

JAN 19 1911

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

JANUARY 1911

NUMBER I

ON THE ANTIQUITY AND THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

The fundamental assertion of the Biblical doctrine of the origin of man is that he owes his being to a creative act of God. Subsidiary questions growing out of this fundamental assertion, however, have been thrown from time to time into great prominence, as the changing forms of current anthropological speculation have seemed to press on this or that element in, or corollary from, the Biblical teaching. The most important of these subsidiary questions has concerned the method of the Divine procedure in creating man. Discussion of this question became acute on the publication of Charles Darwin's treatise on the *Origin of Species* in 1859, and can never sink again into rest until it is thoroughly understood in all quarters that "evolution" cannot act as a substitute for creation, but at best can supply only a theory of the method of the Divine providence. Closely connected with this discussion of the mode of origination of man, has been the discussion of two further questions, both older than the Darwinian theory, to one of which it gave however a new impulse, while it has well-nigh destroyed all interest in the other. These are the questions of the Antiquity of Man and the Unity of the Human Race, to both of which a large historical interest attaches, though neither of them can be said to be burning questions of to-day.

The question of the antiquity of man has of itself no theological significance. It is to theology, as such, a matter of entire indifference how long man has existed on earth.

THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS. APOCALYPSE OR ALLEGORY*?

A book professedly written for the edification of the church which does not contain the word Jesus, or Christ, or gospel, or baptism; which makes no mention of our Lord's birth, baptism, death, or resurrection, or of the Lord's Day; which moreover does not quote a single saying of the Lord's nor indeed from a single book either of the Old or the New Testament may well occasion surprise; and we may have sympathy with those who would doubt its Christian origin.¹ But when it is affirmed that such a work not only is Christian, but also was at one time part of the Christian Scriptures, indeed that it was one of the earliest books to be admitted to this honor, that it was canonical before the Gospels or Epistles, that it is part of the foundation of the New Testament, and that it was ousted from this high position only after a sharp struggle about the end of the second century,² the duty of investigating its claims and early history becomes apparent. The work I refer to is the so called *Shepherd* of Hermas, a book which needs no introduction to those of you who have gleaned even lightly in the fields of early Christian literature. Opinions may differ as to its meaning and value for the early Christians or for ourselves, but no one has read it, I venture to say, without being at least im-

* An address delivered at the opening of the ninety-ninth session of Princeton Theological Seminary, on Friday, September 16, 1910.

¹ Among recent writers Spitta (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*. Vol. ii), regards the *Shepherd* of Hermas as a Christian revision of a Jewish work: Von Soden (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1897, Sp. 586), adopts his conclusions with several modifications; Völter (*Die Apostolischen Väter* Vol. I) thinks it springs from a community of Jewish proselytes. For the views of earlier writers see Gebhardt und Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, Vol. III, p. lxxxiii, n. 2.

² Leipoldt, *Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Vol. i. pp. 33, 37f., 39, Zusatz 2, 41ff.

pressed with its evident seriousness, entertained with its quaint *naïveté*, and amused with the atmosphere of romance that pervades it all.

If it be taken literally, there can be no doubt that the *Shepherd* claims to be a revelation. The visions, commandments and similitudes, of which it is composed, are said to be given and explained by divine messengers—at one time by the spirit of Hermas' deceased mistress, at others by the Church in the form of a heavenly being, most generally by the angel of repentance, called also the "pastor" or "shepherd" from whom the book takes its name. But is it not possible that we would do the author an injustice by taking his words literally? The allegory has always been a popular literary dress with which to clothe moral and religious truths, and may it not be that the *Shepherd* of Hermas is to be classed with such works as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, which also, taken literally, would claim to be supernatural, but which we all know to have been the product of the brain and the pen of John Bunyan the tinker in Bedford jail? This then is the question which I propose for our consideration this morning: Is the *Shepherd* of Hermas an apocalypse or an allegory?

Nor do I need to apologize for choosing what may appear to some of you an unimportant and petty problem in the history of the church. It is not such. Its solution will affect considerably our estimate of the church of the second century, especially in respect to its literary activity, its dogmatic conceptions, and the part played in it by Christian prophecy. Moreover it has a direct bearing on the question of the origin and growth of the New Testament Canon. For there is a number of scholars to-day who affirm that the idea of a New Testament Canon as we now have it does not appear in the church until toward the end of the second century: that up to that time the Old Testament (including the Apocrypha and Jewish Apocalypses) had been the "Bible" of the church, and the words of the Lord and the

utterances of Christian prophets had been closely associated with it as authoritative; that this condition continued until about the close of the second century, when, out of the struggle with Gnosticism and Montanism the church emerged with a new standard of canonicity namely *apostolicity*.³ That is to say it is asserted that Christian prophecies even when reduced to writing were regarded as authoritative in the church just because they were prophecies and without any regard to their date or the person of the prophets, and this continued until the exigencies of the church demanded that a new test be erected, at which time those prophecies which had hitherto been regarded as authoritative were deposed from their high dignity unless they could establish a claim to apostolic origin.⁴

The Shepherd of Hermas has always played a part in the discussion attending this theory for it is one of the so called prophecies which are said to have been degraded, but it has not, I think, played the part it should have or will when its unique position is understood. For not only can its date be approximately fixed in the first half of the second century, but it is the only one of the so-called prophecies which does not claim for itself apostolic origin. In connection with its history therefore, can the test of prophecy versus apostolicity in the middle and third quarter of the second century be brought to the clearest issue. If it be found that the book was published and accepted as a prophecy, we shall be able to tell from the nature of the reception accorded it what the opinion of the church then was regarding contemporaneous Christian prophecy. And if on the contrary it turns out that it was not published or accepted as a prophecy, the main problem will be to ascertain how such a work could in the course of say forty years claim equal rank with acknowledged inspired and authoritative books; and we shall incidentally have removed from the

³ E. g. Leipoldt, *loc. cit.* Harnack *Hist. of Dogma*, Third ed. Eng. Trans. II. 38-66, *Das Neue Testament um 200*. B. Weiss *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3 Aufl. Sec. 5, 4, n. 1; 8, 5; 9, 6.

⁴ Cf. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. Trans. II. 47, n. 2.

discussion the only work, which at present can be pointed to in support of the theory that Christian prophecy *qua* prophecy, was authoritative in the second century.

I hope then that you see clearly what I propose to do. It is to examine the *Shepherd* of Hermas and its early history with a view to determining the author's intention regarding it, the nature of its reception and treatment by the early church, and how and why it is involved in the history of the canon of the New Testament.

It is strange that this subject has been comparatively neglected. The text of the *Shepherd* has recently received very careful attention, the questions of its origin and unity and date have been, and are still, warmly debated, and the material furnished by it is liberally drawn upon by all students of the early Christian church. But the question of the intention of the author in publishing his work in the form of an apocalypse has been on the whole much neglected. Most writers to-day seem to assume that its author and his contemporaries ingenuously believed that he had been the recipient of real and divine revelations. But little or no discussion is given to the matter. For the sake of completeness I shall enumerate the four hypotheses which to my mind exhaust the possibilities, any one of which might be regarded as satisfactory; and I may add that each of them has had its supporters. (1) The work may be regarded as a genuine revelation. This is the view taken by Wake⁵ and some Irvingite scholars⁶ in modern times. (2) It may be regarded as a deliberate though pious fraud.⁷ (3) The visions and revelations may be regarded

⁵ *Apostolical Fathers*, p. 187.

⁶ E. g. Thiersch, *Die Kirche im Apostolischen Zeitalter*, p. 350ff.

⁷ So apparently Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (1902), Vol. I. p. 563, "Der Verfasser schreibt auf Grund göttlicher Offenbarungen und infolge göttlichen Auftrags. Er tritt als ein vom Geiste Gottes inspirierter Prophet auf. Ohne Zweifel hat er damit seinen Mahnungen und Mitteilungen eine grössere Kraft, eine höhere Weihe geben wollen. Dass er Anstoss erregen würde, war kaum zu befürchten. Er schrieb zu einer Zeit, wo der Glaube an die Fortdauer des prophetischen Charismas noch Allgemein geteilt wurde".

as purely subjective. In this case Hermas may be regarded as a mystic, or a visionary, or epileptic, or be classed in a general way with the "prophets" of the second century, without inquiring particularly about the psychology of such "prophecy". Some such explanation as this is quite possible, being not infrequently paralleled in history, and we must give it the more consideration as it is the view most generally accepted by scholars to-day.⁸ (4) We may regard it as fiction, pure and simple, and the visions and heavenly commands as a literary garb deliberately chosen by the author without any intention of deceit; in other words it may be an allegory.⁹ Of these four possibilities we may dismiss the second with few words. The whole work bears such a stamp of artless simplicity, the author is so palpably straightforward and honest, that the charge of deliberate fraud should only be made on the basis of far stronger evidence than has yet been adduced, and after all other hypotheses have been shown to be insufficient. Moreover, as the first and third of the possible solutions mentioned above have certain points of contact and in the minds of some cannot be sharply sundered, we may state

Mosheim, *De rebus Christ. ante Constant.*, pp. 163, 166 inclines to a view of Hermas which makes him "*scientem volentemque fefellisse*".

