
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

following the example of the Council of Trent. Those who have at heart a more general belief in the Eucharist as a sacrifice will do well in placing this argument for the doctrine very much in the back ground; and they will do still better in abandoning it altogether.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

THE LATEST DISCOVERIES AMONG THE FAYÛM MANUSCRIPTS.

IT is now exactly three years since I first brought under the notice of the readers of THE EXPOSITOR a general account of the marvellous "find" from Egypt called the Fayûm Manuscripts. In May, 1885, I gave a sketch of the subject as then known; but three years have since elapsed, and much is now known which then lay concealed from the diligent and learned eyes of the Viennese scholars who have been devoting the labour of their lives to the elucidation of a discovery hitherto unparalleled. It will be my object in this paper to bring the information about these later investigations down to date, hoping thereby to stir up some persons to assist in the work by subscribing at least for the somewhat expensive but yet most valuable *Mittheilungen*, which from time to time gathers into permanent shape the results gained. Its full title we give below.[1]

The chief interest in the discovery for Biblical scholars centred in what has usually been called the Fayûm Gospel fragment. I described that manuscript in the number of this Review published in August, 1885. Three years, however, comprise such a long space, and so many events happen in them, that the most important discoveries are soon forgotten. It will perhaps then be the best course to

[1] *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erherzog Rainer.*

recall the facts at that time known, before proceeding to state the results gained by subsequent investigations. Dr. Bickell, a Roman Catholic divine and Professor of Christian Archæology in the University of Innsbruck, published in that year (1885) a fragment of a Gospel, which he maintained to be a genuine relic or specimen of those original documents which St. Luke tells us he used in the compilation of his own Gospel. As I shall have to refer to the text of this gospel fragment hereafter, I give it below, as I cannot certainly calculate upon every reader having my article at hand for the purpose of consultation.[1] The translation of Bickell's text which I then gave ran as follows: "Now after eating, as they marched out; You shall all be offended this night according to the Scripture, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. Peter said, Though all, yet not I. He said to him, The cock will crow (not the usual word, but a word we might translate 'cry cuckoo') twice, and thou shalt previously deny Me thrice."

This discovery of Bickell's caused a great sensation. The *Times* took the matter up, and its columns gave a much wider circulation to the subject than any Review could. Theological professors and Biblical critics contributed their quota; but notwithstanding all objections, Bickell still holds to his view that here we have a genuine third-century fragment of one of the earliest evangelical documents, and in this contention he is supported by scholars who are the best entitled to speak on this question, such as Wessely, Karabacek, and Krall, who have given years to the study of these Fayûm manuscripts, and must therefore possess a special skill in their decipherment to which no outsider can lay any claim. Bickell now admits that he was mistaken

[1] Μετὰ δὲ τὸ φαγεῖν ὡς ἐξῆγον· πάντες ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτι σκανδαλισθήσεσθε κατὰ τὸ γραφέν· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται. Εἰπόντος τοῦ Πέτρου· καὶ εἰ πάντες οὐκ ἐγώ. ἔφη αὐτῷ· ὁ ἀλεκτρυὼν δὶς κοκκυξει καὶ σὺ πρῶτον τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

