to believe that the Preaching took its history from the Gospel rather than the Gospel its history from the Preaching. If so, and if (as in Part III. we shall find cause to think) the latter was the same book also known as *the Preaching of Peter*, we should have a witness for the Nazarene Gospel at least as early as the third quarter of the 2nd cent., when, as we know from Origen (*In Ioann.* xiii. 17), Heracleon quoted the Preaching.

† A word specially characteristic of Matthew, who has it 62 times, and Luke, who has it 56 or 57 times. Mark has it only 11 or 12 times, John only 4 times.

‡ Matt., Luke, and John very frequently give 'Lord' (=master, sir) as a form of speech to Jesus: Mark only once. In speaking of him Matthew only uses the word once (i.e. xxi. 3='the master hath need of them'), except we admit xxviii. 6 (doubtful reading); and Mark only once (xi. 3=Matt. xxi. 3), except we admit xvi. 19, 20 (verses of doubtful genuineness). But Luke so uses it 13 times (besides xxiv. 3, doubtful reading), and John 9 times.

§ Mark i. 4 and Luke iii. 3 speak of John as 'preaching a baptism of repentance for remission of sins' (κηρύσσειν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν), and Matt. iii. 6 says that the people were baptized by John 'confessing their sins.' 'Remission of sins' is not a common phrase in the N. T.: it occurs only once in Matt. (xxvi. 28 'for remission of sins'); twice in Mark (i. 4 'for remission of sins,' iii. 29 'hath not remission'); and three times in Luke (i. 77 'in remission of their sins,' iii. 3 'for remission of sins,' xxiv. 47 'remission of sins'), who however has it five times in Acts ('remission of sins'—ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43, xiii. 38, xxvi. 18). John never uses it. Paul has it only twice (Eph. i. 7 'the remis-

<sup>1</sup> For note see next page.

have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him? \* except perchance this very thing that I have said is ignorance.'

+7. Matt. iii. 13-17.

1. [And?], ‡ when the people had been

sion of the transgressions,' Col. i. 14 'the remission of the sins'), and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews twice ('remission'—ix. 22, x. 18). 'To remit sins' is a phrase used several times by each Synoptic and in Acts, once in John (xx. 23) and twice in 1 John (i. 9, ii. 12), but nowhere else in the N. T.

|| Cf. John viii. 46, 'Which of you convicteth me in respect of sin?'

\* On the theology of this passage see Part III. Meanwhile, as offering at least a partial analogy to the suggestion of a limited knowledge on the part of Jesus, we may compare Luke ii. 52, 'And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature,' and Mark xiii. 32, 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, NEITHER THE SON, but the Father.'

† Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13, Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι (1) Τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. (2) Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἠμείγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἵδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. (3) Καὶ φωνὴ [ἐγένετο, omitted by Codex V] ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα 'Σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.' καὶ πάλιν, 'Εγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.' (4) Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. Ὁ (edd. ὄν) ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ Σὺ τίς εἶ, [Κύριε, omitted by Codex V]; (5) Καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, 'Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐφ' ὃν εὐδόκησα.' (6) Καὶ τότε φησὶν ὁ Ἰωάννης προσπιασὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε "Δέομαι, Κύριε, σὺ με βάπτισον." (7) Ὁ δὲ ἐκώλυσεν αὐτόν, λέγων "Ἀφίε, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα"—'And after saying a good many things it adds that when the people &c. . . (6) And "then" it says "John fell down &c."' The reader will see that the passage probably began with the conjunction *and* or *now*; he will also see I think that at the beginning of v. 6 the conjunction may belong either to *it says* or to *then John*; or that it would even be possible to divide thus—'And' (then it says) 'John.' Hilgenfeld prints v. 6 with the conjunction and v. 1 without any.

The words 'after saying a good many things' show that there was a considerable interval between this and the last fragment but one. The corresponding interval in Matthew is given to a speech by John, and the Ebionite Gospel may also have contained the last fragment (Nazarene).

‡ Cf. Luke (iii. 21) only—Ἐγένετο ἔτι ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα

Mark i. 9-11.  
 Luke iii. 21, 22.  
 (John i. 32, 33.)  
 (Ebionite.)

baptized Jesus also came and was baptized by John.

2. § And as he went up the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit in shape of a dove descending and entering into him.

τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, literally 'And it came to pass when all the people had been baptized, Jesus also having been baptized.'

§ This verse is far nearer to Matt. than to the other accounts, with one very noticeable exception, 'in shape of a dove': cf. Luke iii. 22, 'in a bodily shape like a dove.' Hilgenfeld quotes Irenaeus (copied also by Hippolytus), Epiphanius, and Theodorot, all of whom say that Kerinthus and his sect held that the Spirit 'descended into him in shape of a dove.' We know that the Kerinthians used Matthew, if not the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

¶ Prof. Westcott (*Introduction*, 467) renders 'which came down and came upon him.' But 'entering into him' is the natural and almost necessary rendering of εἰσελεύσῃς εἰς αὐτόν; in the N. T. for instance there is not a single passage in which εἰς is used merely of motion to a person.

In Matt. iii. 16 D and Eusebius read ἐρχόμενον εἰς αὐτόν, 'coming into him,' instead of ἐ. ἐπ' αὐτόν, 'coming upon him,' while C E and some cursives have πρὸς 'to,' which points to εἰς as the original reading. In Mark i. 10 B D 13. 69. and a few others (followed by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford) read εἰς. And in Luke iii. 22 D, the Old Latin, the revised Latin, and the Vulgate all have the same.

To my mind this version of the descent of the Holy Spirit is the much more intelligible one. No evangelist says that the dove flew away, and John (i. 32) tells us positively that 'it abode (ἐμείνεν, "remained") upon him,' pointing to the Spirit 'as not removing from Jesus' (Alford). It would thus become, at least in appearance, fused in him. In this way the supernatural character of the dove would be manifest; but if on the other hand the dove flew away there would be no evidence of its being more than a mere dove. That Luke speaks of the Spirit as descending 'in bodily shape of a dove' does not in the least militate against such an explanation of the evangelic tradition: bodily *shape* does not necessitate bodily *substance*.

The various MS. readings yield strong reason to believe that 'into' was the original reading in Matthew, and in Luke we find 2nd cent. authority for it—older than any for 'upon' (in the parallel passage of Mark this authority is on the other side). But,

3. And a voice out of the heaven, saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased': and again, \* 'I have this day begotten thee.'

4. And straightway † a great light

although Eusebius and Jerome (in the Vulgate of Luke) adopt this reading without suspicion, it was dangerously convenient for those who maintained that the divine Christ entered into the man Jesus at baptism: hence it would be glossed, and the gloss would pass into the text, or the pious copyist, fearful of sowing error, might even think it allowable to avoid that danger by changing a preposition.

\* Instead of 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased' in Luke iii. 22, 'Thou art my Son; I have this day begotten thee' is read by D, the Old Latin, Clement of Alexandria, Methodius, Lactantius, Juvenius, Hilary, Faustus the Manichean (quoted by Augustine, *Contra Faust.* lib. xxiii.), and once by Augustine without remark (*Inchir. ad Laurent.* c. xlix.), who elsewhere (*De Consensu Evang.* lib. ii. c. 14) says that it was found in some MSS., but was said not to be in the older Greek copies. Justin also in his accounts of the Baptism twice gives these as the words spoken by the voice (*Dial.* cc. 88, 103): the second of these references does not prove that he took them from a Gospel, but strongly implies it:—Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ διάβολος ἅμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῷ λεχθείσης Ὑἱός μου εἶ σύ· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε· ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν Ἀποστόλων γέγραπται προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ Ὑποκύριός μου.—'For this devil, at the same time that he [i.e. Jesus] went up from the river Jordan, after the voice was uttered to him "Thou art my Son; I have this day begotten thee" is recorded in the memoirs of the Apostles to have come to him and tempted him so far as to say to him "Worship me."'

In Matt. iii. 17 D, the Curetonian Syriac, Augustine, and the Old Latin MS. *a* (Codex Vercellensis) read 'Thou art' for 'This is.'

† In Matt. iii. 15 the Old Latin MS. *a*, Codex Vercellensis, adds 'And when he was being baptized a mighty light shone round about from the water, so that all they were afraid that had come thither,' while *g*<sup>1</sup>, Codex Sangermanensis, another MS. of the same version, has 'And when Jesus was being baptized a great light kept shining from the water, so that all they were afraid that had come thither.' The Latin texts are—Et cum baptizaretur (*g*<sup>1</sup> Iesus) lumen ingens (*g*<sup>1</sup> magnum) circumfulsit (*g*<sup>1</sup> fulgebat) de

shone around the place. And when John

aqua ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant (*g*<sup>1</sup> congregati erant). If translated from a lost Greek text, that might run as follows—καὶ βαπτίζομένου αὐτοῦ (*g*<sup>1</sup> τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—*or* ἐν δὲ τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι αὐτὸν [*g*<sup>1</sup> τὸν Ἰησοῦν]) περιέλαμψε (*g*<sup>1</sup> ἔλαμπε) φῶς μέγα ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὥστε φοβεῖσθαι πάντας τοὺς παρελθόντας (*g*<sup>1</sup> συνελθόντας). Both the above MSS. are very ancient and the Codex Vercellensis (4th cent.) is counted the most valuable example of the Old Latin.

Justin (*Dial.* c. 88) mentions the fire at Baptism in remarkable words—καὶ τότε ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνῆφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τουτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν—‘And then when Jesus had come to the Jordan river where John was baptizing, when Jesus had gone down to the water both a fire was kindled, and when he had gone up from the water the Holy Spirit is recorded by the Apostles of this same our Christ to have lighted upon him as a dove.’ Tischendorf conjectures ἀνῆφθαι for ἀνήφθη, and would thus make ‘the Apostles’ responsible also for the statement that ‘a fire was kindled.’

It will be seen from a note on p. 36 that *the Preaching of Paul* related that ‘when he was baptized, fire was seen upon the water’ (cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum).

The fire is mentioned in the 7th Sibylline book, l. 83: ὕδασι ἀγνοῖς Πατρὸν σὸν βάπτισμα δι’ οὗ πυρὸς ἐξεφαάνθης—‘with holy waters sprinkling thy baptism—through which [*or* whom] thou wast manifested out of fire.’

There can be little doubt that Juvencus alludes to it in his account, ‘manifesta Dei praesentia claret,’ ‘the presence of God is manifest in splendour,’ while the Syriac liturgy of Severus (early 6th cent.) says ‘Without fire, and without wood, did the waters glow when the Son of God came to be baptized in Jordan’ (Dodd, 14).

