

# The Journal of Theological Studies

APRIL, 1920

## THE *SHEPHERD* OF HERMAS AND THE PROBLEM OF ITS TEXT.

THERE lived at Rome, during the first half of the second century, an elderly Christian of servile origin named Hermas. At some period of his career—after his children had grown up, but apparently while he was still in early middle life—he had been the recipient of visions and revelations addressed primarily to his own personal and family affairs, but at times of a wider than merely individual scope. In this experience his was not of course an isolated or exclusively favoured case. The early Christians were profoundly convinced that they moved in an atmosphere charged with influences of the Spirit, directing, overruling, and controlling their whole lives. The book of Acts, especially if we read it in the text offered by the Codex Bezae, illustrates this for the first generation of Christians on almost every page: and much later, not less than a century after Hermas, the correspondence of St Cyprian, the sanest and most practical of saints, shews him defending his course of action on more than one occasion by appeal to the visions which had been vouchsafed to him.<sup>1</sup> So far then as the spiritual guidance which had been experienced by Hermas was nothing peculiar or unique, there was no special necessity for publishing his experiences in book form to the community at large, nor is there any evidence that at the time he did so.

But about the year 140 after Christ the fortunes of the family of Hermas took a sudden turn. As successor to bishop Hyginus, the Roman Christians chose Pius to be their head, and Pius was brother to Hermas—probably younger brother, for Hermas must by this time have been an old man, and Pius's tenure of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *ep.* xi 3, 4, lvii 1, 2, lxvi 9, 10, *mortal.* 20, *Vita* 12, 13: and of visions seen by others than himself *ep.* xvi 4, xxxix 1, *mortal.* 19.

Roman see was, if we may trust the traditional chronology of the early popes, longer than that of any of his predecessors. That the scion of a servile family should become bishop of Rome shewed indeed that the Church was not unmindful of the principle asserted by St Paul, that in Christ is neither bond nor free: yet the parallel case of Callistus early in the next century may make us suspect that Pius would perhaps have found the situation not without its difficulties. Possibly the antecedents of Callistus were really dubious, and gave some handle to the attacks of the aristocratic old rigorist Hippolytus: but certainly the edge of Hippolytus's theological bitterness against his opponent was sharpened by the consciousness of social differences as well. An ex-slave uses his episcopal prerogative to sanction the union of slaves with freeborn Roman ladies: that is his gravamen, side by side with the charge of quasi-Patristic heresy. And so, though we have no reason at all to suppose that the earlier slave-pope found any enemy like Hippolytus, yet we may well suppose that his policy and actions would be more liable to criticism at the hands of his clergy than might have been the case with another pope. Anyhow, as the *Shepherd* was published by Hermas during his brother's tenure of the see,<sup>1</sup> and as it seems probable that in Mandate xi he is intending to glance at conditions actually prevailing within the Roman community, then the conclusion is natural that Hermas comes before the public at this particular time both because his relationship to the bishop will attract attention to his revelations, and because in his capacity as a seer he can do something to assist his brother in the difficulties of his position.

This description of the historical setting and surroundings of the *Shepherd* does not claim to be more than tentative: but it is at any rate a good deal less unlikely in itself than other theories which have been ventilated about the book. In especial, the theory that the purpose, or part of the purpose, of the book was to oppose the introduction of monarchical episcopacy in Rome somewhere towards the middle of the second century is in my judgement a serious travesty of facts. It is ridiculous to accept the dating of the book at A.D. 140 or 145 on the ground of the statement in the Muratorian Canon that Hermas published

<sup>1</sup> 'Nuperrime temporibus nostris . . . sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pii episcopo fratre eius' is the statement of the Muratorian Canon about A.D. 200.

when his brother Pius was bishop, and then to use the book to prove that at that date there was no such thing as a bishop in Rome, and that Hermas in particular did not want one.

Let us turn now to the *Shepherd* itself, and see what are the contents of this book, which in the early centuries of the Church had so remarkable a vogue that it even appears in the New Testament of the Codex Sinaiticus. What does it consist of, and why is it called the Ποιμήν or *Pastor Hermas*?