on one point. The fifth and sixth words in the Greek text given above were ὡς ἐξῆγον. These words he proposes to change into ὡς ἐξ ἔθους, so that the English version would run thus: "Now after eating according to custom"—that is, according to the usual paschal ritual. The details of his reasons for this change, which are purely technical, would be of no interest to any but specialists in this department of palæographical study, and must be omitted. Bickell takes occasion, however, from these words, ἐξ ἔθους, to append a discussion concerning the order and time of the consecration of the bread and wine, and the institution of the Lord's supper as described by the synoptics and by St. Paul. St. Matthew (xxvi. 26), St. Mark (xiv. 22), and St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23) place the consecration of the bread first, after which came that of the wine. St. Luke (xxii. 17), on the other hand, mentions a cup first, of which Christ says, "Take this and divide it among yourselves," after which he places the formal consecration of the bread, followed "after supper" by another cup, which was blessed with the words, "This cup is the New Testament in My blood, which is shed for you." Bickell gives a full description of the different parts of the paschal feast according to the customary ritual, which seems to me to clear up part of the difficulty, as it shows that St. Luke simply gives from his sources an enlarged account of the Paschal feast. There were several cups used at the feast, which was very prolonged. The wine too was of a mild character, and always mingled largely with water. The various elements of the Paschal rite were: First came the initiatory thanksgiving and prayer, with drinking of the first cup. Then the question and answer about the origin of the feast, together with the first part of the Hallel (Pss. cxiii. and cxiv.). Then came the blessing and drinking of the second cup, followed by the blessing, breaking, and eating of the bread. The eating of the paschal lamb, the central rite of the whole ceremonial,

then took place. There next succeeded in due order thanksgiving after the eating, with blessing and drinking of the third cup, the second part of the Hallel or great Hallelujah (Pss. cxv.–cxviii. and cxxxvi.); and finally the blessing and drinking of the fourth cup, with thanksgiving.

The difficulty raised by Bickell is briefly this: What position in the ceremonial is to be assigned to the consecration of the bread and wine which became the great Christian sacrament? Was it the second cup, followed by the blessing and breaking of bread, which formed the germ of the Holy Communion, or was it the third or even the fourth and last cup which the Saviour selected? In this latter case, where would come the blessing of the bread, which only found its place in the ritual in connection with the second cup? But this does not complete the difficulty. St. Matthew and St. Mark seem to place the consecration of the bread and wine during the meal, "And as they did eat" (Mark), "as they were eating" (Matthew), while St. Luke and St. Paul distinctly place the consecration of the cup after supper, "Likewise also the cup after supper" (Luke), "After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped" (Paul), a view which the liturgical tradition of the Christian Church from the time of the *Apostolic Constitutions* has steadily followed.

After all it seems to me that Bickell's difficulties are not very serious, though very interesting, and the reconciliation of the evangelical narratives not so very difficult. All the narratives place the consecration of the bread during the meal. This was strictly according to the usual ritual. St. Luke and St. Paul place the consecration of the cup after the entire feast, and make it therefore the third or fourth cup. St. Matthew and St. Mark do not give any note of time as to the period when the consecration of the cup took place. They seem to connect it with the consecration of the bread. They give no hint of any interval, perhaps two

or three hours, which elapsed. They are silent, but their silence is no argument, and their silence is quite compatible with the theory that the cup was the third cup, as St. Luke and St. Paul plainly assert. The consecration of the cup in this case was separated by a wide interval from that of the bread; but this constitutes a difficulty only for Western minds trained in a sacramental ritual where the two acts are necessarily connected; to the Jewish mind the difficulty would have been non-existent. This somewhat lengthened discussion may have been somewhat tedious, but it will show what important questions may be raised by these Fayûm manuscripts, when the simple words ἐξ ἔθους in Bickell's hands lead up to such critical questions as the method and order of the Paschal feast and the institution of the Holy Communion. Professor Bickell's own theological position may indeed somewhat affect his judgment on this question, as he has for the last ten years been trying to trace out analogies between the Jewish Passover and the Roman Mass, which he has embodied in an article in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 1880, pp. 90–112, and in his work styled *Messe und Pascha*.[1]

Bickell has been fortunate enough to discover another most interesting fragment among the Fayûm documents, in a small portion of a third century liturgy. Hitherto the oldest liturgical manuscript has dated back only to the fifth century, so that a manuscript with a liturgical fragment of the third century is a treasure from every point of view, doctrinal as well as liturgical. The scarcity of manuscripts, and their comparative lateness,

