

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*PAPIAS AND THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE  
HEBREWS.*

DISCOVERY itself is worthless without critical capacity to appreciate the treasure-trove. Fortunately we have in Professor F. C. Conybeare an explorer of the rich field of early Armenian church literature thoroughly capable of perceiving the bearing and value of his discoveries. And yet all human experience would be at fault if his estimates left nothing to be changed or added by others. What is here submitted proceeds from the conviction that the whole significance of Conybeare's famous Edschmiadzin codex has not yet been perceived, and that the discoverer himself has, in one respect, both overlooked and obscured it. Ten years having now passed since he exploited this text, with its remarkable attribution of Mark xvi. 9-20 to "the Elder Aristo," it will be expedient to quote some of the discoverer's conclusions which have special bearing on the question whether the Armenian scribe had access, directly or indirectly, to Papias, and whether, if so, he gives us any new knowledge of Papias' text. The conclusions we refer to are here quoted under the original numbering from Conybeare's article in the *EXPOSITOR* for 1895 (v. 2), p. 421:—

7. The episode of the woman taken in adultery [is] alone contained among old codices in the Edschmiadzin copy, but in a new form.

8. The episode translated from that copy [see below].

9. Papias *and the Gospel according to the Hebrews* [italics ours] probably gave it in the new form found in this MS.

10. Probabilities as to this new form of the text of Jn. viii. 1-11.

11. The Armenians excluded this pericope because they knew it was due to Papias, not to John; and excluded Mark xvi. 9-20 because they knew it was Aristion's, and not Mark's writing.

14. Bearing of the appearance in the same codex of the new form

of John viii. 1-11, on the question of the origin of the title "Ariston Eritzu." They both came out of Papias.

17. Contrast between the new, or Edschmiadzin, and the old form of Jn. viii. 1-11.

18. Antiquity of both forms.

Conybeare's argument for the derivation of the new form of the pericope, and of the title "Ariston Eritzu" from Papias, has won wide assent, at least as regards the title,<sup>1</sup> since Papias' *Exegesis* (*Exegeses*?) is known to have survived by many centuries<sup>2</sup> the writing of the Edschmiadzin codex in 989 A.D. Whether the cancellations and other alleged evidences of removal from the primitive Armenian gospels of the pericope adulterae, appendix to Mark, "Western" addition Luke xxii. 43, 44, and the like, was due to use of Papias by these earlier authorities also, seems to us more than doubtful, since the phenomena adduced from Armenian texts are not different from the Greek texts,<sup>3</sup> and imply no more than a knowledge of the non-appearance of these sections in the standard authorities. Against it Burkitt rightly opposes "the absence of the *Pericope* both from the *Diatessaron* and from all early forms of the Four Gospels in Syriac." This, and the location of it by Conybeare's codex in the usual place, after John vii. 52, with the usual title given it by

<sup>1</sup> Burkitt, *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, p. 89 (see below), raises doubts against the derivation of the pericope text from Papias. For the views of Zahn and Resch see *Expositor*, iv. 10 (1894), pp. 219-232. Harnack also considers the title due to knowledge of Papias. The question may be here deferred.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Lit.*, i. 38, S. 69. To these evidences of the continued use of Papias down to the Reformation times add that cited by Conybeare (*ubi supra*) of the gloss "Aristion" written against the margin of Eus. iii. 39, 9, in the translation of Rufinus in a recent Bodleian manuscript. This gloss is a close parallel to the phenomenon of the title in the Edschmiadzin codex. Both evidence consultation of Papias. Similarly the Baroccianus extracts edited by de Boer. The question in the case of the Armenian scribe "John" his whether is data were at first hand or not.

<sup>3</sup> Burkitt, *ubi supra*, p. 83.

