

cultus, then the answer must be 'very little'. It has been, I may say, a satisfaction to me personally that the appearance of these Manichaean Homilies will cause so little change in future editions of my book on the *Religion of the Manichees*. But if by knowing a religion we mean getting into its atmosphere, feeling the hopes and fears, the troubles and the expectations of the faithful, and finding also that they are not utterly different from the hopes and fears of Christians, then these new Homilies are notably informing. The Manichees had many peculiar beliefs, but this book, like many of the Turfan fragments, shews us also the many Christian elements in their view of the world and its history. They believed in judgement to come, when all the world would stand at the Judgement-seat of Jesus, who would divide mankind into the sheep and the goats. Like the Christians, their contemporaries, they thought that monks and nuns had chosen the better part, although an honourable place was reserved for adherents who had not entirely forsaken the world. They cherished the memory of their Martyrs, as did the Catholic Christians, and wrote in detail the account of their sufferings. All this is pressed upon us by these tattered pages, which help to make the Manichaean Faith live before our eyes, while the published fragments of the *Kephalaia* help us very little in these respects.

It would be unfitting to end this brief account of the new 'Homilies' without once again expressing the admiration of all students of ancient religious thought and opinion to Dr Polotsky and Dr Ibscher for their learning and skill, and to Sir Herbert Thompson for making this relic of a forgotten faith available to scholars.

F. C. BURKITT.

JULIUS AFRICANUS AND THE WESTERN TEXT

I

THE history of the sacred text has hitherto been studied mainly with reference to individual manuscripts and their scribes. But labourers in this field have been preparing the ground for a new structure. The history of books and their transmission is for the most part a history of libraries.¹ The catalogues which we owe to Dr M. R. James, to take

¹ The grouping of MSS in the Ferrar series is typical. They seem to represent a local text (Calabria or Sicily). May we enquire what library was concerned? So also with the similar groups which are being slowly disentangled. While the Ferrar series was mostly written under the Norman domination of Sicily and Calabria, Byzantine history must follow up most of the clues to Greek MSS elsewhere. For the catalogues of Byzantine libraries see Krumbacher *Bys. Lit.*² 509 f.

one example, furnish material the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated not only for the transmission of medieval literature but for its production. When we pass backwards beyond the age of vellum to that of the papyrus, the conditions remain the same except for the perishable character of the books themselves. It is on these lines I propose to attack the problems of the 'western' text, and to offer a few suggestions which may or may not commend themselves.

The distinction between books that are produced in libraries and those which are written with little or no reference to other books may be applied with advantage to the N.T. canon. Of the gospels Mark and John, of the epistles those of James and John and perhaps Jude, may have been written with the help of the synagogue scriptures or even the church copy of the LXX alone. Paul seems to have travelled with a small library of his own. Hebrews is obviously in many parts a compilation and still more Revelation. Whereas the first part of Acts occasionally suggests the lamp, the travel document like the gospel of Mark takes us into the fresh air. But there is nothing improbable in the use of libraries, ranging from a few books to considerable private or even public collections by the end of the first century. These considerations throw some light upon questions of authorship. There is nearly as much reason for suggesting that a writer of apostolic times used a library in compiling his book, as that a post-apostolic writer made similar compilations with the same resources. Further, the employment of scribes made it possible for an 'author' to put his name to a blending of his own dictations or notes with the fair copy of the scribe who produced the actual book. If this is usually the case with Paul, there is reason—reserving the question of authorship—to regard the gospel of John and the apocalypse of John as composite productions: the part played by the scribe in the latter is certified by the author xxii 18, and succeeding scribes are warned against interpolations and omissions *ib.* and xxii 19. When we return to the gospel, the distinction between the author and the scribe becomes obvious (John xx 30, 31; xxi 24, 25). The last verse seems to imply the existence of other writings and to have been written with libraries in view. Still more does the conclusion of the apocalypse exhibit the scribe as contemplating the reproduction of his work by succeeding scribes and he uses terms which are conventional in their protest against omissions and interpolations. The distinction which is thus established between the author and the scribe throws a double light on the Johannine writings. When the scribe puts the name of the author to the script, he is not, and was not thought to be, guilty of claiming to figure as the author. In the second place, the relation of the author and the scribe shews two degrees of immediacy: the author may actually dictate to the scribe as

in the apocalypse, or the scribe may work over material which he has previously gathered as in the gospel. It lies outside the scope of this article to follow this question further. It is enough to vindicate the use of libraries from the beginning of the Christian tradition. It is probable therefore that alongside with the great variety of the 'western' texts the not less striking agreements are to be referred, in part, to scribes working in libraries.

