Spiritus Gladius

Lutheran Synod Quarterly

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND COMMUNICATIO IN SACRIS CUM HAERETICIS
The Rev. Tom G. A. Hardt, Sweden

THE MEANING AND USE OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT CRITICAL APPARATUS (concluded)
Prof. Julian Anderson

NEWS AND COMMENTS — MODERN HAGIOLATRY
Pres. B. W. Teigen

March, 1963

Volume III, No. 3

LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Evanelical Lutheran Synod

Edited by the Theological Faculty of the ELS Theological Seminary

M. H. Otto, Managing Editor, % Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minn.

Volume III, No. 3 March, 1963

Subscription Price: $2.00 per year Single Copy, 50¢

"The Primitive Church and *Communicatio in Sacris cum Haereticis*"

The Rev. Tom G. A. Hardt
Stockholm, Sweden

Editor's note: The following essay is a chapter in a larger work: *Communicatio in Sacris*, *The Doctrine of Lutheranism on the Church*, *Dogma and the Sacraments*, *and Their Inter-relationship*. This is the thesis which Pastor Hardt presented to the University of Uppsala for the degree of Candidate of Theology. The translation of this thesis (which in the original runs to over 200 pages) was done, in the main, by Prof. C. U. Faye of Bethany Lutheran Seminary. It has been condensed somewhat by the undersigned, but all the references have been kept intact.

A word about this young Swedish pastor. I quote from a personal letter of Dr. Hermann Sasse who has read the thesis and has served as an informal adviser to Pastor Hardt: "Tom Hardt belongs to the few men in Sweden who courageously drew the consequences from the apostasy of the bishops and severed their bond with the State Church. This means that he gave up a splendid career. He is one of the true confessors, rejecting the compromise of Bishop Giertz and Dean Danell, the leaders of the Confessional 'samling.'" At the present time Pastor Hardt is serving a small "free" Lutheran church in Stockholm, Sweden, and trying to gather together into "free" congregations other truly confessionally-minded Lutherans. He is also working on his Doctorate in Theology.

The *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* presents Pastor Hardt's essay in historical theology with the hope that it will shed some light on the present discussions of the doctrine of the Church and Church Fellowship. This "lonely Lutheran" from Sweden investigates an area of Church History which has been pretty much by-passed by confessional Lutherans. We hope to present in future issues of the Lutheran Synod Quarterly Pastor Hardt's study of Luther and the Problem of Fellowship, and also a history of the practice of Fellowship within the Lutheran Church from the time of Luther until the mid-nineteenth century.

B. W. Teigen

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ever since the sixteenth century, the concept of the one Primitive Church has been deeply cherished. Erasmus as well as Zwingli at Marburg could appeal to this "ideal" church. The ecumenically-minded men of the seventeenth century, men such as the two Calixtuses, the Hollander, Grotius, the Lutheran Cistercian, Abbot Molanus, were all motivated by this concept in their fight to do away with the preceding century's splintering of the church. In the course of time this thought probably gained its strongest foothold in England and the Anglican Church, whence it has been acquired by the present-day high-church schools of thought within the various confessions and also by the ecumenical movement of the day, all of which are inspired by the "ideal" of the Primitive Church.

This "ideal" ascribed to the Primitive Church the following characteristics: 1. Unity; 2. A So-Called Dogmatic Comprehensiveness, both of which are to be given room in the English expression "Catholicity." Included within the concept of "unity" is the premise that the heretics in existence were non-Christians, or that they were to be found beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire, so that there was no local geographic splintering; or that the heretics were, by and large, limited to the heresiarchs, who, to the extent that they organized authentic churches, were insignificant groups which were no problem in the question of communicatio in sacris (i.e., church fellowship). As a result of this opinion, it is held that the boundary between various confessions is a modern problem, dating itself from the Reformation. Compare the position of Hans Asmussen who writes: "Die Trennung am Tisch des Heran wie wirsie heute haben ist in einer Geschichte geworden, die vierhundert Jahre währt."[1]

Bo Giertz in the chapter "Una Sancta"; in his popular Kristi Kyrka, writes of the Primitive Church: "From Spain one could travel along the whole Mediterranean and deep into Arabia and up among the mountains of Armenia, and wherever one came or whenever he went ashore, one could go into the churches, partake of the Lord's Supper, and experience as a wondrous truth what some unknown hymn writer from these centuries wrote in the 'Ambrosian hymn of praise', our Te Deum: Te per orbem terrarum Sancta confitetur ecclesia ("The Holy Church in everyplace Throughout the world exalts Thy praise").[2] The Council of Nicaea is for Giertz "the great day of triumph for the One world-encompassing Church." The church was "united and strong under the leadership of her bishops."[3]

This one society is "catholic" also in the sense of being "dogmatically comprehensive." "The distance between a Jew in Jerusalem, a believer in the ancient faith converted to Christianity, and a recently converted Greek slave in Corinth was certainly greater than the natural distance, as it manifests itself, between a Pentecostal and a Roman Catholic. But in spite of these violent tensions unity was preserved. It rested upon a holy obligation."[4] According to Giertz the unity of the church rested not upon unity in doctrine but rather upon the idea that the Church was an organism, an entity that grew out of the assemblies of the Apostles, one which is constituted by this historic connection but with changing guise, just as, e.g., the Roman Empire during the years 800-1806 existed as a unit constituted from the historic connections, despite the changing forms. This organism is called by Giertz "the body of Christ," which is a symbolic expression for the close dependence of the Church upon Christ. This symbol permits, of course, such usage as "to lacerate the body of Christ," etc. "If the apostles appeared today, and if they were confronted with the splintering in a single, average, Swedish community, they would be horrified and would reproach us with having cut to pieces and lacerated the holy body of Christ."[5] This reproach strikes, not primarily at the false doctrine, but at the spirit of splintering, which would not grant to dissimilar doctrines room within the framework of the one historic church. Thus is understood the contribution of the Primitive Church to the problem: doctrine versus unity.

"From time to time there arose divisions," writes Giertz, but "some of them healed themselves. Others survived as locally limited or insignificant minorities. The more tenacious ones led to the coming into being of independent national churches, often in distant countries far beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire. Yet all the time the great Mother Church was there in constant growth. For more than eight centuries she possessed existence."[6]

The dates 867 and 1054 are mentioned as the year limits for the "great Mother Church." The events of the years mentioned, the emergence of the Roman universal episcopate, signify the destruction of the organizational unity. Only when practice is set against practice (here: papal centralism against the autonomy of the ancient church), is the unity of the Church threatened, a unity which is pure no matter how great the tensions in doctrine: In addition, it is hard to understand how Giertz, with his definition of the Catholic Church, could avoid making his own the words of Archbishop William Temple: "I believe in one Holy Catholic Church but sincerely regret that She does not exist at present!" Thus Giertz concludes the presentation of the portion "Perfectly united into one" with a quotation from a German theologian which also actually implied the destruction of the Catholic Church at the end of the preceding millenium: "Back to the One, back to the whole! beyond the confessions to the undivided Christ!"[7]

This same high estimate of the uniformity of the Primitive Church and as such a model to be emulated, we also find in the great ecumenical collective work A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948. In 800 pages this work presents the history of ecumenicity from Luther's 95 theses (!) to the founding of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam, 1948, with an "Introduction" setting forth, among other things, conditions in the Primitive Church.