Armenian scribes, "the things of the adulteress," suggest for the peculiarities of this text the same explanation we are driven to apply to the gloss on the Bodleian Rufinus. The scribe's knowledge of Papias was an exceptional bit of special information for the airing of which he found welcome opportunity by prefixing to Mark xvi. 9 ff. the "Ariston Eritzou," and by giving "the things of the adulteress" in this new, and—to his mind—superior form.<sup>1</sup> If his knowledge of Papias may be assumed to be direct in the case of Mark xvi. 9 ff., we may infer it in John viii. 1 ff. also. It has at all events acquired immense importance.

Direct or indirect derivation of this text from Papias becomes probable when we compare it with the testimony of Eusebius as to what he read in Papias: for, while Eusebius does declare that the same anecdote was *also* contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it is of Papias that he says ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, and the difference of this description, "a woman taken in many sins, against whom they bore witness before the Lord," from the description in the pericope adulterae in all known texts save D and 1071 (ἐπὶ ἁμαρτία) is so noticeable, that until the Edschmiadzin codex appeared critics no less eminent than Hilgenfeld wholly refused to admit the identity of the two. But place alongside the Eusebian description of Papias' anecdote of "a woman accused of many sins before the Lord" the form of the pericope adulterae found in the Edschmiadzin codex, and a relation becomes very probable.

<sup>1</sup> See the photographic facsimile of the page containing Mark xvi. 9 ff. facing p. civ. of Swete's *Commentary on Mark*, together with Conybeare's statement (ibid.) that "the scribe adds the title *Ariston Eritzou* as it were by an afterthought." It presented in fact every appearance of an interlineated gloss. The title "the things of the adulteress" is added on the margin.

A certain woman was taken in sins (= malitiis), against whom all bore witness that she was deserving of death. They brought her to Jesus to see what he would command, in order that they might malign him. Jesus made answer and said, "Come ye, who are without sin, cast stones and stone her to death (*lit. βάλλετε λίθους και λιθοβολητον ποιείτε*)." But he himself, bowing his head, was writing with his finger on the earth, to declare their sins, and they were seeing their several sins on the stones. And filled with shame they departed, and no one remained but only the woman. Saith Jesus, "Go in peace and present the offering for sins, as in their law is written."

The distinctive feature of this form is the explanation of the writing of Jesus on the earth by a reference to His preceding utterance ("ye who are without sin, take stones"; cf. "they were seeing their several *sins* on the stones"); in the rest of the story the author takes little interest. Echoes of this trait are found in uncial U, and some 20 lesser MSS. which after *εις την γην*, in John viii. 8, add: *ένδς έκάστου αύτών τας άμαρτίας*, and in Jerome, who writes (*Pelag.*, 2, 17): "Jesus inclinans digito scribebat in terra, eorum videlicet qui accusabant et omnium peccata mortalium, secundum quod scriptum est in propheta (Jer. xvii. 13): *Relinquentes autem te in terra scribentur.*"<sup>1</sup> Professor C. R. Gregory, of Leipzig, quotes<sup>2</sup> also "an old manuscript," not otherwise defined, as changing verse 9 to "And they, when they read it, went out one by one." This, which Professor Gregory proceeds to fancifully expound, apparently as if historical, may be a further trace of the influence of the Edschmiadzin form of the story. If, however, this is simply syrhr: *et illi cum soluti* essent, the reading has no right to be considered ancient from its attestation, and bears every mark internally of being an explanatory substitution of *αναγρόντες* for *άκούσαντες*, to agree with v. 8. If there were independent

<sup>1</sup> Conybeare, ubi supra; cf. Tisch. *N.T.* ad. loc.