The editions divide the book into three parts under the following names: the Visions, which are numbered from one to five, the Mandates, of which there are twelve, and the Similitudes, of which there are ten. But even as to names we should give ourselves a more exact idea of the book and of its position in relation to the Canonical Scriptures, if we talked of the Twelve Commandments and the Ten Parables, for the Greek words used by Hermas are the same as are represented in the Gospels by these familiar terms. And as to subject-matter, a more scientific arrangement of the contents, and one which would better keep before our minds the apocalyptic nature of the writing, would be into two parts, the 'Visions' of the Church and the 'Revelation' of the Shepherd. On four separate occasions the Church manifested herself—between the first and second manifestations a year elapsed, between the third and the fourth twenty days: we are not told the interval between the second and the third<sup>1</sup>—first as an aged lady seated in an arm-chair, next time as erect, on the third occasion as young and beautiful and seated on a bench, lastly as a virgin in bridal white. The progressive changes, so Hermas is told, symbolize the progressive rejuvenescence of the Christian community as they put aside their infirmities and return to their pristine faith. At the close of the four Visions the order is given to Hermas to spread the knowledge of them among his fellows, in order that all may be strengthened to bear the coming tribulation. The remainder of the book, that is to say, three-quarters of the whole, falls properly under the single heading 'The Revelation',<sup>2</sup> being the message

<sup>1</sup> It cannot, however, have been more than a few months since the first Vision is still spoken of in the third as belonging to 'last year' (*Vis.* iii 10. 3).

<sup>2</sup> The title of the 'Revelation' is in the editions limited to the first introduction of the Shepherd, and is numbered as a fifth Vision.

conveyed to Hermas by the Shepherd-angel into whose charge he is delivered, 'a man glorious in his visage, in the garb of a shepherd', 'the shepherd, the angel of repentance'. The Commandments and Parables that follow are in fact the message and the revelation.

The subjects of the Twelve Commandments are respectively (1) Monotheism, (2) Guilelessness, (3) Truth, (4) Purity, (5) Patience, (6) Faith in goodness, (7) Fear of God, (8) Self-control, (9) against Doublemindedness, (10) against Depression, (11) against False-prophecy, (12) against Evil Desire. The two most individual characteristics of the ethical teaching of Hermas are, on the one hand the value which he sets on cheerfulness and a single mind, with his corresponding horror of *διψυχία* and *λύπη*, and on the other hand the proclamation by the Shepherd, as an accompaniment of his call to repent and do the first works, of one single opportunity of clearing off all former, even post-baptismal, sins. Here is the first insight that history gives us into the long controversy over the readmission of penitents to communion, which agitated the Western Church and gave rise to the schisms of Hippolytus and Novatian: it was in connexion too with this problem that the work of Hermas excited most attention and exercised most influence. The rigorist party would have none of his proffered readmission of penitents: Tertullian denounced the book as 'that apocryphal *Shepherd* of adulterers': but after the milder policy had triumphed and the discipline of perpetual exclusion had been dropped for one class of offences after another, there are still definite traces—in Clement of Alexandria, in Origen, and in the Syrian *Didascalia*—of the limitation to one readmission after one penance; and it is difficult not to see in this compromise (as it were) between two opposing conceptions a direct trace of the influence of Hermas, and of the deference paid during the second and third centuries to his authority.

If we may judge from the space they occupy, the real interest of Hermas lay in his Parables. And probably we should say the same for ourselves, for the Gospel Parables are one of the most striking features of our Lord's manner of teaching, and it is in Hermas more than anywhere else in early Christian literature that we find the echo and imitation of them. There is something

still in Hermas of the freshness and simplicity of the Galilean ministry: but it must be admitted that no contrast could be greater than that between the brevity and directness, the short sharp outline, of the Parable as it is found in the pages of the Synoptists, and the ponderous and on occasions distressing prolixity of their second-century imitator.

Of the Ten Parables two, the seventh and the last, are not really new parables at all: in effect the number is eight, and of these the first four are relatively brief, the other four are considerably longer. The subject of the first in the series is the contrast between the two cities, the earthly and the heavenly: of the next, the elm and the vine, as the type of the mutual benefit exchanged between poor and rich: of the third the similarity of all trees in winter, whether dead or living: and of the fourth, the distinction of the same trees in summer as leafy or leafless. Of the longer parables the fifth is that of the Vineyard entrusted to the Servant, and of his promotion to be co-heir with the Son. The sixth, the sheep and their aspect and fortunes under the shepherd of self-indulgence and the shepherd of punitive and remedial discipline. The eighth that of the willow and the rods cut from it. The ninth and longest is the Parable of the Gate, and the Tower built on it, and the Stones that make up the Tower; and of the Twelve Mountains. From these, Parables in the strict sense, the seventh distinguishes itself as being no more than the application of the preceding Parable to the case of Hermas and his family, and the tenth as containing simply the final message and farewell of the angel.