[1] Dr. Edersheim, in his *Life of Jesus*, ii. p. 511, ed. 1886, refers to Bickell's theories on this question. Edersheim offers a theory of his own as to the consecration of the bread. He thinks our Lord introduced a new blessing of bread unknown previously to the paschal ritual. The words of our fragment would not then be true, "When they had eaten according to custom" (ἐξ ἔθους). Lightfoot, on St. Matthew, cap. xxvi., Opp. t. ii. pp. 257–259, starts much the same theory.

has sometimes been used as an objection to the primitive character of liturgies. But then men forget how complete was the extirpation of Christian documents owing to the great Diocletian persecution, with which the fourth century opened. We have practically no Christian manuscripts older than the fourth century, owing to that terrible and thorough-going time of trial. The enemies of the truth clearly saw that the Christian religion was a historical creed, and they thought to destroy it by extirpating the documents on which the Christians depended so much and valued so highly. One of the most interesting and beautiful stories of the great Diocletian persecution is that of the testimony and martyrdom of St. Irene of Thessalonica. The leading charge against her was that she concealed a vast quantity of sacred books and parchments which she and her sisters were accustomed, according to her Acts, to study day and night. The anxiety of the Roman magistrate to get at these documents is manifest in the examination of her sisters, who suffered some time before St. Irene, and the magistrates' satisfaction at their final discovery is equally evident in the Acts and examination of St. Irene herself, as told in the last chapter of the Eighth Book of Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History*. The very disappearance of ancient liturgical manuscripts makes the Fayûm fragment the more valuable. The Greek text we give below,[1] of which Bickell gives the following tentative translation: "He that was born in Bethlehem and reared up in Nazareth, who dwelt in Galilee, we have seen His sign from Heaven. When the star appeared the shepherds watching in the field were astonished. Falling on their knees, they said, Glory be

[1] Recto: Ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἀνατραφεὶς ἐν Ναζαρέτ, κατοικήσας ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, εἴδομεν σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ· (τῷ) ἀστέρος φανέντος ποιμένες ἀγραυλοῦντες ἐθαύμασαν· (οὐ) γονυπεσόντες ἔλεγον· δόξα τῷ Πατρί, ἀλληλούϊα· δόξα τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀλληλούϊα, ἀλληλούϊα, ἀλληλουϊα. Verso: Τυβὶ ἑ. Ἐκλεκτὸς ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, ὁ κηρύξας μετάνοιαν ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

to the Father, Alleluia, glory be to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia." And again, "Typi 5. St. John the Baptist is chosen, who has preached in all the world repentance for the remission of our sins." Bickell, and his fellow investigators at Vienna, regard these extracts as genuine third-century remains on several grounds. First come the palæographical reasons,—the character of the writing, style of contractions, etc., of which men like Wessely and Krall are the only competent judges, from their special familiarity with these documents. Bickell offers, however, a doctrinal argument of an interesting character. He maintains that the first fragment at least must come from a pre-Arian and pre-Athanasian period, before controversy had made men suspicious of every novel phrase and narrowed Christian freedom by raising up doctrinal barriers on every side. After the time of Arius, the Catholic party would never consent to insert the Alleluia between the name of the Father and that of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; while, on the other hand, the Arian party would never have consented to the equal glory and honour assigned to the Divine persons of the Godhead. Bickell's theory as to the nature of the liturgical fragments may seem to some biassed by his own theological views. He regards them as Antiphons sung in connection with the Psalms which intervened between the reading of the Old Testament and the New Testament lesson used at the beginning of the Liturgy or service for the Holy Communion. Antiphons are short verses or passages repeating the dominant note or enforcing some special Christian lesson in connection with an Old Testament psalm. Their use in the Anglican Church has been largely discontinued. A well known passage in the Preface to the Prayer Book tells how the Reformers simplified the Church Service by cutting off "anthems, responds, invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of