<sup>2</sup> *The Biblical World*, xii. 5 (Nov. 1898), pp. 303-306. H. B. Swete also somewhere in his *Commentary on Mark* refers to a MS. having a similar peculiarity.

ground for suspecting the lateness of the Edschmiadzin text, this reading might account for the whole edifice of the legendary addition regarding what Jesus wrote. It would be a simple development of the common addition *καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι* (cf. Edsch. "filled with shame." But Jerome and Bar Nebraeus, who draws a similar reading (Ipsa vero inclinatus uniuscuiusque eorum peccata in terra scripsit) from an Alexandrine MS., show its great antiquity. From these meagre traces, however, we might never have known, but for Conybeare's discovery, that there was a version of the pericope corresponding to the Eusebian description.

Professor Burkitt brings forward, indeed, what he himself describes as a "verbose paraphrase" of the pericope, which had been adduced by Gwynn<sup>1</sup> from the Syriac *Ecclesiastical History* of Zacharias. This was taken, possibly in its present form, from "a copy of the Greek Gospels which belonged to Mara of Amid during his exile at Alexandria (517-527 A.D.)," but as it betrays no acquaintance with the distinctive feature of the Edschmiadzin text (Jesus wrote their sins), and describes the woman as "found with child of adultery," it is clearly independent of the Armenian, which, as Burkitt admits, "has a decidedly ancient air, much more so than that of Zacharias." Burkitt's text, accordingly, is of interest only as an example in the same category as Conybeare's, illustrating by its interjected comments (e.g. "for He knew, as God, their lusts of uncleanness and their doings"), its insistence on the great wickedness of the accusers, and its omission of the objectionable clause, "Neither do I condemn thee," the course likely to be taken in expository paraphrase. It presupposes the common text, as is the case at a much earlier date (250 A.D.) with the *Syriac Didaskalia*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Trans. of R. Irish Acad.*, pp. 291 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *T. u. U. N. F.* x. 2, 1904, 38, 35.

“ . . . that *sinful woman* whom the elders placed before him (Jesus) and went away leaving him to pronounce judgment. But he, *who searcheth hearts*, asked her and said to her, ‘My daughter, did the elders condemn thee?’ She answered him, ‘No, Lord.’ He said to her, ‘Go; neither do I condemn thee.’ ”

For in spite of Professor Conybeare’s favourable judgment, and the undeniable internal and external evidence of extreme antiquity, his newly discovered version bears no other relation to the ordinary text of the pericope adulterae than just this of expository paraphrase with imaginative embellishment, the type termed by its Jewish exponents *midrash* and which Papias seems to render by *ἐξήγησις*. The Edschmiadzin text of the pericope adulterae is a later moralizing interpretation of the well known Greek form and neither older nor independent.

Indeed, it is hard to understand how so clear-sighted a critic as Conybeare, unless somewhat under the glamour of his own great discovery, could write the sentence (p. 408), “The shorter text of the Edschmiadzin codex represents the form in which Papias and the *Hebrew Gospel* gave the episode. The longer form current (John viii. 1–11 T.R.) is the same story *edited, so to speak, for inclusion in the Greek Gospels* at some very remote epoch.” Then the notorious stumbling-blocks of the longer form, the definition of the sin as “adultery” and the condonation, “Neither do I condemn thee,” will have been introduced by the editors! And these amazing editors will have thought to make the story more acceptable for currency in the Greek Gospels by striking out the miraculous evidence of Jesus’ insight (as *καρδιογνωστῆς θεός*) into the hearts of the wicked Jews! No one is better able than Professor Conybeare to appreciate upon maturer reflection that this is simply an inversion of the probabilities. Perhaps it may be the easier if it transpire that his discovery then obtains all the greater interest. True, the Edschmiadzin