Salmon, *Dict. Chr. Bio.*, Art. "Hermas", thinks Hermas "probably cannot be cleared from conscious deceit".

⁸ Bigg, *Origins of Christianity*, p. 73f. Zahn (*Der Hirt des Hermas* pp. 365ff.) perceives the importance of the problem and laments the lack of interest shown in it to-day. He regards the visions as real experiences of the author and thinks the Roman Church was right in seeing in them a divine message, but refuses to discuss the question of their permanent worth (pp. 381f.) . Harnack, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* III. p. 369, and elsewhere. Overbeck, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, sp. 282f. (quoted by Harnack, *ibid.*). Leiboldt, *op. cit.*, p. 33, n. 2, and others.

⁹ Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers*, p. 326ff. Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 96. Charteris, *Canonicity*, p. xxiv. Behm, *Ueber den Verfasser der Schrift, welche den Titel "Hirt" führt*.

How these views have received modification and been related to varying opinions concerning the date and authorship of the *Shepherd* may be seen in the table furnished by Harnack in Gebhardt und Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, Fasc. III., p. lxxxiii, n. 2.

our problem in the question: *Is the Shepherd of Hermas an apocalypse or an allegory*,—using the word “apocalypse” as significant, not of the real nature of the contents of the work, but of its claims. And should it appear in the course of our examination that the *Shepherd* does indeed claim to be a revelation, then, and not till then, will emerge the question of the justification of such a claim. A full answer to this question, of course, demands a careful examination of both the contents of the work and its history. But our time is so limited to-day, that I shall confine myself just now to the latter part of the argument, and reserve the other for perhaps some other time. I shall therefore ask you now to follow me as I outline to you what we know of the publication of the *Shepherd*, of its reception by the Church, and of its fortunes until the end of the second century, or thereabouts.

There is no difficulty about determining the date of the *Shepherd* in a general way. Most scholars agree that it was written somewhere between 97 and 140 A.D., or thereabouts.¹⁰ But when we seek to define the time more accurately, a difficulty presents itself. for we have, curiously, two excellent pieces of testimony, one internal and one external, which are hard to harmonize. In the early part of his work¹¹ Hermas refers in quite a natural unforced manner to a certain Clement as one to whom had been committed the duty of corresponding with foreign churches, and apparently as one of the presbyters of the church at Rome, of which Hermas was a member. Now there is one Clement well known to all antiquity as the author of the epistle of the Church of Rome to that at Corinth, to whom this seems undoubtedly to point. That would give a date somewhere about 100 A. D. The other piece of evidence is that contained in the so-called *Muratorii Fragment*, which dates from about the end of the second

¹⁰ For the few who go outside these limits, see the table referred to in note 9.

¹¹ *Vis.* ii., 1.

century. This informs us that the *Shepherd* was written "very recently, in our own times," during the episcopate of Pius of Rome, by Pius's brother Hermas. This would give a date about 150 A. D.

Until quite recently scholars have been divided according as the first or the second of these testimonies seemed to them the more weighty, and ingenious conjectures have been proposed for explaining away the rejected evidence.¹² Lately, however, as an outcome of discussion concerning the unity of the work, the opinion has gained ground that the *Shepherd* was not produced at one time but piecemeal throughout a number of years. This and the uncertainty both of the date of Clement's death and of the years of Pius' episcopate have made it possible for Prof. Harnack to propose a compromise.¹³ He thinks now that this earlier portion of the work was produced about 110 A. D. (possibly in the 3rd year of Trajan) when Clement may still have been living, and that the book was published in its completed form about 135-140 A. D., when Pius may have been bishop of Rome. For our purposes we need not enter into the details of the argument. We shall assume, that which is denied by very few, that the work was in existence in its finished form about the year 135 or 140—always remembering that it may have been known earlier.

Taking this, then, as the date when the *Shepherd* was given to the Church, we ask: how was it received? Remember, it is not a small book; it is about equal in size to our first two gospels together. Nor was it published in a corner, but at the center of the world, in the city of Rome. Such a work as this, if regarded as divinely inspired, must have made a considerable stir, and that immediately, and in the whole Church. And yet there is not one particle of

¹² Zahn, in *Der Hirt des Hermas* and elsewhere, has been strongest defender of the earlier date.

¹³ *Geschichte d. altchristlichen Literatur* ii., i. pp. 257ff., where a brief review of the argument and the more important literature may be found.

evidence to show that it was regarded as Scripture or in any sense divine during the 30 or 40 years following its publication. Not until we come down to Irenaeus, the *Muratorian Fragment*, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian is it quoted and referred to as Scripture or of divine inspiration. Nor can it be objected that this is merely an argument from silence and so of no cogency. For there were events in Rome at this time, and discussions in the Church concerning authoritative and non-authoritative writings, of which we are well informed, and into which the *Shepherd* undoubtedly would have been drawn had it occupied the exalted position that is claimed for it. The result is the same wherever we look—not only at Rome but throughout the whole of the Christian literature coming from or dealing with this period, there is not the slightest evidence that the *Shepherd* was regarded as of any special importance.

It was at this time, for instance, that Marcion founded his school at Rome and formed his canon. But in all the discussions about the books he rejected or received, there is no word of the *Shepherd*, although we are informed by Tertullian¹⁴ that he rejected a work now frequently associated with it in discussions concerning the canon, *viz.*, the Apocalypse of John. This should be decisive alone. If the *Shepherd* were regarded by either party as divinely inspired, it is incomprehensible that it should not have been brought into the controversy by one side or the other.¹⁵ The Gnostic Valentinus was also established in Rome at this time. He accepted all the Catholic Scriptures, as we are informed by Tertullian,¹⁶ and turned them to suit his own ends by means of the allegorical method of interpretation. But there is no sign that he accepted, or so used the *Shepherd*; although its form and contents are admirably

¹⁴ *Adv. Marc.* IV., 5.

¹⁵ Harnack (*Gesch. d. altchrist. Lit.* I. i., p. 51), remarks without comment, and apparently without perceiving the import of his remark: "Bemerkt sei, dass sich bei den Gnostikern und Marcion keine Spur einer Benutzung unseres Buches findet".

¹⁶ *Praescr.* c. 38.

adapted to his methods and results. We know that he so used the Apocalypse of John,¹⁷ but neither Irenaeus, who gives us this information, and who was acquainted with the Shepherd, nor Tertullian, who would not have failed to attack the heretic for making use of a work which he himself regarded as apocryphal and false, contains the slightest indication that Valentinus knew anything about the *Shepherd*. Hegesippus was in Rome at this time—during the episcopate of Anicetus.¹⁸ Unfortunately, the only piece of evidence we have from his pen is the statement preserved by Eusebius to the effect that some of the so-called apocrypha were composed in his (i. e. Hegesippus') day by heretics. And yet even this is important coming as it does through Eusebius, who used all diligence to discover the origin of the books disputed or rejected in his own time—one of which was the Shepherd of Hermas. For, on the one hand, as the Shepherd was certainly not regarded as heretical or apocryphal in the days of Anicetus, it cannot be assumed among those referred to by Hegesippus in this passage; and, on the other hand, as Eusebius records nothing from Hegesippus' writings concerning the *Shepherd*, the probable inference is that he found nothing to record; and this in turn means that, at the time this writer was in Rome, the *Shepherd* was not of sufficient importance to find a place in his memoirs; certainly it was not one of the authoritative books of the Church. Justin Martyr, too, was acquainted with the Rome of this period, and speaks in a general way of prophets being still known in the Church,¹⁹ but in all his writings there is no mention of Hermas or any reference to his book. The answer is the same when we inquire of Celsus, the opponent of Christianity, who probably wrote during the period under review. He shows considerable acquaintance with Christianity and the Christian writings,

¹⁷ Irenaeus, *Haer.* i., 15.

¹⁸ Eusebius, *H. E.* iv, 22.