the Scriptures." Some few still survive however. The Easter anthems, sung instead of the Psalm Venite Exultemus Domino at the beginning of the ordinary Morning Prayer, are antiphons, the Gloria Patri sung at the close of each psalm, according to the Anglican rite, is antiphonal in character, putting a Christian meaning and interpretation upon the ancient Hebrew melodies. In the Roman Church the only antiphon sung during the Paschal season consists in the repetition of Alleluias similar to those we find in the ancient liturgy of the Egyptian Church, while in the ordinary service of the Mass, the Introit, Offertory, and Communion are the technical names given to antiphons sung at the various stages of the service. Bickell regards these Fayûm fragments as antiphons sung, the one in praise of John the Baptist on the Eve of the Epiphany, as still is the case with the Coptic Church, while the other formed a portion of the ritual used on the Epiphany, which since the earliest times has been, in the East, the feast dedicated to the celebration of our Lord's nativity. Bickell even undertakes to determine the psalm to which the Epiphany Antiphon belonged. He fixes upon the 33rd Psalm for this purpose, and even assigns different portions of the antiphon to the different parts of the psalm. This contribution made by Dr. Bickell raises many important questions. If genuine, it pushes back the liturgical and festival system of the Church into the early third century, and therefore practically to the times of the earliest Christian Church, because the early Christians were intensely conservative. This is a view we often forget in our criticisms. We are apt to think that new rites and ceremonies could be introduced, and were introduced, at random, or at the will and pleasure of any influential bishop or presbyter. But this is absurd. In no department of life's activity are men so intensely conservative as in religion. Let me illustrate that fact, which has been too much for-

gotten in many modern controversies concerning the creed and Church government of primitive ages. Take the Anglican Church for instance. It has been three centuries and a half separated from the Roman communion. Yet rites prevail in it without any formal sanction in the Prayer Book, preserved from Roman times simply by the force of conservative tradition. The Gloria repeated before and after the Gospel, bowing and turning to the East at the creeds, and the silence of the people during the Lord's Prayer at the opening of the Holy Communion, in the face of a direct rubrical order for its audible repetition by them, are all survivals of pre-Reformation usages. In the fifth century it was just the same. St. Augustine in one of his letters to St. Jerome, tells us how an African bishop well nigh lost his whole congregation because he dared to adopt St. Jerome's rendering of Ivy instead of Gourd in the narrative of Jonah's preaching at Nineveh. The people were so indignant at the slightest change in the version they had been always accustomed to hear, that Augustine says they interrupted the reader, shouted out the ancient version, and were not contented till the Jewish inhabitants were called in to decide the true rendering, which they did, in opposition to St. Jerome, and in favour of the Old Latin Version which had come down to them sanctified by the memories of saints, doctors, and martyrs, reaching back to apostolic times. Again, when we take up the writings of Tertullian, we find that about the year 200 men pushed this conservative tendency to absurd extremes. While again the Montanist movement was simply a protest of intense conservatism in favour of ancient Church principles against the laxer views and principles current in the West. And now to apply these general considerations to the matter in hand. I can only conclude that if such matters as the festival system of the Church, and antiphons, and the ritual system, and bishops and the episcopal system existed universally

in the third century throughout the Christian Church, they must have existed from the beginning, or else their introduction would have created such a noise and commotion as would have left its mark deeply printed upon history.

I must very briefly mention some other Fayûm discoveries. Wessely has published an elaborate paper touching the dates of the Greek papyri belonging to the period of the Roman empire, showing that the imperial year in Egypt was a fixed matter, and dated from the 29th August in one year to the 28th of August in the next; so that if an emperor succeeded to the throne ever so short a period prior to the 29th of August, that time was counted his first year, while his second year began with the said 29th of August. Wessely's paper has many other illustrations of the inner life and high social organization of the Roman empire, very important for the purposes of ecclesiastical history when books like Mr. Cotter Morison's "Service of Man" are asserting, in the face of all historical evidence, that Christianity only arose when the ancient civilization of the world was dead or in its death throes. The study of these Fayûm documents will prove that never was the social organization of the empire so perfect and so complex as when Christianity had run two centuries of its chequered existence. In a note on page 22 of his article, Wessely notices the interior communications between the various parts of the empire and the capital, and specially between Rome and Alexandria. When one remembers how little men know of the methods and times of even royal communications and posts in England three centuries ago, it is very interesting to get a glimpse into the methods of the imperial posts in the times of Cyprian and Origen. A papyrus horoscope dated December 4th, 137, has also been deciphered. It is an attempt to read a man's destiny by the position of the stars on a certain day, which fact enables its exact date to be settled by astronomical calcula-