text is shorter, but only by virtue of leaving out the nature and evidence of the woman's wrong-doing and the Lord's leniency. These were just the objectionable features to those who, according to Augustine,<sup>1</sup> "from a fear lest their wives should gain impunity in sin, removed from their manuscripts the Lord's act of indulgence to the adulteress." Also it inserts a parallel to Matthew viii. 4, whereas the longer form does not even indicate that the woman was repentant. But are *such* abbreviations and *such* change evidences of priority? And how significant are the additions! The writing on the ground, it is explained in an exegetical supplement (cf. Jerome *videlicet*) to verse 6, was "to declare their sins; and they were seeing their several sins on the stones." Instead of the attitude toward the law so characteristic of Jesus in the authentic records (Mark x. 1-12 = Matt. xix. 1-9) there is an avoidance of any implied disparagement of its harshness and an inculcation of obedience to it, although superseded,<sup>2</sup> as in Matthew v. 18 f., viii. 14, xxiii. 1-3. We have no need to deny the "archaic" character of the Edschmiadzin text, and we admit that it may reflect Papias; but what can be more obvious, when it and the Greek form are placed side by side, than that the latter is the original, and the Armenian the form from which the stumblingblocks have been edited out, while edifying evidences of the divine omniscience of Jesus have been edited in? Then so much the worse for Papias.

Professor Conybeare is also convinced that the Armenian is the text of "the Hebrew Gospel." Why he thinks so is not apparent, unless he infers it from Jerome's acquaintance with the idea (*scribebat peccata eorum*) in which he finds a fulfilment of the scripture, "Relinquentes autem te in terra scribentur." We admit that "Jerome may have based his remark on the Gospel according to the Hebrews

<sup>1</sup> *Conj. adult.* ii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Note the "Johannine" expression "written in *their* law."

which he had in his hands." But he also knew Papias ; and if, as Zahn thinks, his knowledge of Papias was at second hand, his "scripture fulfilment" might come to him indirectly, as we find it in Uncial U, or possibly even by oral transmission from "the elders" themselves.

For if the Armenian form was that of both Papias and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to what origin can we assign the earlier and more authentic form of the Greek codices? Gospel sources containing material of so high a type historically and ethically are not numerous, nor are scribes disposed to make extracts of such length from non-canonical gospels. Special exception may have been made in favour of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, because a tradition at least as old as Jerome, perhaps as old as Papias, connected it with "the Hebrew Matthew."<sup>1</sup> It was quasi-canonical. And the Gospel according to the Hebrews, on the indisputable testimony of Eusebius, did contain the pericope adulterae. In this instance, however, if Professor Conybeare be right, Greek scribes with one consent forsook the comparatively unobjectionable form presented in common by two such great authorities as Papias and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and chose in preference some unknown, uncanonical source, which gave the narrative in a form which *we* recognize to be finer and more historical, but which to medieval scribes would necessarily be much more obnoxious.

Again we must say, this is an inversion of logic. The preponderance of probabilities is immense in favour of the common form being derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and that which has been newly discovered in a manuscript perhaps characterized elsewhere by the use of Papias, but is otherwise known only through rare and faint traces, should be the form given to the episode in the *Exegeses* of Papias. Once more let the testimony of Euse-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. iii. 16, 17, *var. lect.*

bis to what he found there be compared with the Armenian and Greek versions respectively.

EUSEBIUS, "HIST. ECCL." III. 39.

He (Papias) sets forth another story about a woman accused of many sins before the Lord (a story) which the Gospel according to the Hebrews also contains.

EDSCHMIADZIN CODEX.

GREEK (FROM TEXT OF  
VON SODEN).

A certain woman was taken  
in sins

against whom all bore witness  
that she was deserving of death.  
They brought her to Jesus  
(to see) what he would command,

in order that  
they might malign him. But  
he himself, bowing his head,  
was writing with his finger on  
the earth, to declare their sins;  
and they were seeing their  
several sins on the stones.

And filled with  
shame they departed

and  
no one remained but only the  
woman.

Saith Jesus

Go in peace,  
and present the offering for sins,  
as in their law is written.

