

# 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)



Col. 1. It is not impossible that Codex Bezae may have originally contained 1 Peter after Acts. I have supplied the thirteen epistles of St. Paul from the kindred Codex Claromontanus (DPaul), in which Hebrews is obviously an afterthought.

Col. 2. This list apparently dates from 359, and it is therefore the table of contents of some Bible earlier than the Vulgate. It was evidently published at Rome.

Col. 3. Eusebius tells us (*H.E.* v. 26) that St. Irenaeus quoted Hebrews in a book of various discourses. A quotation occurs in the (spurious) second Pfaffian fragment. Photius says that Irenaeus denied the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. There is no certain quotation of it in the five books against heresies (the most probable is *verbo virtutis suae*, ii. 30, 9). Harvey has enumerated only eleven possible references to it. On the other hand the allusions to or quotations from Romans and 1 Corinthians are given by the same editor as 87 and 104 respectively.

Col. 4. Clement was a learned man, who seems to have used other codices besides his habitual Western Bible. But in the *Hypotyposes* he did not comment on James, 2 Peter, and 3 John, and he never quotes these books. He knew Hebrews, of course; but he did not attribute it to St. Paul, except in a presumed Hebrew original. This suggests that it was a separate work from the thirteen Pauline Epistles, as he knew it. The fact that he knew Jude need not surprise us, in view of the number even of Apocrypha to which he attributed some authority.

Col. 5. Tertullian appears to quote Hebrews only on a single occasion, and he then attributes it to Barnabas. He quotes Jude by name. But it is not certain that he knew only a "Western" Bible. He may have used more than one Greek text. Whether he had already a Latin translation of Jude or no, we cannot tell. But this epistle was probably earlier rendered than James and 2 Peter.

Col. 6. St. Cyprian seems not to know Jude. It may be merely accident that Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenaeus never quote 3 John, but it may be a point of contact with Clement (who certainly did not use that epistle), and with the Muratorian canon.

Col. 7. I have added Papias to this list. I cannot here give my reasons for supposing that he knew Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul. It is admitted by Harnack and others that he knew our four Gospels, and I hope to make this clear in the *Revue Bénédictine* for July, 1905. He quoted 1 John and 1 Peter; and had evidently much to say about the Apocalypse. If he had quoted from Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 Peter, or had mentioned them by name, Eusebius would probably have noticed the fact, although he perhaps read Papias rather carelessly. It has been thought that he has a reference to 3 John 12: "ὅτι αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας," where he speaks of precepts ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινόμενας τῆς ἀληθείας (ap. Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 39).

1. The table appears to establish that the Western authorities agree in the use of certain books, and in the omission of others. It seems that Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, and Jude did not belong to this set of books. 3 John is doubtful.

2. But we do not merely conclude that these books chanced to be known individually to a certain circle of writers, for we find that an exact catalogue of them is given by Mommsen's list, that Codex Bezae (+ Codex Claromontanus) contains the same collection. It follows that we have to do with a *definite New Testament*, an authorized collection of canonical books, written in a single codex (or pair of codices) or in rolls contained in a single *capsa*.

3. The unity of this collection is remarkably testified by the type of the text, some of the same marked characteristics which we know as "Western" reappearing more or less in all the books. These have therefore a common history, and have been emendated, interpolated, harmonized, by the same series of hands.

4. This "Western" New Testament was known to Irenaeus and to Clement of Alexandria. It was used later by Hippolytus, sometimes by Origen, and regularly by Eusebius. It is the foundation of the Gospels in the Curetonian Syriac and in the Diatessaron of Tatian, and is at least connected with those of the Sinaitic Syriac. The whole collection was apparently turned into Latin before Tertullian. In the time of Novatian and Cyprian we find already two distinct types of renderings, the so-called African and European.

5. The date of the collection is therefore to be placed before Irenaeus c. 180. In notes to Dean Armitage Robinson's *Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas* we find some reasons for placing the Latin translation earlier than the letter of the Martyrs of Lyons, A.D. 177. Probably the collection was known to Justin, c. 150,<sup>1</sup> possibly to Papias (c. 140-5 at the very latest).

<sup>1</sup> St. Justin Martyr has many distinctively Western readings. Besides the four Gospels, Acts and many Epistles of St. Paul, we find that he certainly knows Hebrews and probably James. Now it is pretty certain that Clement of Rome knew these two books. Hermas also knew James; therefore Justin may have got to know these two Epistles at Rome

6. As to the origin of the collection, I can say little here, except that the evidence (so far as we have traced it above) points to Asia, or thereabouts, as the home of the "Western" New Testament.