The numeration of the Parables given above is that of most of our authorities whether printed or manuscript. But certain Egyptian documents (it should be mentioned in passing), both Greek and Coptic, number them differently: in one Greek papyrus of the fourth century, and in the fragment of a Coptic MS, Parable III is numbered IV; in the same Coptic fragment Parable IV is numbered V; in another early Greek papyrus Parable V is numbered VI. It is clear that this aberrant numeration was common, perhaps even regular, in Egypt: but it does not seem to have any claim to supersede the system with which we are familiar in the printed texts. In order, however, to be really in a position to estimate the balance of the evidence

on such a point, we must first make ourselves familiar with the history, whether in manuscripts and versions or in editions, of the text of the *Shepherd*.

Greek was the language of the Roman Church until at any rate the end of the second century. It is possible that of late years there has been a tendency to prolong unduly far into the third century this Greek character of the church of the capital: but it does not admit of doubt that down to the latest date when Hermas can have been writing, the official proceedings of the Roman Church and the worship of the Roman Christians were conducted in Greek and in Greek only. It was inevitable then that the Visions and Revelations of which Hermas had been the recipient should be given to the world in Greek; and this all the more if they were to be circulated in foreign churches. But though Hermas certainly published his book in Greek, there may be reason to suspect that his own origins were less Greek than Latin. His brother's name is purely Latin (Clement was the first, Pius was the second, Roman bishop to bear a Latin name) though his own is Greek: and there are features in his style which make one wonder if he is not writing in Greek but thinking in Latin.<sup>1</sup>

Anyhow, whether or no we are correct in finding traces of it in Hermas himself, it was certainly in a Latin atmosphere that his book obtained its most flourishing development. It is a commonplace to remind ourselves how strong was the reaction in Hellenic Christian circles, from at least the third century, against apocalyptic literature in all its forms, from the Apocalypse of St John downwards. Only two manuscripts of Hermas, both of them incomplete, have come down to us in Greek: and it is quite possible that both of these derive their descent from the one province which in this, as in so many other matters, represented a tradition divergent from the rest of the Greek East. For Egypt was wholly unaffected by the ban upon apocalyptic

<sup>1</sup> Besides a few Latin words transliterated, e.g. *συμφέλιον* (*Vis.* iii 1. 4 &c.), *κερβικάριον* (*ib.*), *λέντιον* (*ib.*), *στατίον* (*Sim.* v 1. 1), consider phrases like *Vis.* ii 2. 6 *ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν ἐκ πλήρους τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*, cf. Latin phrase 'in pleno'; *Vis.* ii 4. 2 *ἤρρησάμην δεδωκέναι*, Latin idiom 'negavi dedisse'; *Vis.* ii 3. 4 *ἐάν σοι φανῆ*, 'si tibi uidetur'; *Sim.* vi 5. 5 *τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πάθει τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῶν*, Lat. 'satis faciens'.

literature. Among the papyri recently brought to light are fragments of more than half a dozen separate manuscripts of the *Shepherd*, ranging in date from the third century to the sixth. And an Ethiopic version and Coptic fragments bear further testimony to the vogue which the book enjoyed in the Egyptian Church. Of the two late Greek writers who made large, if silent, use of Hermas, the one, Antiochus, was a monk of the monastery of St Saba near Jerusalem early in the seventh century, the other, author of *Διδασκαλῖαι πρὸς Ἀντίοχον ἄρχοντα* that passed under the name of Athanasius, is of uncertain date though presumably of Egyptian origin. But there is a gap of not less than a thousand years between the date of these manuscripts or versions or writers, and the date of their re-discovery.<sup>1</sup> So far as the *Shepherd* of Hermas was continuously known or read between, say, the eighth century and the nineteenth, it was only in its Latin form.

Of the earlier history of the Latin version something will be said at a later point. Here we take our start at the renaissance of learning with the first printed text. The palm of priority in the recovery of the sub-apostolic literature—only it is true in a Latin dress, and for the most part only of spurious writings—belongs unquestionably to the French scholar, Jacques Lefèvre of Étapes, better known as Faber Stapulensis. In 1498 appeared at Paris a first edition, in 1515 a second, of the Apostolic Fathers proper; this contained versions of the works of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, of the letters of Ignatius in their longer (fourth-century) form, and of the genuine letter of Polycarp. Between these two editions, in 1513, falls the book which now concerns us, the *Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum*, a collection of six revelations, in which the place of honour is accorded to the *Shepherd*—‘*Hermae discipuli Pauli liber*’, as the editor calls it on the authority of St Jerome. Of this edition in its external aspect one need only say that it is worthy of the founder of the great printing house of Stephanus: while its text, unsatisfactory as it is, remained dominant through the work of one editor after another. Cotelier at Paris, Fell at Oxford, Le Clerc in his re-editions of Cotelier, contributed something to our better knowledge: but after the first quarter of the eighteenth

<sup>1</sup> Antiochus and ps-Athanasius were both printed in the seventeenth century, but they were not made fully available for the text of Hermas till much later.

century matters slumbered till the middle of the nineteenth. Even now the only edition with an *apparatus* is that by Hilgenfeld (Leipzig 1873), which itself rests apparently on the full collation of only one MS, and that a late one.