The chief priests and Pharisees  
bring to him a woman taken in  
adultery, and setting her in the  
midst they say to him, Teacher,  
this woman was caught in adult  
tery, in the very act. Now  
Moses in the law commandeth  
to stone such; what then dost  
thou say? But they were saying  
this to tempt him, that they  
might have an accusation against  
him. And Jesus, stooping down,  
wrote with his finger on the  
ground;

but  
as they still continued asking  
him he sat erect and said to  
them, Let him that is sinless  
among you be first to cast a  
stone at her. And stooping  
down again he wrote upon the  
ground. And when they heard  
it they departed each severa|  
one, beginning with those who  
were older; and he was left  
alone and the woman standing  
in the midst. And looking up  
Jesus said to the woman, Where  
are they? Doth no man condemn  
thee? And she said, No man,  
Lord. And Jesus said, Neither  
do I condemn thee,

Go,  
sin no more.

There would be more room for question as to the derivation of the Greek version from the Gospel according to the Hebrews if the authorities which contain it appeared to draw from a variety of sources; but such is not the case. We owe to the well-nigh incredible minuteness and patience in research of von Soden<sup>1</sup> an inquiry into the textual history of the pericope adulterae which stands alone in all the annals of this science for exhaustiveness. Von Soden's conclusion is ungainsayable: the pericope<sup>2</sup> with all its multitudinous variants, more exposed as it has been to textual corruption than any other part of the New Testament, is certainly derived from a single Urtypus, the form above given in translation. The variants, some of them paralleling the Edschmiadzin text, have entered by corruption. To argue for its textual antiquity is needless, because no mere second century gospel tradition has anything comparable with the purity, the power, the ring of authenticity that pervade this simple and touching story, so unimpeachably true to the very life and spirit of Jesus. Even the Edschmiadzin text, as already shown, exhibits a long step of degeneration toward the second-century controversial and apologetico-doctrinal standpoint. It is not the story, but a *midrash* based upon it.

We know the story was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and we have no reason to suppose it was found anywhere else, except in derived forms. Indeed the silence of Eusebius rather implies that he had no knowledge of it elsewhere. We know for what special reason the Gospel according to the Hebrews was treated by scribes and glossators with unique regard, as quasi-canonical, and we now have reason to think that even the later paraphrases of Papias, the *Syriac Didaskalia* and Zacharias were based upon the single common original. All this may

<sup>1</sup> *Schriften des neuen Testaments*, i. 49-58.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* S. 500.

not establish more than a probability that the Greek version of the story comes from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but it certainly puts the burden of proof on him who would assign to it any other derivation; and, moreover, we are not entirely without evidence to carry back still further the use of this as the common original.

The opening words of the pericope (John vii. 53-viii. 2 are as follows: *Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ, Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. Ὁρθρου δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν.* These introductory words, which thus far have been left out of consideration, show that the pericope belonged originally to a consecutive account of the final week of teaching in the temple closely kindred to the Synoptic section Mark xi. xii. and parallels. In particular "The Mount of Olives," as Jesus' lodging-place, connects it closely with the special source of Luke (Luke xxii. 39 *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος*; cf. Mark xi. 11, xiv. 3 *Βηθανία*). Still more remarkable is the expression *ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν*, to which the common text adds *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς* (cf. Matt. v. 1, xiii. 1-3, 48, and Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, S. 17). It is the equivalent of the Hebrew *וַיִּשְׁׁרְצוּ* "and . . . rose up early in the morning and . . ." (*LXX. καὶ ὄρθρισεν καὶ*) so frequent in Old Testament narrative, in particular a stereotyped formula of document E of the historical books.<sup>1</sup> Curiously the formula occurs in but a single New Testament writer, Luke xxi. 38, xxiv. 1-22, Acts v. 21. In Luke xxi. 38 the context is so important that we must quote the whole: *Ἦν δὲ (sc. Ἰησοῦς) τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ἠυλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὄρθριζεν<sup>2</sup> πρὸς αὐτόν ἐν*