*a.* Papias is an Asiatic. We know that Justin was converted at Ephesus, and he seems to have combined the Western collection with books used at Rome, where he afterwards resided and died. Irenaeus passed his youth at Smyrna. Clement had an Asiatic teacher. The Latin translation, wherever it was made, may quite well have used a text derived from Asia. At the end of the second century the Western text was largely diffused. This was not owing to Roman influence, so far as we can tell, for there is no evidence before Hippolytus that the text was even known at Rome. We naturally presume Asiatic influence, for the Asiatic churches were immensely populous and prosperous.

*β.* In the third century the Western text seems to have lost its vogue, and with Origen the neutral begins to dominate. I cannot here explain the many reasons which have gradually led me to hold that the neutral readings in the African Latin are not original, but corrections made at the beginning of the third century, when "Western" peculiarities were beginning to be looked upon askance. I regard the European text as retaining earlier readings, though the African has the earlier renderings.<sup>1</sup> In the same way I

for they were probably not known in Asia. As he knew the Apocalypse, he will probably have known 1, 2 John. As 1 Peter was known both at Rome (Clement, Hermas) and in Asia (Polycarp, Papias), he can hardly have been ignorant of it. It is therefore probable that he knew the whole Western collection, together with Hebrews and James. Hippolytus also used the Western collection, and perhaps other books also.

<sup>1</sup> The question whether we are to look upon the European and African texts as two translations seems to me a question of words. They cannot be wholly independent in origin. But "a greatly revised edition," or "a new translation under the influence of the earlier one" are indistinguishable, so far as I can see.

suppose the Curetonian Syriac to have received some neutral emendations, while the Sinaitic may be a very completely neutralized Western text, or a Westernized neutral text,—in any case less primitive in form than the Curetonian, although its readings are much older and better. I do not dogmatize on this subject; I merely mention what has for some time seemed to me the most convenient working hypothesis. However this may be, there seem to be some symptoms of the wane of the importance of the “Western text” from the beginning of the third century. This remarkably coincides with the wane of the importance of the Asiatic Churches, principally owing to the prevalence of Montanism among them, and (possibly in some part) to the Paschal controversy.<sup>1</sup>

γ. But the internal evidence of the collection is not to be passed over. We find in it the Tetreteuangelium, a collection which was very probably made in Asia. We find a Pauline collection, which naturally connects itself with the Pauline Churches of Asia:—Acts, Epistles of Paul, joined to the Gospel of St. Luke. Then there is an *instrumentum Joannis*,—the Apocalypse and 3 (2?) Epistles. These are Asiatic. One book remains, 1 Peter. This was addressed to Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, ASIA, and Bithynia. The omitted books,—Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 Peter, are just those books which have no apparent connexion with Asia at all.

δ. The internal evidence of the books has also to be con-

<sup>1</sup> It was precisely at this time that the earlier canon of the Old Testament came to be questioned. The earliest Christian writers, beginning with Clement of Rome, habitually quoted the deuterocanonical writings of the Old Testament as Scripture (Swete, *Introd. to O.T. in Gk.*, p. 224). These books seem to have been translated into Latin together with the “Western” New Testament. But at the end of the second century doubts begin to appear. Melito of Sardis made enquiry in Palestine, and arrived at the Hebrew canon, about 180 A.D.; later on, Origen arrived at a similar result, and the subsequent Greek Fathers followed suit. So that the earlier O.T. canon appears to have gone out of fashion in the East just about the period in which the earlier N.T. canon was being doubted and its text superseded.

sidered. The most important point is that the famous Western interpolations in Acts were made by some one who knew Asia. It is probable that both the *pericope de adultera* and the last twelve verses of St. Mark belonged to the Western text. Both seem to have been known to Papias. If these premises are right, we have found a further connexion with Asia.

These suggestions are all I have to say for the moment about the date and origin of this early Testament. But the existence of such a collection and its wide diffusion in the second half of the second century throws great light on the history of the deuterocanonical writings of the New Testament.

On the one hand we have the Apocalypse. We have no evidence that its authenticity and canonicity were ever doubted until the first years of the third century, when Gaius at Rome rejected it, and evidently ascribed it to Cerinthus. But this book formed a part of our widely circulated Asiatic New Testament. This explains its rejection, and accounts also for the possibility of its reception by the anti-chiliastic party at a time when the Western collection was going out of fashion and the Asiatic Churches were losing some of their prestige, and when Alexandria was taking the first place in theology.

