

## IS HERMAS ALSO AMONG THE PROPHETS?

THE kindness of a friend has made me the possessor of the sumptuous volume in which the Clarendon Press has published Prof. Lake's photographs of the New Testament in the Codex Sinaiticus, together with his twenty pages of Introduction; and I cannot better justify the gift than by putting before the readers of the JOURNAL an idea which suggested itself to me on a first examination and which, if correct, appears at once to explain some curious features in the MS and to throw light upon the history of the reception of the *Shepherd of Hermas*.

The three points in the MS which I want to bring into connexion with one another are the following:—

1. *Matter has been lost between the Old Testament and the New.*

The original numeration of the gatherings differs in the New Testament from the present (eighth-century?) numeration: Lake, p. xvi. In the Old Testament there is no trace of change; in the New each quaternion is now marked with a lower number than it was by the original scribe. On foll. 78, 86, and elsewhere, of the New Testament both numerations are still partially visible; and it would seem that the gathering which is now 83 (πρ') was at first 84 (πδ), and that which is now 84 was at first 85 and so on. Therefore between the Old Testament and the New there was originally another gathering (it would have had the number 73, which is the revised number for the first gathering of St Matthew), and this extra gathering had either disappeared or been removed when the present numeration was substituted for the older cyphers in the New Testament.

2. *The New Testament originally ended with the Epistle of Barnabas.*

The gatherings of the MS are almost invariably quaternions or sheets of eight (four conjugate) leaves: Lake, p. xvi. There are only four exceptions in the New Testament, and of these four two belong to Barnabas. At the end of St Luke, the 78th gathering—by the present numeration—has only seven leaves<sup>1</sup>; at the end of the Gospels

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately Prof. Lake (who by the way has printed ση' by mistake for οη' as the number of the quaternion) does not say at what point in this quaternion a leaf has been lost; but I note that what is now the last leaf of the quaternion, fol. 47 b, is quite unique for its excellent state of preservation. In this MS—as so often happens in older MSS which were left unbound in sheets—the first and last leaves

(no doubt in order that the Epistles may begin on a fresh gathering) the 80th gathering has only six leaves, the whole of the *verso* of the last leaf (fol. 61 *b*) being blank. After the Gospels the Pauline Epistles, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse proceed regularly with quaternions, from fol. 62 to fol. 133 inclusive. The 90th gathering, which contains just the end of the Apocalypse and the greater part of Barnabas, has six leaves, foll. 134-139. Then, quite exceptionally, a gathering of two leaves, foll. 140, 141, is added for the end of Barnabas; and Hermas begins with a fresh gathering on fol. 142. The most natural deduction from these phenomena is that the scribe was nearing the conclusion of his work; that he miscalculated the space which would be taken up by Barnabas (Barnabas may well have been copied from a distinct MS, and a distinct MS may have been of a different size and in a different script, making calculation difficult) and supposed that six leaves might do; that when he found that six were not after all enough, he added a new gathering of the smallest possible size, two pages, so that the text and the gathering might end as nearly as possible together. He has done this at no single point after the Gospels. Acts begins on a fresh leaf, Catholic Epistles and again Apocalypse on a fresh page; but nowhere is there any sign of anxiety to begin on a fresh gathering. I conclude that he regarded Barnabas as the end of his New Testament.

3. *Hermas was written and corrected by the same scribes as the Prophets.*

This is of course a point on which one simply accepts the views, wherever they agree, of Tischendorf and Lake; and both scholars conclude (*a*) that—apart from cancel-leaves, representing the work of the *diorthota*—two scribes, and two only, were at work on the New Testament, namely a scribe called by them A, who wrote the Gospels, Pauline Epistles, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse, Barnabas; and a scribe called B, who wrote Hermas: (*b*) that the scribe who wrote Hermas wrote also the prophetic books of the Old Testament. But Hermas is connected with the Prophets not only in the original production of the MS, but in its correction as well. About the corrector called C<sup>a</sup> there is not sufficient information given by Prof. Lake to enable one to speak with certainty; he is said (p. xviii) to have ‘corrected the

of each gathering are always more or less rubbed; fol. 117 *b* is perhaps the least injured of the rest, but even that leaf does not approach the splendid condition of 47 *b*. I conclude therefore that 47 *b* was not the last of the gathering, and that the lost leaf (blank?) intervened between the end of St Luke on fol. 47 *b* and the beginning of St John on fol. 48 *a*. If it was blank, that may have been the reason why at some later date, perhaps when the MS was bound, it was removed; even a blank half leaf between the end of Philemon and the beginning of Acts, fol. 99, has been treated in the same way.

whole of the New Testament, as well as much of the Old, and Hermas, but omitted Barnabas'. But the work of a later, eighth-century, corrector or group of correctors called D is confined to the Prophetic Books and to Hermas (p. xvii).