<sup>1</sup> Thirty-three occurrences in the historical books. Elsewhere only Job i. 5, Isa. v. 11 and Zeph. iii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> With this Old Testament expression compare that of the pericope 'returned every man to his place' similarly employed in Gen. xxxi. 35 Num. xxiv. 25, Jud. vii. 7, ix. 55, xix. 28, 1 Sam. xiv. 46, xxvi. 25, xxix. 4,

τῆ ἱερῶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. This is obviously nothing else than an equivalent for the introductory words descriptive of the scene which preface the pericope adulterae in the Greek form. After them we naturally expect some example of how Jesus taught the people in the temple ; but we are disappointed, for our evangelist utilizes them merely to effect the change of scene, and proceeds immediately with another subject—the betrayal.<sup>1</sup> Once more comparison in parallel columns will suggest to a critical and impartial scrutiny a real literary dependence, *but on the side of Luke.*

JOHN VII. 53-VIII. 2.

And they went every man to his place, but *Jesus went to the Mount of Olives*; and *rising up early in the morning* he came again into the temple [and all the people would come unto him and he would sit down and teach them].

LUKE XXI. 37-38.

Now during the days he was in the temple teaching, but for the nights he was wont to go forth and *make his lodging on the mount called (Mount) of Olives.*<sup>2</sup> And all the people *rose up early in the morning* unto him in the temple to hear him:

It is just because Luke xxi. 37-38 so manifestly duplicates John vii. 53-viii. 2 that textual critics with one accord scout the idea of locating the pericope where the group of manuscripts designated the Ferrar group locate it, at the end of Luke xxi. And justly, for unless we misinterpret the evidences of literary dependence these two verses *were written for the very purpose of taking the place of the pericope, while preserving its (supposed) representation (so different from Mark's) of Jesus' (habitual) lodging at night on the Mount of Olives.*<sup>3</sup> In other words, our third evangelist had 2 Sam. xv. 19, xix. 39, 1 Kings xx. 24, Job ii. 11, and note that the only New Testament equivalent is Acts i. 25.

<sup>1</sup> The nature of the eschatological discourse, Lk. xxi. 5-36, is such that it cannot be uttered under the circumstances of verse 37. Mark, we observe, places it "on the Mount of Olives over against the temple." The true place of xxi. 37 would therefore be adjoining the incident Mk. xii: 41-44, Lk. xxi. 1-4; cf. Jn. viii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lk. xix. 29, Acts i. 12, ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου ἐλαιῶνος, against Mt. Mk. τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.

<sup>3</sup> See Bacon, *Introd.* p. 214 note. The idea of Luke (xxii. 39) that Jesus

before him the pericope in its Greek form (ἐπορ. ἐκ. εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ, ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν), but for the same reasons as were urged in later times against the story, dropped it out, retaining only the feature of Jesus' (nightly) lodging on the Mount of Olives (and daily teaching in the temple?) because it seemed to him to explain the arrest in Gethsemane which he proceeds to relate (xxii. 39 κατὰ τὸ ἔθος).

But the Ferrar manuscripts do not locate the pericope after Luke xxi. 38 because some scribe had detected subtle affinities of style with this verse, but because of some authority. Notoriously the pericope has no affinity with the Fourth Gospel. Its connexions are synoptic. Its location in John, either somewhere in the context from vii. 36 to viii. 20, or appended to the close of the Gospel,<sup>1</sup> which is the common location, may be accounted for, with Conybeare, as due to the influence of Papias, who perhaps gave the story among his *paradoses* of "the Elder John"; or, as Blass thinks, its connexion with John may only signify that it was first attached as an appendix at the end of the Gospel canon. But compare the tender pathos of this priceless jewel of gospel tradition with the character and animus of the so-called special source of Luke<sup>2</sup>; recall the Publican and Pharisee, Zacchaeus the Publican, the Good Samaritan and Samaritan Leper, the Woman that ministered (the Widow casting into *the temple treasury*),<sup>3</sup> the

made Gethsemane his lodging throughout the Passover week is a misunderstanding in the line of ix. 57-58, apparently based on Jn. vii. 53-viii. 2.