The writer of *Supernatural Religion* (4th ed. i. 323) says ‘Credner has pointed out that the marked use which was made of fire or lights at Baptism by the Church during early times probably rose out of this tradition regarding the fire which appeared in Jordan at the baptism of Jesus.’ It might, however, have been suggested by Matt. iii. 11, ‘he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire’—which consideration prevents me from claiming in illustration the passage quoted by Hilgenfeld from Eusebius (*De Pasch.* c. 4), δι’ ὕδατος καὶ πυρὸς Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἀναγεννηθέντες, ‘having been regenerated through water and fire of the Holy Spirit.’ Or, since baptism was called in

saw it he saith unto him \* 'Who art thou, [Lord?] ?'

5. And again a voice out of heaven unto him, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

6. Then John fell down before him and said 'I pray thee, Lord, baptize thou me.'

7. But he prevented him, saying 'Let be; for thus it is becoming that all things should be fulfilled.'

early days φωτισμός, 'illumination,' we might regard the use of lights as symbolical of spiritual enlightenment. The late Mr. Marriott, however, in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, shows from Cyril of Jerusalem that in 347 A.D. baptism took place at night, and, since there is nothing to show that this was not the practice still earlier, very reasonably believes the original use of lights to have been free from any symbolical meaning.

Is it possible that a reference to this tradition lurks in I Pet. iv. 14, 'for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you'—*ἐπι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται*? The phrase ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐπὶ τινα, 'to rest (i.e. take rest) upon a person,' is found nowhere else in the N. T., but in the fragment which immediately follows this we are told that a voice came from heaven at the Baptism saying 'My son, in all the prophets did I await thee, that thou mightest come and I might rest in thee'—*requiescerem in te*. Can the Spirit of Glory mean the Spirit of the Shechinah or visible glory of God? The previous verse confirms the idea that a reference to some event in the life of Jesus may be intended:—*ἀλλὰ καθὼ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χάρετε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι*, 'but according as ye share in the sufferings of the Christ rejoice that ye may rejoice with pride in the revelation also of his glory.' I do not press this, but it does not seem to me impossible: we shall hereafter find a reference by Paul to a tradition of which except in the Gospel according to the Hebrews no other trace has been preserved.

\* The very question (Τίς εἶ, Κύριε;) asked by Paul in response to the heavenly voice, Acts ix. 5, xxii. 8, xxvi. 15. In his case also there was 'much light' (φῶς ἱκανόν, xxii. 6) 'shining around' him (περιλάμψαν με, xxvi. 13). Is the parallel accidental? But it must be noted that Codex Venetus omits 'Lord.'

† 8. Matt. iii. at end.  
(Nazarene.)

1. And it came to pass, when the Lord had come up from the water, the entire fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and ‡ rested upon him and said to him

2. 'My § son, in all the prophets did I await thee, that thou mightest come and I might rest in thee;

3. 'For thou art my rest; thou art my firstborn Son that || reignest for ever.'

¶ 9. Matt. iv. 5.  
Luke iv. 9.  
(Nazarene?)

in [-to?] Jerusalem.

† Jerome, *Comm. in Isai.* xi. 2, (1) Factum est autem, quum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum et dixit illi (2) 'Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te; (3) Tu es enim requies mea; tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in sempiternum.'

‡ Is. xi. 2, 'And the Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him,' i.e. the branch of Jesse. I have already quoted a parallel in 1 Pet. iv. 14. 'Rested upon him' is the reading of the Curetonian Syriac in Matt. iii. 16.

§ See note on Fr. 30.

|| The only passage in the Gospels in which Jesus is spoken of as *reigning* is Luke i. 33, 'he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.'

¶ Tischendorf's Cod. A, margin, Τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν οὐκ ἔχει 'Εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν,' ἀλλ' 'ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ'—'The Jewish has not "into the holy city" but "in Jerusalem."' On which Hilgenfeld, after his manner, rushes to the conclusion that 'Jesus is not miraculously conveyed out of the desert into the holy city, as the canonical Matthew has reported, but is placed at Jerusalem on the summit of the temple.' According, then, to Hilgenfeld the Gospel according to the Hebrews either made Jerusalem, instead of the desert, the general scene of the temptation, or else divided the temptation into two—one occurring in the desert, and the other during some after visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. There is, however, no need to draw this startling conclusion from a single preposition whose context is lost. In the first place, for aught we know, 'in Jerusalem' may have followed the words 'on a pinnacle of the temple.' Secondly, reference to a Greek lexicon or to Bruder's *Concordance* would have shown numerous instances of the use of ἐν 'in' with verbs conveying an



\*10. Matt. v. 22. *In the Gospel . . . according to the Hebrews he is set down among the greatest criminals who hath grieved the spirit of his*  
 (Nazarene.) *† brother.*

†11. Matt. v. 24. *And be ye never joyful save when ye*  
 (Nazarene.) *have looked upon your brother in charity.*

§12. Matt. vi. 11. *[Our bread?] of the morrow [give us*  
 Luke xi. 3. *to-day?].*  
 (Nazarene.)

idea of motion where we should look for εἰς 'into.' Thirdly, in Jerome's Greek version of the Gospel, from which we may suppose the quotations to come, the accompanying verb may have been κατατίθεσθαι, 'to set down,' or some other verb which might be naturally followed by 'in.'

\* Jerome, *Comm. in Ezech.* xviii. 7, In Evangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt inter maxima ponitur crimina qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit. Hilgenfeld refers this and the next fragment to Matt. xviii. 6, 7, which must be a clerical error for Matt. xviii. 16, 17 or thereabouts. That passage, however, refers to the sins of a brother against oneself, whereas the parallel in Matt. v. 22 is very remarkable.

† Matthew uses 'brother' in this sense 15 times, Luke 6 times, John twice, Mark never. In Acts and most of the Epistles it is very common indeed.

‡ Jerome, *Comm. in Ephes.* v. 4, Ut in Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus Dominum ad discipulos loquentem: 'Et nunquam,' inquit, 'laeti sitis nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate.' If this fragment came anywhere else it might possibly be in Matt. xviii. between vv. 14 and 15.

§ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* vi. 11, In Evangelio quod appellatur 'secundum Hebraeos' pro '*supersubstantiali* pane' reperi *Mahar*, quod dicitur *crastinum*—ut sit sensus 'Panem nostrum crastinum,' id est, futurum, 'da nobis hodie'—'In the Gospel which is called "according to the Hebrews" instead of "*supersubstantial* bread" I found "*Mahar*," that is to say, "*of the morrow*," making the sense "Our bread of the morrow," that is, of the future, "give us to-day."'

After the exhaustive excursus of Bishop Lightfoot (*On a fresh Revision*, App. I. 195–234) there ought no longer to be any doubt that ἐπιούσιον (A. V. 'daily') is an adjective formed from (ἡ) ἐπιούσα (ἡμέρα), '(the) following (day),' 'the morrow.'



\*15. Matt. xii. 10.

Mark iii.

Luke vi.

(Nazarene.)

I was a mason, seeking sustenance by my hands: I beseech thee, Jesus, that thou restore me health, that I may not shamefully beg for food.

†16. Matt. xii. 47-50.

Mark iii. 32-5.

Luke viii. 20, 21.

(Ebionite.)

1. . . . 'Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without.'

†† Cf. John xvii. 6, 'the men which thou gavest me out of the world, thine they were, and thou gavest them me,' and ib. 9, 'I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me.'

\* Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* xii. 13, In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae . . . . homo iste qui aridam habet manum caementarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans, 'Caementarius eram, manibus victum quaeritans: precor te, Iesu, ut mihi restitues sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos'—'In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use . . . . that man who has the dry hand is described as a mason, beseeching help in words of this sort, "I was &c."'

† Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 14, Πάλιν δὲ ἀρροῦνται εἶναι αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰρηθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου οὗ εἶρηκεν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῷ ἀναγγελεῖν αὐτῷ (edd. αὐτὸν) ὅτι (1) 'Ἰεσοῦ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν,' ὅτι (2) 'Τίς μοῦ ἐστι μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφοί;' (3) Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητάς ἔφη 'Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρὸς μου'—'And again they [the Ebionites] deny that he was man, forsooth from the word which the Saviour spoke (when message was brought him "Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without"), "Who is &c."'

Codex V reads in (3) 'my brethren and mother and brethren' (καὶ ἀδελφοί—no οἱ), and this text Hilgenfeld prints, putting a comma after μήτηρ but none before οἱ ποιοῦντες. He does not vouchsafe the slightest justification of this splendid audacity, but I suppose he construes 'and brethren [are] they that do the wishes of my Father.' I am strongly prepossessed in favour of the MS. which has revealed to us the true reading φύσει ὄν for φύτον in *Haer.* xxx. 6—to say nothing of its superior antiquity to the other MSS.—but I really cannot accept this. Καὶ ἀδελφοί stands either for καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί 'and brethren' accidentally repeated, or for καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ 'and sisters' (cf. Mark iii. 35).

In (1) the 'desiring to speak with thee' of Matt. is omitted, but there is no other difference. From Luke (viii. 20) there is a little more difference, and from Mark (iii. 32) much more.

2. . . . 'Who is my mother and brethren?'

3. And he stretched out his hand over the disciples, and said 'These are my brethren and mother, that do the † wishes of my Father.'

§ 17. Matt. xv. 24.

I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

In (2) Matt. has 'who is my mother (ἡ μήτηρ μου) and who are my brethren?' Luke omits the clause altogether. Mark has 'Who is my mother (ἡ μήτηρ μου) and my brethren?' which is nearer.

In (3) Matt. differs widely 'Behold my mother and my brethren: for whosoever doeth the wish (τὸ θέλημα) of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother'—not to dwell on the slight differences between 'the disciples' and 'his disciples,' ἔφη and εἶπεν, which might be due to Epiphanius. Mark differs much more, but for 'the wish' (τὸ θέλημα) B reads 'the wishes' (τὰ θελήματα). Luke has 'My mother and my brethren are these, that hear and do the word of God' (Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιῶντες), and does not represent Jesus as pointing to any one.

In the so-called 2nd Epistle of Clement, we are told (ix. 11) that 'the Lord said' (εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος) 'My brethren are these, that do the wish of my Father' (Ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου). This is far nearer to the Ebionite Gospel.

† Cf. Acts xiii. 22 ('my wishes') and Eph. ii. 3 ('the wishes of the flesh'), the only places in the N. T. where the pl. θελήματα occurs, except in the various reading of B on Mark iii. 35. According to Tischendorf it is common in the LXX version of the Psalms and Isaiah.

§ Origen, *De Princ.* iv. 22, Ἐπὶ φάσκει ὁ Σωτὴρ 'Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ,' οὐκ ἐκλαμβάνομεν ταῦτα ὥς οἱ πτωχοὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ Ἐβιωναῖοι ὥστε ὑπολαβεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς σαρκίους Ἰσραηλίτας προηγουμένως τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιτεδμηκέναι—'When the Saviour declares 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' we do not take this as the poor-witted Ebionites, so as to suppose that the Christ came and dwelt of fore intent among the Israelites of the flesh.' Origen in calling the Ebionites 'poor-witted' puns on their name, *Ebionim*, 'the poor.' The quotation agrees exactly with Matt. xv. 24.