This work also presupposes a unity with "tensions" in doctrine. For example, Paul's conflict with the Galatian heretics is explained as being a conflict of the "nature of family quarrels."[8] The heretics which were actually excluded were such as took upon themselves to "radically change the original gospel," e.g., gnosticism, which is ascribed to the "speculative temperament of the Levant." The criterion of the true Church was that she was world-wide"; the Council of Nicaea represented the Church from Spain to the slopes of Hindu Kush." The restrictions in admission to divine service which the author knows of are taken to be directed against pagans and spies, and the doctrine that "anyone who... communicated ... with a tainted sheep thereby became tainted himself" has been developed by some "puritans such as Lucifer of Cagliari." With the exception of the Donatists, local splintering did not occur, but it is admitted that on one occasion six bishops were to be found in Antioch, and that in the year 367 the Novatians had churches in Constantinople. The heretical associations play here a somewhat greater role than with Giertz. Throughout, nevertheless, there is still the concept of the great Mother Church with dogmatic tensions (whose doctrinal basis peculiarly enough seems to coincide with that of the World Council of Churches) but which perishes in "the Great Schism." The doctrine of not having _communicatio in sacris cum haereticis_ is, after all, the invention of an exceptional rigorist. Heretics are, after all, those who spread abroad false Christology and thereby, _eo ipso_, stand outside the Church. Remaining heresies are rather to be considered mistakes; Montanism is "a protest of the prophetic element in the church against the increasing weight of organization and the dullness of official routine." The difference between Alexandrian and Antiochian Theology is a matter of "different traditions in Biblical exegesis", etc. No longer do the heretics play a prominent role in the Church, and they are not in general to be found in orthodox dioceses. Compare Giertz's presentation![9]

We turn now to the Primitive Church and ask: What were the regulations concerning _Communicatio in Sacris_? Could one, "wherever one went ashore," communicate? Are the delimitations aimed only at the "grave" heretics, who, _eo ipso_, were non-Christian? Where were the heretics to be found? Were there only a few of them? Was the Primitive Church "dogmatically comprehensive?" In the Primitive Church what is the significance of the rule: _Nulla communicatio in sacris cum haereticis aut schismaticis_?

Undoutedly there were to be found in the Primitive Church at least some who manifested a modern, ecumenic disposition in their practice with regard to the Lord's Supper. Tertullian speaks of heretics who "come together, listen together, pray together" with those of different faith, yea without even differentiating between baptized and unbaptized; "furthermore, when pagans come, they cast that which is holy before the dogs and the pearls which are not in fact pearls before swine."[10] The heretical churches which applied this practice to circumstances could have been but few. On the other hand, the many safety measures against heretical infiltration can testify that Christians were to be found who were impelled by unionism as a principle, and who applied it when this was possible. The church father Basil appeals in a moving letter for testimony by letter from his brethren in the faith, in order to prevent the unionism and the slackness in belief that menaces his church where the Catholics begin to accustom themselves to the heretics' mass, baptism, deaconry, etc. (these heretics were made up of an anti-Nicaean majority in the diocese)."[11] The Catholics could also then in certain cases set aside rules concerning _communicatio in sacris_, but that causes, as in this case, intervention by Basil.

In the Ancient Church there is an abundance of regulations against communicatio in sacris cum haereticis. They are repeatedly found in the church ordinances, in the works and letters of the Fathers, and in the liturgies themselves. Already the Apostolic Epistles contain exhortations not to have fellowship with such as do not obey the apostolic doctrine. This holds good also in the cases when repentance is conceivable, and the erring one can be looked upon as "brother."[12] The words in I Cor. 16, 22 "If any man love not the Lord, let him be Anathema, Maranatha!" have been made parallel to the Eucharistic formula in Didache, 10, 6: "If any man be holy, let him come; if he be not, let him do penance! Maranatha! Amen," which presumably were pronounced by the celebrant after hailing the assembly: "May grace come and this world perish!"; to which the assembly responded with its "Hosanna, the God of David!" Here the liturgical kiss of peace, as in I Cor. 16,20, has had its place. We should then in First Corinthians, as also in Rev. 22, 16-21, according to some investigators, have to do with the first liturgical expressions of the strict interpretation of communicatio in sacris in the Primitive Church.[13] Paul may here have made use of a liturgical tradition already firm in the Church to which the conclusion of his Epistle in a natural way could be linked; for the Epistle, of course, was read before an assembly, which, after the reading of the Epistle, proceeded to celebrate the Eucharist.

The Church Fathers often present the doctrine of communicatio in sacris in connection with the treatment of the sacraments. Both Ignatius and Justin Martyr affirm the prohibition against fellowship with the heretics together with an emphasis on the Incarnation and the Eucharistic Real Presence.[14] Origen maintains that the Christian Mass is essentially something else than a school of Philosophy and is therefore by nature closed.[15] Colloquy is the life form of philosophy, not of the Church! Therefore Didascalia demands of the Deacon that he is to demand information from the stranger as to whether he belongs to the Church or a sect ("Haeresis").[16] The Apostolic Constitutions prescribed in addition a document of legitimation.[17] The Synods in Elvira (in the year 306) and Arles (in the year 314) ordained that orthodox travelers should be provided by their bishops with literae communicatoriae so that they could be admitted to the divine service in strange places. The synods in Antioch (in the year 341) and Carthage (345-348) repeated the prohibition against admitting unknown persons to the liturgy.[18] Heretics may not set foot in the room where divine service is conducted, neither may Catholics set foot in heterodox churches or synagogues according to the Synod in Laodicaea (about the year 360).[19] The prohibition against communicatio in sacris holds good as a matter of course as regards prayer fellowship. The cleric who has prayed together with a heretic is excommunicated, according to the Synod in Laodicaea.[20] He who, owing to a matter of principle, could not be admitted to communion, could not either partake in the prayer of the church, "the Holy Liturgy" (for pedagogical reasons penitents could meanwhile be permitted to partake in the liturgy but not in the Eucharist). In Serapion's Liturgy (about the year 340) the deacons called out after the sermon and benediction, but before the Prayers: "Let the catechumens go!" Let no catechumens remain! "Let the catechumens go!" And, after the dismissal of the catechumens, the words: "The doors! The doors! — αἱ θύραι, αἱ θύραι." Only thereafter could the Church begin the Prayers in Jesus' name, "the Holy

Liturgy."[21] In the Clementine liturgy (about 380, made up of older components), the Deacon calls out: "Let none of those who have been merely auditing this service, none of the unbelievers, none of the heterodox, take part!"[22] Not even in danger of death could communicatio in sacris be established between the Catholic and a heretic. All regulations concerning communion of heretics presuppose a conversion to the Catholic Church on the death-bed.[23]

That the rules concerning communicatio in sacris were actually applied in all their strictness is shown by the Church Father Chrysostom's unfortunate lot. In Alexandria an arch-presbyter had communicated the Eucharist to a Manichaean woman and was excommunicated for this. Since another presbyter and four monks continued to have sacramental fellowship with the arch-presbyter, they also were excommunicated. Since Chrysostom as patriarch of Constantinople, whither these five came on a journey, gave them right to participate in the Prayer (though not in the sacrament), the Patriarch in Alexandria thereby took the opportunity to accuse Chrysostom who was deposed, inter alia, on account of this matter. We have here then a veritable chain reaction, a logical application of the strict view of the limits of church fellowship.[24] When a monophysite Patriarch of Antioch communicated as a Catholic, even he is refused communion by his brethren and is deposed.[25] The same view of the boundaries of the church occurs then even among the heretics.

That common communion meant a common Church was so self-evident that in order to enjoy the stability that a unified state church could give, the state was determined at any price to force common communion between opposing parties. All that the state here desired, however, was the ritual observance of fellowship. Each and every one was permitted to have his own faith as long as it did not threaten the outer unity of the Church, the common cultus! When the Arian emperor Valens in the year 369 arrives at the city Tomis on the Black Sea, he demands of the Catholic bishop there, Brettanion, that he communicate with the Arians. Not with one word is it intimated that Brettanion is to give up his faith. The Union (to make use of a later term) is to take place, "the confessional status being unhurt," or using a modern expression — "in accordance with the principle of the differentiated discipleship." As a true Catholic bishop Brettanion refuses to pay homage to the Arian monarch. According to Sazomen, Brettanion proclaims the Nicaean dogma in a manly and frank manner before the ruler, and, followed by the Catholic people, he leaves the church where the meeting took place, proceeding to another house of God in order to celebrate Mass. The bishop is arrested and sent into exile as punishment. To proclaim the Nicaean dogma is, accordingly, not to repeat a formula; it is to put into practice the anathemata of the Nicaean Council and to accept the consequences thereof. No doctrine exists without its "negativa," and both "affirmativa" and "negativa" have their deciding Sitz im Leben ("place in life") in the divine service, in sacris.

