

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

their dream of a united Motherland restored to what they deem its pristine glory. But they have nothing to put in its place, and many not unnaturally complain that the followers of Christ are as little liberated from the seen as they have felt themselves to be from the bondage of the karmic law. The Christian Gospel speaks of God as redeeming love, and calls us now to an eternal life which death cannot interrupt but will consummate. A message so strange and glad will be believed as it is not only preached but manifested, and the Church will make credible the Christian doctrine of immortality as it shows forth in act the meaning of that communion with God which through Christ we are meant already to experience.

SYDNEY CAVE.

*THE ENCRATITES AND THE MARRIAGE  
AT CANA.*

THE earliest days of the Church are marked by an outburst of asceticism, which expressed itself, amongst other developments, in abstinence from flesh-food and wine. As a consequence (just as in our own times in Temperance circles) it became necessary to prove that the New Testament was on the side of the abstainer, and that our Lord and His disciples belonged to the order of Nazarites, much as, if they were alive to-day, we might prove them to be Good Templars or members of the Independent Order of Rechabites.

Then, as now, the stumbling-block was in the account of the marriage at Cana of Galilee, where the house was "dry," at an early stage of the proceedings, and the language used suggests that the guests might have imbibed as much as was good for them. So the question arises as to how the

Encratites (as they were called) of the second century and their leader Tatian would deal with this incident, so as to harmonise it, if possible, with their own position and practice.

The Fourth Gospel (as we call it in deference to criticism) was certainly in their canon ; and while there is evidence to show that Tatian was not averse to making minute changes in the Gospel text, it would hardly be practicable for him, even in making a Harmony, to omit the second chapter of John, or to deal violently with it. Any changes introduced must be moderate, and, if possible, explanatory : if they deal with the difficulty intelligently, the various reading which is caused in the text, whether by addition or omission or other modification, can be labelled as an Encratism or a Tatianism, and set on one side by subsequent editors ; just as, for example, when Tatian sets John the Baptist a diet of *milk* and wild honey, it is clear the milk is a substituted Encratism for a troublesome insect.

Now when we look at the text of the Gospel in the passage referred to, the first thing we notice is an explanation, in two Old Latin MSS., that the reason for the deficiency of wine was that there was a concourse of guests, beyond those expected or prepared for : thus the Palatine Codex (cod. e) says :

et factum est per multam turbam vocitorum vinum consummari,  
and the MS. known as Codex Rehdigerianus (cod. l) says :

et factum est præ multa turba vocatorum vinum consummari.

Here we have an explanation given of the shortness of the supply, and it might easily be taken as a proof that the amount of wine individually consumed must have been very small when there were so many persons at the banquet. There is, however, another explanation current, which is certainly due to Tatian himself and was part of his Harmony.

According to this theory, for it can only be a theory, our Lord did not arrive until late in the festival, when the supply of wine was exhausted. The remark of His mother regarding the lack becomes, on this showing, an expression of surprise. The festival was now Encratite of necessity; Jesus and His disciples are not responsible for the preliminary proceedings.

Now let us see if we can establish the truth of our statements. We turn to Ephraim's commentary upon the Diatessaron (Mös., p. 52 ff.) and find as follows:

"There was a wedding in Cana of Galilee; and *when the Lord came thither*, his mother says to him, '*They have no wine here.*' Jesus says to her, 'What have I to do with thee, woman? my time is not yet come.'"

This professes to be the text of the incident, and it is followed by a profuse commentary, sprinkled with bits of text. What are we to say of the words which we have italicised?

Ephraim proves them to be part of the text, either by adding comments upon them, or by repeating them in an emphatic manner. He tells us that Mary was anxious because those who were responsible for the banquet would have been dishonoured, "for they will hear *that thou hast arrived* when the wine has failed."

Again he says definitely (p. 56), "Our Lord, when he was invited, did not come with the rest of the invited, who preceded him, in order that they might consume the first and light wine; and *then he came himself*, in order that he might bring wine of the sweetest kind." Here it is quite clear that our Lord is a late-comer, presumably with His mother and His disciples, which accords with what Ephraim gives as the Gospel text. "No wine *here*" is the language of a late arrival.

In the next place we pick out of Ephraim's commentary

the traces of the reading which we found in the two Old Latin MSS. Here it is said (p. 55) :

“His opulence did not scorn their poverty, who could not even supply light wine to *match the number of those who were invited.*”

The excessive number of guests is what causes the deficiency in the inferior wine at the beginning of the feast, and the best wine had not yet arrived !

What about the statement of Mary, “They have no wine here” ? Ephraim repeats it again in an expanded form : “*My son, they have no wine here !*” The addition of the words “My son” to the address is found also in our two Old Latin MSS., which are this time reinforced by no less a person than St. Ambrose, if we may believe Tischendorf, who quotes that father but without giving a reference. Setting Tischendorf, however, on one side, we have twice convicted our pair of Old Latin MSS. of a Tatianism. The only word for which we have not found attestation is *hic*, but since Ephraim gives it twice we need not hesitate to restore it to his text, that is to the *Diatessaron*.