¹⁹ *Trypho*, c. 82.

but there is no sign of Hermas or his *Shepherd*.²⁰ Nor does the early history of Montanism, although concerned with prophecy, afford any evidence. It is not until the time of Tertullian that it is brought into the discussion.²¹ It is true that a relationship has been found or fancied between the *Shepherd* and the letters of Ignatius,²² that of Polycarp,²³ the so-called Second Epistle of Clement,²⁴ the Preaching of Peter,²⁵ Theophilus of Antioch²⁶ and Melito of Sardis,²⁷ but these are mere resemblances²⁸ and prove at most only acquaintance with it. None of them rises to the rank of citation, much less is there anything to show that the *Shepherd* was regarded as on an equality with the Old Testament or divinely inspired. In short, there is nothing in the literature of this period to show that the *Shepherd* of Hermas commanded any more respect than might be given to any work suitable for edification.²⁹

In and after the last quarter of the second century we

²⁰ A definite reference could hardly be expected. Celsus knows of Christian prophecy in his own time, but the description he gives of it does not tally with the contents of the *Shepherd*. See Origen, *contra Cels.* vi., 34f., vii., 11.

²¹ The Anti-montanist of Eusebius (*H. E.*, v., 17), gives a list of those who prophesied under the new covenant. Two names are added to those known in Scripture, but Hermas is not one of them. This writer is later however than the period we are discussing; Bonwetsch (*Art. Montanismus in Herzog, Realencycl.*, third ed.) and McGiffert (*Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 233, n. 32), put him about 192 A. D.

²² Zahn, *Ignatius von Antioch*, pp. 618f.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 620.

²⁴ Harnack, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, Col. 104. Cf. Overbeck, *Ibid.* 1877, Col. 287f.

²⁵ Hilgenfeld, *Hermae Pastor*, pp. 1f., 35.

²⁶ Harnack *Patr. Apostol. Op.*, Fasc. iii., note to Vis. 1, 6.

²⁷ Harnack, *Sitzungsbericht d. Berliner Akademie d. Wissenschaft*, 1898, p. 517ff.

²⁸ For still more doubtful resemblances to other works, see Gebhardt und Harnack, *Patr. Apostol. Op.*, Fasc. iii., p. xlvif., n. 2.

²⁹ Leipoldt, *op cit.*, pp. 33ff., p. 38, Zusatz 1, gives the earliest references to the Apocalypses. A convenient list of early citations of the *Shepherd* may be found in Harnack's *Geschichte d. altchristl. Literatur*, I. i., pp. 51ff., and a fuller discussion of them in the various editions of the text, particularly that of Gebhardt and Harnack.

find a change of attitude toward the *Shepherd*. In Gaul Irenaeus quotes it as "Scripture"³⁰ (γραφή), thus apparently putting it on a par with the other canonical works. And yet scholars are by no means agreed that this is his intention. It is difficult to reconcile Irenaeus' usage elsewhere, and his emphasis upon apostolicity as a prerequisite of canonicity, with such an explanation. It is noted that the *Shepherd* is not named in this quotation,³¹ nor is it quoted anywhere else in Irenaeus' works as far as we know them, although some resemblances are found;³² moreover, when he is confessedly marshalling the scriptural arguments against the Valentinians,³³ though he quotes freely from most of the books of the New Testament (as we know it), he has no reference to, or proof drawn from, the *Shepherd*. In view of these facts some scholars have thought that Irenaeus regarded the book as of apostolic origin,³⁴ others have supposed that he may have used the term "Scripture" in this place in the general sense of "writing", or that he made a mistake, fancying that the passage he quoted was Scripture;³⁵ others again are of the opinion that Irenaeus, while not ascribing the same honor to the *Shepherd* as to the prophetic and apostolical writings, regarded it nevertheless as authoritative.³⁶ It is not necessary for the pur-

³⁰ *Haer.* IV. 20, 2, quoting *Mand.* I., I.

³¹ It is a possible but not necessary inference that Harnack (*Patr. Apostol. Op.*, Fasc. iii. p. xlv, n. 1, c.) draws from this fact, viz. that the book was so well known that its name might be omitted.

³² Harnack, *Geschichte d. altchr. Lit.*, I, i., p. 52, gives the following passages: *Haer.* I, 13, 3 = *Mand.* xi, 3; I, 21, 1 = *Mand.* I, 1; II, 30, 9 = *Sim.* IX, 12, 8; *Frag. Gr.* 29 (Harvey II, p. 494) = *Sim.* VIII, 3, 2, and perhaps *Haer.* IV, 30, 1 = *Sim.* I. Cf. Zahn, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, p. 267, n. 2. None of these are more than resemblances.

³³ *Haer.* Book III.

³⁴ Hilgenfeld, *Apostolische Väter*, p. 180. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, i., p. 335.

³⁵ Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers*, p. 319, though not committing himself to this view. Gregory, *Canon and Text of N. T.*, p. 241f. But he treats the evidence too cavalierly.

³⁶ Harnack, *Geschichte d. altchristl. Literatur*, I, i., p. 52; *Patr. Apostol. Op.*, Fasc. III, p. xlvi. A fuller discussion of the matter may be found in this latter place, or, where a different conclusion is reached, in Zahn, *Geschichte d. neutest. Kanons*, I, p. 333f.

poses of this investigation to decide between the merits of these differing views, but I may be allowed to say in passing that neither the view that Irenaeus regarded the *Shepherd* as fully canonical and of apostolic origin, nor that which asserts that he regarded it as authoritative, but not canonical in the strict sense of the word, accounts for the fact that he quotes the *Shepherd* only once when he might have used it many times to his advantage, unless it be assumed that he was not well acquainted with the contents of the work. Again to say that he was mistakenly of the impression that he was quoting from some canonical book is to take refuge in a conjecture which is incapable of proof; and to take *γραφή* in any other than its usual technical sense of "Scripture", while permitted by the usage of this author in a few places,³⁷ is contrary to general custom of the time, and unsuitable in the passage before us, where the passage from Hermas is used for the purpose of proving a doctrine and inserted between two passages from the Old Testament. All the facts of the case would be accounted for if we might assume that the *Shepherd* had only lately come into Irenaeus' hands, that he regarded it as canonical and of apostolic origin, but had not been able to acquaint himself intimately with its contents.

In North Africa, Tertullian, in his treatise *De oratione*, not only shows acquaintance with the *Shepherd*, but also informs us indirectly that the book was well known in the Church³⁸ and that some Christians regarded it as normative in matters of devotional conduct. Whether or not he shared their views may not be clear; but certainly he was not concerned to argue the matter at this time.³⁹ In another work,

³⁷ *Haer.* III, 6, 4; III, 17, 4; V Preface.

³⁸ Harnack in *Patr. Apostol. Op.*, Fasc. iii. p. xlviij, n. 1, a. e. agreeing with Zahn (*Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1873, st. 29, s. 1155), concludes that in Tertullian's time the *Shepherd* was known to the North Africans in a Latin Translation. Since then Zahn has changed his opinion and affirms that it was not translated until later, (*Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons* I, 345). Cf. also Harnack, *Das Neue Testament um 200*, p. 87.

³⁹ Tertullian, *de orat.* 16.

however, after he had been converted to Montanism, and found the *Shepherd* in conflict with his rigoristic views, he calls it "that apocryphal *Shepherd* of adulterers,"⁴⁰ and reminds his opponents that it had been condemned as "apocryphal and false by every council of the churches, even your own,"⁴¹ and that the Epistle of Barnabas (the canonical Hebrews) was more received among the churches than it was.⁴² It is sometimes said that in the period which elapsed between these two references to the *Shepherd* the attitude of the Church generally toward the work had undergone a change; the first coming from a time when it was universally regarded as authoritative and inspired, the second from a later time when the apocalypses were being excluded from the canon. Such a sweeping inference is, of course, unjustifiable; we cannot say that Tertullian speaks for a larger section of the Church than that with which he was familiar. But we are bound to ascertain, if we can, Tertullian's attitude toward the *Shepherd*, and whether he changed it, and, if so, why. There can be no doubt of his later attitude. He then considered the work "apocryphal and false" and so unworthy of a place in the "divine instrument". We cannot be altogether sure what he meant by "apocryphal" here. The word has been variously understood in different periods. The earliest meaning⁴³ appears to have been "excluded from public use in the Church," without reference either to origin or contents of the book excluded. Soon, however, it came to denote not the fact but the grounds for such exclusion; that is to say, it stigmatized a work as untrue with respect either

⁴⁰ *De pudic.* 20.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁴² Utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum, *Ibid.*, 20. I cannot find any justification for Gregory's translation, "Would that the letter of Barnabas were rather received among the churches than that apocryphal *Shepherd* of adulterers" *Canon and Text of the N. T.*, p. 223.