Three years later a similar occurrence took place in Edessa, when an Imperial Prefect demanded of the Catholic clergy either to "communicate with the wolf," as Theodoret expresses it in his Church History, or to go into exile. Elert comments: "There is no question at all of any dogmatic adjustment but also not of an exhortation to be converted to Arianism. The criterion of the offered church fellowship is neither the Arian nor the Nicaean but the Emperor. Communicate with the Emperor, then everything is in order!"[26] In our following presentation we will find that this last imperative often voided the communicatio-in-sacris rule.

About the year 360 there occurs one of the clearest and at the same time most offensive examples of what actually communicatio in sacris implied. The homoiousian bishop Macedonius in Constantinople wished to unite with his own church, the Nicaean Novatians, with whom the Nicaean Catholics at this time practiced what was later called Simultaneum — alternating use of the same church. In accordance with the reasoning given above there was no demand to convert the Novatians. All that was demanded was that they communicate with Macedonius. After mistreatment, which did not have as its aim to convince a delinquent of the excellence of the homoiousian mediation theology, but to get him, without renunciation, to swallow the consecrated elements, inter-communion took place, at which the Novatians received the Body and Blood of Christ after their mouths were pried open with the help of pieces of wood.[27] The one state church pleasing to Caesar was made a reality!

On another occasion some Monophysite bishops were prevailed upon to communicate with Catholics. To save their consciences they solemnly cursed the Council of Chalcedon in the moment that they were to receive the Eucharist. "Thus appeared the fellowship of the Body of Christ when existing contradictions were not previously removed."[28]

Against this background perhaps we can understand the words of the great dogmatician John of Damascus: "We must with all strength hold fast to the principles neither to receive the Lord's Supper from heretics nor to give it to them."[29] It is also evident that in the Primitive Church one could by no means communicate "wherever one went ashore."

THE "CHRISTIAN" HERETICS

One often meets the concept that the heresies of the Primitive Church were of such a nature that the heretical churches de facto were not Christians. Hence strict church discipline would be directed against those who could properly be called heathen.

This is, however, an exaggerated conception of the status of heretics in the Primitive Church. The Nicaean Council, for example, demanded re-baptism only of the Paulinians. The remaining heretical churches were looked upon as administering valid baptism.[30] With very few exceptions all were willing to acknowledge the authority of the Biblical Canon, "to stand under the Word." Behind the proposal to reconcile the contending parties in the Arian controversy with the expression "uniformly in accordance with the Scriptures," there stands the Biblical principle with its self-evident presupposition of a generally accepted acknowledgment of the authority of Scripture. In addition, the validity of the heretical offices is of course often acknowledged. And even if one knew of the duty not to have communicatio in sacris with heretics, occasionally practical cooperation between the confessions would take place; in theological-polemical areas one could for instance help one party in its controversy against a third which clearly was a common foe.[31] Yes, the observance of the rule nulla communicatio in sacris cum haereticis was so far from being dictated by personal ill-will against a heretic or by a false conception of his "heathen" state of mind, that young students of different confessions could have regular gatherings for mutual spiritual benefit and at the same time accept as self-evident that the sacramental fellowship is brought to nought by diverging confessions.[32] Since one did not proceed in accordance with the principle of compulsory union, the various parties could gather to discuss doctrine, whereby consensus de doctrina was occasionally attained, with common communion as a result. As long as the principle of church fellowship was not violated, one could, in spite of the canons which forbade setting foot in heretical churches, avail oneself of a Simultaneum, when this was necessary.[33] In one case, an esteemed bishop was followed to the grave by different confessions.[34] It seems that no hate was leveled against a heretic. Furthermore, a certain humor could develop in the inter-confessional discussions, as for instance, between Chrysostom and Sisinnius, a Novatian bishop.[35] A historiography of the Primitive Church was capable of striving for an impartial judgment of the opposing party and acknowledging its subjective honesty.[36]

The strictness as regards church fellowship could scarcely be ascribed to the temperament of the Levant. On the whole, one surely does well to pay attention to the basic similarities which are found between the world of the Primitive Church and ours. Here we are not dealing with any counterpart in church history to the well-known "Prelogical stage of thinking" in the history of religion; nor did the Primitive Church live in a time which, in contrast to ours, was peaceful and outwardly calm, permitting idle theologians to indulge in speculative dogmatizing from which they constructed an absurd church discipline. When the "controversy within the church" against Arius was at its height, the smoke of the sacrifices on the pagan altars of the Capitol still arose. Yes, the fact that the Catholic Church was menaced with bloody martyrdom, that heathen religions still had vigorous life, that enormous social and moral, economic and political revolutions were shaking the dying Roman Empire, was not considered with regard to the "stress of the times"—a dispensation from the duty of guarding dogma for the bishop or for the watcher at the church door which was to be closed when the Holy Liturgy began. If one will keep in mind the martyrdom of the Church in the third century when, for instance, Didascalia came into being, one will understand that the communicatio-in-sacris problem was experienced as a part in a bloodily realistic church existence! That prominent heretics could set the rabble in an uproar, as when Arianism associated itself with the Jewish and pagan elements in Alexandria and was supported by great mobs of organized women as pressure groups, did not cause anyone to lose his self-possession.[37] The mob is usually heretical. Basil of Caesarea, for instance, is plagued by the heretic-rabble alliance. Gregory of Nyssa speaks of how Christology is discussed in the exchange office, bakeries and public baths by those who understand nothing of it.[38] The world of the Primitive Church was not too unlike ours. But it is in its doctrine concerning church fellowship that the Primitive Church distinguishes itself from modern ecumenic Christianity.

THE UBIQUE ET AB OMNIBUS OF HERESY

Before Constantine, the Catholic Church had no privileged position over the heretical bodies. She was one among many churches. At this time the various churches could not even control the changes of confession by their members (in Alexandria, for instance).[39] Even after the directives of Theodosius against the heretics, they could, in spite of everything, have churches in the capital city itself. Socrates relates that an economically-minded Jew, who for the sake of gain, let himself be baptized in Constantinople by the Arians and the Macedonians, only to be finally exposed during his visit to the Novatians. Werner Elert maintains that about the year 500 when "Emperor Anastasius I transferred the right of asylum from the "Great Church" to the churches of the heretics, the Capital City presented a motley of denominations quite comparable to that of a German or English metropolis today!" After Nicaea a splintering takes place in the Eastern dioceses and even in the local congregations: "Nicaeans, Semi-Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, Apollianarians live side by side in the same locality. The pre-Nicaean Novatians have at the same time spread and continued for a long time to spread a net of congregations over many parts of the same area. To this there come after Chalcedon the Monophysites who in their turn split again."[40]

Many minor points have been advanced to prove that the heresy in the Primitive Church extended far more widely than has been customarily supposed. Eusebius's silence concerning the church life in Middle and Eastern Asia Minor might be due to the fact that Christendom in these areas was heretical.[41] Ignatius, too, in his letter omits naming certain churches of Asia Minor which appear in the Book of Revelation, in spite of his including the rest of these churches. It is tempting to assume that Ignatius looked upon the omitted churches as now having become entirely heretical.[42] The heresy mentioned in the Book of Revelation could then have choked the orthodox Christendom in the time before the letter of Ignatius.

Just as heresy can ascribe to itself ubique, it is also embraced ab omnibus. To be sure, there is to be found above all in Augustine the thought that the legitimacy of the Church should be able to be proved from her numbers and geographical catholicity.[43] But that this thought was not alone dominant is clear from the following quotations from the Fathers.[44]

Basil makes a reference to the three men in the fire and writes: "They teach us to do what should be done when no one is of our opinion. In the middle of the flames they praised God; they looked not upon the multitude which spoke against them, but were satisfied to be united although they were only three." As we noted above, Basil was contending against just such a heretical majority.