There is another direction in which Tatian was obliged to change his text. In the second chapter of John the Cana incident belongs to the beginning of the ministry and has the preface “On the third day.” Tatian, however, in order to make a harmonistic sequence, carries the incident to a much later period in the life. This required a re-adjustment of the opening words, and they were either omitted, as here in Ephraim’s text, or they were replaced by a non-committal sentence as in Dr. Plooijs’ Liège Harmony, which says “Upon a day.”

A further difficulty will arise over the words, “This beginning of miracles,” according to which John puts this particular one into the front, in the order of time, of all our Lord’s works of power. This, however, admits of a very easy interpretation ; we have only to say that it was the

first miracle done in Cana of Galilee, and then all is clear ; the wedding can take place at any time.

Now let us return to our Latin MSS. (codd. *e* and *l*) and see if they show any other variations in their account of the incident.

In John ii. 5 we are told that our Lord's mother said to the servants, "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it." Then, in verse 7, "Jesus says to them, Fill the waterpots with water." Now, in our Palatine MS. (cod. *e*) the verse is introduced as follows: "And the mother of Jesus called the servants to her and said" (*et advocatis ad se ministris mater ihm dixit illis*). In the seventh verse there is a similar expansion; this time it is Jesus that called the servants to Him and said to them (*et ihs vocatis ad se ministris dixit illis*). At this point the other MS. (cod. *l*) has a similar expansion (*et vocavit ihs ministris et dixit eis*, where the incorrect form *ministris* is a survival from an original *vocatis ministris*). We note again the concurrence of the two MSS. in the peculiar reading, and this time they are joined by a third Old Latin text (the Corbey MS. *ff*), so that the variant is of wider diffusion than might at first have been suspected.

It is lawful to suggest that here also we have a survival from the *Diatessaron*. It is not, of course, necessary to limit Encratite glosses or modifications of the text of the *Diatessaron* to the hand of Tatian. There were other literary men in the movement, whose minds might affect the text. It is interesting to notice, however, how often our enquiries lead us, with Ephraim's assistance, to the *Diatessaron* itself.

Another interesting and parallel line of investigation of possible Encratisms elsewhere in the Gospel will be found in a recent article by Dr. Plooij in the *Zeitschrift für neutest. Wissenschaft* (22 Bd., 1923), under the heading, *Eine enkrati-*

*tische Glose im Diatessaron*, where he shows reason for believing that the addition of the name *Adam* in Matthew xix. 5, so as to read,

“And *Adam* said, For this cause shall a man, etc.,”

is an Encratite modification of the Gospel. Dr. Plooij found it, for instance, in the Old Dutch Harmony at Liège, to which he has already drawn attention as being derived ultimately from Tatian himself.

Something like the same interpretation will be found in Theophilus of Antioch in his *Discourse to Autolycus* (Bk. ii., c. 28), where he writes as follows: “And *Adam* said to Eve, This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; and further he prophesied as follows: For this cause shall a man, etc.” Here *Adam* is defined to be the speaker in Genesis as the *Diatessaron* defines him in the Gospel. Theophilus is a contemporary of Tatian. Either might have taken his interpretation from the other. It is a gloss belonging to the end of the second century.

The foregoing pages are not to be regarded as offering an exhaustive treatment of the variations of the text in the second chapter of John. Our object is to show that Encratite readings are found in the Gospel text just as, as we have shown elsewhere, there were Marcionite readings in some of the oldest Latin MSS. And if we remember that Encratism was, in its earlier history, a movement inside the Church itself, we shall not be altogether surprised if we find the hand of Tatian over-writing the text of St. John in copies current in orthodox churches.

These studies are important as explaining to the average Biblical student the genesis of New Testament variants. We have long felt that the older method of settling the text by means of groups of letters and figures was unsound, and that erroneous readings are not got rid of finally except by explanation. All the older rules about “harder readings,”

“shorter readings,” “earlier readings,” and the like are out of date. As Dean Burgon once said, “Have you not yet found out, sir, that all various readings are early?” Or as M. Solomon Reinach recently remarked, in defending a brilliant emendation which he had made to the text of Philippians, “On peut m’objecter le vieil adage—*lectio difficilior præferenda faciliori*—faux comme tous les adages.”

The New Testament critic of the future will endorse both these statements; he will require not maxims, but explanations.

RENDEL HARRIS.

### MESSENGER AND MASTER:

#### A STUDY OF PROFESSOR PEABODY'S "PAUL."<sup>1</sup>

IN this recent book, Professor Peabody makes a valuable contribution to Pauline Literature. The personality of the Apostle is clearly drawn, and the individual elements in Paul's thinking are sharply denoted. The book is apparently written for those who “cannot claim specialised qualification as exegetical or philosophical scholars,” and the writer attempts to delimit those regions of Pauline speculation where it is unnecessary for such “laymen” to penetrate. In other words, Professor Peabody seeks to make Paul intelligible to the “modern mind,” which itself often seems to elude definition. Its currents and cross-currents of thinking are very bewildering. One characteristic, however, is clearly marked, which the American writer shares—its dislike and distrust of all dogmatic philosophies and closed systems of thought, and its emphasis on what may be called the historic in religion. Often dogma and history are regarded as alternatives. The antithesis is misleading,

<sup>1</sup> *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*, by Francis Greenwood Peabody. New York: The Macmillan Company, 10s. 6d. net.