II

The impressions of a modern who, by some miracle, should be transported to a library of the first Christian century, would be not unlike that of a Greek who, by another miracle, should enter to-day the public library of a popular seaside town. The ancient Greek might expect to find books on science and engineering and would be put off with Edgar Wallace. His disappointment would match that of the eighteenth-century scholars who hoped to find hitherto unknown masterpieces of Greek or Roman literature in the papyri of Herculaneum and had to content themselves with second- and third-rate philosophical disquisitions. Paul warned Timothy against wasting his time upon such studies in terms which echo the catholic judgement passed by Aristotle upon 'the empty phrases of dialecticians' (*de an.* I. i 8).

Galen found such philosophizing more inimical to a scientific attitude than the tenets of Judaism and Christianity. For there does not seem to have been a breach between the rising faith and the science of the time. The author of the *Poimandres*, a gnostic Christian writing of the second century, was probably a physician (*J.T.S.* v 412). That Luke a physician should have been the sympathetic companion, if not the historian, of the 'travel' section of Acts anticipates the friendly attitude of Galen himself towards 'superstition'. (The criticism of the 'we' section of Acts usually disregards the relation of the author to the scribe.) The fact that the terminology of the Lucan writings so largely repeats the language of Hippocrates and anticipates that of Galen illustrates the non-Attic course of the main scientific tradition and takes us to the Asia Minor which now, alas, is no longer Greek. Hobart's *Medical Language of St Luke*, indeed, has a wider scope than its title suggests. In the second part, which deals with terms used outside medical subjects, found in the Lucan documents and in medical writings, he has shewn that the Lucan vocabulary, unlike that of the rest of the N.T., ranges over a great part of the scientific knowledge of the age. The parallels which Hobart adduces from Hippocrates and Galen might well have been supplemented from non-medical sources. The Lucan vocabulary includes an adequate proportion of terms used in scientific research. And further, the vocabulary of everyday took a

scientific turn in the Lucan documents when it was employed in recording observations which by precision were almost scientific in the modern sense. In comparison with the current quasi-scientific philosophy of the schools, Luke stands out by his contact with experience. His procedure which was based on the records of direct observation—the autopsy of Luke i 2—is illustrated by the ‘we’ passages in which the ‘author’ if not the ‘scribe’ speaks at first hand. It is remarkable that the scientific character of the Lucan style should not have received more attention. Undoubtedly Luke gained much of his knowledge from the libraries. But he was not an Atticist, and the roughness which some have traced in Acts is reconcilable with his general method. If Deissmann has vindicated the share of the vernacular element in the vocabulary of the Greek N.T., Hobart has performed a parallel service in collecting some 300 scientific terms from the vocabulary of Luke.

III

Scientific terms, by their very precision, run the risk of being misunderstood. And the reviser who tones down his text to the imagined needs of popular usage is more dangerous to tradition than the ignorant scribe. There are some traces of this in D. For Luke’s *συνεχομένη*, he has *κατεχομένη* iv 38; for the scientific *ἦχος*, the current *ἀκοή* iv 37; he introduces the non-Lucan *παραλυτικός* v 19; he gives himself away by attributing to the prophets ‘writings’ *‘γραφάς’* in place of ‘utterances’ *‘φωνάς’*, where the new papyrus 45 joins B against D, Acts xiii 27. One slight touch is worth notice. In Acts xiii 46, 48, D has *αἰώνιος* with two terminations, B and the papyrus in this short passage use both the m. and f. forms with *ζωή*. These cases are quoted not so much as instances against the primitive character of D, but as illustrating by comparison the combination in the other sources of scientific tradition with neglect of grammatical uniformity.

IV

We have found in Luke a predecessor of Julius Africanus in scientific attainments. But while Luke is the biologist—his interests included botany—Africanus is the engineer and is in close touch with mathematics and mechanics. Nor is the scientific tradition broken when we pass to Origen. Yet it is weakened. Origen inclined rather to the empty dialectic in which Greek philosophy was fading away than to the exposition of the rich content of experience which can be traced in Luke and not less in the *Kestoi* of Africanus. That the agricultural sections of the *Kestoi* should have been preserved is noteworthy, still more that the sections on military engineering should have contributed

to the art of war in medieval Byzantium. Africanus was even greater in scholarship. His list of Olympic victors preserved by Eusebius is one of the foundations of Greek chronology.

