

INTRODUCTION: THE TESTIMONIES OF THE
EARLY CHURCH REGARDING JEWISH-CHRISTIAN
GOSPELS

In the second edition of this work H. Waitz rightly described the problem of the Jewish-Christian Gospels (JG) as one of the most difficult which the apocryphal literature presents, “difficult because of the scantiness and indefiniteness of the patristic testimonies, difficult also because the results of scientific investigation are often self-contradictory” (p. 10). There are preserved, mostly as citations in the Church fathers, only small fragments from which conclusions as to the character of the whole book are difficult to draw, and also accounts which are in themselves often very vague and in their entirety make possible a whole kaleidoscope of interpretations. The Church fathers hand down the title of only one JG, that of the Gospel of the Hebrews (Gospel according to the Hebrews). On the basis of their accounts it is possible to see in this Gospel of the Hebrews either with Jerome the Gospel of the Nazaraeans or with Epiphanius that of the Ebionites or with Eusebius an independent entity and so to distinguish it from each of these. A problem in itself is the relationship of a “Gospel of the Twelve (Apostles)”—it is mentioned by Origen and identified by Jerome with the Gospel of the Hebrews—to these or to one of these JG (on this see H.-Ch. Puech, p.264 below). Thus the number of the JG—whether there be one, two or three such Gospels—is uncertain, the identification of the several fragments is also uncertain, and finally the character and the relationship to one another of the several JG is uncertain.

Reflecting these uncertainties, investigation has led to numerous hypotheses but to no generally recognized result. Information about its position, which until now has not changed, is given in an article by Waltz (*ZNW* 36, 1937, 60f.). The older view that there was only one JG or two adaptations of this JG has been abandoned, and now two theories are in competition, of which the one distinguishes two and the other three JG. The first of these, which depends upon some degree of confidence in the accounts of Jerome, distinguishes the Gospel of the Hebrews (the Gospel of the Nazaraeans) and the Gospel of the Ebionites (the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles) -so, e.g., Klostermann; the other considers that the Gospel of the Nazaraeans,¹ the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Ebionites are different entities- so, with differences in detail, Waitz, Dibelius and Bauer.

¹ The designation of this JG varies in the sources. I have on each occasion been guided by the author cited; but have myself used the designation Gospel of the Nazaraeans although the group from which the work comes was probably called the Nazoraean.

Schmidtké’s identification of the Gospel of the Ebionites with the Gospel of the Hebrews has met with violent rejection.

It seems to me that the assumption of three JG most easily does justice to the texts and accounts and their uncertainties. But as regards the state of the sources the statement of Dibelius cannot be firmly enough underlined: “Enlightenment is to be expected not from new hypotheses but only from new discoveries” (*Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* I, 1926, 55). How right he was the discovery at Nag Hammadi has shown (see the passage on Clement Alex. below). The following investigation concentrates on critical analysis and does not purpose to cover over the gaps in our knowledge of the JG with hypothetical constructions; it attempts to make do with a minimum of such hypotheses. Having persuaded himself of the existence of three JG, the author had to allot to the different books the fragments that have been handed down; when on this more technical ground a decision had to be taken where a *non liquet* would rather have been in order, its hypothetical character has always been made clear.

1. *Irenaeus* gives the earliest testimony—it is admittedly indirect—to the existence of a JG. He reports that the Jewish-Christian sect of the Ebionites used only one Gospel, that of Matthew (*adv. haer.* I xxii; III xi, 10 Harvey). But when in other places he says that they had eliminated the virgin birth (III xxiii; V i, 3), it is clear that the Gospel used by them cannot have been the canonical Mt., and that Irenaeus had not himself seen this book; otherwise he would not have been able to identify it with Mt. This JG had apparently no special title.

2. *Clement of Alexandria* on the other hand mentions a “Gospel according to the Hebrews” and quotes from it an apocryphal saying of Jesus (*Strom.* II ix, 45). He adduces this saying once again in *Strom.* V xiv, 96 in a longer version, but without stating where he found it. That this version gives the full text is clear from Pap. Ox. 654, in which the logion in question in its longer version occurs as the second of six sayings of the Lord. Waltz (*Apokr.* 2, 49ff.) has assigned the complete text of the papyrus to the Gospel of the Hebrews (GH). But he has done so wrongly, for this text is found in its entirety in the same sequence in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas discovered at Nag Hammadi (see pp. 97ff. above). This discovery makes it doubtful if the saying quoted by Clement should be assigned to the GH. It is, however, quite possible that it stood in both Gospels. If in this state of affairs conclusions as to the character of the GH in respect of its form and content must be reserved, Clement testifies nevertheless to [119] the existence of a “Gospel according to the Hebrews” that was well known in Egypt.

3. *Origen* also quotes the “Gospel according to the Hebrews” (*in Joh.* vol.II, 12) and indeed a saying of Jesus about His being carried away; His mother, the Holy Spirit, took Him by one of His hairs and carried Him to the high mountain Tabor. This account is adduced once again by Origen but without any statement as to where he found it (*in Jer.* vol. XV, 4). In this quotation we have to do with a variant of the story not of the transfiguration but of the temptation (Mt. 4:1-II and pars.; cf. Walter Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu*, pp. 143ff.; Waltz, *Apokr.* 2, p.13). The deviations from the canonical account are very considerable; out of the report given by the Evangelists has come an account given by Jesus Himself of His experience, the devil is replaced by the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is identified with the mother of Jesus. This last trait presupposes the Semitic conception of the Spirit, since in the Semitic tongues the Spirit is *femini genens*, but it does not imply that the GH was originally written in Hebrew or in Aramaic (Waitz, p.52; for further particulars see Bauer, *loc. cit.*). The mythological conception of the Holy Spirit as the mother of Jesus separates the GH from the canonical nativity narratives and also from the conception of Joseph as the father of Jesus that obtained among the Ebionites of whose Gospel Irenaeus speaks; the GH cannot have been identical with that Gospel.