Theodoret mentions in his Church History an exchange of words between the Pope Liberius and the Arian Emperor Constantine who asked the Pope: "How large a part of the circle of the earth have you behind you, which contradicts in this manner?" Liberius answered: "Through my isolation and loneliness the Word of Truth loses nothing. There were also once only three who put themselves against the edict of the King."

Against the Arians also Gregory Nazianzen writes the following words: "Where are they that judge the church by number and despise the little flock who measure the divinity with a measure and place the people so high, who place sand high and despise the light of the world, who collect mussels and despise pearls? They have the houses, we the inhabitants — they have the churches, we God; yea, we are the temple of the living God, a living sacrifice, a spiritual burnt-offering. They have the people, we the angels; they audacity and daring, we the faith; they threats, we prayers; they gold and silver, we the pure doctrine of the faith." Similar thoughts are found again in Chrysostom: "What is most useful, to have much straw rather than precious stones? Not in the number of the multitude but in the strength of the conviction consists the true majority. Elias was only one but the whole world sufficed not to outweigh him." And in the so-called Responsiones ad Orthodoxos he wrote: "Why are only they who are adherents of the pure doctrine and have a pure mind pleasing to God, when they in the question of numbers could not measure themselves with Greeks, Jews, and all heretics except to stand far behind them? . . . This results in its being said about the little flock of the orthodox Christians somewhere: Many are called, but few are chosen."

To sum up, we quote Jerome's words against a Pelagain: "That you have many like you will not at all make you a Catholic; on the contrary, it proves that you are a heretic." To the fullness of the Catholic faith belongs the fact that in the controversy about faith, this faith is often cherished by only a minority.

For the Primitive Church every dogma was of vital importance. Denial of the part was denial of the whole, and in order that the Word go out as "Kerygma" intact, the formal dogmatizing is, according to Ireneus, necessary. No one can then unnoticed make addition or leave out any part.[45] Athanasius also called the Nicaean Dogma just that: "Kerygma."[46] If one comments, as for instance, Yngve Brilioth does, on the Chrysostom Liturgy's dialogue between Deacon and Choir: V, "Let us love one another in order that we may in concord confess" — R, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost — the Trinity one in essence and indivisible," with few words which oppose "the speculative formulations of the 4th century" to "the intimate fellowship-consciousness of the original Christian assembly,"[47] then one is ignoring completely and radically what the men of the Primitive Church, from the simplest layman to the highest Patriarch in Alexandria or Rome, themselves meant concerning their faith.

NOTES

1 Hans Asmussen, "Abendmahlsgemeinschaft?" in the book of the same name (Beiheft 3 zur Evangelischen Theologie, 2nd uppl. München 1938), p. 5.

2 Bo Giertz, Kristi Kyrka,(4 uppl., Stockholm, 1946), p. 65.

3 Giertz, p. 63. 4 Giertz, p. 61. 5 Giertz, p. 65

6 Giertz, p. 66. 7 Giertz, p. 74.

8 Stephen Charles Neill, in A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948 (edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, London, 1954), "Introduction: Division and the Search for Unity prior to the Reformation," p. 6.

9 Neill, pp. 5-12.

10 Werner Elert, Abendmahl und Kirchegemeinschaft in der Alten Kirche Hauptsächlich des Ostens," (1 uppl., Berlin, 1954), p. 65. Elert mentions, p. 101, the abolition of the Penitentiaria in Constantinople, in 391, and maintains that the counsels given in connection therewith by a Presbyter Eudaimon, to let each one communicate according to his conscience, should mean "open communion." Elert is, of course, of the opinion that the counsel was not followed and that it is quite unique. Oscar D. Watkins' A History of Penance, Vol. I, p. 348ff (not utilized by Elert), however, throws light on Eudaimon's counsel. What Eudaimon wished to abolish was the half-open confession which took place within the Penitentiaria, and where the enumerated sins could entail the intervention against involved persons. Of concern here were the penitents who denounced themselves. No sins were, according to Eudaimon's counsel, any longer to be confessed in this way. The jurisdiction of the Church over open sins should on the contrary, of course, not be impugned.

11 Elert, p. 126.

12 E.g., Romans 16,17; I Tim. 6,3ff; II John 10ff; II Thess. 3,14-15; concern cases where repentance can be thought of. Hermann Sasse points out in Kirche und Herrenmahl, p. 14, that Revelation 3,20 presupposes close communion.

13 Gunther Bornkamm, Das Ende des Gesetzes (Paulus Studien, beitrage zur Evangelischen Theologie, Theologische Abhandlungen, 16, Munchen, 1952), p. 123ff., and E. Peterson, Eis Theos.

14 "The Epistle to the Philadelphians, III," and "The Apology, I, 66.

15 Elert, p. 64.

16 Elert, p. 96.

17 Elert, pp. 96,108,110.

18 Elert, p. 108ff

19 Elert, p. 96.

20 Elert, p. 96, and L. Zander, Intercommunion and Co-celebration, p. 357.

21 Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (second edition, Westminster 1945), p. 42.

22 Elert, p. 96.

23 The common notion that the Primitive Church in articulo mortis would have admitted heretics without conversion arises from a misunderstanding. Canon 13 in the Decree of the Council of Nicaea, which is misunderstood by some, speaks expressly of that viaticum to a heretic implies reconciliation with the Church. "As for them who are dying, the old and canonical law is to be observed which forbids that, if anyone is dying, he be refused the last and most necessary viaticum. If after he is reconciled and again has entered into the fellowship of the Church, he anew belongs to the number of the living (i.e. recovers), he must then have his place among them who only possess the fellowship of prayer. But generally, when anyone, whoever it may be, is dying and requests to receive the Eucharist, the bishop is to give it to him after due investigation" (Canon 13, Nicaea, trans. from Watkins, p. 291). James Ignatius King attempts in The Ad-

ministration of the Sacraments to Dying Non-Catholics, p. 74f, to interpret this canon so that its former part up to "but generally.....", is to refer to the Absolution, which could freely be communicated to all dying heretics, while the last clause was to refer to the Eucharist which could only be communicated to the one who let himself be accepted into the church. The Absolution, which could be communicated, was according to King, private and not to be confused with the public one, which required acceptance into the church. This distinction between Absolution and Eucharist conflicts even with King's own authorities (p. 74, note 33). The distinction between heretics and converts conflicts indeed likewise with what the canon, expressis verbis, says ("If after he is reconciled..."). They who, in accord with this canon, have had the sacrament communicated to them are all willing to be received into the Catholic Church. This is also evident from the fact that the neighboring canons (8,10,11,12,14, Watkins, p. 271ff.) deal with penitente (converts). King's peculiar treatment of the material is dictated by a desire to trace back to the Primitive Church the present day Roman practice (Sanctum Officium,20 /7 1898, 26/5 1916, King, pp. 25 and 80). The last clause in Canon 13 could be an emphatic repetition of the import of the canon, which was of weight in opposition to rigoristic false doctrine (cf. Canon 22, The Synod in Arles, Watkins, p. 282f, which denies viaticum in this case!). Elert also maintains that the primitive church knows of communicatio in sacris cum haereticis (p. 87f) and in the article "Abendmahl und Kirchegemeindschaft in der Alten Kirche," p. 67, in Koinonia. Elert's own impressive material indicates, however, that it has to do only with an in articulo mortis hastened reconciliation-process. The Synod of Ancyra (in the year 314) speaks expressly of penitents who, before the time of penance had run out, encountered the danger of death (Canon 6). Dionysius of Alexandria (Bishop 247-265) declares that the penitent who communicated in articulo mortis, is to remain communicant after a possible recovery (Pitra I, 546, Manuscript), that is to say, that the one communicated embraces really the Faith of the Church and is no longer a heretic. The Primitive Church has never known communicatio in sacris cum haereticis in articulo mortis!