⁴³ See Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentl. Kanons*, I, p. 125ff. E. Schürer in *Herzog, Realencyclopaedie*, Ed. 3, Vol. I, p. 622ff.

to its contents or to its origin⁴⁴ or both. But though we know that these several connotations existed in the early centuries, we cannot always be sure in which of them a writer uses the word. It is indeed sufficiently clear, from the opprobrious terms Tertullian heaps up, that he condemns the teaching of the *Shepherd* out and out, but we should like to know whether by "apocryphal" he means to imply that the work is also not what it claims to be with respect to origin; and of this we cannot be certain.

Let us now turn to an examination of the earlier reference. Some of the North Africans apparently regarded it as important to lay aside their cloaks during prayer and to seat themselves afterwards. In justification of the first of these they appealed to 2 Tim. iv. 13, and for the second to the fifth vision of the *Shepherd*. Tertullian treats both customs and both passages appealed to in the same way. Such customs he says are irrational, superstitious, and savor of idolatry, and such an interpretation of Scripture childish, and leads to the foolishest consequences if consistently applied. Now while it is true that this argument says nothing either of the canonicity of Paul's letter or the uncanonicity of the *Shepherd*, still as Tertullian did regard Paul's epistles as canonical, and as the North Africans to whom he was writing seemingly regarded the *Shepherd* as equally authoritative in matters of conduct, it is often affirmed that the African father would not have lost this opportunity to correct the erroneous estimation placed upon the latter, had he been at the time of this writing of the same opinion that he was when he wrote *De pudicitia*. Moreover, it is noted that he here calls the *Shepherd* "*Scriptura*". It is true that he does this also in the later reference, but in that case it is obvious that he does so sarcastically with reference to the attitude of those who would appeal to it, and that he may contrast it with the true

⁴⁴ To Augustine "apocryphal" meant that the origin of a book was "hidden" or unknown, *De civit. Dei*, xv., 23, 4. Harnack, *Patr. Apostol. Op.*, III, p. xlix., n. 1, b., thinks Tertullian uses it with reference to authorship.

Scriptures.⁴⁵ But in the former case there is, it is said, no sign of sarcasm, nor anything to show that he differed from his correspondents in his estimate of the *Shepherd*, or that he regarded it as less binding than the writings of Paul.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ "At ego eius pastoris scripturas haurio qui non potest frangi".

⁴⁶ Harnack (*Patr. Apost. Op.*, Fasc. iii. p. xlix) thinks that Tertullian at this time regarded the *Shepherd* as "Scripture" but as inferior to the prophets and the apostles ("sed minime audeo dicere Carthaginienses tum temporis Pastorem inter scripturas prophetarum et apostolorum recensuisse"). He refers to Tertullian's treatment of the Book of Enoch and suggests that the *Shepherd* may have had a place at the close of the New Testament after the Epistle to the Hebrews. But, in Tertullian's treatment of the Book of Enoch (*de cult. fem.* I, 3; II, 10, *de idol.* 15), there is every sign that he himself regarded this work as of equal authority with other Old Testament Scriptures; he calls it "*Scriptura*", cites it by way of proof, answers criticisms of its authorship and transmission, says it is vouched for by the Apostle Jude, and tries to explain why it was unjustly rejected by the Jews. Nor can the statement *et legimus omnem scripturam aedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari* (*de cult. fem.* I, 3, 2 Tim. iii. 16), be taken to explain Tertullian's attitude toward the *Shepherd*, for Tertullian is speaking here only of the Old Testament Scriptures, as was St. Paul before him—a thing that is often overlooked in discussing this passage (on the importance of this interpretation of Paul's words for the history of the New Testament Canon, see Harnack, *Das Neue Test. um das Jahr 200*, pp. 25, 35, 39f., and opposed to him Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, p. 40).

With regard to the relative value of the *Shepherd* and the Epistle to the Hebrews the matter is somewhat different. Harnack is here following Credner (*Geschichte d. neutest. Kanons*) and Rönisch (*Das neue Testament Tertullians*), in the view that Tertullian had in his New Testament as a kind of appendix, some works which were to some degree inspired and authoritative but on a lower plane than others. Rönisch gives as the names of these the Epistle of Peter *ad Ponticos* (1 Peter), the Epistle of Barnabas to the Hebrews (Hebrews), the Epistle of Jude, and the Epistle of the Presbyter (2 John). But, without going into details, it is hard to believe, after reading *Scorp.* 12 and 14, and *de orat.* 20, that Tertullian set the known writings of Peter in any respect below those of Paul; the Epistle of Jude is referred to only once (*de cult. fem.* I, 3), but then as the work of an Apostle and as authoritative; and 2 John is neither mentioned nor used by the North African Father (Rönisch, p. 572, see Zahn, *Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons*, Vol. I, p. 111, n. 1, pp. 304ff., pp. 320f.).

Tertullian's attitude toward the Epistle to the Hebrews requires closer examination. In his treatise *de pudic.*, after he had passed in review the teaching of the Evangelists, the Acts of the Apostles, Paul and the other Apostles, concluding with the Revelation and First

If this be the correct explanation of this passage we have to ask further on what grounds Tertullian granted such a high place to the *Shepherd*. In the first place it cannot be thought that he accepted it without having some opinion of its authorship; for he denounces strongly all works that do

Epistle of St. John, Tertullian draws the argument to a close (*de pud.* 20), and then adds, "I wish however to subjoin in addition, redundantly, the testimony also of a certain companion of the Apostles, which is well adapted for confirming, by nearest right, the teaching of the masters" (*volo tamen ex redundantia alicuius etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum* (Ed. Oehler). He then introduces the Epistle to the Hebrews as the work of Barnabas for whom Paul vouched, and adds, "and at all events the Epistle of Barnabas is more received among the churches than that apocryphal *Shepherd* of adulterers" (*et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum*). He then quotes Heb. vi. 1, 4-8. There are two questions raised by this passage: the first concerns Tertullian's estimate of Hebrews, the second the comparative value of the *Shepherd* and Hebrews. With regard to the first of these it is evident that the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to Tertullian, was not in itself possessed of divine authority. This appears from the formal conclusion of his argument based on the Apostolic teaching (*disciplina apostolorum proprie*) before he turns to it, from the express statements that he uses it only to *confirm* the teaching of the Apostles and that it is superfluous (*ex redundantia*), from the fact that he does not ascribe but rather denies apostolicity to it, and that he never calls it "Scripture" (he uses *titulus* instead or refers to it by name). The view, which Zahn thinks possible, (*Gesch. d. Neutest. Kanons*, Vol. I, p. 291) that Tertullian himself placed a higher estimate on the work than is here apparent, and did not cite it among the writings of the New Testament only because it was not universally received, and therefore any argument drawn from it not universally valid, while commending itself for several reasons is incapable of proof. According to the evidence before us the Epistle to the Hebrews was outside of Tertullian's canon, and enjoyed only that amount of favor which was due to the writings of a man who was approved of St. Paul and God. But what does Tertullian mean by saying that the Epistle to the Hebrews was "more received among the churches" than was the *Shepherd*? Does "*receptor apud ecclesias*" mean that it was more highly esteemed, or that it was received as canonical by more churches? Rönisch understands it to mean both (*Op. cit.*, p. 565); Harnack to mean one or the other, he does not say which (*Patr. Apost. Op.* III, p. xlix, n. 1, c.), but in stating that the *Shepherd* seems to have had a place at the end of the New Testament *after* the Epistle to the Hebrews (*Ibid.*, p. xlviii, n. 1, e) he favors the former, and in another place (*Texte und*

not "bind themselves by full title and due profession of author".⁴⁷ And it is equally clear that he received only such works as were of apostolic origin, that it to say, composed either by Apostles or apostolic men.⁴⁸ We would therefore conclude that Tertullian regarded Hermas as a disciple of the Apostles. But if this be so the question immediately thrusts itself upon us, why does he not use the *Untersuchungen* V, i., p. 59), the latter. Zahn holds firmly to the latter interpretation (*Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, I, pp. 121, n., 292f.) on the ground that "receptus" is not capable of degrees, and of the presence of the plural "ecclesias". So also Credner, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, p. 117. But neither of these explanations is free from difficulty. By the first Tertullian is made to disagree with his other statement in this same treatise, that all the councils of the church had declared the *Shepherd* "apocryphal and false", and so he is sometimes accused of exaggerating in the latter remark (Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, V, i., p. 59, Weiss, *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, 3rd Ed., p. 74). This is unwarranted, and, as we shall see later, these words may express literally a natural interpretation of a Roman statement concerning the *Shepherd*. Zahn's argument is unsatisfactory because it does violence to the Latin. Had Tertullian wished to say that the Epistle to the Hebrews was received by more churches than the *Shepherd* we would expect "receptus apud plures ecclesias". It seems to be true that "receptus" was used as *terminus technicus* to denote the inclusion of a work among the canonical books, and that in this sense it was incapable of degree. But the word was not used exclusively in this connection, and when not it could be compared (see instances in Zahn *loc. cit.*). It is in this latter sense that the word is used in the passage before us. The discussion is not about canonical works, but about two, both of which Tertullian definitely excludes from the Scriptures. With this in mind the argument in this chapter of *de pudicitia* is both clear and consistent with other parts of the treatise. I have now, says Tertullian in effect, concluded my argument from the New Testament Scriptures, but I wish to add the testimony of one other, which may not be used in the argument proper but is of value in confirming the teaching of the Apostles, for its author was their comrade. I refer to an Epistle of Barnabas, a man commended by God and the Apostle Paul. And though he is not an authority, you must at least acknowledge that his Epistle is recognized as of more value by the churches than that apocryphal *Shepherd of adulterers* which has been condemned by all the councils of the churches.