On the other hand, James, Jude, 2 Peter and Hebrews begin to emerge from obscurity just at this very time. At first their reception by the Churches is hesitating. They had been known, perhaps, in a single region, or here and there. I have remarked above that there are traces of James at Rome, and also of Hebrews. But of Jude and 2 Peter there is no certain trace in the second century. Jude first appears in Clement of Alexandria, and as an addition to the Latin translation of the Western New Testament. 2 Peter finds the most difficulty in gaining recognition, as being the latest (it would seem) to be

published to the world from the place of its hiding. At the same time other writings are pleading for recognition, the Pastor, the Apocalypse of Peter, and many others of less weight. The "Western" canon is not after 200 regarded as so authoritative that it may not enlarge its borders.

But we must not hastily assume that this "Western" collection was the only New Testament of the second century, because we know of no other. The second century writers who are preserved to us are connected with Asia, and it is natural that we find few traces of the books which had no connexion with that province. But there were certainly other texts in use, and the "Western" text was eventually so completely smothered by these and by their developments, that its form of the Gospels has survived but in a single Greek manuscript, its Acts in perhaps two, its Apostolus in three or four, while its Apocalypse is utterly lost so far as a continuous Greek text is concerned. We should therefore not be safe in assuming it to be certain that even in the second century the "Western" text was the most widely diffused, though there is considerable probability in this. But it is at least probable that it was the earliest large collection, the earliest which we could practically consider to be a whole New Testament. If not the most diffused text, yet the Bible of the populous Churches of Asia Minor had, perhaps, the greatest number of readers, and it was that of the chief writers of the second century. It belonged to a region in which an Apostle was believed to have lived until the time of Trajan, and where Apostolic memories were longer related at second hand than elsewhere. The collection was certainly—whether Asiatic or not, whether the most widely diffused or not,—the most important second century collection. It may have been not merely the largest, but the only large collection. For the use of the various inspired books may



have been sporadic and accidental, and they may have been only loosely united to one another by the habits of individual Churches. On this point it is not necessary to dwell here. One cannot help wondering where the neutral text came from, and where it was latent in the second century. It must surely have existed in Bible form in the third. Had this collection been made up from different groups or different units? If so, how comes it that the text is so uniform in certain characteristics, so singularly pure, and so uncontaminated by the Western peculiarities?

The determination of the contents of the Western New Testament elucidates another difficult point; I mean the list given by Eusebius. In *H.E.* iii. 25 he enumerates the New Testament writings. First come the Gospels, then the Acts, then the Epistles of Paul, and one of John and one of Peter. To these the Apocalypse is to be added, "if this is thought good": *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις*, "these are counted as acknowledged." It seems a contradiction thus to call the Apocalypse an "acknowledged" book, and yet to permit its rejection! Eusebius continues:—The *ἀντιλεγόμενα* or disputed books, but known to most, are James, Jude, 2 Peter and 2 John. A third class contains the *νόθα* or spurious books, to which are assigned the Acts of Paul, the Pastor, the Apocalypse of Peter, Barnabas, the Didache, and "as I said" the Apocalypse, in the opinion of some.

Now the acknowledged books are simply the "Western" New Testament, minus 2 and 3 John (both of which may have been sometimes omitted as private letters).<sup>1</sup> It has been already remarked that Eusebius almost always used a distinctively "Western" text. We now see why he

<sup>1</sup> But it is also possible that only 3 John was wanting in Eusebius's Western Bible, and that he added 2 John to it as an *ἀντιλεγόμενον*, because it was obvious that both were by the same author, and because he wished to attribute both to John the Presbyter.

included the Apocalypse among the *ὁμολογούμενα*,—it formed part of this venerable collection. The *ἀντιλεγόμενα* or deuterocanonical books, are the books which in Eusebius's day were received by most, but did not form part of the "Western" text.<sup>1</sup> Consequently the Apocalypse belongs by right to the *ὁμολογούμενα*, but if rejected (on account of the support it gives to chiliastic views, and in accordance with the arguments of Dionysius the Great) it tumbles into the third class of *νόθα*. It could not be reckoned, in any case, in the second class.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

<sup>1</sup> Only one difficulty is to be noticed. The Epistle to the Hebrews is passed over, unless we suppose that Eusebius includes it among those of St. Paul. But it seems rather from carelessness that it is not here mentioned as doubtful, since Eusebius had pointed to the fact in iii. 8 and records elsewhere the opinions of Clement, Gaius and Origen about it (vi. 14, 20, 25).