The task of critically editing the Latin *Hermas* is therefore still to be performed, and it is still a crying need. But attention was diverted from the Latin version by sensational discoveries, during the nineteenth century, of other forms of the text.

Before the middle of that century nothing at all was known of the Greek original of *Hermas*, save the patristic quotations and one catena-fragment published in Grabe's *Spicilegium* (1698). But in 1856 Anger and Dindorf published at Leipzig an edition of the Greek text (an emended critical edition of the Latin was included on the title-page, but I do not know that it ever saw the light): this new Greek text was nearly but not quite complete, and had been acquired by the University of Leipzig in the preceding year from a Greek scholar, one Constantine Simonides. In fact, of the nine leaves sold by Simonides, three were genuine relics of a fourteenth-century MS; the others were admittedly in his own handwriting, but he claimed that they were a transcript executed on Mount Athos from the other leaves of the same fourteenth-century MS. Simonides, however, was a fraudulent liar: it was true that he had copied the whole MS, but he had kept back the copy and sold a composite text of his own making. The *editio princeps* was therefore for two-thirds of its Greek text quite worthless, and the title and credit belong rather to Tischendorf, who in the year following Anger's volume edited for Dressel's *Patres Apostolici* a new Greek text consisting of the three fourteenth-century leaves and of Simonides's actual transcript of the remainder. So far so good—though there were not wanting in Germany eminent scholars who still pinned their faith to the forgeries—but at the best Simonides was only a second-rate copyist, and if there was an original MS of *Hermas* on Mount Athos it was essential that its real evidence should be made available. Nevertheless both critical editions of *Hermas*, that published in 1877 by Gebhardt and Harnack (*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* fasc. iii) and that in 1881 by Hilgenfeld, still depended for their Greek text on the 'apographon Simonidis': it was not till 1888 that Dr Armitage Robinson published at



Cambridge a collation, with Gebhardt and Harnack's text, of MS 96 of the monastery of Gregory on Mount Athos.<sup>1</sup> This collation marked a great step in advance: but it has in turn been superseded by Prof. Kirsopp Lake's photographic edition, with transcript facing each photograph, of the six Athos leaves (Oxford 1907). Even now the evidence has still to be incorporated in an edition of the text.

To sum up: the Greek text, not indeed of the whole of the *Shepherd* but of the first nine-tenths of it, is at length accurately known according to a late Greek MS, of which three leaves at Leipzig have been already utilized in a critical edition, while the six leaves still at Athos are available through Prof. Lake's photographs for any future editor. But when all is said and done, the Athos MS is not only not quite complete, but it is very unsatisfactory as a unique authority. How unsatisfactory it is, even when freed of the added mistakes of modern transcribers, can easily be seen when it is brought into comparison with the still more sensational discovery of a piece, but only a piece, of the *Shepherd* in the Codex Sinaiticus of the Greek Bible.

In the fourth century after Christ the limits of the New Testament had not yet acquired everywhere the precision of later times: and of the two Greek New Testaments which have come down to us entire from the fourth or fifth century each contains by way of appendix some books excluded from our present Canon. The Vatican codex being mutilated at its close, before the end of the Pauline Epistles, we cannot tell whether it contained either the Apocalypse or any additional books: but the Alexandrine codex adds to the Canon the two Epistles of Clement of Rome, and the Sinaitic adds the Epistle of Barnabas and the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Unfortunately, while Barnabas is complete, Hermas is a mere fragment, less than a quarter of the whole. Tischendorf published his text of the N. T. of Codex Sinaiticus in 1863: and short of photography the reproduction was as perfect as could be, though now that Prof. Lake has published this part of  $\aleph$  (Hermas of course included) in photographs

<sup>1</sup> The collation was based on a transcript by a pupil of Prof. Lambros, the distinguished author of the catalogue of the Athos MSS: on which work his fame will rest more securely than on his achievement as Prime Minister under the ex-king Constantine.