\*18. Matt. xvi. 17.  
(Nazarene?)

Son of John.

†19. Matt. xviii. 22.  
Luke xxvii. 3, 4.  
(Nazarene.)

1. He saith 'If thy brother hath sinned in ‡word and hath made thee amends, seven times in a day receive him.'

2. § Simon his disciple said unto him 'Seven times in a day?'

3. The Lord answered and said unto him 'I tell thee also, unto seventy times seven: for in the prophets likewise, after that they were ||anointed by the Holy Spirit, utterance of sin was found.'

\* Tischendorf's Codex A, margin, Τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν· 'Υιὲ Ἰωάννου'— 'The Jewish: "son of John."' No doubt the Aramaic was *Bar Jochanan*. There is hardly any question that the name, *Jona*, of Simon's father is not the same as *Jonah*, but is a contraction of *Jochanan*, John. In all other places in the N. T. where the name of Simon's father occurs (John i. 43, xxi. 15, 16, 17) recent editors rightly read 'son of John.'

† Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* iii. 2, Et in eodem volumine "Si peccaverit," inquit, "frater tuus in verbo et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum." Dixit illi Simon discipulus ejus "Septies in die?" Respondit Dominus et dixit ei "Etiam ego dico tibi usque septuagies septies; etenim in prophetis quoque, postquam uncti sunt Spiritu Sancto, inventus est sermo peccati."

‡ Matthew and Luke (xvii. 4) do not limit the offense to offense of speech. It is possible that Jerome rendered too literally here, and that the proper rendering would be 'in a thing,' 'in anything.' In Hebrew 'word' is not seldom used in the sense of a *subject of speech*, a 'thing,' just as our *thing* and the Latin *res* mean a *subject of thought*. Dr. Hermann Adler tells me that this usage, though rarer in Aramaic, is not unknown to it.

§ This style occurs again in the next fragment; it is not found in the Four Gospels. Peter is spoken of as plain 'Simon' only once in Matthew and John, but 7 times in Mark and 8 times in Luke. The title 'disciple' is a specially favourite one with John (who uses it some 80 times), next with Matthew (about 80 times), and Mark (45 times); whereas Luke has it only about 40 times, or in proportion to his length only twice for every five times that Matthew and Mark have it, and for every 7 times that John has it. He also uses the title 'Apostle' 6 times, while each of the others has it only once.

|| Cf. Acts x. 38, 'God anointed him with the Holy Spirit.'

¶20. *Matt. xix. 16-24.* (16) 1. \*\* The other of the rich men said  
*Mark x. 17-25.* to him 'Master, what good thing shall I  
*Luke xviii. 18-25.* do and live?'  
*(Nazarene.)*

Luke uses the verb 'anoint' twice more—Gosp. iv. 18, Acts iv. 27; it is only found twice again in the N. T.—not at all in the other three Gospels.

¶ Latin trans. of Origen (see above, p. 4), (1) *Dixit ad eum alter divitum 'Magister, quid bonum faciens vivam?'* (2) *Dixit ei 'Homo, legem [Migne has leges, sic] et prophetas fac.'* (3) *Respondit ad eum 'Feci.'* (4) *Dixit ei 'Vade, vende omnia quae possides et divide pauperibus et veni, sequere me.'* (5) *Coepit autem dives scalpere caput suum, et non placuit ei. Et dixit ad eum Dominus 'Quomodo dicis "Legem feci et prophetas"?—quoniam scriptum est in lege "Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum," et ecce multi fratres tui, filii Abrahae, amicti sunt stercore, morientes prae fame, et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos.'* (6) *Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo, sedenti apud se, 'Simon, fili Iohannae, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acus quam divitem in regnum caelorum.'*

\*\* The three Synoptic Gospels only mention one rich man—indeed, only one man, rich or poor—as asking a question of Jesus at this time. Hilgenfeld conjectures that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the entire passage ran somewhat as follows:—*'And behold there came to him two rich men. The one said "Good master"—But he said "Call me not good: for he that is good is one, the Father in the heavens." The other &c.' Call me not good* is the reading of the Clementine Homilies (xviii. 3, 17) in *Matt. xix. 17*, and *the Father in the heavens* is added to the answer of Jesus by them, by Justin (*my Father &c.*) once (*Dial. 101*—but *God who made all things, Apol. i. 16*), and by the Marcosians (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer. I. xx. 2*): these, however, say nothing of two questioners.

This number *two* may be thought to afford a straw's weight of presumption in favour of the Matthaean origin of this version. It occurs in Matthew much more often than in the other Gospels, and in *viii. 28* and *xx. 30* he has represented Jesus as healing two demoniacs and two blind men where Mark and Luke only mention one: on the other hand he (with Mark) only speaks of one angel at the sepulchre, where Luke and John mention two.

The now (rightly) accepted reading in *Matt. xix. 16* is 'Master,' not 'Good Master,' and in *xix. 17* 'Why askest thou me of the good? he that is good is One.'

(17) 2. He said unto him \* 'Man, perform the law and † the prophets.'

(20) 3. He answered him 'I have performed them.'

(21) 4. He said unto him ‡ 'Go, sell all that thou hast and divide it to the poor, and come, follow me.'

(22) 5. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said unto him 'How sayest thou "I have performed the law and the prophets"?' seeing that it is written in the law § "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and behold many of thy brethren, || sons of Abraham, are clad with dung, dying for hunger, and thy house is full of much goods, and there goeth out therefrom nought at all unto them.'

(23-4) 6. And he turned and said to Simon his ¶ disciple, \*\* sitting by him,

\* This form of address is only found in Luke xii. 14, xxii. 58, 60.

† This conjunction of the prophets, as the base of a code of life, with the law is peculiar to Matthew: cf. vii. 12, 'Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.' And xxii. 40, 'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'

‡ Luke (xviii. 22) omits 'Go,' but otherwise he is a little nearer to the Gospel according to the Hebrews than are Matt. and Mark: cf. his πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις with their σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα and ὅσα ἔχεις; and his διὰ τοῦτο with their ἐὼς.

§ Cf. Matt. xix. 19. Mark and Luke omit this injunction.

|| Cf. Luke xix. 9, 'son of Abraham,' and xiii. 16, 'daughter of Abraham.' John has 'seed of Abraham' twice and 'children of Abraham' once.

¶ See note on the last fragment.

\*\* It was the custom for the scholars of a Rabbi to sit on the floor or benches, while the Rabbi himself sat a little above them on a raised platform: thus Paul speaks of himself as brought up 'at the feet of Gamaliel' (Acts xxii. 3). As regards the phrase

‘Simon, son of†† John, it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle than a rich man into the kingdom of the heavens.’

21. †† Matt. xxi. 9.      §§<sup>1</sup> Hosanna |||<sup>1</sup> in the heights.  
 Mark xi. 10.  
 Luke xix. 38.  
 John xii. 13.  
 (*Nazarene.*)

‘sitting by,’ Hilgenfeld quotes Josephus (*Bell. Iud.* i. 6, 5), ἦσαν δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγοι πατερεύοντες αὐτῷ τῶν μαθητῶν ‘and there were not a few of the scholars sitting by him’ (i.e. Judas the Essacan). Jesus himself certainly liked to teach, as a Rabbi, sitting: see Matt. v. 1, xiii. 1, 2, xv. 29 (xxiv. 3?), xxvi. 55, Mark iv. 1, ix. 35, Luke v. 3, John vi. 3. It may be observed that this little bit of Jewish colouring is supplied by Matthew more often than in the other three Evangelists together, and that he alone speaks of the Scribes and Pharisees as ‘sitting in Moses’ seat’ (xxiii. 2).

†† See note on Fragment 18. ‘Iohannae’ in Origen’s translator points to a Greek Ἰωαννᾶ: cf. *Iovā*.

‡‡ Jerome in a letter to Pope Damasus (Martianay’s ed. iv. 148) after explaining the word *Osanna* proceeds thus:—Finally, Matthew, who composed the Gospel in the Hebrew language, put in these words, *Osanna barrama*, that is ‘Osanna in the heights,’ because when the Saviour was born salvation reached as far as heaven, that is even to the heights, peace being made not only in earth but also in heaven (Denique Matthaeus, qui Evangelium Hebraeo sermone conscripsit, ita posuit, *Osanna barrama*, id est ‘Osanna in excelsis,’ quod Salvatore nascente salus in coelum usque, id est, etiam ad excelsa pervenerit, pace facta non solum in terra sed et in coelo). The date of the letter is about 380 A.D.

It seems to me (as to Anger and Hilgenfeld) almost certain that Jerome is here quoting the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and for three reasons (1) he was not the man to *conjecture* that Matthew wrote *barrama* and then state it as a *fact*; (2) the introduction of the word is so altogether irrelevant that I suppose him to have introduced it simply as an example of what he believed to be the veritable Aramaic of Matthew; (3) it is almost certain (see note on p. 18) that he had copied the Nazarene Gospel before he wrote this letter to Damasus, and it is not to be believed that, holding his opinion of it, he should say that Matthew wrote Aramaic words which it did not contain. Yet see *Addenda*.

<sup>1</sup> For notes see next page.





[substantially, it would seem, and perhaps almost verbally, as follows:—

opinion. The recent textual editors, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and Westcott and Hort, all deny it the same authorship. Of living English writers of note only McClellan opposes, only Farrar hesitates: Ellicott, Hammond, Lightfoot, Sanday, Scrivener, and even Wordsworth, allow that the Story of the Woman taken in Adultery is an interpolation. In *Appendix F* I have given a minute analysis of the evidence for and against it.

Several of the above writers conjecture that the story is the same with that told by Papias. Mr. McClellan (*New Test.* 721) objects that the woman spoken of by Papias was 'secretly accused' (διαβληθείσης) of many sins, whereas the Woman taken in Adultery was *openly* accused, and of one sin only. Now in the first place to translate διαβληθείσης 'secretly accused' is to strain its meaning unwarrantably, and in the second place, as Tischendorf says, the words 'from this time no longer sin' seem to indicate that the woman had been a frequent sinner. And it is impossible to escape from the fact that Rufinus, in his translation of Eusebius, paraphrased his author's words so as to make him say that Papias published 'another relation concerning an [or the] adulterous woman who was accused by the Jews before the Lord' (aliam historiam de muliere adultera quae accusata est a Iudaeis apud Dominum). Now if it can be said confidently of any man but Jerome that he *must* have read through the Gospel according to the Hebrews that man is Rufinus. The fellow-student of Jerome at Aquileia, he went with him to the East in 371 A.D., he was in Palestine between 377 and 397, up to 393 he was on the most cordial terms with Jerome, and for the last seven years of that time the two were living a little more than an hour's walk from each other, Jerome at Bethlehem, Rufinus at Jerusalem. Now it is almost certain that Jerome had copied the Nazarene Gospel not later than 379 A.D., he began to quote it in his commentaries in 387, and in 392 he speaks of having lately rendered it into Greek and Latin. Is it to be credited that he should render it into two languages for the reading of all the civilized world, and that neither of these translations should have been read by his intimate friend living some half-a-dozen miles off? Mr. McClellan himself would not say so, and putting together the evidence of Eusebius and Rufinus (who translated Eusebius about 408) I must regard it as *absolutely certain that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained a story of an adulteress accused before Jesus.*

But, asks Mr. McClellan, if contained in the Gospel according

## 1. And they went each to his own

to the Hebrews, 'how could it have been (with some trifling exceptions) universally transferred to the *Gospel of St. John*, and never once to the more kindred *Gospel of St. Matthew*?' Farrar seems to feel the same difficulty as to its interpolation into *John*, and many of those who repudiate the genuineness of the passage must have stumbled over it in their own minds. The question can, I believe, be answered satisfactorily, as follows.