<sup>1</sup> See Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 156. This special place in the Gospel of "John" may have been chosen, as usually assumed, because of Jn. viii. 15 f. It would seem equally probable that it was suggested by viii. 28, especially if in the source it was connected with the scene at "the treasury."

<sup>2</sup> On the humanitarian animus of Luke's special source see Bacon, *Introd. to N.T.*, pp. 219, 220.

<sup>3</sup> This incident is indeed taken up by canonical Mark as a kind of note on the phrase xii. 40, "they devour widows' houses," but it has no real relation to the context, constitutes almost the only incident of Mark not

Penitent Thief, and, above all, the Woman that was a Sinner, or better; the whole paragraph by which this evangelist in Luke vii. 36-viii. 3 illuminates the saying (vii. 34-5), "Ye say, behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, but Wisdom is justified of her children." Who that recalls the characteristics of this material found only in Luke can reject the verdict of Blass<sup>1</sup> that "the place in Luke's Gospel claimed by the section in question (according to the Ferrariani) really seems to have been its original place," even if by "original" we mean something more remote than canonical Luke?

Doubtless it would be precipitate to identify this special source out of hand with the Gospel according to the Hebrews as known to Eusebius and Jerome. Some allowance must be made for three centuries of degeneration, change, accretion, in a gospel unprotected by canonical standing, and some also for the improvements of such a skilled writer as Luke. But H. J. Holtzmann will not be called precipitate, and a reference to his *Einleitung*<sup>2</sup>, S. 102 and 441 will show no small amount of evidence for an exceptional dependence of our third and fourth evangelists on "the Gospel according to the Hebrews."<sup>2</sup>

known to canonical Matthew, and in all its affinities reminds us of the special source of Luke. I am compelled, therefore, to regard it as a secondary element.

<sup>1</sup> Ubi supra, p. 159.

<sup>2</sup> To the characteristics of Luke's special source found by Holtzmann in the Gospel according to the Hebrews we would add the following features of style: (1) A son (daughter) of Abraham as ground of compassion, Lk. xiii. 16, xix. 9; cf. *Ev. Hebr.* "fratres tui, filii Abrahae, amicti sunt," etc. (2) "Jesus" in address (according to Zahn "unheard of in the Gospels") Lk. xxiii. 42; cf. *Ev. Hebr.* "precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas," etc. (3) "The Lord" of Jesus in narrative is regular in *Ev. Hebr.* Luke alone of our synoptists employs it, freely, but almost always in the sections drawn from the special source. (4) *kai ἐγένετο* (καὶ ἐγένετο) is a Semiticism specially characteristic of Luke (see Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, S. 25); cf. *Ev. Hebr.*: "Factum est autem cum ascendisset dominus," etc. On the characteristics of Luke's special source see Bacon, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 213, note 1, and compare the note on the survivals of pre-canonical literature in the "Western" text on p. 220. As an example of how Luke might improve

The Ferrariani location of the pericope adulterae has no more reasonable explanation than a knowledge direct or indirect of its place in the pre-canonical gospel from which they derive it; just as the other authorities which attach it to "John," either somewhere about the close of chap. vii., or at the end of the Gospel, are possibly influenced by finding the "exegesis" of it attributed by Papias to "John," but certainly not by its source. The location of the Ferrariani and the text of the Edschmiadzin codex are isolated phenomena each of which perhaps points to a source of special knowledge in the hands of the scribe ultimately responsible. In the case of the Edschmiadzin codex there is some reason to think of the *Exegeses* of Papias. In the case of the Ferrariani is it unreasonable to think of Jerome's translations of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, since it was only in the west that it crept into the canonical text?

