

prayers of the suffering saints on earth may be heard before the throne of God." We should naturally expect, then, that the prayers should be represented as rising to God in terms of sound. As a matter of fact they are represented as rising in terms of sacrifice, so that the silence in heaven does not seem so necessary. The angel adds incense to them, and they ascend with the incense and are found acceptable. In the beautiful Old Testament phrase the Lord "smells a sweet savour in them." Incidentally, the present position of v. 2 finds support in this inconsistency.

There are many suggestive things in Dr. Charles's book with which we cannot deal. This foretaste whets the appetite for the full feast. If many of his conclusions have the revolutionary look of this one, his commentary will not prove the final word upon the interpretation of the Book of Revelation; but, coming from the hand of so great a master of apocalypse, it cannot fail to throw a flood of light upon a Book of which Dr. Charles justly says that "in its own literature it stands absolutely without a rival, while in the literature of all time it has deservedly won for itself a place in the van."

J. T. DEAN.

PAPIAS AND THE GOSPELS.

THE quotations in Eusebius iii. 29 from Papias have been sifted *ad nauseam*, and by every man according to his ability or prejudice. Yet they are of sufficient importance to be sifted ever afresh. They are being used every day. Thus in the EXPOSITOR for March 1914 Dr. Bacon breaks a lance over them with the "sixteen reconstructors of Q." The theory that Matthew made a collection of Logia in Aramaic which Matthew and Luke used and translated each according to his ability harks back to poor Papias. Papias actually

said "Matthew *composed* the Logia in Hebrew dialect, and each translated "*them* according to his ability." Zahn thinks, as did Salmon, that this "composition of the Logia" was our present Gospel of St. Matthew, and that the *each* who translated them were the Preachers and Teachers of Asia Minor who used it, the translation being piecemeal and extempore. Dr. Brown doubts the truth of the statement and affirms that Papias made it on unknown authority if on any. Zahn, too, makes Papias speak here "of himself"; and even of the quotation that deals with Mark, assigns the greater part to Papias and the first sentence only to the Presbyter. Dr. Swete infers from it that St. Mark was St. Peter's dragoman, St. Peter not knowing Greek enough to address cultured audiences; while Zahn, with good reason internal and external, repudiates this suggestion and finds no thought of translation at all in this sentence.

The account that Papias himself gives of his methods shows that he had some perception of the rules of evidence.

He writes it at the time when he is collecting material for his work on the Interpretation of the Logia of the Lord. He leaves us in no doubt as to what he means by the Logia. They are the "commandments of the Lord committed to Faith," the Holy Tradition or Deposit of Faith. His work is a commentary on them containing illustrated notes as to their meaning, together with other words of the Lord, parables, and narratives of miracles that he has collected. His Logia were arranged in five Compositions (Syngrammata), and the commentary was a systematic one, following the order of the text.

Logia (pracles) differ from Logoi (words) of the Lord Jesus only in so far as the former implied canonical authority, authority, i.e., as Scripture; and Logoi (words) of the Lord included as in the Epistles to Timothy, all such matter as

we find, e.g., in St. Mark's Gospel, i.e. "things said *and things done* by Christ." The steps by which this extension of meaning is reached are (a) that the Logia are embedded in narrative, (b) that they require narrative for their interpretation, (c) that the Lord teaches by Deed as by Word, by Example as well as Precept. Nevertheless, Logia are for Papias primarily things said. We gather that there were in circulation when Papias was planning his work many Bibloi or pamphlets of matter such as he was in search of. But he put them aside in favour of what he calls the Living Voice, i.e. the actual testimony of "disciples of the Lord." Irenæus says, and there is no reason to doubt him, that Papias was a hearer of John. Papias himself says that he collected his material from hearers of "the Presbyters." (of whom he names seven). Testimony of this kind went far back, for hearers whom Papias interviewed told of things heard long ago. Two disciples of the Lord are mentioned as still living, and the hearers come straight from them: one is Aristion, the other is "The Presbyter John" already mentioned in the first list of seven of whom the other six are apostles. Papias avows that he cross-examined all these hearers strictly, and he vouches for the truth of that which he tells upon their evidence.