24 Elert, p. 143.

25 Elert, p. 144.

26 Elert, p. 155ff.

27 Elert, p. 158f.

28 Elert, p. 160.

29 Elert, p. 102.

30 Elert, p. 68.

31 Elert, p. 156.

32 Elert, p. 149. Contrary to Elert, the author does not find it possible to establish that prayer fellowship took place. Most probably it seems to have to do with common visits in (for private devotion) open churches. Nowhere are divine services spoken of (cf. Po II, 51, 54f). Zacharias does not first confess his Monophysite faith at a communion, but at the invitation to be god father for the Catholic Severus, which indicates that, as a matter of principle Koinonia et Ecclesiastica was not restricted to concern only the Lord's Supper. All that Elert says about "Studenten Gemeinde" (student assemblies) is erroneous.

33 Elert, p. 158.

34 Elert, p. 118. The hymn singing that then took place in fellowship is still a clear breach of the communicatio-in-sacris rule. A similar example, but without hymn singing and fellowship, is to be found in the history of the later church

when ministers of the Augsburg Confession took part together with Reformed in the funeral procession of Polish dignitaries (cf. Hans Leube, Kalvinismus und Luthertum in Zeitalter der Orthodoxie, I, p. 208. Cf. H. Jone, Katolische Moral Teologie, No. 127, a.).

35 Elert, p. 164.

36 Watkins, A History of Penance, p. 349.

37 B. J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A. D., 461 (Oxford, 1922), pp. 14-18.

38 Elert, p. 120.

39 Quoted from Werner Elert, Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der Alten Kirche, in Koinonia, p. 58.

40 Elert, Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der Alten Kirche, Haupsachlich des Ostens, p. 117.

41 Walter Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im Ältesten Christentum (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 10, Tübingen, 1934), p. 176.

42 Bauer, p. 83. One may, moreover, point out that the letters in Revelation 2, as a matter of fact, are occupied with communicatio in sacris cum haereticis, for which sin otherwise praiseworthy orthodox assemblies are accused (cf.2, 14 with 2, 13; 2, 20 with 2,19). The mere presence in the assembly of heretics (Balaamites, Nicolaitanes, a woman Didaskalos, etc.) is a sin.

43 Contr. Crescon. Donat, III, 67, etc., quoted from Friedrich Heiler, Urkirche und Ostkirche (Munchen, 1937), p. 5ff.

44 The following quotations are found without reference from whence they might have been taken in Löhe's Drei Bucher von der Kirche, p. 114f. All the quotations are taken directly from Johann Gerhard's Loci Theologichi (De Ecclesia, caput x,xi). The whole second book (in II, Von den Kirchen) in Löhe's work, is, both as to content and as to arrangement, to a high degree dependent upon Gerhard.

45 Elert, p. 53.

46 Elert, p. 54.

47 Yngve Brilioth, Nattvarden i Evangeliskt Gudstjänstliv (1 uppl., Uppsala, 1926), p. 64.

On August 19-23 there will be a continuation of the Mequon Conclave, 1962. The Conclave will be held at Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minnesota. There will be papers on the following topics: Church & Ministry and Church Fellowship.

The College will provide food and lodging for the regular delegates. The College may be able to provide for a few visitors. Please send your reservations to Prof. Milton Otto, Bethany Lutheran College.

THE MEANING AND USE OF THE GREEK

NEW TESTAMENT CRITICAL APPARATUS (Cont.)

By Prof. Julian Anderson

In fairness to Westcott and Hort, however, it should be pointed out that all text critics today follow their views to this extent — that they all agree in assigning the Alexandrian family — and especially the two manuscripts B and Aleph — a special position of pre-eminence in the work of recovering the original text of the New Testament. Streeter, who was the first to point out that the Alexandrian family represents only the text of one geographical area, agrees wholeheartedly that this family does, indeed, preserve the text of the original autographs in its purest form, as compared with the other local texts. His reason for this evaluation — and a very cogent one — is that the city of Alexandria was indisputably the one great center of scholarly learning in the ancient Mediterranean world from the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285 B.C.) and thereafter. It was there, as we know, that the greatest gathering of ancient scholars was assembled to edit critically the texts of all the ancient Greek classical authors; and there that the greatest library of antiquity was established. Furthermore, it has long been recognized that the work of these scholars in the field of textual criticism was of first-rate excellence. In Alexandria, of all the great cities of the ancient world, therefore, there was established a tradition of great scholarship in the editing and copying of ancient texts; and it is there, then, that we may reasonably expect the text of the Greek New Testament to be preserved in its purest state because of this tradition.

Having granted this major premise, however, it does not follow that the Alexandrian text is necessarily free of all corruption, since such a state of affairs is manifestly impossible in an age when all books were copied laboriously by hand, a process in which copyists' errors must inevitably occur. Present-day scholarship, then, does, indeed, regard the text of the Alexandrian family as the best and most reliable of all, but not as infallible. The modern principle is that the readings of this family must be carefully checked against those of the other families, especially the Syro-Latin, in order to distinguish those places where the Alexandrian text may be in error.

The third great family of manuscripts has been commonly designated by textual critics as the "Byzantine" family, to which, perhaps, 90% or more of our extant manuscripts must be assigned. Simply stated, this Byzantine family includes all the other manuscripts that do not exhibit an Alexandrian or Syro-Latin text. The local area in which this family circulated has also been clearly established — namely, ancient Asia Minor, having developed, perhaps, out of the local text current in Ephesus during the first three centuries, and then in Constantinople, from the fourth century onward, when that city became the ecclesiastical center of the whole Christian world. In contrast with the other two great families, none of the early versions originated in this area, nor do any of the early versions show any affinities whatsoever with this well-defined Byzantine text. Despite the lack of corroborative evidence of any of the early versions, however, the identification of this grouping of manuscripts as Byzantine is established beyond all doubt; and its early history is known to a greater degree than any of the others from certain references in the early historical literature of the church.

In the early history of the text of the New Testament, one historical fact is known which forms the keystone, so to speak, in our efforts to reconstruct the history of this text — namely, the reference to a revision of the text of the New Testament made under the general supervision of Lucian, the bishop of Antioch, sometime around the year 300 A.D. It will be noted that the date of this revision corresponds very closely with the date of the first Edict of Toleration (311 A.D.); and that it thus stands at the beginning of that period in which Christianity occupied the favored position of the official religion of the Roman Empire. Coming at this fortuitous time, and coupled with the fact that this Lucianic revision seems to have been an "official" revision — that is, authorized by the Eastern church — the resultant text was the one most certainly adopted as the standard by the Eastern church when Constantinople was established as the main see. The immense influence of Constantinople in the years which followed led, in turn, to the adoption of its own local text as the "authorized" text throughout the Christian world, designated by the textual critics as the α text, or family. The fact that the overwhelming preponderance of manuscripts belong to this α family is easily accounted for by the fact that this was, in actual fact, the authorized text of the Christian Church from the fourth century on.

Three other facts seem to corroborate this view of the origin of the α family still further. The first is the fact that none of the papyri, and none of the early manuscripts which can be regarded as reflecting a text earlier than the fourth century, show any similarities to this Byzantine text whatsoever. Secondly, not a single one of the quotations of the early church fathers (before 350 A.D.) show any familiarity with this α text whatsoever. And thirdly, this α, or Byzantine, text clearly shows itself, on internal grounds, to have been a later revision of the two earlier families — the Alexandrian and the Syro-Latin — by the presence of a whole host of so-called "conflated" readings, embodying both the Alexandrian and Syro-Latin variants in those places where the two differ from each other.

It is these many conflated readings which constitute the most convincing evidence that this Byzantine text was, in fact, a revision of the two earlier local texts, or families — the Alexandrian and the Syro-Latin. In the absence of any definite statements as to the exact texts which were used as the basis of Lucian's revision, the internal evidence would point clearly to the fact that he began with the local text current in his own city of Antioch — the so-called "Syriac" text, and that he proceeded then to revise and correct this text by comparison and collation with the two local texts which carried the greatest prestige in the ancient world — the Alexandrian, originating in the world's center of scholarship, and the Caesarean, associated with the name of Origen, the ancient world's greatest textual critic. However that may be, there is no question as to the position of superiority enjoyed by the Byzantine text in the post-Nicene era.