If the reader turns to p. 7, he will see that Eusebius says that Papias 'also transfers to his own work other accounts, by the afore-said Aristion, of the Lord's discourses, and traditions of the Elder JOHN.' Of course when he repeated one of the Elder John's traditions he must have mentioned him by name, or Eusebius would not have known whence they were derived. My theory is that Papias in telling the Story of the Woman taken in Adultery said that it was related by John, meaning the Elder; that some one else supposed him to mean the Apostle, and added it to his own copy of the Fourth Gospel, perhaps in the place where we now find it, or perhaps as an appendix at the end of the Gospel, whence it may have been transferred by the next copyist.

It is easy to see why this particular place was found for it. It seemed to come most naturally *just before* viii. 15, where Jesus says 'Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man'; and *just after* c. vii., where there had been far more mention of 'Moses' and 'the law' than in any other part of the Gospel—'Moses' being named 4 times, and 'the law' 5 times, against twice in any other chapter—and there being no good opportunity of inserting it before v. 52. Again Jesus is mentioned twice in c. vii. and once in c. viii. as *teaching in the Temple*, but nowhere else in the Gospel.

The story evidently belongs to the Passion-week, when 'in the day-time he was teaching in the Temple; and at night he went out, and abode in the mount that is called the Mount of Olives. And all the people came early in the morning to him in the Temple, for to hear him' (Luke xxi. 37-8).

Hitzig would find room for this incident between Mark xii. 17 and 18, that is between the question of the Herodians and that of the Sadducees: but this is contradicted by Matt. xxii. 23 which says that the Sadducees came to him 'the same day' as the Herodians. It might be put after Matt. xxii., if that chapter did not end with the statement that 'neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.' But there seems no reason why we should not give it a place in time between Matt. xxi. and xxii., that is between the parables of the Wicked Husbandmen and the Wedding-

house, and \* Jesus went to the Mount of the Olives.

feast—especially as we are told in Mark xii. 12 that after the former parable ‘they left him and went their way.’ It would then come before the questions of the Herodians, Sadducees, and Pharisees, immediately after which we find from Mark xii. 35 and 41 that he was ‘teaching IN THE TEMPLE’ and that he ‘SAT over against the treasury’—facts which do not of course prove anything for this theory, but are simply quoted to show its consistency with what we know of the actions of Jesus on this particular day.

As to the text of the passage, the number of various readings is so unparalleled, and so many of the most ancient MSS., versions, and Fathers fail us, that its exact determination is hopeless. I subjoin the text which I frame, and which I have rendered as closely as possible. The reader who compares it with the notes to this passage in Tischendorf’s eighth edition will see that in every case where he has definitely indicated one reading as proferable to the rest I have been able to agree with him.

(1) Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.

(2) Ὁρθρου δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ Ἱερὸν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

(3) Ἀγουσιν δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι γυναῖκα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ κατελημμένην.

(4) Καὶ στήσαντες αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ εἶπον αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ κατελήπται ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ μοιχευομένην.

(5) Ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῶν Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο τὰς τοιαύτας λιθάζειν· σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις;

(6) Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.

(7) Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.

(8) Ὡς δὲ ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες αὐτόν ἀνέκυψεν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν πρῶτος ἐπ’ αὐτὴν τὸν λίθον βαλέτω· καὶ πάλιν κάτω κύψας ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.

(9) Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐξήρχοντο εἰς καθ’ εἷς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ οὕσα.

(10) Ἀνακύψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Γύναι, ποῦ εἰσίν; οὐδεὶς σε κατέκρινεν;

(11) Ἦ δὲ εἶπεν· Οὐδεὶς, κύριε. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρινῶ· πορεύου καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε.

\* Matthew (xxi. 17) says that on the evening after the entry into Jerusalem Jesus ‘went out of the city to Bethany and lodged there,’ and subsequent passages imply that the lodging was not

2. \*And at dawn he came again into the Temple, †and all the people came to him, and ‡having sat down he taught them.

3. And the § scribes and the Pharisees bring || a woman taken up for adultery:

merely temporary. The same with Mark (xi. 11). But Luke (xxi. 37, quoted above, and xxii. 39, 'and went as he was wont to the mount of [the] Olives') is the only evangelist who vaguely mentions this mountain, and not Bethany, as the lodging-place of Jesus at night.

\* There are two close parallels to this verse in the writings of Luke. The first is Luke xxi. 38, 'And all the people came at dawn [A. V. early in the morning] to him in the Temple, for to hear him': *came at dawn* is expressed in the Greek by a single word ὀρθρίζε, the verb of ὀρθρον 'dawn.' The second is Acts v. 21, 'they entered into the Temple toward the dawn [A. V. early in the morning] and taught': here the word used is again ὀρθρον.

It is remarkable that, putting aside this fragment, no N. T. writing, except those of Luke, contains the word ὀρθρον or any of its kin: in addition to ὀρθρον and ὀρθρίζειν Luke also has ὀρθρινός (xxiv. 22). Matthew, Mark, and John always use πρωί or πρωτα, Luke never.

† From here to the end of the verse is left out by seven cursives, including several of the best (e.g. Cod. 16 and Cod. 39). But as six of these read at the beginning of the next verse καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ the omission may arise from the copyist glancing accidentally from one καὶ to another two lines below it. D omits 'and having sat down he taught them,' but the copyist may have confounded this sentence (καὶ—αὐτοῦς) with the one before (καὶ—αὐτόν).

‡ As the Rabbis taught sitting, so, very often at least, did Jesus. See Matt. v. 1 ('and when he had sat down (A. V. when he was set) his disciples CAME UNTO HIM, and he opened his mouth and taught them'); xiii. 1, 2; xv. 29; (xxiv. 3?); xxvi. 55 ('I sat daily with you teaching IN THE TEMPLE'); Mark iv. 1; ix. 35; Luke v. 3; John vi. 3. It is Matthew who is most fond of specifying this attitude.

§ Matthew has *scribes and Pharisees* 6 times, Luke 3 times, and Luke and Mark have each *Pharisees and scribes* once.

|| D has a very likely-looking reading—'a woman taken for sin' (ἐπὶ ἁμαρτία γυναῖκα εἰλημμένην)—which recalls at once Papias's 'woman accused of many sins,' the 'adulterous and sinful generation'

4. And having placed her in the midst they said to him ¶ 'Teacher, this woman hath been taken up in adultery, in the very act;

5. 'And in the law Moses commanded us \*\* to stone such: †† what therefor dost thou say?'

6. And this they said ‡‡ trying him, §§ that they may have whereby to accuse him.

7. But Jesus having bent down kept

of Mark viii. 38, and the woman 'which was a sinner' of Luke vii. 37. It is however without support.

¶ It is a great pity that the A. V. obscures the meaning of the original by invariably giving the ambiguous 'Master' as its translation of διδάσκαλος.

\*\* This particular mode of death is not definitely prescribed in the law for any form of adultery except that in which a woman 'betrothed unto an husband' is guilty: see Dent. xxii. 23-4. It might however be inferred from Dent. xxii. 22, compared with the foregoing and following verse, that a *married* woman committing adultery was also to be killed by stoning.

It is not likely that they had any thought of really stoning this woman. They might not put to death without leave from the Roman governor, who would hardly give it in such cases as this.

†† D reads 'but what dost thou say now?'

‡‡ Matthew four times represents the Jews as trying (A. V. always '*tempting*') Jesus (xvi. 1, xix. 3, xxii. 18, 35), Mark thrice (viii. 11, x. 2, xii. 15), Luke twice (x. 25, xi. 16).

§§ Cf. Luke vi. 7, ἵνα εὕρωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ 'that they may find whereby to accuse him,' and Matt. xii. 10, Mark iii. 2, 'that they may accuse him.'

If he answered that they ought to stone her they might accuse him to Pilate of counseling disobedience to his authority, if that they ought not to stone her, they might accuse him to the people of counseling violation of the law.

D leaves out this verse, but reads (4) thus, 'And having placed her in the midst the priests say, trying him, that they may have accusation of him (κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ), Teacher &c.' D however stands alone, except that there is a fair, but still insufficient, amount of authority for the addition of the single word 'trying' in (4).

\* writing down with his finger upon the ground.

8. But as they continued asking him he unbent and said to them 'Let the † sinless one of you first cast against her the stone.' And having bent down again he kept writing upon the ground.

9. But they having heard went out one by one, beginning from the elder ones, and Jesus was left alone, and the woman in the midst.

10. And Jesus having unbent said to her '‡ Mistress, where are they? Hath none condemned thee?'

11. And she said 'None, § sir.' And Jesus said 'Neither || will I condemn thee: go, and from this time no longer sin.']

\* Or 'drawing,' another meaning of *καταγράφειν*.

† Perhaps with reference to the special sin in question; see above.

The person to be stoned was thrown down by one of the two chief witnesses from an erection of twice the height of a man. If he was killed by the fall, the actual stoning was omitted. If not, after he had been turned on his back the other chief witness dashed a stone on to his breast, and if this did not kill him the rest of the bystanders stoned him. So this punishment is described in the Talmud, *Sanhed.* vi. 4.

‡ *Urau*, a term of courtesy, used 5 times by John, twice by Luke, and once by Matthew.

§ This or 'master' is of course the natural rendering of *κύριε*, the common N. T. form of deferential address, used by servants to their masters (Matt. xiii. 27, xviii. 26, xxv. 20, 22, 24, Luke xiii. 8, xiv. 22, xix. 16, 18, 20, 25), sons to their fathers (Matt. xxi. 30), the Jewish leaders to Pilate (Matt. xxvii. 63), strangers to Philip (John xii. 21), and Mary of Magdala to a gardener (John xx. 15).

|| The difference in the Greek between 'do I condemn' and 'will I condemn' is merely one of accent—*κατακρίνω* and *κατακρινῶ*—and the great majority of MSS. during the first few centuries were written without accents. But, as far as MSS. and versions are of avail in such a case, half the uncials, a large number of cursives, and the Old Latin and Vulgate favour the future, which, fancying it a little the better, I therefor adopt.