(Oxford 1911), all previous presentations of the evidence are again superseded. Where **N** is extant, that is to say, for the Visions and, speaking roughly, for the first two Commandments and the first half of the fourth, its testimony of course takes the first place. Yet even **N** is not by any means a perfect text. The ancestry of the MS of Hermas must have come down through very ignorant hands, for the itacisms and such-like minor defects are far grosser than one commonly meets with: moreover the numerous corrections—partly by a contemporary hand, acting perhaps as the *diorthota*, but largely also by a hand of about the sixth century who must have had a different MS at his command—shew that the text was felt at a quite early date to call for systematic improvement.

Another source of Greek evidence was opened up with the study of the papyri: and it is obvious that Hermas was a favourite author with Egyptian Christians, for fragments of seven different MSS of the *Shepherd*, ranging in date from the third to the sixth century, have been published in England or Germany, besides a quotation from the book in an eighth MS. But the papyri are fragmentary, some of them very fragmentary, and only one of them overlaps the text as preserved in **N**.<sup>1</sup> The actual amount of matter that they preserve between them is so minute that they can hardly take rank as a new witness. But on occasion they

<sup>1</sup> I name and classify them as follows:

Pap.-a: s. iii-iv: a quotation of a few lines from *Mand. xi. Oxyrhynchus Papyri* i no. 5 (1898).

Pap.-b: s. vi: seven fragments, spread over the whole book from *Vision i to Sim. ix*, coincident with **N** at the one end, and reaching beyond the Athos MS at the other end. *Amherst Papyri* ii 190 (1901).

Pap.-c: s. iii-iv: a very fragmentary text of about a page (in Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*) from the end of *Sim. x*, where we have no other Greek authority. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* iii 404 (1903).

Pap.-d: s. iii: two fragments containing the end of *Sim. ii* and a piece near the beginning of *Sim. iv*. Berlin pap. 5513: in Schmidt and Schubart *Allchristliche Texte* (1910) p. 13.

Pap.-e: s. vi: a page near the beginning of *Sim. viii*. Berlin pap. 6789: Schmidt and Schubart, *op. cit.* p. 17.

Pap.-f: s. iv: nearly the whole of *Sim. ii*, coincident in part with Pap.-d. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* ix 1172 (1912).

Pap.-g: s. iv-v: a small piece with the end of *Sim. iv* and beginning of *Sim. v*. Hamburg Town Library: Schmidt and Schubart in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy for 1909, p. 1077.

Pap.-h: s. iv: a page and a half from *Sim. viii*. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* xiii 1599 (1919).

enable us to restore what is unquestionably the true reading, and thus serve to deepen our distrust of a text that reposes only on the authority of the Athos MS. In illustration two passages may be cited from the Parable of the Elm and the Vine. In the first passage, *Sim.* ii 3 (Lightfoot 343. 23), the editors follow the Athos MS with the intelligible if uninteresting statement that the Vine cannot bear fruit *ἐὰν μὴ ἀναβῆ ἐπὶ τὴν πετέλεαν*, 'unless it ascend on to the Elm'; but when the same verb reappears in the interpretation of the Parable, *ib.* 5 (344. 8) *ὅταν ἀναβῆ ὁ πλούσιος ἐπὶ τὸν πένητα*, it is less intelligible, and the reading of Pap.-f *ἐπαναπαῆ* (possibly we should read *ἀναπαῆ*) 'rest on', 'support himself on', is an obvious improvement. But then we find, on looking back to the similar phrase at the commencement of the Parable, that the Latin version rendered 'applicata fuerit ut *super illam refrigeret*', and we cannot doubt that this again is nothing but a paraphrastic version of *ἀναπαῆ* or *ἐπαναπαῆ*, which should be substituted in both places for the banal *ἀναβῆ* of the Athos MS. The second passage to be cited consists of the last words of the same Parable: in the printed texts they run *οἱ γὰρ ταῦτα φρονοῦντες δυνήσονται ἀγαθόν τι ἐργάζεσθαι*, for the Athos MS omitted the clause altogether, and the editors, rightly divining that the sense was to be found in the Latin version, had just made shift to retranslate the words 'qui hoc enim senserit poterit aliquid (or 'aliquid boni') ministrare'. But Pap.-f gives *ὁ γὰρ συνίων τοῦτο δυνή[σεται] καὶ διακονῆσαι τι ἀγαθόν*, and Pap.-d, which here overlaps the other papyrus, and is the oldest of them all, gives the same reading with the omission of the final word *ἀγαθόν*. The rejection of the testimony of the Athos MS by the editors is abundantly vindicated: but the misfortune is that though the Latin evidence may shew us time after time what is in substance the true sense, it cannot give us any certainty about the actual words. For that purpose fresh Greek evidence such as that of the papyri is essential, and we can only regret that the amount of the text as yet recovered in this form is so inconsiderable.