From the ninth century on, practically every manuscript, with one or two notable exceptions, exhibits this Byzantine text; and the homogeneity of these manuscripts is amazing. Aside from obvious scribal errors, they all agree with one another almost perfectly. Another evidence of the influential position of the α text is the fact that most all of the manuscripts from the fifth to the ninth centuries show clear evidence of assimilation to the α text — that is, places where they have been corrected to agree with the standard. The best representatives of the Byzantine family are the uncials E and S, although most of the later uncials and almost all of the minuscules contain this text. Curiously, the fifth-century manuscript A — regarded as one of the best manuscripts — has the Byzantine text in the gospels, while in all the other portions of the New Testament, its text is definitely Alexandrian. In the gospels, therefore, A represents the oldest form of the α text. Of interest to the later history of the Greek New Testament and the English versions is the fact that this Byzantine text, by reason of its wide circulation, became the basis of all the early printed editions of the Greek New Testament — the Complutension Polyglot of 1514, Erasmus' edition of 1516, Stephanus, in 1550, and the Elzevir editions, from 1624 on; and thus also the basis of all English translations of the Scriptures previous to the E. R. V. of 1881. In passing it may be noted that this Byzantine form of the Greek text has now been commonly designated as the "Textus Receptus" since 1633, when the third Elzevir edition referred to it as "textum...nunc ab omnibus receptum."

Before leaving this discussion of the classification of manuscripts into families, mention should be made briefly of a third class of evidence employed in the science of textual criticism — the patristic quotations. This category constitutes, as one might surmise, the largest single body of evidence with which the text critic must deal, since the number of such church fathers runs into the hundreds, and in the vast corpus of their collected writings there are literally thousands upon thousands of quotations from the New Testament, many of them quoting some form of a Greek text. The question which presents itself, therefore, is this: To what extent are these many quotations of any value in the recovery of the original text of our Greek New Testament?

By way of answer, it may be stated briefly that this type of evidence is really of very limited value, mainly because of the fact that the texts of these church fathers have also been subjected to the same kind of corruption that we have previously noted in connection with our manuscripts of the New Testament itself, and particularly because the ancient copyists were so prone to "correct" these patristic texts to bring them into agreement with the standard Byzantine text. This being the case, there is no way of knowing how accurately the current patristic texts we now have represent the local text known by and used by each father. Besides this, a second difficulty arises — namely whether the father was quoting from "memory," which always plays strange tricks, or whether he was actually copying his quotation from a written text in front of him. It is generally agreed that in the case of longer quotations and in commentaries, the practice of quoting from memory would be much less probable. It is also generally agreed that the testimony of any of the church fathers later than 350 A.D. is largely worthless, textually speaking. The exception to this rule has been well stated by Streeter — that only those patristic quotations are of any value which differ from the standard Byzantine text.

From this it should not be inferred, however, that the science of patristics can be ignored by the text critic. On the other hand, as Streeter has shown, the testimony of the fathers — especially those who can be dated previous to 350 A.D. — is of considerable importance, insofar as they add immeasurably to our knowledge of the history of the various local texts. The real value of the church fathers lies in the fact that they can be so exactly dated and identified as to their place of residence. In this respect they are of great help in dating and localizing whichever particular type of text they exhibit. Thus, for example, it has been rather definitely established that in the case of the very earliest church fathers — those living in the first two centuries — the Syro-Latin text is almost universally used, indicating that this type of text is, in fact, the earliest of all known text forms; and that it was circulating and in use practically all over the Christian world prior to 200 A.D. As we move into the third century, however, the situation changes. Then we find that the fathers are divided into two distinct groups, some of them continuing to use the old Syro-Latin text, while a great many others are now found to be quoting from the Alexandrian text. Significantly, however, it is to be noted that not a single father prior to the year 300, or 350, has been known to use the Byzantine form of text — rather convincing proof of the lateness of that text, as discussed above. From this evidence we would also gather that the form of text known as Alexandrian was the result of a revision which was effected somewhere around the year 200 A.D., since it is not known to appear before that date. This would place this revision in the time of Clement of Alexandria, although the name of Hesychius is usually associated with this Alexandrian revision; and the whole family is designated in the critical apparatus by the Old English capital letter .

Specifically, in the case of Marcion (140 A.D.), Justin Martyr (150 A.D.), and Hippolytis (@ 200 A.D.), all of whom were associated with the city of Rome, we find that their quotations all exhibit an Old Latin text, which is exactly what we would expect. And in the case of Origen (230-250 A.D.), Athanasius (350 A.D.), and Cyril of Alexandria (400 A.D.), all of whom were associated with Alexandria, we note that their quotations uniformly agree with the Alexandrian text, also according to expectations. It is on the basis of evidence such as this that the existence of the three main families of texts has been based. The abbreviations for the various church fathers used in our critical apparatus are all self-explanatory, and are found on pages 18-19 of Nestle's sixteenth edition.

On the basis of the materials thus presented, then, we can proceed to a brief discussion on the methods of textual criticism, in answer to our question: How is the critical apparatus used? From the foregoing discussion it will be seen that the first task of the textual critic is to classify each of the known manuscripts and versions as to their "pedigree," or family relationship — whether Syro-Latin, Alexandrian, or Byzantine. This, says Streeter, is the "high road" in the recovery of the original text of our Greek New Testament — "to first recover the local texts of the great churches, and then to work back to a common original that will explain them all."[4]

---

[4] Streeter, op. cit., p. 39.

After having classified the various manuscripts into their respective family groups, the critic's next task is to determine, as nearly as possible, the true, or original, reading of each family, or local text, by the application of the principles that will be set forth here shortly. Once this task has been accomplished, all of the variant readings which at first present themselves will have been reduced to three in number — a Syro-Latin reading, an Alexandrian reading, and a Byzantine reading; and the recovery of the original will have been carried back to a period not more than two and a half centuries anterior to the autographs, since the latest of the recensions — the Byzantine — can be dated about 300 A.D., while the Alexandrian can be reasonably assumed to date back another 100 years — to about 200 A.D., and the Syro-Latin still further — into the second century. On the basis of the evidence now available, this seems to be as far back as we can go, in point of time. To get from this point back to the original text, however, is the prime task of the science of textual criticism; and to do so certain well-defined principles have been developed. It may be noted in passing that the first scholar to make any attempt to formulate any such principles for the science of textual criticism was Richard Simon, in the year 1689.

The first of such principles, then, is that the general character of each of the families must be assessed. In this regard textual critics today are generally agreed that the Alexandrian family represents the most reliable tradition; that the Syro-Latin family represents the oldest of the three texts, dating back into the second century, at which time, however, the text of the New Testament was rather freely handled with little regard to scholarly principles, so that the possibilities of scribal errors and interpolations are greatly increased; and that the Byzantine family is not only the latest, but generally the least reliable, so far as testimony to the original text is concerned. It follows, then, that in practice — all else being equal — precedence is given first to the Alexandrian reading, then to the Syro-Latin reading, and lastly, the Byzantine. This, however, may be modified by other principles which follow.

The first really scientific principle to be enunciated in the science of textual criticism was that of the great text critic, J. A. Bengel, in the early 18th century, and is still a valid one — namely, lectio difficilior potior — "the more difficult reading is to be preferred." This principle is founded on the assumption, which is demonstrably correct, that the tendency among ancient copyists and editors was always to simplify, to explain, or to clarify. Thus, in any case where the three families present variant readings, the more difficult is the more likely to represent the true, original text, or that which has suffered least from intentional scribal interpolations and alterations. Especially in the text of the gospels is this principle of value, in which case it can be restated somewhat as follows: that reading is much more likely to be correct which differs from the parallels, inasmuch as there was such a pronounced tendency among the ancient scribes to harmonize the parallel passages and bring them all into conformity. It goes without saying that this principle of preferring the more difficult reading cannot be blindly followed, and that there are certain limits to its usefulness, as, for example, in the case of those readings which are so difficult that they make no sense. It has also to be observed that this principle is most successful in dealing with intentional errors — those cases where a copyist has sought to amend the text; but that it fails when the errors being dealt with are unintentional, resulting from a slip of the hand, eye, or ear, since in such cases the resulting reading often makes no sense.