In the judgment of Eusebius Papias was a "thin-witted man"; "he inserted in his Compositions some "paradoxical miracles and parables," and he was a Chiliast believing in "the speedy coming of the Lord to reign with the Saints for 1,000 years upon the earth." "He mistook things spoken symbolically for literal truth." We gather that Papias would have therefore a particular interest in the Eschatological or Apocalyptic Logia. Nevertheless such "thin wittedness" does not imply that he would be incapable of sifting evidence after the manner that he describes. If he were ever so incompetent, the quotations given from him suffice

to prove that the Gospels of St. Mark and of St. Matthew in the lifetime of disciples of the Lord (*a*) were beginning to be treated as having almost canonical authority, and (*b*) were causing from this point of view difficulties from inconsistencies with one another or from failure in prediction. The authority of these Gospels rested upon their apostolic origin. *The quotations limit the responsibility of apostles for them by indicating the mode of origin, and that upon the authority of apostles.*

Mark is a "Gospel according to Peter" only so far as its characteristic feature is found in recollections of "Words of the Lord" as St. Peter habitually told them; and the Greek Matthew is a translation only of an original Aramaic.

The differences between these two Greek Gospels arise from this difference of origin.

"There were many omissions in Mark." Yes. St. Peter had not told everything, or Mark had not been always present, or Mark's memory had failed.

There were many differences in order. St. Peter never had any order; he told "the words of the Lord" after the manner of a preacher as the needs of the moment suggested: St. Mark made his own order from indications given in the subject matter, or from knowledge gained in the mother-church during the fifteen years between the Passion and his leaving Jerusalem, or even possibly from St. Matthew's Aramaic Gospel. He would not follow the order of that Gospel precisely, for St. Matthew's Gospel is a Composition, and even a Syntaxis, of the Logia with a definite purpose.

There were differences in representation. St. Mark rightly preferred St. Peter's version to St. Matthew's in "some" cases: both might be true, and in others St. Peter was the better witness: all through it was not because the words were new that St. Mark was first called upon to write the recollections, but because of the vividness in detail that impressed

them upon the hearers. There were differences in the wording even of the Logia in the stricter sense. Well, St. Matthew's Gospel is after all a translation ; St. Mark's is perhaps at points a translation of St. Peter's Aramaic, in parts a translation of St. Matthew's, while in fact even the apostles, when they talked or wrote Greek, were translators. This point indeed Papias could not raise ; the apostles were already in a sense "as the Lord" for him. The ultimate questions of the Modernist, "What manner of men were the apostles ? What manner of man was the Lord ?" were questions already settled for the circle of Papias. They were not so settled for Eusebius.

Eusebius was a critic, and a man of culture, well placed in the world, and content with it, a courtier and servant of the empire, averse to Dogmatic Theology. The bad grammar, the solecisms, the fanaticism of apocalypses repelled him. Above all, the revolutionary spirit of the apocalyptic literature was alien to his temper. That spirit, that attitude to the world, characterises indeed all the Johannine scriptures ; it breathes even through the Gospel. Actually and temperamentally Eusebius and the Johannines are ever in antagonism. But the Gospel of St. Matthew is also eschatological. In it, however, the eschatology is balanced by another outlook. For St. Peter and St. Paul, the world, and the empire, are still of God ; loyalty to them is of the Gospel : they can be "saved." An eschatology with violent cataclysms of destruction is not of their essence. All things can be made new, reformed and transformed by the beneficent activities of the Church. The "cue" of symbolism was helpful in removing the alien strata ; and Eusebius was indebted to Papias for providing him with still another formula in the "each man translated according to his ability." Papias indeed was using it to account for a certain definiteness of prediction, and of prediction unful-

filled, to be found in St. Matthew. As in John xxi. "inaccuracy of reporters" is the escape from a dilemma.

Eusebius had a special interest also in Mark xvi. 9-20. Apart from critical reasons these verses report "paradoxical" miracles that offend the taste; and the "he that believeth not shall be damned" recalled the spectres of the hordes of hermits and monks who fought for Athanasius. All the authority for Mark xvi. 9-20 comes from the Johannine School, and Eusebius must have been well pleased to find in Papias a testimony of an estimate of St. Mark's Gospel, and a discontent with it, that would account for its "mutilation," and account for the "new ending" issuing from Ephesus.