⁴⁷ *Marc. IV, 2.*

⁴⁸ To Tertullian apostolic men (*apostolici*) were those who had associated with and learned from the Apostles, *Marc. IV, 2; Praescr. 32.* Cf. also *Praescr. 21ff.; 30; 44;* and what he says against works of post-apostolic date, *Praescr. 30.*

Shepherd more frequently in his writings? To this no certain answer can be given, though it may be pointed out that Paul's Epistles to Titus and Philemon, the First Epistle of Peter and that of Jude, although undoubtedly belonging to Tertullian's canon, are referred to no more frequently or hardly so than is the *Shepherd*.

But this view, although held in slightly differing forms by many scholars, appears to me to be wrong from beginning to end. When the Christians of North Africa, in defence of their superstitious practices of laying aside their cloaks before prayer and of sitting down after it, appealed to the statements that Paul had left his cloak behind him at Troas (presumably having laid it aside at prayer) and that Hermas had sat down on his bed after prayer, the answer that sprang to Tertullian's lips, as it would to those of any other sensible Christian, was that such a use of Scripture was childish, silly, superstitious, and incapable of being indulged without entailing ridiculous results. More was unnecessary. To argue the question of the authority or canonicity of the *Shepherd* would not have been to the point. On the contrary it would have weakened the argument, as it might be taken to imply that had the *Shepherd* been authoritative, such a use of it would have been justified. Tertullian here as elsewhere sees the main issue clearly and sticks to it. And yet he has not left us without at least a hint of his estimate of Hermas and his book. He introduces them with the words "that Hermas whose scripture is generally called the *Shepherd*"^{48a} This is not the way one introduces a well known and acknowledged canonical book. The demonstrative "that" pointing to Hermas with quite particular emphasis is hard to account for unless we find in it, as several scholars do,⁴⁹ the note of contempt. The words "that Hermas" find their parallel in "that *Shepherd* of adulterers", and the delicate sarcasm of the words "whose

^{48a} Quid enim, si Hermas ille cuius scriptura fere Pastor inscribitur, etc. *De orat.* 16.

⁴⁹ So Credner, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, p. 117; Oehler, *Tertull. op.*, Vol. I, p. 567, not. c; Gregory, *Canon and Text of the N. T.*, p. 242.

(i. e., Hermas') scripture" is perceived at once when they are put beside those others, which we have heard Tertullian using elsewhere in discussing the *Shepherd*, "but I quaff the scriptures of that Shepherd who cannot be broken".⁵⁰ We are compelled therefore to the conclusion that, though some of his countrymen estimated the *Shepherd* very highly,—exactly how highly we cannot say for lack of evidence,—Tertullian at no period of his life of which we have any knowledge shared their views. He despised it.

In Alexandria Clement knew the *Shepherd* and was fond of it. He quotes it freely and shows beyond possibility of doubt that he believed it to contain a genuine revelation. He speaks of "the Shepherd, the Angel of Repentance" that spoke to Hermas,⁵¹ of the "Power that spoke divinely to Hermas by revelation"⁵² or "the Power that appeared to Hermas in the vision in the form of the Church";⁵³ more frequently he cites it simply as the "*Shepherd*"⁵⁴ (*ποιμήν*). He appeals to it as proof of Christian teaching associating it with the books of our Bible, he even interprets one passage allegorically.⁵⁵ And yet in spite of all this there are few who venture to affirm that Clement puts the *Shepherd* on a par with the Gospels and writings of the Apostles. It is noted that he never calls Hermas an Apostle as he does Barnabas and Clement of Rome, that he does not cite his book as "Scripture" as he does for example the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.⁵⁶ It is pointed out that he re-

⁵⁰ See note 45.

⁵¹ *Strom.* i., 17, 85.

⁵² *Strom.* i., 29, 181.

⁵³ *Strom.* vi., 15, 131, cf. *Strom.* ii., 1, 3.

⁵⁴ The passages have been gathered by Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.*, I. i., p. 53.

⁵⁵ Harnack (*Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.*, I. i., p. 53). Kutter, (*Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, p. 86) would weaken the force of this, by showing that what Clement does is to interpret allegorically an act of Hermas. But in any case Clement is dealing with a passage out of the *Shepherd*.

⁵⁶ Kutter, *Clemens Alex. u. d. Neue Test.*, p. 139 f. On the use of *γραφή* in a broad sense and the extension of the term apostolic to include the later years of John's life and also Clement of Rome and Barnabas, *ibid.*, pp. 130, 136.

garded Greek Philosophy and the oracles of the Sybil as in a sense divine.⁵⁷ An attempt has even been made, but with indifferent success, to show that he values the revelations of the Angel of Repentance in the *Shepherd* more highly than he does the words of Hermas.⁵⁸ And the testimony of Eusebius is called in to show that in the *Hypotyposes* in which he commented upon all the books of the canonical Scriptures not omitting the disputed books, which are more nearly defined as Jude, the other Catholic Epistles, Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter, the *Shepherd* of Hermas is not included.⁵⁹ It has been argued too that, as the final authority for Clement was the Lord and His Apostles⁶⁰ and as the apostolic time ended for him in the days of Nero,⁶¹ he could not have regarded a work, which he must have known to be of later origin, as on a par with the writings of the Apostles.⁶² It does not come within the scope of our investigation to inquire more definitely into the merits of these views. Our purpose is accomplished when we have ascertained that Clement as a matter of fact did regard the *Shepherd* as at least containing a divine revelation: though it is not unimportant to note that of all the Christian writings appealed to by Clement as authorita-

⁵⁷ *Strom.* vi., c. 5. See Eickhoff, *Das Neue Testament des Clem. Alex.*, p. 7. Kutter, *op. cit.* 140f.

⁵⁸ Kutter, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

⁵⁹ Eusebius (*H. E.* vi., 14). Photius' statement (*Bibl. cod.* 109) that the *Hypotyposes* covered only Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms, the Pauline Epistles, the Catholic Epistles and Ecclesiastes, cannot stand in the face of Eusebius' explicit reference to the Apocalypse of Peter. Nor is the omission of the *Shepherd* accounted for by saying that Eusebius has probably omitted it through accident (Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.* I. i., p. 53) or that Clement did not comment on it because of its length (Zahn, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, i. p. 330). Nor does Eusebius' failure to mention the *Shepherd* among his works used by Clement (*H. E.* vi., 13) destroy the argument.

⁶⁰ *Strom.*, i. 1, 11.

⁶¹ *Strom.*, vii., 17, 106.

⁶² Kutter, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 128ff., 139f. cf. Kunze, *Glaubensregel etc.*, pp. 40, 138. But it is by no means sure that Clement was as well informed of the origin of the *Shepherd* as was the author of the Muratori Fragment, as Kutter assumes.

tive, this is the only one for which apostolical origin was not claimed in one way or another; and the difficulties which arise in connection with his use of the *Shepherd* would be to a large extent removed, and his procedure shown to be consistent with his own principles, if we might assume that for which there is nothing *pro* or *contra* in his writings, namely, that he thought this book to be the product of the golden age of the Apostles.

Origen, the successor of Clement in Alexandria, regards the *Shepherd* as "very useful and divinely inspired",⁶³ and frequently adduced proof from it as from any other Scripture. But he also informs us that the book was not universally received but even despised by some.⁶⁴ From him also we have a definite statement concerning the authorship and date of the *Shepherd*, namely that it was written by the Hermas to whom the Apostle Paul sends greetings in his Epistle to the Romans;⁶⁵ that is to say he refers it to apostolic times, the period which produced all the other canonical books.⁶⁶ Nor can we doubt that the opinion of Origen with respect to the authorship of the *Shepherd* was shared by a large proportion of the Alexandrian church.⁶⁷

Among the Roman writers of this period we find no such high respect for the *Shepherd* as we have found in Alexandria. Hippolytus especially, than whom none was better acquainted with the affairs of the Roman Church, and who

⁶³ Valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata. *In Rom.* (xvi., 14), com. x., 31.