Another useful principle — and one of easy application — is that all plainly conflated readings are almost certainly wrong and to be rejected, for the reason already stated — that the tendency among ancient scribes was always to expand and amplify, but never to abbreviate. The application of this principle works strongly against the authority of the Byzantine text, with its many conflated readings. Indeed, one of the characteristics of the older and better manuscripts is that they never include conflates.

A third principle, enunciated first by Westcott and Hort, is that that reading is to be preferred which best accounts for the origin of the other variants. In this case, however, it is true that it is much easier to enunciate the principle than to apply it. In practice it sometimes happens that the very arguments which may be advanced in favor of one variant, as explaining the origin of the others, may be reversed with quite as much cogency, to work in exactly the opposite direction. Especially is this true in those cases where suspected marginal glosses are involved. To carry this discussion any farther, however, would lead us into some very technical points, far beyond the limits of this paper.

Another principle, laid down by Westcott and Hort, is that in most cases the shorter reading is more likely to be correct, because of the previously mentioned tendency in ancient times to add and expand the text by the addition of marginal glosses or conflations. In later times, however, this principle has been called into question, and is now held to be not universally valid. All critics agree that the shorter reading is to be preferred when one of the variants is clearly a conflated reading. Also that the principle has value when dealing with clearly intentional errors — where the copyist has obviously sought to amend the text by the addition of explanatory notes. All critics likewise agree that this principle of preferring the shorter reading is valid in the recovery of the original text of the gospels, where the greatest corruptions have resulted from the conscious attempts on the part of the copyists to harmonize the texts. It has been shown that such harmonizations almost always result in the addition of words and phrases which are found in the parallel passages of the other gospels, but are missing from the text in question. In all such cases Westcott and Hort's principle, preferring the shorter reading would be applicable.

On the other hand, it has been clearly demonstrated by the researches of classical scholars that the most common error among the ancient scribes was that of accidental omission, and that this type of error far outnumbers that of intentional addition. It will be readily seen that this fact points in the very opposite direction from Westcott and Hort's principle — namely, that in most cases the longer reading would have the greater probability of being the correct one. Present day New Testament criticism, therefore, generally follows the principle that, except in the case of the gospels, where harmonization was so common, and in the cases of clearly demonstrated conflated readings or intentional interpolations, the longer reading is usually to be preferred. The application of this principle has given new importance to Syro-Latin, or "western" readings, especially in the Book of Acts.

In a more practical way, the following canons may be cited as being generally useful and valid. Any reading in which the Alexandrian and the Syro-Latin families agree, as against the Byzantine, is almost certainly the correct one, since these two represent the oldest and the most reliable traditions. On the other hand, any case in which the Byzantine agrees with either of the other two, there is a strong presumption that this represents the original text. Thus these two principles may be re-stated as one — namely, that in any case where an agreement is found between any two of the three families, that reading is to be preferred as correct.

This brings us, then, to the last possibility — namely, to those relatively few instances in which all three of the families exhibit distinctly different texts. Here the problem is admittedly much more difficult, and much must be left to the individual judgment of the critic. Here it is often necessary to re-examine the readings of the individual manuscripts again, especially the papyrus fragments and those of the eight primary uncials — B, Aleph, D, C, L, W, Θ, and A — in that order. In such cases the principle of Westcott and Hort is to be kept in mind — namely, that any reading in which B and Aleph agree is strongly to be preferred. In those cases where no such agreement is found, the problem can only be solved on the basis of intrinsic probabilities, which involves ultimately the judgment of the critic. In such cases due consideration must be given to the context and the style of the individual author, and each reading must be examined in the light of which one accords best with these considerations. Often consideration must be given as to which reading is supported by the majority of local texts, remembering that the so-called Syro-Latin family represents actually four such distinctly local texts — those of Carthage, Rome, Caesarea and Antioch. Beyond this, there is little that can be said. In some cases there is simply no single reading that can be adopted with any degree of certainty.

A closing word, however, must be added lest the impression be given that the present critical text, as given in Nestle, is somehow uncertain or unreliable, in that it contains a large number of readings which cannot be proven to be those of the original text. It should be pointed out that the preponderant majority of variant readings are concerned with such inconsequential matters as variant grammatical forms, or variant spellings, or differences in word order, or the addition or omission of the definite article or particles — variants which have no bearing whatsoever on the thought expressed. In actual fact the number of real textual problems — or cruxes, as they are called — is surprisingly and gratifyingly small. Even more reassuring is the fact that in no single case does any of these textual problems cast any shadow of doubt on any of the doctrines set forth in the Scriptures. For all practical purposes, therefore, it may be said that our present critical text is, in all essentials, that of the original autographs.

As an appendix to this paper, I should like to offer a few typical examples, selected at random, to show how some of the above-mentioned principles are actually applied in the science of textual criticism — a practical demonstration, so to speak, as to how to use the critical apparatus. Mention should first be made, however, to some of the abbreviations used most commonly in the critical apparatus as found on page 15 of Nestle's sixteenth edition, as follows: al (alii), meaning others, usually a considerable number of the remaining manuscripts; pm (per-multi), meaning the majority of the other manuscripts; pl (plerique), meaning almost all of the remaining manuscripts; and rell (reliqui), meaning all witnesses except those enumerated; and pc (pauci), meaning a few others.

The examples quoted are as follows: Mark 1:1; Mark 8:26; Luke 2:5; Matthew 27:16; Mark 10:12; Mark 10:2; Matthew 24:36; and Matthew 16:2f.

A Select Bibliography

Souter, Alexander, The Text and Canon Of The New Testament (London: Duckworth, 1913, reprinted 1948[5]).

Robertson, A. T., An Introduction To The Textual Criticism Of The New Testament (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1925).

Kenyon, Frederic G., The Text Of The Greek Bible (London: Duckworth, 1937, reprinted 1949[2]).

Kenyon, Frederic G., Our Bible And The Ancient Manuscripts (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1895, reprinted 1948[4]).

Kenyon, Frederic G., Handbook To The Textual Criticism Of The New Testament (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1912[2]).

Nestle, Eberhard, Introduction To The Textual Criticism Of The Greek New Testament, tr. William Edie (London: Williams & Norgate, 1901).

Hammond, C. E., Outlines Of Textual Criticism Applied To The New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902).

Lake, Kirsopp, The Text Of The New Testament (London: Rivingtons, 1908).

Robertson, A. T., Studies In The Text Of The New Testament (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926).

Streeter, B. H., The Four Gospels, A Study Of Origins (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1924, reprinted 1930).

Maas, Paul, Textual Criticism, tr. Barbara Flower (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958).

Milligan, George, The New Testament Documents (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1913).

Hutton, Edw. A., An Atlas Of Textual Criticism (Cambridge: University Press, 1911).

Taylor, Vincent, The Text Of The New Testament (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1961).

Williams, C. S. C., Alterations To The Text Of The Synoptic Gospels And Acts (Oxford: Blackwell, 1951).

Burgon, John W., The Last Twelve Verses Of The Gospel According To Saint Mark (Ann Arbor: The Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959).

* *

NEWS AND COMMENTS — Modern Hagiolatry

By Pres. B. W. Teigen

Criterion (Vol. II, No. 1, Winter 1963), a publication of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, carries some interesting items, items which are not available to the general reader. For example, this publication announces that the Rev. Dr. Martin E. Marty, a pastor of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod and Associate Editor of the liberal Christian Century, is currently "visiting Associate Professor of Church History in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago."

An item perhaps of more interest in the current issue of Criterion is the stenographic report, in toto, of the questions, answers and discussions between Karl Barth and a panel of six American theologians, held on the evenings of April 25 and 26, 1962, at the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, of the University of Chicago. The current religious periodicals have made many references to this exchange of theological ideas but only here is to be found the complete text, which runs to sixteen pages of print (8 1/2 x 11).