Meanwhile the authorities for the text of Hermas were being reinforced from other directions by the publication of an Ethiopic and of a second Latin version, each of them resting on the text of only a single manuscript. From Abyssinia the French scholar

Antoine d'Abbadie had brought back a transcript of an Ethiopic MS of the *Shepherd* under the title 'Of Hermas the prophet', and this was issued, together with a Latin rendering of the Ethiopic, in the transactions of the German Oriental Society in 1860 (*Abhandlungen der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* vol. ii part i, Leipzig). The Ethiopic version is believed by experts to have been made direct from the Greek: but it must represent of course a Greek text current in Egypt, and its close resemblance to the inferior text of the Athos MS shews that its text is not of the purest type, and may suggest also that the Athos MS itself is ultimately of Egyptian descent. At the best an oriental version, owing to the different genius of the language, is a far more inadequate representative of a Greek text than a Latin version; and it is not from this quarter that we can expect much new light.

The second Latin text on the witness of a fourteenth-century MS now in the Palatine collection at the Vatican (cod. Vat. Pal. 150) and is known, in contradistinction to the Vulgate or ordinary Latin version of Hermas, as the Palatine. It was first edited by Albert Dressel, in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers, in 1857 (*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, Leipzig, ed. i, 1857, ed. 2, 1863), and has been republished—apparently with a fresh collation of the MS, though I do not see this definitely stated—opposite the Greek text in Gebhardt and Harnack's critical edition of 1877. Thus the testimony of this version is now easily and fully accessible. But it is later and less important than the Vulgate Latin. The most superficial comparison of the two translations is enough to shew the superior antiquity of the Vulgate, and though Haussleiter in 1884 published a pamphlet intended to shew that the Palatine was an older African version, the Vulgate later and Italian, I do not think that he made any converts. No doubt the two versions are not independent: and since the Palatine is a revision of the earlier one made no doubt with the help of a Greek MS, it has, in the relative absence of good Greek authority, some importance of its own wherever its differences from the Vulgate indicate a different underlying text.

But it has another importance also. Though in date the revision is, as I suppose, some centuries later than the Vulgate, it must presumably have been carried through when Greek MSS

were still available in the West, that is hardly after about the year A. D. 550: and so far as it retained the Vulgate text unaltered it becomes a witness to the Vulgate text, and a witness as old in all probability as the archetype of all existing MSS of the Vulgate version. Gebhardt and Harnack enumerate sixteen MSS of the Vulgate: except one or two quite late copies, all of them come from Switzerland, South Germany, Northern France, and England. The oldest of them are (1) a fragment of the *Shepherd* in the great St Germain Bible (Paris Bibl. Nat. 11553<sup>1</sup>; at an earlier time known as Sangermanensis 15) of the ninth century: the fragment consists of only the last three leaves of the manuscript as it stands, foll. 187-189, for, just as with the Codex Sinaiticus, so here too this deutero-canonical book was copied at the end of the MS and most of it has perished. (2) St Gall 151, pp. 195-316, saec. x. (3) Carlsruhe Augiensis clxxxiii, written in the tenth century at the island of Reichenau near the town of Constance, consisting of the *Shepherd* only. (4) Oxford, Bodley Laud. miscell. 488 (not, as Gebhardt and Harnack conjecture, Hatton 22, which has nothing to do with the text of the *Shepherd*, but only contains mention of it in a list of canonical books), of the second quarter of the twelfth century, written according to our palaeographical experts in the South of Germany. (5) Paris Bibliothèque Nationale 14656, from the monastery of St Victor, foll. 103-150: of the twelfth century. (6) Lambeth cod. 73, of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, probably of English *provenance*. (7) Vienna lat. 821 (Theol. 705), foll. 1-62, twelfth century: not quite perfect, for it wants *Vis. v 2-Mand. viii 9*: closely related to the St Gall MS. (8) Cambridge University Library Dd. iv 11, foll. 68-90, thirteenth or early fourteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In this case, as in some other cases, the data of Gebhardt and Harnack were quite inadequate for the identification of the MS.