¶ 23. *Matt. xxiii. 35.* Zacharias son of Joiada.  
*Luke xi. 51.*

(*Nazarene.*)

\*\* 24. *Matt. xxv. 14-*

*30.*

*Luke xix. 11-27.*

*The Gospel which comes to us in Hebrew characters has directed the threat not against*

¶ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt. xxiii. 35*, In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni pro filio Barachiae filium Joiadae reperimus scriptum—'In the Gospel which the Nazarenes use we find "son of Joiada" written for "son of Barachias."'

No Zacharias son of Barachias is known except the minor prophet of that name. There is no Jewish tradition that he died a violent death, and there is not the slightest doubt that the person referred to is the 'Zechariah the son of Jehoiada' of 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21, who actually was stoned in the court of the priests, between the altar of burnt offerings and the Temple itself, and whose death forms the subject of one of the wildest Talmudic legends. As the murder of Abel comes first in the Old Testament so in the Jewish arrangement of the books the murder of the son of Jehoiada came last.

The words 'son of Barachias' in *Matt. xxiii.* are indeed left out by  $\aleph$  and Eusebius, but are kept by VACD, the Latin versions, the Thebaic, the Peshittā, by Irenaeus, and by Origen; the Curetonian Syriac, which is deficient here, probably contained them also, for it adds them to *Luke xi. 51*. Thus the testimony both of numbers and antiquity compels us to keep the words, and to account for them as best we can.

It is next to impossible that the original reading was simply 'Zacharias.' No authority previous to the 4th cent. omits the words 'son of Barachias.' And the name 'Zacharias' of itself so naturally suggests the minor prophet that a copyist who believed him to be the person intended would scarcely think it needful to indicate him more closely by adding 'son of Barachias.'

On the other hand it seems most improbable that this glaring mistake should be due to the Jewish writer himself.

I believe that the Gospel according to the Hebrews has kept the original reading, and that the passage passed through three different forms:—(1) *Zacharias son of Jehoiada*—so the original; (2) *Zacharias son of Barachias*—so a very early copyist (or the translator if the Greek Matthew be a translation), knowing only the minor prophet, and correcting, as he thought, the mistake; (3) *Zacharias* by itself—so some later copyists, correcting the real mistake of No. 2.

\*\* Eusebius, *Theophania* (the Greek fragments in Migne's



*the hider, but against the \*abandoned liver. For it has included three servants, one † which devoured the substance with harlots and flute-women, and one which multiplied, and one which hid the talent: then that one was ‡ accepted, one only blamed, and one shut up in prison.*

§25. Matt. xxvi. 17,  
18.  
Mark xiv. 12.  
Luke xxii. 15.  
(*Ebonite.*)

1. . . . 'Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee the passover to eat?'

2. . . . 'Have I desired with desire to eat this flesh the passover with you?'

edition of Eusebius, iv. 155), Τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἦκον Ἑβραϊκοῖς χαρακτηῆσαι Εὐαγγέλιον τὴν ἀπειλὴν οὐ κατὰ τοῦ ἀποκρύψαντος ἐπῆγεν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοῦ ἀσώτως ἐζηκότος. Τρεῖς γὰρ δούλους περιεῖχε, τὸν μὲν καταφαγόντα τὴν ὑπαρξιν μετὰ πορνῶν καὶ αὐλητριδῶν, τὸν δὲ πολλαπλασιάσαιτα, τὸν δὲ κατακρύψαντα τὸ τάλαντον· εἶτα τὸν μὲν ἀποδεχθῆναι, τὸν δὲ μεμψθῆναι μόνον, τὸν δὲ συγκλεισθῆναι δεσμοτηρίῳ.

\* Cf. Luke xv. 14 (of the Prodigal Son), ζῶν ἀσώτως 'in abandoned living.' We cannot tell how far Eusebius is summarizing the parable in language of his own or how far he has kept any of the phrases of the original.

† Cf. Luke xv. 30 (of the Prodigal Son), ὁ καταφαγὼν σου τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν 'which hath devoured thy living with harlots.'

‡ Or 'received'—a phrase common in Matt. and Luke, but particularly Luke.

§ Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 22, καὶ ἐποίησαν τοὺς μαθητὰς μὲν λέγοντας 'Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν'; καὶ αὐτὸν εἶπεν λέγοντα 'Μὴ ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν;'—'And they have made the disciples say "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?" and him to say "Have I desired with desire to eat this flesh the passover with you?"' Epiphanius proceeds, Ἀντὶ τοῦ γὰρ εἰπεῖν Ἑπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα προσέθεντο τὸ Μὴ ἐπιθύμημα . . . . Αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπιγράψαντες τὸ Κρέας ἑαυτοὺς ἐπλάτησαν, ῥαδιουργήσαντες καὶ εἰπόντες Μὴ ἐπ. &c. 'For instead of saying "I have desired with desire" they have added the adverb *μή* . . . . But they, having introduced the word *Flesh*, deceived themselves and fraudulently said "Have I desired &c.?"' See also *Addenda*.

The first question, 'Where wilt thou &c.?' is the same with that in Matt. xxvi. 17. The second, 'Have I desired &c.?' is very near to Luke xxii. 15, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover

[? originally 'With desire I have desired to eat this (omitting flesh the?) passover with you.']

|| 26. *Matt. xxvi. 74.*

*Mark xiv. 71.*

(*Nazarene?*)

¶ 27. *Matt. xxvii. 16.*

*Mark xv. 7.*

*Luke xxiii. 18.*

*John xviii. 40.*

(*Nazarene.*)

And he denied and swore and cursed.

\*\* The son of a master [of them? who had been condemned on account of sedition and murder?].

with you before I suffer' (*Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν*). Epiphanius believed that they had tampered with the words reported by Luke in order to make Jesus express the same aversion from eating flesh which they themselves entertained. We are strongly justified in suspecting that they did so (see notes on Fr. 5 and Fr. 33), and I have therefor put in brackets what may have been the original reading. I have only to add that the charge however probable cannot be proved.

|| Tischendorf's Codex A, on the margin of *Matt. xxvi. 74*, *Τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν*: 'καὶ ἠρνήσατο καὶ ὡμοσεν καὶ κατηράσατο'—'The Jewish: "and he &c."'

¶ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt. xxvii. 16*, 'Iste in Evangelio quod scribitur iuxta Hebraeos filius magistri eorum interpretatur, qui propter seditionem et homicidium fuerat condemnatus'—'In the Gospel which is inscribed according to the Hebrews he is interpreted the son of a master of them—who had been condemned on account of sedition and murder.'

It is difficult to know how much of this is quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Hilgenfeld excludes 'of them' but includes 'who—murder.' The words 'of them' seem to be Jerome's own, and that suggests that the following words are his also. Moreover 'interpreted' points to 'the son of a master' (= *Bar Rabban* or *Bar Abba*) as being the only words quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, nor would Jerome have any need to quote from it a statement that Barabbas 'had been condemned on account of sedition and murder,' when *Luke xxiii. 19*, says that Barabbas 'for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison.' I therefor believe that the words out of brackets represent the limit of Jerome's quotation.

\*\* Taking his name either as *Bar Rabban* 'son of a Rabbi' or *Bar Abba* 'son of a Father.' The word 'master' perhaps favours

- \*28. Matt. xxvii. 51.      *The lintel of the Temple, of immense  
Mark xv. 38.      size, was broken and fell down.*  
Luke xiii. 45.  
(Nazarene.)
- †29. Matt. xxviii.      1. And when the Lord had given his  
(Nazarene.)

the former, but Lightfoot in his *Horae Hebraicae* quotes from the Talmuds *Rabbi Nathan Barabba*, *Rabbi Samuel Barabba*, and *Abba Barabba*—the name *Abba* 'Father' being used as a title of spiritual reverence (cf. Matt. xxiii. 9, 'call no man your father upon the earth') like *Padre*, *Père*, *Father*, and the son of such a reverend person being sometimes surnamed *Bar Abba* 'son of the Father.' In the N. T. there is next to no authority for the doubled *r*, but the Harklean Syriac (5th cent.) has it in Matt. (? elsewhere) and it is the form found in the *Acta Pilati*.

Be these things as they may, there is no doubt that the name *Barabbas* was rightly treated in the Gospel according to the Hebrews as a mere surname, nor have I any doubt that the reading 'Jesus Barabbas' in Matt. xxvii. 16, 17, supplies his real circumcision-name, and I hope to satisfy those who care to pursue this point in *Appendix G*. Does it not seem likely that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, if it explained this man's surname, also gave his circumcision-name?

\* Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* xxvii. 51, In Evangelio cuius saepe fecimus mentionem, superliminare Templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus—'In the Gospel of which we have often made mention we read that the lintel of the Temple, of infinite size, was broken and splintered.' Again (*Ad Hedyb.* viii.), In Evangelio autem quod Hebraicis litteris scriptum est legimus non velum Templi scissum sed superliminare Templi mirae magnitudinis corruisse—'In the Gospel, however, which is written in Hebrew letters we read not that the veil of the Temple was rent but that the lintel of the Temple of wondrous size fell down.'

The only particular *words* of which we can be absolutely certain are 'lintel of the Temple': whether *the* lintel of the Temple itself or *a* lintel of one of the gateways of the Temple-courts, but the former is the more natural inference from the expression.

† Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccl.* (under 'Iacobus'), Evangelium quoque quod appellatur 'secundum Hebraeos' . . . post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert (1) *Dominus autem quum dedisset sindonem suam servo sacerdotis ivit ad Iacobum et apparuit ei.* (2) *Iuraverat enim Iacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini donec videret eum resurgentem a mortuis.*

Rursusque post paululum (3) *Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem.* Statimque additur (4) *Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et post dedit Iacobo Iusto et dixit ei 'Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius Hominis a dormientibus'*—'The Gospel also which is called "according to the Hebrews" . . . after the resurrection of the Saviour relates (1) *And—from the dead.* And again after a little *Bring, saith the Lord, a table and bread.* And immediately it is added *He took up—them that sleep.'*

In the N. T. there is no mention of an appearance to James except in 1 Cor. xv. 7, where, having already mentioned appearances to Kephas, to 'the Twelve,' and to 500 brethren, Paul says 'Then was he seen by James, then by all the Apostles' (*Ἐπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, ἔπειτα τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν*).

There can be no doubt that this James was not the son of Zebedee (whom Paul never mentions and who had been dead many years) but 'James' (Gal. ii. 9, 13) bishop of Jerusalem, called also 'James the Lord's brother' (Gal. i. 19). The words 'then by all the Apostles' do not imply that this James was one of the *Twelve*, but only that he was an Apostle (as he is also styled in Gal. i. 19)—a much wider title, given in the N. T. to Paul, Barnabas, and apparently (Rom. xvi. 7) to Andronicus and Junias: see Bishop Lightfoot's excursus 'The name and office of an Apostle' (*Ep. to the Galatians*, 92).