Prof. Jaroslav Pelikan, a member of the clergy of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, formerly of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, now professor of Theology in Yale University Divinity School, served as moderator. The panel was undoubtedly picked with considerable care; one, Prof. Edward Carnell, of Fuller Theological Seminary, represented the conservative branch of the Protestant Church; the Roman Catholic Church was represented by Prof. Bernard Cooke, S. J., Marquette University; Judaism (modern) by Prof. Jakob Petuchowski, Hebrew Union College. The panel had one lay theologian, an attorney, Mr. William Stringfellow (Episcopalian), New York City. The other two panel members, Prof. Hans Frei, of Yale University, and Prof. Schubert Ogden of Southern Methodist University represented the liberal, neo-orthodox position found in most seminaries today.

It is interesting to note that the questions for the most part centered around the problem of authority for religious belief and knowledge. At the beginning of the second evening's discussions, Moderator Pelikan stated, "Most of last night's questions and, indeed, of tonight's, deal with the relation between what Father Danielou has called God, and the ways of knowing, or what the professional in theology calls 'prolegomena,' theology and/or versus philosophy, faith and reason, authority and related issues." (p. 10). None of the questions dealt with the Trinity, the Person of Christ, the Atonement, the Sacraments, Justification, and Election, although the latter was possibly touched on when Prof. Carnell tried to pin down Barth as to whether he taught Universalism or not. Incidentally, about all that Barth would admit about his dogmatical position on this question was that it "neither implies nor does it exclude what you call tacit universalism." (p. 11).

It appeared to this reader that the conservative (Carnell) and the Jewish theologian (Petuchowski) raised the most pertinent questions and drew out of Barth the most significant statements. Prof. Carnell asked Dr. Barth: "I would ask how you would reconcile your judgment expressed in I:2 of the Dogmatics, that the Word of God is sullied with errors and inconsistencies even in theological matters, with your extensive appeal to Scripture as a normative source for evangelical theology? How do these fit together?" (p. 11). I am not sure that we learned how these fit together, but Karl Barth said: "The Bible — being a human instrument and document bound and conditioned by the temporal views of nature, of history of ideas, of values — to that extent is not sinless, like Jesus Christ Himself, and thus not infallible, like God." (p. 11). But he felt that the Bible had proved "itself to be a true, a fitting instrument to point man to God and His work and His words, to God Who is alone infallible." In a slightly different connection, Karl Barth declared that he had always stressed the objective character of the inspiration of Scripture: "Insofar as Scripture is the unique witness for that work of God whose content is the covenant of Jesus Christ (the work of reconciliation — one can also say, Atonement) it realizes for all men the objective character of its inspiration." (p. 11).

This hardly sets forth the objective character of the Biblical authority but rather involves man in making the decision as to what is divine witness in Scripture and what is not.

It appears that Rabbi Petuchowski was quick to see that this open-ended way of theologizing left Dr. Barth's theology on a low enough level so that dialogue would become possible with one who rejects the New Testament Scriptures. First, the Rabbi complimented the Swiss theologian on being one of the most Christian theologians of all ("in the traditional sense of that term"). He declared, "There are other Christian theologians behind whose Christological vocabulary I am able to detect a common human nature, when they speak of creation, of revelation, and redemption, or even of Christ. I have no great difficulty in finding similar, or at least corresponding categories within my own Jewish universe of discourse." (p. 18). Next, the Rabbi pointed out that according to Barth, "Revelation culminates in the existence of Jesus of Nazareth"; yet, "the existence of the Synagogue, alongside the Church is based upon the denial of Jesus Christ." (p. 19). Then comes Petuchowski's question: "What does intrigue me, however, and this is the real point of the question, is the problem of how you would communicate with the Jew? How would you attempt to convince him that revelation culminates in the existence of Jesus of Nazareth? Would that not involve you necessarily — this confrontation with a Jew — in the discussion of those very questions of history, Biblical criticism, and even world views?" Barth (rather lamely, I thought) ventured as an answer that as they read "these documents together" they would be able to arrive at "a common understanding of the problem of these documents."

The Rabbi rejoined by saying that in his particular religious tradition, "due to the teachings of the Pharisees and Rabbis, we do not believe that God has stopped revealing Himself, and that God has stopped speaking." But he declared that the point of his question was that in trying to answer the question that Barth had raised, namely, "Was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah? Did the disciples and the apostles witness the fulfillment of the Messianic prophesies as understood by the Hebrew Bible?" — Would we then not really — you and I as 20th century people — would we not have to deal with questions of historical scholarship in order to make that identification?" (p. 20). Barth answered, "I have never denied that if we have to explain texts, that criticism — literary criticism — must have its place; and certainly if this dialogue should take place, we would have to undertake very earnest common research. That is for me not a question, certainly." To which Rabbi Petuchowski answered: "I am grateful for this information; certainly I am glad to hear you say that. I must have misread those aspects of your writings that have come to my attention. . ."

When one got to this part of the script, one could not help thinking of the Shakespearean script where one of the protagonists exclaims: "If I can catch him once upon the hip!"

Professor Pelikan in his opening statement on Wednesday evening said: "Indeed, to be serious for a moment, I am sure I am speaking for most of those present, both in the audience and on the panel, when I say that to Karl Barth, as probably to no other living theologian, we may without blasphemy or exaggeration, apply the words of the Fourth Evangelist, 'And of his fulness have all we received and grace for grace.'" (p. 3). On Thursday evening Prof. Pelikan repeated himself, only with greater emphasis: "Anyone who earns his groceries, as I do, teaching about the theology of the Church Fathers, must find it a signal but strange honor to meet a Church Father in person, and then to preside over a panel discussion with him, and then in English rather than Greek. But as I said to last night's audience, and I think it bears repeating in all seriousness, but more, in gratitude, I am sure I speak for all of you when I say that from my own twenty years of preoccupation with him, that to Karl Barth, as to no other living theologian — and to very few of the theologians of the Church's past, I find myself able without any exaggeration to apply the words of the Fourth Gospel — 'And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace.'" (p. 10).

We have noticed during the past ten years that more often than not, when Professor Pelikan has attempted to be coy and arch, his efforts have been considerably less than successful. But these statements can hardly pass for a misguided effort to be scintillating. One would think that after the first dud, he would try a different rocket at the next launching.

For several years, modern neo-orthodox theologians have been busy de-mythologizing Biblical concepts. The Biblical creation story went by the board, then the virgin birth of Christ, and even now the resurrection. Here, apparently, a Missourian has de-mythologized the Biblical concept of blasphemy. Presumably, it had to go too. Still, it is difficult to understand his attitude of fawning adulation. Other observers have noticed how these young neo-orthodox professors have organized a fairly effectual society for mutual self-admiration, but we had never seen anything like this before. The script from the Criterion did not reveal that Karl Barth thought that this might have been a slight "exaggeration." Was it too much to hope that the venerable Swiss creature would have been as horrified at Pelikan's words as another creature of God once was when he received similar adulation: "See thou do it not! I am thy fellow servant. Worship God"?

The entire script (besides Pelikan's words) reveals an inordinate amount of hero worship. It is ironical that Karl Barth, who 25 years ago withstood the Nazi efforts to paganize the Christian religion, when some confessional Lutherans were unable to stand up against the pressure to use the church for the aggrandizement of the State, — it is ironical indeed, that this man should now apparently willingly accept this fawning adulation to become the symbol, the model of the Christian hero. Thirty years ago to the year (Reformation Day, 1933) Dr. Martin Niemoller warned the German people against the paganism of worshiping Martin Luther, the man. The Barthian sycophants who had such an orgy a year ago when their hero was "passing through the midst of them," could well listen to Niemoller quoting Martin Luther: "The great Reformer himself knew what he was doing when he opposed his followers' desire to name themselves after him, and mockingly and drastically called himself 'an old bag of worms'. 'It is not I who matter,' he said; 'it is not the man — the fighter — the hero — or whatever else you may call me — who matters; so for God's sake don't make a new saint out of me!'" (Here Stand I, p. 61).