V

The librarian of the Pantheon displays the same scientific tendency when he turns to the genealogy of Jesus. He seeks a historical foundation in the records alleged to have been preserved by the kinsmen of Jesus himself (Eus. *H. E.* I 7). The whole passage about the *desposyni* suggests a human background for the life of Jesus, which to the Jewish Christian was guaranteed by the genealogies, to the Gentile Christian was obscured by the *metaphysical*¹ use made of those same genealogies. The fact that D replaces the Lucan genealogy by that of Matthew suggests that the Lucan genealogy was not found in the sources of D. In that case the narrative of Africanus is noteworthy as furnishing an explanation of the source of Luke's genealogy. D agrees with the Hebrew and Africanus against the LXX, Gen. x 24, and against the other MSS of the N.T. in omitting Cainam (the son of Arphaxad) Luke iii 36; the Syriac replaces Cainam by Elam. Africanus's omission of Matthat and Levi, Luke iii 24, is quoted from the Greek text itself (Eus. *H. E.* I 7, 10) and is supported from the Latin. Are we to speak of these cases as 'western' non-interpolations? The answer to this question will demand consideration.

VI

The association of Africanus with Origen, whom he addresses as a 'son', was probably not confined to the exchange of letters. We may infer that Africanus was the intermediary between Origen and the empress-mother Mamaea when they met at Antioch. For the office of imperial librarian filled by Africanus carried with it usually an intimate relationship with the emperor.

Are we to go back to Alexandria and imagine Africanus as one of the teachers of Origen? The correspondence of master and disciple about the Susanna episode in the LXX Daniel is instructive in two ways: it leaves the palm of scholarship with Africanus and exhibits the imperfect knowledge of Hebrew possessed by Origen. To Africanus, who spent much of his life at Emmaus—not that of Luke—in Palestine, Syriac must have been familiar, if not his mother-tongue, and consequently

¹ The distinction between 'theology' and 'metaphysics' made by Ritschl is illuminating. In fact Ritschl's whole system seems to be related to some of the characteristics of the 'western' text.

the cognate Hebrew would present fewer difficulties to him than to Origen. In this respect, as in some others, Africanus was better equipped for N.T. textual criticism than Origen. In view of the difference of attitude about the LXX, it is unlikely that Africanus would be at one with Origen in his treatment of the text of the Greek N.T.

As a textual critic Origen is unreliable. He furnishes evidence not always adequate for the state of the Greek text and, incidentally, for the causes which modified it. The outstanding case is Mark vi 3, where Celsus appeals to the reading *τεκτών*, and Origen denies that the reading was found in any of the gospels read in the churches. Yet Celsus is supported by \aleph ABD, &c. (The fact that ψ^{46} supports Origen as against the rest, and generally divides its allegiance between the 'neutral' and 'western' types, complicates to an extraordinary degree the problem of determining what the 'Alexandrian' type of text really was.) In this particular case, the prejudice against vulgar occupations reaches its climax and prepares us for the smoothing over of those vernacular touches which, for example, are characteristic of D. But this smoothing over of the vernacular carried with it the partial obliteration of technical and even scientific detail. Hence the technical and scientific vocabulary of Luke rendered the gospel and the Acts peculiarly exposed to the danger of revision by the amateur. On the other hand, the balance between the dialectician and the grammarian on the one side, and the craftsman on the other, demanded for its adjustment a critic with the equipment of Africanus, and by a happy coincidence he was in a position to further the circulation of MSS of the Greek N.T. from Rome itself as a centre.

VII

We may add to this the fact that the communication of Rome with the Syrian east was easy and frequent; *iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes | et linguam . . . vexit*. There were Syrian schoolmasters and even Syrian popes. Hence when Tatian came to Rome c. 160, and when the king of Edessa himself, Abgarus IX, visited Rome c. 202 and became a convert to the Christian faith, they found themselves among compatriots. (Abgarus indeed seems to have been in communication with Africanus.) Early Syrian literature maintained an independent existence from the first. And it is probable that the first form of Tatian's *Diatessaron* was Syriac.¹ Syrian influence at Rome culminated under the Syrian emperor, Alexander Severus, when Africanus was appointed Director of the Pantheon library. We are thus prepared

¹ 'Ein syrisches Originalwerk auf Grund des griechischen Textes der vier kanonischen Evangelien' (Baumstark *Die christlichen Literaturen des Orients* i 54 f.).

for the conclusion that Rome (and in particular the Pantheon library) was a meeting ground for the three main elements among the authorities for the 'western' text: the Greek before Origen, the Old Latin, and the Old Syrian.