<sup>2</sup> Of the remaining MSS, Trin. Coll. Camb. Gale O. 2. 29 is nothing more than two fragments, containing the commencement of the Visions, and most of the Mandates, in a hand of the thirteenth century. To the fourteenth century there appear to belong Vatic. 3848, foll. 1-40, and St Omer 234: to the fifteenth century Paris Arsenal 337 MS A, foll. 167-216 (an Italian MS from the library of the Carmes Déchaussés or Barefooted Carmelites of Paris, wrongly supposed by Gebhardt and Harnack to be lost); Dresden A 47 (a MS of the Bible, with *Hermas* on foll. 247-266 between *Psalms* and *Praverbs*); Cues on the Moselle 30; Vienna lat. 1217 (Theol. 51), related to the Dresden MS; York Minster XVI 1. 1.

The date and geographical distribution of these manuscripts seem to make it tolerably certain that they descend from some common archetype of the time of Charles the Great. Nothing was more characteristic of the work of the scholars of the Carolingian revival than the reproduction of the literature of Christian or classical antiquity of which isolated copies had been found, written in the fifth, sixth, or seventh century, and sometimes in script that was unfamiliar or even unintelligible. We may conjecture that a single manuscript of *Hermas* had turned up, that copies of it were made and circulated, and that all known exemplars descend from this solitary archetype. Obviously the best that we can in the first instance hope to do with the Vulgate Latin version is to restore the text of this single MS. But it was certainly in places corrupt, and very likely it was not older than the sixth century.

We must not then expect too much from a new edition of the Latin *Hermas*. Nevertheless the preparation of such an edition is the indispensable preliminary to a really critical edition of *Hermas*, firstly because the version to be edited is so old as to be nearly contemporary with the original, secondly because existing editions are so extraordinarily unsatisfactory.

Of the antiquity of the Vulgate Latin I feel more and more strongly convinced. I believe it to be by far our oldest witness to the text—older probably by at least a century than the Codex Sinaiticus—and to belong to very nearly the oldest stratum of Old Latin versions. It may not be quite so primitive as the Gospels and Pauline Epistles of St Cyprian's Bible: for though it shares with them the original rendering of *μακάριος* by *felix* rather than *beatus*, it shews no trace of their use of *clarifico* for *δοξάζω*. It is likely that we have to do here with the next stage of translations, and that the *Shepherd* was turned into Latin at the same sort of date, and under the same sort of auspices, as other books like the Catholic Epistles that hovered on the fringe of the New Testament Canon. Its language is primitive; it does not yet know *blasphemia* but finds Latin equivalents, nor *paeniteri* for *μετανοεῖν*. With *k* of Mark x 19 it renders *ἀποστέρησις* by *abnegantia*: cf. Pliny's letter 'ne depositum appellati abnegarent'. Instead of *presbyteri* and *diaconi* it uses *seniores* and *ministri*. For *ἄγγελος* it employs *nuntius*, and is almost the only

witness to any other rendering than the transliteration *angelus*.<sup>1</sup> We are still in a very early stage of the creation of Christian Latin.

It is worth some pains to try to reproduce this, the most ancient witness we possess for the text of Hermas, in something more like its original form: first by collation of the older MSS, and then by some use of conjectural emendation. Of the results to be expected from the former a specimen will be given at the end of this paper. Two or three simple suggestions may suffice here in illustration of the latter.

*Vis.* iv 1. 1 tulerunt cathedram iterum ad orientem. *For* iterum *read* et ierunt. *Gr.* καὶ ἀπῆλθον.

*Vis.* iv 1. 1 in illa via Campana. *For* in illa *read* in uilla, *Gr.* εἰς ἀγρόν.

*Mand.* v 1. 7 scies et si non custodieris te . . . perdes spem tuam. *For* scies et *read perhaps* scilicet; *Gr.* καὶ μήν.

*Mand.* xii 54 'ad homines seruos dei.' *Read* ad omnes *with Gr.* ἐπὶ πάντας.

*Sim.* i 5 propter aliquos apparatus. *Read* propter reliquos *with Gr.* ἕνεκεν τῆς λοιπῆς ὑπάρξεως.

*Sim.* viii 2 data eis ueste candida et sic eos dimisit. *For* sic eos *the Oxford MS* has sic illos. *Read* ueste candida et sigillo (*or* sigillis) *with Gr.* ἱματισμὸν καὶ σφραγίδας.