The solution of these various phenomena which I venture tentatively to suggest is that Hermas was originally transcribed as part of the Old Testament and not of the New—after the Prophets, and not after Barnabas—and that it was possibly not till some centuries later that he was removed from the Canon of the Old Testament and transferred as a sort of appendix to the end of the whole Bible.

There is nothing in itself inconceivable, or even improbable, in this connexion of Hermas with the Old Testament. Of the Latin MSS of the *Shepherd* catalogued by von Gebhardt (*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* fasc. iii, 1877, pp. xiv–xix) a few give it among the Old Testament books, none among the New: Bodl. Hatton 22 between Tobit and 1 Maccabees, Dresden A 47 between Psalms and Proverbs, Vienna lat. 1217 (theol. 51) between Wisdom and Isaiah. But it is still more germane to our purpose that the Muratorian Canon excludes the book in set terms from the *corpus* of the Prophetic and the *corpus* of the Apostolic books alike, 'legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare vero in ecclesia populo neque inter profetas completum numero neque inter apostolos in finem temporum potest'. Clearly there is evidence of a tendency to find place for the *Shepherd* in the Canon, in whatever position it might be easiest to foist it, whether in the Old or in the New Testament. The controversy with Gnosticism tended to enhance the level of 'apostolic' authorship required for admission to the New Testament, and Hermas could not even be called, like Mark and Luke, Barnabas and Clement, the companion or disciple of Apostles. It might well seem easier for the moment to retain the book as part of the Prophetic Canon.

But I must not close this note without calling attention to a serious difficulty affecting the combination which I have proposed. The *Shepherd* when complete ought, if I reckon rightly, to have occupied some four quaternions of the Codex Sinaiticus; but the evidence of displacement collected above points to a single gathering only. It is true that the portion of Hermas now actually surviving in  $\aleph$  is less than a gathering—six leaves, and large portions of the seventh—but we should not naturally suppose that the book was from the first incomplete.

Two brief remarks on other matters suggested by the book may be added here. In the longer books, at least from fol. 21 onwards—that is to say in Mark, Luke, John, the Acts, the Apocalypse, and Hermas, the rule appears to be constant that the head-lines occur only

on alternate pairs of leaves, that is to say, on foll. 1 a: 2 b 3 a: 4 b 5 a: 6 b 7 a: 8 b of each sheet. I have noticed the same feature in some early Vulgate MSS, e. g. the Gospel fragments at St Gall; I wish that Prof. Lake had been able to throw some light on the currency of this practice.

The second remark is only the expression of my regret that Prof. Lake still speaks (p. xiv) as though 'a certain Evagrius' was only busied with the Euthalian apparatus at some later stage of its history than its original production. The preponderance of probability appears to me to be quite overwhelming that the illustrious Origenist Evagrius, whose literary work falls in the last quarter of the fourth century, was the original author of the so-called Euthalian edition. One would even like to speculate as to whether Evagrius, himself a calligrapher of no mean order, may not have had something to do with the production of Codex  $\kappa$ .

C. H. TURNER.

### TERTULLIAN AND THE PLINY-TRAJAN CORRESPONDENCE (*Ep.* 96).

THE purpose of this note is to suggest an interpretation of a phrase in Tertullian's reference (*Apol.* 2) to Pliny's famous letter to Trajan on the subject of the Bithynian Christians, by which the supposed discrepancy may be eliminated and the substance of the two accounts brought into complete agreement. The point would seem to be one of some importance for Roman law, for the text-tradition of the Pliny-Trajan correspondence, and also for definitive pronouncement on the authenticity of the Plinian letter.

It may provoke a smile even to hint that this last question has not yet reached the haven of *res iudicatae*. This particular heresy, however, has had the bad taste to survive a number of refutations. Lightfoot (*Ignatius* i 54) and Boissier (*Revue Archéologique*, 1876, pp. 114 sqq.) have between them subjected the general arguments urged against the Plinian authorship to a searching and destructive analysis, while at a later date Mayor (*Class. Rev.* iv p. 210) strongly supported the same conclusion on stylistic grounds. How comes it then that many modern scholars, such as Reinach and De la Berge, like Aubé and Desjardins before them, have entrenched themselves on narrower grounds, maintaining that while the 96th letter is in its general tenor authentic, it cannot be regarded as a complete or exact copy of the original document?

The answer is not far to seek. The residual objection has still to be met that Tertullian (*Apol.* 2), in giving the substance of Pliny's letter,