⁶⁴ καταφρονούμενος, *De princip.* iv., 11; cf. *In Psalm. Selecta*, hom. i. in *Psalm.* 37; *In Ezech.* xxviii., 13, hom. xiii. These and other references in Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.*, I. i., pp. 53ff.

⁶⁵ *In Rom.* xvi., 14, com. x., 31, "Puto tamen, quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur".

⁶⁶ Cf. Origen in Euseb. *H. E.* vi., 25, 12f.

⁶⁷ See Zahn. *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, i., pp. 330ff. where he retracts his earlier statements. Harnack (*Patr. apost. op.* iii., p. lvii) would have us believe that Origen is expressing only his own opinion when he ascribes the *Shepherd* to the Hermas of Rom. xvi., 14. It may be true, as he asserts, that Origen does not claim to have any traditional basis for this opinion and never calls Hermas *virum apostolicum*, but it is hard to believe that a man of such scholarly methods as Origen was should make such a statement without basis for it.

had plenty of opportunities to use it, does not once mention by name, or quote from, the work.⁶⁸ And yet there is perhaps reason for believing that here too the book was regarded as inspired and authoritative and on a par with other canonical writings. I shall briefly review what evidence there is. (1) The position given to the Shepherd in the *Muratorian Canon*. We shall reserve our consideration of this for a few minutes. (2) Tertullian, in a passage already referred to, has in mind that the *Shepherd* is opposed to his montanistic views and defends himself against its teachings. "But I would yield to you", he says, "if the Scripture called the *Shepherd*, which alone loves adulterers, were worthy of a place in the divine instrument,—if it had not been adjudged among the apocryphal and false writings by every council of the churches even your own".⁶⁹ As Tertullian throughout this treatise has the bishop of Rome in mind, the *Pontifex Maximus* as he sarcastically calls him in the initial chapter, it has been inferred that the Roman had appealed to the *Shepherd* in defence of his laxer administration of discipline.⁷⁰ The inference is possible but by no means necessary. Tertullian had to defend himself not only from the actual arguments of the past but also from the possible ones of the future, against attacks not only from Rome but also from nearer home, where as we have seen the *Shepherd* was in high repute. The words "your churches" refer of course to the Catholic churches, not to those of any particular locality.^{70a} (3) The third witness is the so-called *Liberian Catalogue* of the bishops of Rome, which has the following note under the name Pius: "During his episcopate his brother Hermes wrote the book in which

⁶⁸ Bonwetsch, *Zu den Komm. Hippolyts. Texte u. Untersuchungen* N. F. Vol. i., 2, p. 26, finds a couple of resemblances.

⁶⁹ *De pudic.* 10. "Sed cederem tibi si scriptura Pastoris qui sola moechos amat divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum etiam vestrarum inter apocrypha et falsa iudicaretur".

⁷⁰ So Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.*, I. i., 52, and others.

^{70a} According to Harnack, Tertullian could not be referring to Roman or Italian councils (*Texte u. Untersuch.* V. i., p. 59).

is contained the command which the angel enjoined upon him when he came to him in the garb of a shepherd".⁷¹ This catalogue in its completed form belongs to the middle of the fourth century and therefore lies outside the period of our investigation; but there is good reason for supposing that the earlier part of it, down to 231 A. D., was composed a century or more earlier and is from the pen of Hippolytus himself.⁷² But even the earlier part did not leave the hand of Hippolytus in its present form. Some later editor or continuator added chronological synchronisms at least (the names of contemporary consuls, Emperors, &c.), and perhaps also this and one other note (concerning the death of the Apostle Peter). According to the table of contents appended to one of the recensions of Hippolytus' *Chronica* we should find in it *Nomina episcoporum Romae et quis quot annis praefuit*.⁷³ The natural inference is that all except the names and the number of years was added later. Still while expressing doubt on the matter both Lightfoot and Harnack think it probable that the notice concerning Hermas was in the original work, the former because it "seems intended to discredit the pretensions of that work to a place in the canon and therefore would probably be written at a time when such pretensions were still more or less seriously entertained", the motive being "the same as with the author of the *Muratorian Canon* who has a precisely similar note",⁷⁴ the latter because "just at Hippolytus' time the *Shepherd* was excluded from the sacred collection in many churches and this notice apparently has reference to the controversy [involved]".⁷⁵ It is true that the *Liberian Cat.* agrees with the *Muratorian Fragment* in ascribing the *Shepherd* to a certain Hermas (or Hermes),

⁷¹ "Sub hujus episcopatu frater ejus Hermes librum scripsit in quo mandatum continetur quod ei praecepit angelus cum venit ad illum in habitu pastoris".

⁷² See discussion in Lightfoot, *Apostol. Fathers* I. i., pp. 253ff. and a summary of results in Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.*, II. i., pp. 144ff.

⁷³ Lightfoot, *Loc. cit.*, p. 260.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 261f.

⁷⁵ Harnack, *Loc. cit.*, p. 150.

the brother of Pius, but it is equally important to note that it definitely asserts that it is a genuine revelation, which the Muratori Fragment does not; and it is highly improbable that Hippolytus, had he entertained this view of the work, would have made no mention of, or citation from, it in his other works. Moreover, if the purpose of the author of this notice was to contribute something toward the settlement of the controversy concerning the canonicity of the book, he chose a very inappropriate method. The statement that the book dates from the days of Pius does indeed implicitly deny apostolicity to the work, but the affirmation of its prophetic character definitely asserts its inspiration.^{76 and 77}

⁷⁶The singular *mandatum* also is suspicious. *Mandata* (pl.) might by a stretch be made to cover the whole book, but not its singular. The question rises what is meant thereby. The explanation of Zahn (*Hirt des Hermas*, p. 25f.) would solve the problem. In a letter of Pseudo-Pius dealing with the Quarto-decimanian controversy and therefore dating probably from early in the 4th cent., the writer appeals to a command given to Hermes by the angel that appeared to him in the garb of a shepherd, to the effect that the *Pascha* should be celebrated on the Lord's day ("eidem Hermae angelus domini in habitu pastoris apparuit et praecepit ei ut pascha die dominica ab omnibus celebraretur"). Zahn thinks this is the command referred to in the *Liberian Cat.* in which case the notice there contained must not only be from the fourth cent., but also have no reference to our work for it contains no such command. See also Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.* I, i., p. 56, who finds Zahn's explanation "very improbable".

⁷⁷For the sake of completeness we must say a word about the puzzling Pseudocyprianic tract known as *de aleatoribus*. This work might be ignored here were it not that Prof. Harnack (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. v.) some years ago endeavored to show that it is from the pen of the bishop Victor of Rome. This view has not found much favor with scholars and recently Prof. Harnack himself does not seem so desirous of maintaining it. (*Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.*, i., 52, 719. Cf. Herzog, *Realencycl.* 3rd Ed. Vol. iv., p. 374; xx., p. 602); it has however been taken up by Leipoldt in his *Entstehung des newtestamentlichen Kanons*, and part of Harnack's argument made the basis of much of this work. In this tract the *Shepherd* is quoted once fairly literally, once loosely, and several passages seem to reflect the words and thoughts of Hermas. (The text with notes may be found in the treatise by Prof. Harnack mentioned above). In no case is the *Shepherd* or its author mentioned by name. In the case of the first quotation (cap. 2) the introductory words are *dicit enim scriptura divina* and the

We may pause here for a moment to review our examination to this point. There is no evidence that, during the first thirty or forty years of its existence, the *Shepherd* occupied any preëminent position in the Church. There are signs that it was known and used, but there is not the slightest reason for thinking that it was regarded as an apocalypse, as authoritative, or in any sense on a par with quotation is coupled with a passage from Sirach and one from an unknown source [*"dicit enim scriptura divina* (quotation from *Sim.* ix., 13, 5), *et alia scriptura dicit* (Sirach xxxii., (xxxv.) 1), *et iterum* (an unknown passage)"]. In the second case (cap. 4) the author evidently thinks he is quoting St. Paul, [*"apostulus idem Paulus commemoratdicens* (several passages from the Epp. to Timothy being combined), *iterum* (I Cor. v., 11), *et alio loco* (apparently from Mand. iv., 1, 9) *in doctrinis apostolorum est* (a quotation from an unknown source, possibly dependent on the *Didache*)"] Our hesitancy, in the face of this, to receive this author as a first-class witness to the canonical authority of the *Shepherd* is increased when we take into account his very loose manner of quoting, the fact that several of his quotations cannot be identified, and also that all the Old Testament passages he cites are to be found in Cyprian's *de Lapsis* or *Testimonia*.