Now this very antique specimen of Christian Latin is practically known to us only through editions of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. No modern edition is of the least real value. That by Dressel (included in the same volume of the *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* [1857] as contained his *editio princeps* of the Palatine version) rested on a collation of the late Vatican MS 3848: the second, which still holds the field, was due to Hilgenfeld (1873), whose title-page asserts 'veterem latinam interpretationem e codicibus edidit Adolphus Hilgenfeld', though in fact he appears to have relied entirely on printed books save for a collation of the late Dresden MS. Neither of the two editors, it seems, had inspected any one of the six or eight older MSS. More was really done by Gebhardt and Harnack, who did make use, in their *apparatus criticus* to the Greek text, of the testimony of the St Gall MS. But they did not print the

<sup>1</sup> Pontius *Vita Cypriani* 13 has 'angelus . . . Dei nuntius'.

older Latin version as a whole, and that task still remains to be done. My own material at the present time includes photographs of the Paris St Germain fragment and of the St Gall MS, and collations of the Oxford and Lambeth MSS (the latter was most kindly lent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bodleian for my use), and a collation of the first three-fifths of the Paris St Victor MS. The sum total is still very imperfect: I know as yet nothing of one of the two earliest complete manuscripts<sup>1</sup>: but imperfect though it may be, it is enough to shew how real an improvement can be made in the text. Of course in only a small proportion of cases does the true text of the Latin enable us to restore the true text of the Greek. But very frequently the Greek and Latin are brought into accord with one another in the order of the words: and on occasion the results are of crucial import.

Such an occasion is provided in the Fifth Parable, where the elements of the true text were all present either in the Greek or in the printed Latin, but the true text of the Latin itself has them all. Hermas lived in a period when Christian thought was being directed to the subject of Christology. He experienced the influence of his surroundings so far as to venture himself at times upon this topic: but his intellectual capacity was not equal to the enunciation of any clear line of doctrinal thought, and it would probably be difficult or impossible to reconcile the point of view of the Fifth Parable with the statements and implications of the Ninth. In the Fifth Parable he interprets the servant entrusted with the Vineyard to be the Son of God, while the son of the lord of the Vineyard is identified with the Holy Spirit. It is to the credit of our witnesses that, strange as this language must have seemed to scribes accustomed to the formulated theology of the Church, they have not attempted to tamper with it more than they have done. But if we compare certain parts of the sixth chapter of this Parable (1) in the Greek of the Athos MS, (2) in the printed text of the Latin, (3) in the text of the Bodleian MS (O), we shall see reason to conclude that there is still much to do in the criticism of the text.

<sup>1</sup> I hope to be able to arrange for a complete set of photographs of the Carlsruhe MS, the Denyer and Johnson Trust having kindly made a grant towards the expenses of an edition.



Athos MS	Hilgenfeld	Bodley MS
(1) ἄκουε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πρόον, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶ- σαν τὴν κτίσιν, κατώ- κισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα ἣν ἐβούλετο.	quia nuncius audit illum spiritum san- ctum qui creatus est omnium primus in corpore quod ei uide- batur :	audi. illum spiritum sanctum qui creatus est omnium primus <sup>1</sup> in cor- pore in quo inhabitaret deus collocauit, in[t]e[1]- lecto <sup>2</sup> scilicet corpore quod ei uidebatur <sup>3</sup> :
αὕτη οὖν ἡ σὰρξ ἐν ἣ κατώκησε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . . .	hoc ergo corpus in quo deductus est <sup>4</sup> spiritus sanctus . . .	
(2) [ἰσχυρῶς καὶ ἀνδρείως ἀναστραφείσαν μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου εἴλατο κοινωνόν]	corpus illud seruili- ter conuersatum est sed fortiter cum spi- ritu sancto conpro- batum deo rece- ptum est.	corpus illud, sed uirili- ter conuersatum esset et fortiter, cum spiritu sancto comprobatum deo receptumque est.
(3) ἐν ἣ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατώκησεν	in quo habitandi gratia constitutus fuerit [fuerat O] spiritus sanctus	

Here then for the time we part from Hermas. If he does not take us back so near Apostolic times as St Clement, if he does not illuminate so many problems of faith and order as St Ignatius, he has yet, one cannot but feel, been unfairly neglected. Granted that neither his mind nor his style entitles him to a place in the first rank, yet his moral earnestness, his simple enthusiasms, his championship of a straightforward cheerfulness, *ἰλαρότης*, as a great Christian virtue, should assure him a rightful place in the august company of the Christian worthies of the generations that followed the Apostles.

C. H. TURNER.

<sup>1</sup> The Greek original was probably something like τὸ πρωτόκτιστον πάσης κτίσεως.

<sup>2</sup> Intellecto *cod.*: in electo *coniect.*

<sup>3</sup> The fullness of the Latin is due to the desire of rendering κατοικίξεν fully, 'set in order to dwell': compare passage (3).

<sup>4</sup> Both here and in passage (3) the Greek κατώκησε should be corrected to κατώκησε (*sc. ὁ θεός*) or κατωκίσθη.