The Gospel according to the Hebrews certainly suggests that the appearance to James was earlier than others to which Paul gives the priority: such difference in the chronological order of incidents is common among the N. T. writers. There is seemingly no other tradition of an appearance to James.

M. Nicolas and Mr. Baring Gould give references for the tradition to Gregory of Tours (latter part of 6th cent.), to the *Historiae Apostolicae* of pseudo-Abdias (6th cent., but based to some extent at least on legends quite as early as the 4th cent.), and to the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine.

Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Francorum* i. 21) writes 'James the Apostle is said, when he had seen the Lord now dead on the cross, to have called to witness and sworn that he would never eat bread unless he beheld the Lord rising again. At last on the third day the Lord, returning with triumph from the spoil of Tartarus, showing himself to James saith "Rise, James, eat, for now I am risen from the dead." This is James the Just, whom they style the brother of the Lord, because he was the son of Joseph, born of another wife' (*Fertur Iacobus Apostolus, cum Dominum iam mortuum vidisset in cruce, detestatum esse atque iurasse numquam se comesturum panem nisi Dominum cerneret resurgentem.* Tertia

demum die rediens Dominus, spoliato Tartaro cum triumpho, Iacobo se ostendens ait 'Surge Iacobe, comede, quia iam a mortuis resurrexi.' Hic est Iacobus Iustus, quem fratrem Domini nuncupant, pro eo quod Ioseph fuerit filius, ex alia uxore progenitus).

Mr. Baring Gould (*Lost and Hostile Gospels*, 150) says that Gregory 'no doubt drew it,' the story, 'from St. Jerome.' This can only be on the supposition that Gregory quoted very roughly from memory, for the words attributed to Jesus differ considerably, while Gregory plainly says that James took this oath after seeing Jesus dead on the cross.

The so-called Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* vi. 1) makes James the brother of Simon the Cananaean and 'Judas of James.' Of these three brothers he says 'James, the younger, was at all times specially dear to Christ the Saviour, and burnt with so great a yearning toward his master in return that when He was crucified he would not take food before that he saw Him rising from the dead, which he minded to have been foretold to him and his brethren by Christ when He was still among the living. Wherefor He chose to appear to him first of all, as also to Mary of Magdala and Peter, that He might strengthen His disciple in faith; and, that he might not bear long hunger, when a honeycomb was offered Him, He invited James likewise to eat it' (Quorum minor natu Iacobus Christo Salvatori in primis semper dilectus tanto rursus desiderio in magistrum flagrabat ut crucifixo eo cibum capere noluerit priusquam a mortuis resurgentem videret, quod meminerat sibi et fratribus a Christo agente in vivis fuisse praedictum. Quare ei primum omnium ut et Mariae Magdalenae et Petro apparere voluit ut discipulum in fide confirmaret: et, ne diutinum ieiunium toleraret, favo mellis oblato ad comedendum, insuper Iacobum invitavit). Mr. Baring Gould's translation of this passage is very far from accurate, but, as he gives neither the original nor a reference, it may be borrowed. 'Abdias' agrees with Gregory in dating James's oath from the crucifixion, but, unless he is unconsciously blending this story with Luke xxiv. 42, the substitution of the honeycomb shows that he drew his account from some other unknown source.

Jacobus de Voragine (*Legenda Aurea*, lxvii.) tells the story thus:—'And on Preparation-day, after the Lord was dead, as saith Josephus and Jerome in the book *Of Illustrious Men*, James vowed a vow that he would not eat until he saw the Lord to have risen from the dead. But on the very day of the resurrection, when up to that day James had not tasted food, the Lord appeared to the same James and said to them that were with him 'Set a

\* linen cloth to the † servant of the priest

table and bread," then taking the bread he blessed and gave to James the Just, saying "Rise, my brother, eat; for the Son of Man is risen from the dead" (In Parasceue autem, mortuo Domino, sicut dicit Iosephus et Hieronymus in libro *De Viris Illustribus*, Iacobus votum sumpsit se non comesturum donec videret Dominum a mortuis surrexisse. In ipsa autem die resurrectionis, cum usque in diem illam Iacobus non gustasset cibum, eidem Dominus apparuit ac eis qui cum eo erant dixit 'Ponite mensam et panem,' deinde panem accipiens benedixit et dedit Iacobo Iusto, dicens 'Surge, frater mi, comede; quia Filius Hominis a mortuis surrexit.' —Graesse's text, 297).

Mr. Baring Gould tells us that this story passed into the work of De Voragine from that of Gregory of Tours. But he gives neither original nor translation of Gregory or De Voragine, and to the latter not even a reference; it is very doubtful, therefore, whether he had read either account; certainly he had not read both, or he would have seen that De Voragine cannot possibly have copied Gregory (i.) because his account is fuller and nearer to Jerome, (ii.) because he says that the story is found in the *De Viris Illustribus* of Jerome, whom Gregory does not mention.

The allusion to 'Josephus' as one of the authorities for the story is capable of double explanation. The historian Josephus actually does mention the *death* of James the Just, and this may be simply a 'shot' on the part of De Voragine. But the person intended may be the 2nd cent. Christian writer Hegesippus. The name Hegesippus was in his case as in many others merely a Graecized form of his original name Joseph, and the two names were possibly interchanged to some extent, as in the time of De Voragine himself there was current under the name of *Egesippus* a free version of part of *Josephus's* Jewish War with additions from his Antiquities and other sources. Now we know that *Hegesippus* wrote largely about James the Just, and his Memoirs were still in existence at least as late as the 6th cent. It is the more probable that his account of James *did* include this story because we have already seen that he used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The concurrence of De Voragine with Gregory in the insertion of the word 'Rise' seems to point to the existence of some other authority besides Jerome.

\* The 'linen cloth' (Matt. xxvii. 59) in which the body was wrapped by Joseph of Arimathaea.

† 'The servant of the high priest'—not a servant as the A. V. twice has it—is mentioned in Matt. xxvi. 51, Mark xiv. 47, Luke

he went to \*James and appeared unto him.

2. For James had †sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein ‡ he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he saw him rising again from the dead.

3. . . . 'Bring a table and bread.'

4. . . . [And ?] he took up the bread

xxii. 50, John xviii. 10. He had helped in the seizure of Jesus, and had had his right ear cut off with a sword by Simon Peter, but touched and healed by Jesus: his name was Malchus, i.e. Maluch. One must guess in the absence of context that he had been entrusted with the setting of the watch (mentioned by Matt. only) over the tomb, had been witness to some of the phaenomena of the resurrection, and had thrown himself at the feet of Jesus.

\* This mention of James the Lord's brother without anything to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee shows that this passage *must* have been written *after* the martyrdom of the latter, A.D. 44.

† Cf. the oath of more than 40 men 'neither to eat nor drink till they had killed Paul' (Acts xxiii. 12).

‡ According to this reading James was either one and the same with James the son of Alphaeus or else the Last Supper was not confined to the Twelve.

The first supposition accords with the 'Hieronymian' theory as to the degree of relation between James and Jesus; but that theory, apart from its extreme improbability, is not known to have been held by any one whomsoever before 382-3 A.D., when Jerome advanced it.

Of the second supposition we can only say that it is *not absolutely contradicted* by the statement in Matt. xxvi. 20 that Jesus sat down 'with the Twelve,' and in Luke xx. 14 'the Apostles' is now recognised as the true reading and not 'the twelve Apostles.'

The oath of James reads as if suggested by the declaration of Jesus that he would drink no more of the fruit of the vine till he drank it with them in the kingdom of God. James might not take the same oath because Jesus bade the rest drink the cup: but he might take an oath against eating bread because the bread of the Last Supper had already been eaten.

Bishop Lightfoot reads 'wherein the Lord had drunk the cup'

i.e. *Dominus* for *Domini*. He says (*Ep. to the Galatians*, 266) 'I have adopted the reading "*Dominus*," as the Greek translation has *Kύριος*, and it also suits the context better; for the point of time which we should naturally expect is not the institution of the eucharist but the Lord's death. Our Lord had more than once spoken of His sufferings under the image of draining the cup (Matt. xx. 22, 23, xxvi. 39, 42, Mark x. 38, 39, xiv. 36, Luke xxii. 42—comp. *Mart. Polyc.* 14, *ἐν τῇ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου*); and he is represented as using this metaphor here.' He thinks it probable 'that a transcriber of Jerome carelessly wrote down the familiar phrase "the cup of the Lord."'

It is true that 'the point of time which we should naturally expect is not the institution of the eucharist but the Lord's death,' and it might have been added that the latter is the point of time actually indicated by Gregory and pseudo-Abdias. They however, as we have seen, either wrote roughly from memory, or followed some other authority, and I have above suggested how the oath may be connected with the supper: at the supper Jesus spoke plainly of his approaching death, and at least immediately after it he is represented in Matt. xxvi. 32 as announcing his resurrection.

Again we should not expect an *historical narrative* to speak of the death of Jesus 'under the image of draining the cup': this may be the language of prophecy or rapt devotion, it is not natural to history. In the N. T. the metaphor is only used by Jesus himself, and by him only on two occasions.

[Of course 'the cup' can hardly mean 'the cup' of the eucharist, if we read *Dominus*, for Matt. xxvi. 27-9, Mark xiv. 23-5, and Luke xxii. 18-19 represent Jesus as refraining from it; nor can it be strained to signify the anodyne mixture offered to him, as to other condemned persons, on the way to execution, since Matt. xxvii. 34 and Mark xv. 23 distinctly state that he refused this mixture.]

But it is on textual grounds that I have the most confidence in rejecting *Dominus*. So far as I can discover, that reading is not known to exist in any Latin MS., and is only supposed by Bishop Lightfoot to have existed at some time in some MS. because the Greek translator has *ὁ Κύριος* (= *Dominus*) instead of *τοῦ Κυρίου* (= *Domini*). But one need not read much of the Greek translation to see that (i.) it must have been made from a very corrupt Latin MS.; or (ii.) the translator understood Latin very badly; or (iii.) he never looked twice at the sentences he was translating. Only a few lines before, he actually renders *apparuit ei*, 'appeared to him' i.e. James, by *ἠρρέεν αὐτῷ* 'opened to him' as if the Latin had been *aperuit ei*. Such a man's translation, opposed, as I



and \* blessed and broke and afterward gave to James the Just† and said to him 'My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from them that sleep.'

‡30. (Matt. xxviii.)  
Luke xxiv. 39, 40.  
(*Nazarene.*)

And, when he came to §' those about

presume, to all known MSS. of the original, has next to no authority. Let me add that Sedulius Scotus, who flourished about the year 800, in a note on 1 Cor. xv. 7 says that the James there mentioned was 'the son of Alphaeus who took witness that he would not eat bread FROM THE SUPPER OF THE LORD until he saw Christ rising again: AS IS READ IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.' I have little doubt that Sedulius got this not merely from the Gospel according to the Hebrews (which however would be quite enough), but from Jerome himself, since he wrote *Explanations of Jerome's Prefaces to the Gospels*, a work still extant. The original of the above passage of Sedulius is Alphaei filio, qui se testatus est a coena Domini non comesurum panem usquequo videret Christum resurgentem: sicut in Evangelio secundum Hebraeos legitur.