We are not now concerned except indirectly with the general question of his forms of citation and the argument that is built upon them in the discussion of the history of the canon of the New Testament; but I cannot refrain from remarking that when Prof. Harnack lays down, as the basis of further argument, the *dictum* that the author (of *de aleatoribus*) "follows a quite definite and strongly consistent method of citation" ("*eine ganz bestimmte und streng festgehaltene Citationsweise befolgt,*" *loc. cit.*, p. 56) he should not weaken his own argument by assuming that the author had two forms of citation, *dicit scriptura divina* and *dicit dominus*, that were apparently of equal value (*augenscheinlich gleichwerthig*). Nor should he say in another place (*Das neue Testament* um 200, p. 36) that according to *de aleatoribus* "the Old Testament and the Apocalypses of Hermas and John belong to the *scripturae divinae* but not so the Gospels and Epistles". Nor should Leipoldt follow him by saying (*loc. cit.*, p. 37) that "this writing (*de aleatoribus*) regards apparently only two books outside of the Old Testament as Holy Scripture in this strict sense of the term". As a matter of fact the Old Testament is never cited as *scriptura divina* in *de aleatoribus*, the passage from Sirach alone excepted, nor is the Apocalypse of John, which is introduced by the words *dominus occurrat et dicit* (cap. 8). To say, as Leipoldt does (*loc. cit.*) that this is apparently accidental is to confess that the whole argument is unfounded. It has escaped the notice of these writers that another and simpler, and consistent principle may be found for the author's method

the Scriptures of the Old Testament. On the contrary, there is good reason for the opinion that no one, orthodox or heretical, was concerned to make or maintain any such claims for it. After that period a higher estimate of it appears in some sections. In Gaul it is quoted by one great teacher as "Scripture", but in such a way as to leave us in doubt whether he really regarded it as Scripture in the strict sense of the word. In Africa the common people esteemed it highly, but their scholarly leader Tertullian despised it. In Alexandria it fared better. Both Clement and Origen regarded it as a real revelation, the former for reasons not clear to us, the latter ascribing it to the Apostolic age. From Rome, where it was produced and where it presumably was best known, comes exceedingly little evidence. Not a single author can be proved to have regarded it as divine or authoritative, but neither do we find any condemnation of it. This can not be the record of a work which was originally published as a divine revelation, accepted as such by the leaders of the church, and drawn upon by them in matters of faith and practice. It is rather the story of a book that began its career in a humbler fashion, that found its way to the hearts of the common people first, that was then occa-

of citation, namely, that in all passages, whether from the Old or the New Testament, from the Gospels or Apocalypse, in which, *in the Scriptures*, the Lord is represented as speaking the introductory formula is *dominus dicit*. In the one occasion where the words quoted are not immediately ascribed to God in the Scriptures, the introductory phrase is enlarged by the addition of *per prophetam* (cap. 10, quoting Eli's words in I Sam. ii., 25.). When the quotation is from the Gospels the addition *in evangelio* is found three times (cap. 3, 10) and in the only other formal quotation from them, both *dominus* and *in evangelio* are lacking (cap. 2). The subject could be mentally supplied; and *in evangelio* was apparently not regarded as necessary. When the quotation is from the Epistles either the name of the apostle (Paul, cap. 3, 4, John, cap. 10), or the title *apostolus* without name (cap. 4, 10) is found with *dicit* (*dicens*). When the authority of the apostolic college is cited the formula is *in doctrinis Apostolorum* (cap. 4). In all other cases the general term *Scriptura* is used (cap. 2). The author has given us no passage from the Acts of the Apostles or from narrative portions of the Bible, and so we cannot say how he would have introduced them.

sionally dimly reflected in the words of some writer or other, and that then here and there, especially far from its native place, and where a wrong opinion of its origin was current, came to be regarded as divine. But we have still one piece of evidence to consider, perhaps the most important of all, and we shall turn to it now.

The so-called *Muratorî Fragment*,⁷⁸ it is generally conceded, comes from about the end of the second century and reflects the opinion of the Roman or Italian church. It contains an incomplete list of the books received into or rejected from the New Testament Scriptures, with notes on the same. Toward the end of the list is found the following paragraph: "Of apocalypses also we receive only those of John and Peter which (latter) some among us will not have read in the church. But the *Shepherd* was written by Hermas, very recently, in our own times, when his brother Pius the bishop was sitting in the episcopal chair of the church of the city of Rome, and therefore it ought indeed to be read, but it cannot be publicly read to the people in church, either among the Prophets whose number is complete, or among the Apostles to the end of time".⁷⁹ Such

⁷⁸ The text may be found in an appendix to Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, also in Zahn, *Grundriss der Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, p. 75, Harnack, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. v., p. 595, and elsewhere. An English translation is given in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. v., p. 603. This is not the place to discuss the date and source of this unique document. I shall assume that it comes from Rome or at least represents the Roman tradition. Also when the plural number is used to denote the authors, I am only following a hint contained in the *Fragment* itself, ("*recipimus*"), without affirming anything of the authorship.

⁷⁹ Ll. 71-79. "Apocalypse etiam iohannis et petri tantum recipimus quam quidam et nos|tris legi in eclesia nolunt pastorem uero | nuperrim e temporibus nostris in urbe | roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe|tra urbis romae aeclisiae pio eps fratre | eius et ideo legi eum quidē oportet se pul|licare uero in eclesia populo neque inter | profetas completum numero neque inter | apostolos in finē temporum potest". In corrected Latin: "Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt. Pastorem uero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre ejus; et

a statement as this would not be found in this place unless canonicity had been claimed for the *Shepherd*. It is natural too to infer that such claims had been made within that particular church from which the *Fragment* emanates. But this is not necessary. The writers had in mind not their own community only, but also the whole Catholic Church,⁸⁰ and therefore had to take cognizance of works for which claims were made by outsiders. From whatever quarter these claims may have come, however, the *Fragment* leaves us in no doubt about certain pretensions which were made for the *Shepherd*, and which were doubtless urged in favor of its canonicity. These were two in number. The first was that the *Shepherd* dates from apostolic times. This is evident from the way the *Fragment* heaps up clauses to disprove such an early origin.⁸¹ It was written, it says, "very recently", "in our own times", "when Pius was bishop of Rome", by the brother of this same Pius and this is given as the ground (*et ideo*) for its exclusion from the Canon.

The second argument was that the *Shepherd* was an apocalypse. This is evident enough from its being classed with the Apocalypses of John and Peter. What is the attitude of the *Fragment* toward this? In the first place, it cannot be urged that the parallelism "we receive only . . . but" ("*tantum recipimus . . . vero*") shows the writers' own view *viz.* that the *Shepherd* too is an apocalypse. The only necessary inference is that the work was commonly or sometimes ranked as an apocalypse. Again, it may be asked, whether in asserting the late date of the book the *Fragment* does not mean to imply that it is not apocalyptic. No definite answer can be given to this, but

ideo legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare vero in ecclesia populo, neque inter prophetas completo numero, neque inter apostolos in finem temporum potest".

⁸⁰ *Frag.*, I, 66, *cf.* 69.

⁸¹ So too Zahn (*Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, I, p. 340) who however does not regard the *Fragment* as well informed concerning the date of the *Shepherd*, but thinks its author was driven to exaggeration by the zeal of the advocates of an early date.

the indications are that it does. Elsewhere⁸² the *Fragment* is pronouncedly anti-montanistic, and it is hard to believe that its authors could have thought of prophecy still existing in the Church as late as the time of Pius.⁸³ But there is still another indication that this is really the view of the *Fragment*. The last lines of our paragraph read, "it cannot be publicly read . . . either among the Prophets whose number is complete or among the Apostles till the end of time". "Prophets" and "Apostles" here, as elsewhere in the literature of this period, are doubtless equivalent to the Old and New Testaments. But there seems to be an especial appropriateness in the use of the terms here. Out of several designations of the Scriptures at their disposal, all current at the time, the authors of the *Fragment* have chosen two which had reference to the two arguments advanced in favor of the *Shepherd* by their opponents. That this is so, that the use of these words is not perfunctory, is shown too by the insertion of the phrase "whose number is complete" after "prophets". This phrase indeed amplifies and completes the argument against the reception of the *Shepherd*, begun in the assertion of its late date. The *Fragment* therefore says in effect, that the *Shepherd* cannot be classed with the Apostles for it is of later date, nor with the Prophets for their number is complete, that is, Hermas was not a prophet nor his work a revelation.⁸⁴

Taking this then as the view of the authors, and remembering the historical situation, this little section of the *Muratorii Fragment*, so puzzling to commentators, becomes a well conceived and carefully guarded statement. The problem was this: Here was a work forty or fifty years old, which had been popular and useful in the church. On account of its apocalyptic form and the apostolic name of its author

⁸² L. 84.