But again, it is with St. Matthew's ending that the ending of St. Mark must be compared. Both indeed have been "tampered with." The translator in the one, the Ephesian emendator in the other have effectually destroyed the original record.

From the point of view either of Eusebius or Papias, the two Gospels referred to in the quotations are the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew; the two are coupled, and the two notices explain one another. The "each man" who translated refers (*a*) to the Greek translator of St. Matthew, and (*b*) to St. Mark himself. "Translation," we need scarcely say, was not limited by modern restraints or by the restraint of dealing with Scripture. Summaries, expansions, and even the incorporation of new matter would all be covered by it. For modern ears "Greek editor" is not perhaps so misleading as "Greek translator."

With regard to Mark it is to be remembered (*a*) that the addresses given by St. Peter in Rome, according to tradition, were only some of those that St. Mark wrote down from memory, (*b*) that the form only and not the matter of them was striking, new, and of use, (*c*) that the arranging of them into a

connected narrative was a distinct step that may have been taken at a later time, and that (*d*) St. Matthew's Aramaic Gospel in its written form must have corresponded to a scheme of teaching with which St. Mark, from the circumstances of his life must have been familiar.

With regard to Matthew and Mark it is to be remembered that great part of the material must have existed in a Greek "translation" at a very early date.

Whether it existed in a written form or as an "Oral Tradition" after the model of the Oral Tradition of the scribes, or in a written form is uncertain and irrelevant. There are certain recurrent formulæ, as e.g. Judas, "one of the twelve," "who also betrayed Him," that point irresistibly to the idea of a tale systematically told: the "tradition" is at once stereotyped and mobile: there are "forms of words" and "fixed images," and yet there is a moving rush of life that plays about them.

In the Pastoral Epistles the "words of the Lord" are a Systematic Body of Doctrine, and are the sacramental means by which believers are "modelled unto eternal life." Some "Discourses" are evidently used liturgically, as for Ordination services, or Baptism and Confirmation services, or for the keeping of the Paschal Feast.

The "translator" naturally availed himself of these, and there was no reason, if Mark's version of St. Peter's narratives, e.g., were at hand, why he should not take from them what he wished.

In Mark the lines of the framework (Syntaxis) of Matthew are still plainly visible, but in the story of the early stages of the ministry in Galilee they have been dislocated. The reasons are (*a*) that Mark follows St. Peter as the eye-witness, (*b*) that he records as happening together things that St. Peter told together. Possibly since the Syntaxis of St. Matthew did not aim at strict chronological se-

quence, the order of events in Mark is nearer to fact in some cases than the order in Matthew. After Cæsarea Philippi, it is no longer a question of the order of these two as contrasted with one another, but of the synoptic order generally as contrasted with that of St. John. Here, too, Papias and the Johannine school found a help in recollecting the possibilities of error in translation.

As for our Greek Matthew, it contains within itself the indications of its Aramaic origin : (*a*) the famous formula, " And it came to pass when Jesus had finished," is Aramaic in origin. It follows and closes each of the five great " blocks of sayings " and is a formula of transition to a connecting narrative of " things said and done." The first is preceded by a general summary of circuit work in Galilee with its results : the last is followed by the story of the Passion culminating in the great commission given to the regathered Church " at the Mount " in Galilee. The whole " from the Mount " " to the Mount " is an artistic and dramatic presentation of the story of the Church from the laying down of its first lines to its launching fully equipped upon the deep. The " Galilee ending " is dramatically necessary in Matthew and original there. Again (*b*) the whole ministry in Galilee is divided into two portions by another Aramaic formula, " From then," each culminating in a dramatically necessary climax, the first portion at Cæsarea Philippi, and the second at " the Mount " in Galilee. One portion has for its theme the preaching of the kingdom, the other portion the preaching of the Passion ; but in fact the drama thus articulated by Aramaic formulæ has too many principles of unity to be summed up in one. They all coincide as unities of life. The great drama is still again linked on to forewords and prefaces by other formulæ of Aramaic idiom ; while in these prefaces, which determine the place in history

of the drama that they introduce, the recorder shows himself dealing freely with and translating independently Hebrew scriptures essential to the motive.