\* Blessed not *it* (as our A. V. wrongly supposes in the similar passages Matt. xxvi. 26 and Luke xxiv. 30), but *God*. Graces both before and after meat were enjoined by the oral law: the words of the former varied with the character of the food, those of the latter with the number of those present. In the *Mishna*, *Berachoth*, vii. § 3, may be seen many forms of grace after meat: they all begin with the words 'Let us bless' or 'Bless ye.' From the note of Maimonides to *Berachoth*, vi. § 8, it would seem that the blessing before meat began with the words 'Blessed be thou O Lord our God': the *Mishna* itself (*Berachoth*, vi. § 1) tells us that when the food was bread the words 'who bringest forth bread from the earth' were inserted.

† Hegesippus (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23) says that he was 'named by all men Just from the times of the Lord even to us' (ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων Δίκαιος ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου χρόνων μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν).

‡ Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 3, 'Εγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ, ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς 'Αάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδτε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ψαυμάριον ἀσώματον.' Καὶ ἐνθὺς αὐτοῦ ἠψάντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κρατη-

Peter, he said to them 'Take, feel me, and

θέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θανάτου κατεφρόνησαν, εὐρέθησαν δὲ ὑπὲρ θάνατον. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ Πατρὶ—'For I both know that he was in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is [in it]. And, when he had come to those about Peter, he said to them "Take, feel me, and see that I am not a bodiless devil." And straightway they touched him and believed, being constrained by his flesh and spirit. Because of this they despised even death, and were found superior to death. And after the resurrection he ate and drank with them as one in the flesh, though spiritually united to the Father.'

Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 36, § 11) says 'And the same [Ignatius] writing to Smyrnaeans has used sayings from a source unknown to me, proceeding in some such words as these respecting Christ: "When—believed"' ('Ο δ' αὐτὸς Σμυρναίοις γράφων οὐκ αἰδ' ὀπόθεν ῥητοῖς συγκέχρηται τοιαῦτά τινα περὶ Χριστοῦ διεξίων· 'Εγὼ—ἐπίστευσαν [quoted with the sole variation ἐλήλυθεν for ἦλθεν]).

Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* § 16) says that Ignatius in the above Epistle 'also puts forth evidence respecting the person of Christ from the Gospel which has been lately translated by me, saying "But I have both seen him in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is [in it]. And, when he came to Peter and to those who were with Peter, he said to them 'Behold, feel and see me that I am not a bodiless devil.' And straightway they touched him and believed"' (in qua et de Evangelio quod nuper a me translatum est super persona Christi ponit testimonium, dicens 'Ego vero et post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi et credo quia sit. Et, quando venit ad Petrum et ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis "Ecce, palpite et videte me quia non sum daemonium incorporale." Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt').

Theodoret (*Inconfusus*, dial. II.—opp. ed. Sirmond. *Par.* 1642, vol. iv. 86) quotes Ignatius by name down to ἐπίστευσαν, 'believed,' without variation.

As all students of Ignatius know, there have been long and fierce controversies as to the epistles bearing his name. Bishop Lightfoot in the *Contemporary Review* for Feb. 1875 looks upon it as now certain that Ignatius wrote epistles, and that either the three of the Syriac edition (which does not include that to Smyrnaeans) or the shorter of the two Greek editions (which does) must be taken to be his genuine work: he gives good reasons why the seven epistles of this Greek edition, even if they be spurious, can hardly have been later than the middle of the 2nd cent., and he adds

further reasons showing why, against his former opinions, he has 'grave and increasing doubts whether, after all, they are not the genuine utterances of Ignatius himself.' From a note in Zahn's 1876 edition of Ignatius I find not only that his championship of these Greek letters had converted continental opposition but that on Dec. 16, 1875, Bishop Lightfoot sent him a letter containing the words 'since I wrote the article on Ignatius I have been more and more impressed with the unity and priority of the seven Epistles, as representing the genuine Ignatius.' I therefore believe that I am not going too far in assuming that in the judgement of competent critics the genuineness of the Epistle to Smyrnaeans is at last settled.

I now come to the words of Ignatius. If the first sentence is to be rendered as I have rendered it, it is very clumsy Greek: but I am obliged to give up my earlier rendering, 'For I know and believe that he was in the flesh even after the resurrection,' on account of the anti-climax, not to say that we should have looked for αὐτὸν after πιστεύω instead of where it is. Both Jerome (who seems not to have seen any Ignatian epistles but to have merely translated from Eusebius) and the translator whose full Latin version has come down to us seem to have been as much put out as I am, for they both render 'For I have both seen him in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is [in it],' which, in the absence of any various reading εἶδον, is an impossible solecism. Happily this sentence is no part of Ignatius's quotation.

The extent of the quotation itself is doubtful. It seems to begin at the second sentence, by Ignatius's saying not 'For' but 'And.' Does it, however, include the words 'constrained by his flesh and spirit'? With Eusebius and Theodoret, I think not; but if this view be right it is a pity that Ignatius did not begin a new sentence. Again the reading and translation of these last words are very doubtful. The MS. has the very strange κραθέντες 'having mixed with,' i.e. come in contact with 'his flesh and spirit' (or, flesh and *breath*, but that in conjunction with σὰρξ πνεῦμα must almost necessarily mean 'spirit,' and that σὰρξ καὶ πνεῦμα 'flesh and spirit,' or body and mind (as we should say) is a favourite phrase with Ignatius). Voss reads κρηνθέντες 'constrained by his flesh and spirit,' and this was clearly the reading, or conjecture, of the Latin translator, who renders 'convicti.' The reading or conjecture which is at the root of the Armenian version was clearly χρηθέντες and αἵματι, for Zahn gives its renderings as 'sacra cena usi' and αἵματι: to the Syriac translator from whom the Armenian version was made the passage meant 'using his flesh and blood,'

i.e. making an eucharistic supper. Apart, however, from the fact that we should have looked for *χρώμενοι* rather than *χοιθέρες*, it is hard to believe that the latter would have been altered to the much less common *καθέρες*, while the converse is likely enough. With only unsatisfactory readings to choose from I felt inclined to read *κρέα θέρες . . . αἱμάτι*, 'setting meat for' the requirements of 'his flesh and blood,' seeing that the parallel passage Luke xxiv. 39, 40, is followed by a request of Jesus for food, which is thereupon given him: but, not to say that the words 'and blood' would seem superfluous, Ignatius immediately goes on to tell us in words taken from Acts x. 41 that Jesus ate and drank after the resurrection. As the least evil I therefor read *κρυηθέρες*, out of which (if written *καθερές*) the reading of the Greek MS. would easily arise.

Jerome (*Comm. in Isai.*, lib. xviii. *Prol.*) also writes 'For, when the Apostles thought him a spirit, or, according to the Gospel of the Hebrews which the Nazarenes read "a bodiless devil" (Quum enim Apostoli eum putarent spiritum, vel, iuxta Evangelium quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazaraei, incorporate daemonium).'

Origen (*De Princ.*, *Prol.* c. 8, extant only in a Latin translation) says 'But the appellation *ἄσωματον*, that is "bodiless," is not only unused and unknown in many other writers, but also in our writings. If, however, any one should wish to quote to us from that little book which is called *the Teaching of Peter*, where the Saviour seems to say to the disciples "I am not a bodiless devil," in the first place he is to be answered that that book is not reckoned among ecclesiastical books, and to be shown that it is a writing neither of Peter's nor of any other person whomsoever who has been inspired by the spirit of God' (*Appellatio autem ἄσωματον*, i.e. *incorporei*, non solum apud multos alios verum etiam apud nostras scripturas est inusitata et incognita. Si vero quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libro qui *Petri Doctrina* appellatur, ubi Salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere 'non sum daemonium incorporeum,' primo respondendum est ei quoniam ille liber inter libros ecclesiasticos non habetur, et ostendendum quia neque Petri est ista [so Zahn rightly for 'ipsa'] scriptura neque alterius cuiusquam qui spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus).

Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, 601-2) thinks that Jerome in the passage I first quoted from him wrote hastily, and that the exact words of Ignatius were not to be found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He holds it much more likely that Ignatius quoted *the Teaching of Peter*, and possible that he used neither one nor the other, but a third work which had availed itself of the same

oral tradition. He says he has elsewhere shown that Ignatius twice agrees with our Matthew against the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thinks it hardly conceivable that, considering his position towards Jewish Christendom, he should, if he referred to the Nazarene Gospel at all, do so only once. I cannot find that he has shown the genuine Ignatius in agreement with our Matthew against the Gospel according to the Hebrews more than once—namely, where Ignatius says that Jesus was baptized by John ‘that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him’ (*ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ*, *Smyrn.* i. 1), Matthew having ‘to fulfil all righteousness’ while the Ebionite Gospel (see Fr. 7) had ‘that all things should be fulfilled.’ On the other hand it is at least worth notice that of Ignatius’s 12 references to a Matthæan text there is not one which is an unmistakeably exact quotation, while the words used differ several times very markedly from our Matthew; and that in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, xix. 2, Ignatius describes the appearance of the Star of the Nativity thus:—‘A star shone in heaven above all the stars, and its light was unspeakable, and its novelty afforded amazement. And all the rest of the stars, together with sun and moon, became a group to the star, and of itself it made its light exceed them all; and there was confusion as to whence this novel and irregular phaenomenon occurred to them’ (*Ἄστηρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκλάλητον ἦν, καὶ ξενισμὸν παρέειχεν ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ. Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἄστρα ἅμα ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ χόρος ἐγένετο τῷ ἀστέρι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑπερβάλλων τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ πάντα· ταραχὴ τε ἦν πόθεν ἡ καινότης ἡ ἀνόμοιος αὐτοῖς*). This can hardly be our Matthew—even our Matthew heightened—and, though the *Protevangelium of James* § 21 tells of ‘an immense star shining among the stars of the heaven and dulling the other stars so that they were not to be seen’ (*ἀστέρα παρμεγέθη λάμπαντα ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις τοῦ οὐράνου καὶ ἀμβλύνοντα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστέρας ὥστε μὴ φαίνεσθαι αὐτούς*), yet we cannot trace that book back to within a century and a quarter of Ignatius (if so early), nor does it say anything about the amazing behaviour of the other heavenly bodies. I do not deny that his account of the star *may* be mere tradition, and that all of his other Matthæan references may be references to our Matthew, but I say that there is something substantial to be said for the idea that, if he did use our Matthew in referring to the baptism of Jesus, he also did use a form of the Matthæan Gospel which was not exactly our Matthew. I may add that it would not be one whit more surprising that Ignatius should quote the Nazarene Gospel once only than that knowing Acts, as he shows that he did, he should never once refer to the Gospel according to Luke.