⁸³ Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii., p. 116.

⁸⁴ Similarly, Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, p. 48; Hesse, *Das muratorische Fragment* p. 270f.; Credner, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, p. 117, whose statements however are not in full harmony, *cf.* p. 165; Overbeck, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, pp. 100, 105, and others.

it was held by some to be divinely inspired and equal to the canonical Scriptures. The authors of the *Fragment* knew better. They knew by whom it was written and when, and that it was not a revelation. They had to remove the misunderstanding that was abroad concerning the work, but they had to do so warily or create an opinion of the *Shepherd* as incorrect as the one they would destroy. They dared not say for instance "we do not receive it", a phrase which is used of other rejected books.⁸⁵ Of course in one sense the *Shepherd* is rejected.⁸⁶ It is not recognized as part of the canonical Scriptures. But all the works of which "not received" is said, (apocryphal letters of Paul and the writings of Arsinous and others), are not only rejected from the Canon but positively stigmatized as evil: as the *Fragment* says, "gall should not be mixed with honey".⁸⁷ This phrase could not therefore be used of the *Shepherd* without giving rise to the impression that it was "gall", and so the authors avoid it. Again, put yourself for a moment mentally in the position of those who believed Hermas to be the friend of Paul to whom he sent greetings, and the *Shepherd* to be the record of divine revelations which had been vouchsafed to him. What would be your first thought, were you informed that the book was written a hundred years after you had supposed, and was not a revelation? You would say at once: then the book lies about its origin and its contents, it is apocryphal and false. These are exactly the words Tertullian, as we have seen, used to describe the declaration of some councils of the churches concerning the Shepherd, and it seems more than probable that just such a statement as the one before us was in his mind.⁸⁸ Whether, however, Tertullian is

⁸⁵ Ll. 63ff; 81ff.

⁸⁶ This is involved in "*tantum . . . vero*".

⁸⁷ L. 67.

⁸⁸ Similarly Credner, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, p. 117. An interesting parallel to Tertullian's statement is found in Zahn, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, ii. p. 113, "wer das Buch trotz des Namens Clemens (vis. ii. 4) und vieler anderer Anzeichen für ein Werk aus der Zeit um 145 hielt, musste es für eine pseudepigraphische Fiction halten". Cf. also p. 118 and Vol. i., p. 342.

guilty of this or not, such a false inference had to be guarded against, and it is for this purpose that the authors of the *Fragment* after the assertion of the *Shepherd's* late date hasten to add "therefore it ought to be read". Commentators have been puzzled by the "therefore" here. One, who otherwise has excellently understood the situation, is driven to the extremity of saying that the work was ordered to be read because it was written by the brother of a bishop.⁸⁹ But the matter is clear when seen in its proper setting. The writers have in view those who would be inclined to go from the extreme of admiration to that of denunciation. To these they say: "the *Shepherd* is not what you think it is, but you must not condemn *it* because *you* have made a mistake; it is a good book and therefore it ought to be read". But after all the main thing in the writers' minds is to ensure the exclusion of the *Shepherd* from the Scriptures, and so, after having qualified its rejection in this way, they conclude strongly (the "therefore" being still in force): "but it cannot be read publicly in the church to the people either among the Prophets whose number is complete or among the Apostles to the end of time"; that is to say, it is to be ranked with neither the Old nor the New Testament.

The correctness of this interpretation will be more apparent when we see how others are involved with difficulties. I will take for examples those of Professors Zahn and Harnack, who approach the matter from different standpoints. Professor Zahn,⁹⁰ who has little respect for the judgment of the author of the *Fragment*, explains the injunction to read the *Shepherd* as follows. The Fragmentist believed that the *Shepherd* had been published as an apocalypse but was himself of the opinion that it was not such, and was not friendly disposed toward it. But because it could not be charged with heresy, or intentional falsehood, or because it had been found valuable in the church, or perhaps by way of concession to the opposite party,—we

⁸⁹ Hesse, *op. cit.*, pp. 268ff.

⁹⁰ *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, Vol. i., pp. 342ff, Vol. ii., pp. 111-118; in Herzog, *Realencycl.* 3rd Ed Vol. ix., pp. 778f.

cannot be sure of his motives,—he retained the work in a minor position, as a sort of deuterocanonical work, and ordered it to be read, only providing that it shall not be read in the public services of the church along with the Old and New Testament. But such an interpretation is possible only to one who holds as low an opinion of the author or authors of the *Fragment* as Prof. Zahn does. In several respects it is out of accord with the statements of the *Fragment*, and what we know from other sources about this time. Elsewhere the *Fragment* is straightforward, honest, and, we may add, definite in its statements concerning the rejection or acceptance of writings. When there is a difference of opinion in the church regarding a work, as in the case of the Apocalypse of Peter, the fact is recorded without comment or attempted compromise. It is hardly thinkable therefore that the author or authors would admit even to a secondary place a work which they believed laid claim to inspiration falsely. Moreover, there is no sign in the *Fragment* or in the other literature of this time of any deuterocanonical books,⁹¹ and later when there were, only such works were involved as were of obscure origin. For the authors of the *Fragment* the origin of the *Shepherd* was not doubtful.

Professor Harnack⁹² thinks that the author of the *Fragment*, in agreement with the church generally, regarded the *Shepherd* as a genuine prophecy; that the eloquent silence of the author concerning Christian prophetic writings in their relation to the authoritative church collection is very significant; that the time was past when prophecy just because it was prophecy could be accounted canonical; other conditions were now prerequisite to reception into the sacred collection; that it was necessary therefore for the *Fragmentist* to create a new category for Christian prophetic books, and that he did this by making it the *duty* of Christians to read them *privately*, that is, not in the public church

⁹¹ Harnack emphasizes this, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, iii., p. 399.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 369ff.

services. But how inconsistent this is with itself and with what Prof. Harnack says elsewhere in the same article! How can the *Fragment* be "eloquently silent concerning the relation of the prophetic writings to the authoritative church collection" and at the same time "create for them a special category"? And how does the creation of a special category differ from the erection of a deuterocanon, of which Prof. Harnack tells us there is no sign at this time in the *Fragment* or elsewhere? Or, looking at the larger question, is it possible that works which a few years before had occupied a position second to none among the Christian writings, should within one generation be relegated to at least comparative obscurity?⁹³ But quite apart from these considerations Harnack's interpretation is wrecked on the fact that the *Muratorii Fragment* has not one word to say about Christian prophetic writings as a class being read. All other so-called Apocalypses are definitely excluded by the *tantum* of line 72; only the *Shepherd* is separated from them and made the subject of special remark. There is not a shadow of justification for the statement that the contents of this remark were applicable to any other writing or class of writings.

When, therefore, we find these scholars, differing as they do in their attitude toward the history of the Canon and in their estimate and interpretation of the *Muratorii Fragment*, both alike involved in difficulties and inconsistencies through the assumption that the *Shepherd* was published, and for long regarded, as an apocalypse, we come back with the more confidence to the interpretation of this passage to which we were led by our investigation of the historical background. What the authors of *Muratorii Fragment* say here is in effect: "We know in detail the history of the origin of the *Shepherd* of Hermas and can assure the church that it never was intended to be taken as an apocalypse; those who have so regarded it have been mistaken; it is a

⁹³Harnack himself (*Ibid.*, p. 405) acknowledges the "ausserordentlich raschen Verlauf des Prozesses. Cf. the criticism by Overbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 75f.

good book and ought to be read, but it is not part of the Scriptures". In other words, what the *Muratorî Fragment* does, is not to take away the authority which had universally been conceded to the *Shepherd* at one time, but to check a growing tendency to regard it as canonical.

We have now reviewed the important evidence of the second century in respect to the position occupied by the *Shepherd* in the Church. What is our conclusion? Just this: the only assumption about which the known facts may be arranged logically and consistently is that the *Shepherd* was published originally, and accepted by the author's contemporaries, as a purely human work in the form of an allegory. It soon became widely known and popular among the churches, and some thirty or forty years after its publication was regarded in some localities as inspired and Scripture. Its literary form doubtless deceived many who were not acquainted with its origin into thinking it a genuine revelation. The attempt was also made to foist it upon the apostolic age. But the Church of Rome, of which Hermas had been a member and in which his work had been produced, was comparatively or wholly free from these wrong opinions, and, as represented in the *Muratorî Fragment*, entered a strong protest against this false valuation of a useful but purely human work.

Princeton.

KERR D. MACMILLAN.