It would seem, then, that a study of the "quotations" in Papias from the point of view of Papias indicates that the two "quotations" are put together as supplementing one another, and explaining one another. It is these two Gospels that trouble the "arranger of the Interpretations of the Logia in Five Syngrammata or Compositions." Matthew also has Five Syngrammata; to account for his discrepancies compared with Mark, and to find an explanation of their discrepancies compared with John or fact, these are the motives of Papias in recording the dicta; and so read the plain statement of the "thin-witted man" is confirmed by the critical analysis. If, however, "the Logia" are the "Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke" or the Q of critics, we look in vain for any signs that it ever existed; if it ever existed, it existed in Greek, not Hebrew; it was not a "Syngramma" or Composition; and the dictum that Matthew wrote it in Hebrew must be left as a statement "made on unknown authority if on any," entirely unconfirmed by any facts; while the sense of "each man interpreted it as he could" will remain for ever an unanswered riddle.

The date of the Aramaic Matthew has a bearing upon the critical view that the unity of the Greek Matthew is due to the Greek editor.

From internal evidence it might be inferred that the Aramaic Gospel was written (a) by a Galilæan for Galilæans, (b) for the support of the Galilæan Jewish Christians against the propaganda of Scribism and the Holy War, before war in Galilee had actually commenced, (c) at a time when the cleavage of the Church from the "old people of God" was complete, (d) at a time when there was a decision or a necessity to go "into all the world," (e) at a time when the primacy

of St. Peter needed vigorous assertion against some rival authority. This authority is not that of St. Paul. St. Peter and Paul were at one in their view of the attitude of the Church to the world and the empire. It is St. John whose name stands for the converse outlook.

All these indications point to an early year in the sixth decade. But at any such time, and even as early as 44, we may say with certainty that even in Jerusalem a Greek Catechism, Instruction, or Tradition of which the Logia formed the substance was familiar. No Greek "translator" would approach the task of "translating" an Aramaic St. Matthew without such an acquaintance with the Greek Logia as would enable him to write *currente calamo*, and to transfer continually sentences and paragraphs by memory from the existing Greek equivalents. Such a translation was made perhaps in Asia during the mission work of St. Peter in Asia Minor, in which St. Mark had a part, and while yet Asia had not yet become frankly and entirely Johannine. I should conjecture also that St. Mark's Gospel, as distinct from St. Mark's recollections of St. Peter's narratives, had its origin then and there.

If this account be true, the "two quotations" contain the brief statement of unforgettable incidents in the story of the Asian Church.

If Mark finished his Gospel before he was summoned to Rome (Ep. 2 Tim.) and left in Colossæ one copy finished before starting to join St. Paul, it is perfectly possible that he perished with St. Paul, never escaped from Italy, and that any other copy that he had perished with him.

It is clear, if this account be true, that Papias had no knowledge of any St. Matthew but the Greek; nevertheless he makes no suggestion of any *interpolation* by the translator. Just as Mark is on the whole an accurate painstaking

and trustworthy narrative, so the Greek St. Matthew is a trustworthy version of the original. It must be remembered that "Matthew" is one of the seven Presbyters from whom Papias, by his own account, derived his "testimony of the living voice."

I subjoin a literal translation, without commas, of the quotations, and suggest that so interpreted they are the plain record of most important facts that consist with the facts of history and criticism. Papias, of course, himself is not as a fact quoting. He is giving in his own words the substance of a repeated teaching.

This the Presbyter used to say. Mark indeed having become interpreter of Peter as many things as he remembered accurately wrote not however in order either the things said or the things done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord, nor followed in His steps but later as I said followed the steps of Peter who used to adapt his teachings to the needs of the moment, not as one framing consciously for himself a Syntaxis of the Words of the Lord, so that Mark made no mistake in writing some things as Peter told them and he recollected for one thing only he was careful to omit nothing that he heard and to falsify nothing.

These things then are recorded by Papias as the result of his investigations about Mark.

But about Matthew these things are said—

"Well then Matthew in Hebrew Dialect composed the Logia, and *each* translated them according to his ability."

W. D. ALLEN.