tions, while the whole document throws an interesting side-light upon Egyptian life and religion in the times of Justin Martyr and the Antonines. The Christian organization of Egypt soon after the triumph of Christianity can be realized from these documents. Oxyrrhynchus and Arsinoe were towns where Christianity in its monastic shape obtained their greatest triumphs. They were both celebrated in the religious struggles of the fourth and fifth centuries. Oxyrrhynchus, about A.D. 400, became enthusiastically monastic, a very town of monks, as Ruffinus tells us, "filled within and without with monks, who swarmed even in the ancient temples, which they had turned into monasteries, so that there were more monasteries than houses in the town."[1] He then tells us that there were twelve churches in the town; a number afterwards enlarged to 360. Now Wessely has from a study of his documents restored the names of the streets and the dedications of the numerous parish churches of the neighbouring town of Arsinoe, affording vivid and almost contemporary illustrations of the confessors and martyrs, like Thecla, Victor, Theodore, Apollonius, who suffered in the Diocletian persecution, after whom the churches were doubtless named. Finally, Krall, to whom the Coptic documents have been entrusted, has contributed some papers of great interest. One deals with the Coptic version of the Book of Zechariah, Krall having found a parchment volume of 133 leaves containing the minor prophets in Coptic, from which he shows that various Greek versions of the Scriptures were current in Egypt; some approaching more closely to the Alexandrian, and others more to the Vatican Manuscript. Krall has also elaborated a theory that a large portion of the newly found manuscripts, including some of the most important Biblical

[1] Ruffinus, *Historia Monachorum*, cap. v. Ruffinus mentions that in Oxyrrhynchus alone, there were, according to the local bishop, 20,000 nuns and 10,000 monks.

fragments, belong to a convent library which he fixes at the ancient Hermopolis Magna, the modern Ashmuneim, built perhaps on the supposed site of our Lord's residence in this city of Hermopolis, the refuge of His infancy according to tradition, certainly as old as the third century (Hyvernat, *Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte*, pp. 82, 92). I cannot at the end of this very discursive paper give any account of Krall's elaborate essays, which will well repay careful study, stuffed full as they are of vivid illustrations of ancient Christian life and literature. Mr. Butler, in the preface to his work on the ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt, has remarked that "the history of Christian Egypt is still unwritten, or at least that part of it about which the most romantic interest gathers, the period which witnessed the passing away of the ancient cults and the change of the pagan world. We have yet to learn how the cold worship, the tranquil life and the mummified customs of that immemorial people dissolved in the fervour of the new faith; how faces like those sculptured on the monuments of the Pharaohs became the faces of anchorites, saints, and martyrs." Butler's statement is true, but modern research is speedily accumulating materials for the supply of that want he so keenly laments. Christian Egypt is now revealing herself, her people, her sacred literature, her Biblical manuscripts, her ancient ritual and social customs.

The extracts and facts submitted in this paper will plainly show that among the chief sources of this most interesting knowledge of early Christian life, these Fayûm documents, illustrated by the loving and learned labours of their Viennese custodian and commentators, must ever take an honourable position.[1]

GEORGE T. STOKES.

[1] I may perhaps mention that the last number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* contains a most interesting account of Christian novel reading and novel writers among the monks who swarmed all along the