If then the recently discovered Armenian version of the pericope adulterae, and the well known Greek form bear this relation to one another, it is high time to cease speaking as if the story which Papias "set forth about a woman accused of many sins before the Lord" were verbally identical with that contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. On the contrary, while we cannot say that our Greek text is certainly that of this extra-canonical source, we may be sure that it is older than the Edschmiadzin version, and in fact bears to it the relation of text to commentary. We may consider it highly probable that it represents, if not Jerome's *ipsum Hebraicum*, at least the pre-Lucan form which had found embodiment in the time of Eusebius and Jerome in that noteworthy source. To imagine another and divergent form of the story is gratuitous.

on his source, compare Luke xiv. 7-11 with the version of this parable added by "Western" scribes from an extra-canonical source after Matt. xx. 28.

The corollaries of this conclusion are not unimportant. (1) If the Edschmiadzin text represents Papias' modification of the pericope adulterae from the Greek type, as Eusebius' language suggests, and the Greek type is that of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or its pre-Lucan ancestor, it follows that in the region whence Papias derived his exegeses and traditions the Gospel according to the Hebrews was current, whereas it was not current in his own, else he would not re-narrate the story with the modifications he allows himself. The bearing of this point on the question of the domicile of Papias' "elders," in particular "the Elder John," is so obvious that all that is here required is a reference to a recent article<sup>1</sup> aimed to show that this group of apostles, elders, and witnesses who perpetuate the apostolic gospel tradition, is that of Luke, of Hegesippus, of all the earliest writers, namely, the Palestinian mother-church.

(2) If Conybeare's text really represents Papias, by whatever road it found its way into the hands of a tenth century Armenian scribe, the contrast of text and paraphrase will be highly instructive regarding the character and historical value, and indirectly the date, of Papias' traditions and exegeses. If he, or his informants, of whom Aristo and John the Elder were chief, improved upon the Gospel according to the Hebrews by such midrashic additions as "to declare their sins, and they were seeing their several sins on the stones," such smoothing of difficulties as the removal of the nature and evidence of the woman's sin and substitution of the Mosaic ritual of the penitent for the hard saying, "Neither do I condemn thee," Eusebius was right in his imputation to Papias of a certain credulousness. The miraculous writing may be classed with the other *μυθικώτερα* of which Eusebius cites examples. That Papias followed Palestinian authorities may well be granted him, but the new evidence certainly

<sup>1</sup> "The Johannine Problem, II." *Hibbert Journal*, ii. 2, Jan. 1904.

does not favour an early date, nor a close relation to any apostle, nor a higher rank as a historical authority than some removes below the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The evidence of the title Ariston Eritzou must be discussed hereafter.

B. W. BACON.

### WELLHAUSEN.<sup>1</sup>

THE name of Wellhausen is well known to English readers as that of the foremost representative of the dominant school of Old Testament criticism. Since the publication of his *History of Israel*, vol. i., in 1878, he has rightly occupied that place. But this is only one side of his remarkable personality and work. He is without question the greatest living force in the whole field of Old Testament scholarship. He has also done work of the first importance in the near-lying fields of Arabic history and religion, and—especially of late years—the origins of Christianity. In all these departments his finest work is constructive, and is marked by rare insight into the movements of the religious spirit. Wellhausen himself is anything but the cold dry critic of popular imagination. He is a man of deep religious feeling, who finds in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments a real revelation from the living God, and whose studies are all inspired by that faith.

Julius Wellhausen was born May 17, 1844, in the picturesque old town of Hameln on the Weser, where his father was pastor. He received his early education in his native town, and afterwards for a few years in Hanover.

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my obligation to Professor Wellhausen for the kind interest he has taken in the preparation of these articles. To him I am indebted for the more personal details I have been able to introduce, as well as for the use of his early *Dissertation*. He has also read the manuscript, and approved my presentation of his aims and work as just. I should like also to express my indebtedness to Professor Duff, Bradford, for friendly counsel and help.