But a retraction is due to Africanus. In the article of which this is a sequel ('The Greek Origin of the Pantheon' *J.R.I.B.A.* Nov. 26, 1932) βιβλιοθήκη τῆ καλῆ ἦν αὐτὸς ἠρχιτεκτόνησα τῷ Σεβαστῷ was interpreted as though Africanus represented himself as the architect of a 'beautiful' library, whereas the 'fineness' consisted in the contents themselves, the rolls and, as we may now say, the codices contained in the *armaria*. The addition of Abraham and Christ to the portraits which adorned the private chapel of Alexander Severus was probably carried out under the supervision of Africanus (who seems to have advised the autocratic empress-mother Mamaea in fine art as well as in theology) and symbolizes the presence of Jewish and Christian literature in the library. But we may go farther back than this. When the empire was threatened by the Marcomanni, Marcus Aurelius summoned the priests of foreign religions to Rome that they might practise their foreign ritual for the salvation of the empire (*Hist. Aug. M. Aur.* 13, 1). The toleration of ritual implies the toleration of the corresponding literature. Hence we may not hastily assume that Christian books were first introduced to the imperial library by Africanus.

VIII

We get a casual glimpse of the working of the library from Africanus. Although he dedicated the *Kestoi* to Alexander Severus, only thirteen of the twenty-four books of the treatise were at the time of writing to be found in the Roman library, while the complete work was to be found in other libraries, Jerusalem and Nysa in Caria (*P. Oxy.* iii 412). The library at Jerusalem had been recently founded by Alexander the bishop—and friend of Origen. If Africanus could send the complete text of a scientific work to an ecclesiastical library, we may infer *a fortiori* that there was a similar circulation of the books of Scripture.

It remains to gather up and summarize the results of our enquiry. We have proceeded in close contact with such first-hand authorities as are available. The most fruitful conclusion is that which distinguishes between the vernacular and scientific character of the pre-Alexandrian text on the one hand and on the other the variations which are found largely in the quotations of Origen. We have found reason to dissent from the high estimate of Origen's critical power which has prevailed in some quarters. To take one case, the influence of the contemporary philosophizing upon him has exercised a disturbing influence upon the

reports which he gives of his texts. With him, therefore, Greek dialectic enters upon the scene and appears as an intruder. The so-called 'neutral' text has thus a negative quality in its rejection of the scholasticism which threatened the church: a quality it shares with the 'western' text. As against the popular 'western' text, it retains the scientific terminology which can be so traced in Luke and—to a less extent—in Paul.

Is it possible to find some general explanation of the character of the 'western' text? May it be said that it represents the imperfectly grecized tradition of scripture? When, at the beginning of this paper, it was suggested that the gospel and apocalypse of John were written in libraries, those libraries, probably attached to a church, need not have contained more than the generally recognized books of scripture along with the current apocalyptic writings. Such libraries were far from the comprehensive scope of the great library at Jerusalem, and were aloof from the Greek philosophical tradition.

The largely Syriac evidence for the 'western' text guarded its non-Hellenistic character and culminates in the directorship of Africanus at the imperial library. That the 'western' text was earlier than the 'neutral' text as exhibited in the Chester-Beatty codex is perhaps indicated by the fact that along with a strong bias towards the 'neutral' text—stronger I think than the statistics of Sir Frederic Kenyon suggest—the papyrus gives considerable support, as we might have expected, to the prevailing popular text.

FRANK GRANGER.

Note.—The antithesis between the 'Semitic' character of the 'western' text and the Hellenistic character of the 'neutral' text must not be pressed, but it must include the fact that the African Latin grew up amid a population whose mother-tongue, the Punic, was closely allied to Hebrew. The fact that the 'western' text is mainly non-Greek, D itself being accompanied by a Latin translation, may be connected with the disuse of Greek as the *lingua franca* of the church. And so we reach the conclusion that the 'western' text became current about the middle of the second century.

F. G.

I. ἐπινοέω, ἐπίνοια, and allied words

II. ἐπιούσιος

THE following notes are part of the material compiled for the proposed *Lexicon of Patristic Greek*, the editor of which (Dr Stone, Pusey House, Oxford) is always glad to receive suggestions.

E. C. E. OWEN.