Lastly, if, as I believe and as Zahn also seems to believe, Hilgenfeld is right in identifying (see my Part III. ii. a) *the Teaching of Peter* with *the Preaching of Peter* and that with *the Preaching of Peter and Paul* and that again with *the Preaching of Paul*, we have already (see Fr. 6) seen that it contained evangelic matter in common with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the presumption is that if either borrowed from the other it was the Teaching which borrowed from the Gospel and not *vice versa* (see Part III. ii. a).

In no case would I have agreed to set aside the very precise statement of Jerome that a passage substantially the same as that of Ignatius was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the presumption (derived from Irenaeus, from Eusebius's statement about Papias, and from the agreement of our Gospel with certain peculiarities of Justin) in favour of the chronological priority of the latter over *the Teaching of Peter*.

It may be added that Jerome has three variations from the text of Ignatius—'to Peter and to those who were with Peter' for 'to those about Peter'; 'Behold,' for 'Take'; and 'feel and see me.' Of these the first and third look like mere differences of feeling in translating, and the second may be a mere slip, suggested by *ἴδετε*, 'see' or 'behold,' a few words later on. It is just possible that Jerome was consciously or unconsciously correcting Ignatius's quotation by the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but the use of 'Peter' and not 'Simon' (see Fr. 19 and Fr. 20) or 'Kephias' makes this less likely.

From the second of the two passages in Jerome there can be no reasonable doubt that this is the same appearance of Jesus described in Luke xxiv. 36 seqq., and the parallel in v. 39 of that chapter is a close one—'handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones according as ye behold me having' (*ψηλαφίσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὅσπερ οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα*).

§ The phrase which I thus literally render may also mean 'Peter and those about him.' In Mark iv. 10, Luke xxii. 49, *οἱ περὶ αὐτόν*, 'those about him,' are distinguished from Jesus himself. In Acts xiii. 13 *οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον* includes Paul, and the same might be said of xxi. 8 but that the words are there rightly left out by editors as spurious. In John xi. 19 Tischendorf reads (with A and the greater number, but much the less *weight*, of authorities) *τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίας*—'And many of the Jews came to those [*feminine*, the women] about Martha and Mary'—and Alford is almost inclined to do the same: the reading certainly seems far less likely than the other to be due to the carelessness or stupidity of a copyist. If the reading be right, then Martha and Mary are

see that I am not a bodiless \* devil.' And straightway they touched him and believed.

(Of very doubtful connexion.)

†31. Just now my †<sup>1</sup> mother the Holy Spirit  
(Nazarene.)

certainly included (see v. 31). And there is no doubt that in the passage before us Peter himself is included.

'Those about Peter' is not necessarily a synonym for 'the Apostles,' though they are comprised in it. According to Luke the appearance was to 'the Eleven and those with them' (τοὺς ἑνδεκά καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, v. 33).

It is worth noticing that in Mark xvi. Codex L gives an alternative ending to the Gospel, which it says 'is current in some quarters' (φέρεται πον), beginning thus, 'And all that had been bidden them they told in short to those about Peter' (Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξηγγειλαν), referring to the message sent in v. 7 to 'his disciples and Peter' (τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ). So too *k* of the Old Latin (Codex Bobbiensis, 4th or 5th cent.), the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Aethiopic.

\* All other translations of this passage that I have seen render δαιμόνιον 'spirit,' which is doubtless more elegant, but entirely opposed to the usage of the N. T. and Christian writers. There is nothing at all surprising in the expression 'bodiless devil,' for the Jews believed that the devils which possessed the living were sometimes the spirits of dead persons. In the Curetonian Syriac 'devils' is several times given as the translation of πνεύματα, 'spirits.'

† Origen (*Comm. in Iohann.* iii. § 63), 'Εάν δὲ προσέται τις τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίων Εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν "Ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν μία τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρας τὸ μέγα Ταβώρ"—' But if any one admits the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour himself says &c.'

He quotes it elsewhere (*Homil. in Ier.* xv.) without the words 'by one of my hairs,' but these are given by Jerome, who also quotes the passage thus far (*Comm. in Mic.* vii. 6—in quo ex persona Salvatoris dicitur 'Modo tulit me mater mea Spiritus Sanctus in uno capillorum meorum'), likewise mentioning that it was put in the mouth of Jesus.

Hilgenfeld says (*Nov. Test. extra Can. Recep.* iv. 23) that this

<sup>1</sup> For note see page 76.

passage was commonly referred to the Temptation, but that Baur (*Manichäisches Religionssystem*, 485) had rightly assigned it to the Transfiguration. On turning to Baur I find that he gets this connexion by fitting together a bit of the Clementine Homilies, a bit of Manichaeism, and a bit of Valentinianism, starting from the assumption that the feminine nature attributed to the Holy Spirit postulates an identity with the Gnostic Sophia. The answer to Baur is not merely that the Fragments contain no trace of sympathy with the Gnosticism of the Clementine Homilies, no Manichaeism, no Valentinianism, but that the words 'my mother, the Holy Spirit' admit of an ideally simple explanation which is at the same time consistent with the severest orthodoxy—an explanation which I mention in my next note and fully justify in Part. III. i. I may add that Mt. Tabor is in no way indicated by the canonical Gospels as the scene of the Transfiguration; in fact their narrative is quite inconsistent with such a supposition, and the mountain undoubtedly owes this traditional honour to its striking physical prominence. Nor do we find it as the Mt. of the Transfiguration even in tradition before the middle of the 4th cent.

My own impulse first was and still is to connect this fragment with the Temptation, which would appear to have taken place somewhere between the Jordan and Nazareth, for Jesus was *returning* (Luke iv. 1), he had come from Nazareth (Mark i. 9), and Nazareth is the first town named (Matt. iv. 13, Luke iv. 16) as visited by him after his return. And this suits the position of Tabor, which does lie between the Jordan and Nazareth. In the next place it is curious that the arrival of Jesus at the scene of the Temptation is ascribed in Matthew and Luke to the personal action of the Holy Spirit, whom the former represents as 'leading' him 'up' and the latter as 'leading' or 'driving' him. One is very strongly induced to think that where our Matthew says Jesus was 'led up' another early account may have had it that he was 'borne up': indeed this *may* have been the meaning of an Aramaic original, ambiguous possibly and therefor misconceived, or softened into 'led up' because by the Spirit was understood the Spirit received into him at the Baptism, and acting from *within* him.

If connected with the Temptation, this passage might possibly have formed part of an account of the speech of Jesus in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke iv. 16 seqq.) on his return. Or it may have belonged to his answer to Satan in Matt. iv. 7. Adopting the text of Matthew (A. V.) the request of Satan and answer of Jesus would run thus:—'And saith unto him "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at



\* took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain † Tabor.

any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' " Jesus saith unto him "It is written again, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' *Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain Tabor.*" " Or the order of the last two sentences might be reversed.

This hypothesis probably seems to the reader utterly fantastic and improbable. But let us look at it more closely. Jesus is asked to throw himself down in reliance on the promise of God, to prove that he is Son of God. He replies that we are forbidden to try God in this manner, and adds that he has already experienced the truth of God's promise, since he had just been borne up by a single hair on to Mt. Tabor.

The circumstantial evidence however is not strong enough to warrant our assigning to this fragment any definite place in relation either to the text of Matthew or the life of Jesus: I merely suggest in all fearfulness this connexion for it.

‡ In Hebrew *ruach* 'spirit' is sometimes masculine, though more commonly feminine; but in Aramaic the corresponding word *ruha* is feminine. Matt. i. 18 and Luke i. 35 assign to the Holy Spirit the chief, and seemingly the sole, agency in the conception of Jesus by Mary. See my remarks on the theology of this fragment in Part III. i.

\* Hilgenfeld notes the following analogous passages: (i.) Ezek. viii. 3 (A. V.) 'And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem'; (ii.) Bel and the Dragon, 36 (A. V.) 'Then the angel of the Lord took him by the crown, and bare him by the hair of his head, and through the vehemency of his spirit set him in Babylon over the den'; (iii.) Acts viii. 39, 40 (A. V.) 'The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing. But Philip was found at Azotus.' Hilgenfeld rightly observes that the antiquity of this fragment is exalted, rather than (as some thought) detracted from, by the mention of such an incident. Let me add to the passages compared by him 1 Kings xviii. 12 (A. V.) 'And it shall come to pass, as soon as I am gone from thee, that the Spirit of the Lord shall carry thee whither I know not,' and 2 Kings ii. 16 (A. V.) 'lest peradventure the Spirit of the Lord hath taken him up and cast him upon some mountain, or into some valley.'

† About seven miles E. of Nazareth. A mound-shaped height

§ 32.

He that hath marveled shall reign, and  
he that hath reigned shall || rest.

¶ 33. Luke xiii. 3?  
(Ebionite.)

Unless ye cease from *sacrificing* [spu-  
rious] the\*\* wrath shall not cease from you.

of some 1,000 ft., rising by itself from the plain, and affording a wide and far view. The name seems to mean 'height.'

§ Clement of Alexandria, after citing Plato and *the Traditions of Matthias* as testimonies to the value of wonder in stimulating enquiry, says 'just as in the Gospel according to the Hebrews it is written &c.' (*Strom.* ii. 9—for the Greek see p. 3, note).

Hilgenfeld connects this fragment with Matt. xi. 8, 'Come unto me &c.' The connexion is just possible, but I do not think likely.

|| 'Rest' in this spiritual sense is a term peculiar to Matthew, who uses the noun in xi. 29 and the corresponding verb active in the verse before.

¶ Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 16), Φάσκουσι δὲ καὶ ἐλθόντα, καὶ ὑφηγησάμενον (ὡς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει) ὅτι ἦλθεν, καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή—'And they say that he both came, and (as their so-called Gospel has it) instructed them that he had come, to dissolve the sacrifices, and "Unless &c."'

It is surely impossible that Jesus ever uttered this threat, and we have already (see notes on Fr. 5 and Fr. 25) found grave cause to suspect the Ebionites of adapting their Gospel to suit their own views. But only the word *sacrificing* needs be spurious.

Hilgenfeld would insert these words in that passage of the Ebionite Gospel which answers to the place occupied by Matt. v. 23, 24, in the canonical Gospel! To me it seems very possible that they were part of a paragraph answering to Luke xiii. 1-3, where Jesus takes for his text the death of 'the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.' Our fragment would then answer to Luke xiii. 3 'Nay, I say unto you, but except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner be destroyed.'

\*\* Matthew (iii. 7) and Luke (iii. 7) have each 'the wrath' once for 'the wrath of God,' and Luke also has 'there shall be wrath' (xxi. 23). John has only 'the wrath of God' (once, iii. 36), which the others do not use.