A further quotation from the GH occurs in the Latin revision of Origen’s commentary on Matthew (*in Matth.*, vol. XV, p.389, Berz-Klostermann), a fictional development of Mt. 19:1 ~24. Schmidtke (pp. 90-94) has with reason made it probable that this quotation was inserted in the commentary not by Origen himself but by the later reviser and also that it does not come from the GH used by Origen (otherwise Bardy, p. 29). Certain indications, such as the singling out of Simon (“dixit Simoni discipulo suo”) connect this pericope with the Gospel fragment in Jerome *adv. Pelag.* (“dixit illi Simon discipulus eius”), whilst the address “Simon, fill Jonae” (not: Simon, son of John; so Waitz, p.13) points rather to Mt. 16:17 than to the scholium of the Judaikon, which in this place gives “son of John” (cod. Ev. 566).

4. *Eusebius*. The accounts of the JG given by Eusebius are in his Church History (*Historia Ecclesiastica, HE.*), partly in his comments on the history of the canon and partly in the information he gives about Papias and Hegesippus; he adduces direct quotations from JG only in his *Theophania*.

In his statements about the compass of the canon Eusebius mentions the GH and its constituency.

To these [i.e. to the spurious writings] some reckon the Gospel according to the Hebrews in which especially those Hebrews who have become converted to Christ find delight (*HE.* III. xxv, 5).

The readers of the GH were above all Jewish Christians; the designation “Hebrews” indicates where they belonged as a people, but not their tongue; according to the context these Jewish Christians in the time of Eusebius used the GH side by side with the four canonical Gospels. It was otherwise with a special school of thought among the Ebionites: the members of this school, in contrast to the ordinary Ebionites, recognized the virgin birth of Jesus although they called His pre-existence in question (*H.E.* III. xxvii, 1-3).¹

... as they use only the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews, they attach little value to the rest (*HE.* III. xxvii, 4).

Since two fragments of the GH assume the pre-existence of Jesus, this Ebionite group either did not dispute it or did not read the GH. But apart from this question, this note shows that for Eusebius the GH was not identical with the gospel which according to Irenaeus was used by the ordinary Ebionites.

The note of Papias of Hierapolis (c. 150) quoted by Eusebius, that Mt. collected the sayings of the Lord in “the Hebrew tongue” and that every one interpreted them as he was able (*H.E.* III. xxxix, 16), was meant to defend the Gospel of Matthew from being used improperly, as in the opinion of this churchman of Asia Minor heretics were using it (W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, pp. 187ff., 207f.); but it is at most an indirect witness for a specifically Jewish-Christian Gospel, if Schmidtke’s conjecture should be right (46f.), that the statements of Papias were occasioned by accounts of an Aramaic revision of the Gospel of Matthew.

After observing that Papias also used I Jn. and I Pet., Eusebius says:

And he has adduced another story of a woman who was accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*HE.* III. xxxix, 17).

The statement of the place where this story was found clearly comes not from Papias but from Eusebius (Schmidtke, pp. 149ff.; Waltz, *Apokr.* 2, p.”; id. in *ZNW* 36, 1937, p.68). What story Is meant is uncertain. As it cannot be identical with Lk. 7 :36-50—otherwise Eusebius would not have assigned it to the apocryphal GH—it has since Rufinus been readily equated with the *pericope*

¹This information comes from Origen (c. Celsum; V, 65, p.68 Koetschau). There is dispute as to what sort of a group we are here concerned with (cf. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, p. 16).

adulterae (Jn. 7:53-8:11), which originally did not belong to Jn. and is found there for the first time in codex D; but it is already attested earlier by the Syriac *Didascalia* (Achelis-Flemming, *TU* 25.2, 1904, 38f.), and here the woman is not called an adulteress but a sinner, as in Jn. 8:3 D (cf. W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 3rd ed. 1933, 115ff.). But this evidence does not suffice either for the identification of the story adduced by Papias with the pseudo-Johannine pericope in the version of cod. D or for conclusions as to the literary character of the apocryphal gospel. That the story adduced by Papias lies before us in Jn. 7 :53ff. is merely a possible hypothesis; if Eusebius localizes it in the GH, he must have found it there; and nothing justifies our assigning it to the Gospel of the Nazaraeans and fixing its original position between Mt. 22:22 and 23 (against Waitz, *Apokr.* 2,11f.;18).

Regarding Hegesippus and his “Memoirs” Eusebius reports:

He quotes both from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and from the Syriac (Gospel) and in particular some words in the Hebrew tongue, showing that he was a convert from the Hebrews (*H.E.* IV. xxii, 8).

The attempts frequently undertaken to equate the GH and the “Syriac Gospel” with one another are abortive; because of the Greek syntax Eusebius’ sentence can only be understood as meaning that Hegesippus quoted two different Gospels, the GH and a Syriac one, i.e. one written in Aramaic, and that Eusebius also distinguishes these. The “Hebrew tongue” is as elsewhere in Eusebius the Aramaic, the “mother-tongue” of the “Hebrews”; the quotations “in the Hebrew tongue” come therefore not from the GH but from the “Syriac Gospel”. That Eusebius designated this as “Syriac” contrary to his usage elsewhere, may be put down to Hegesippus’ account (Schmidtke, pp. 51ff.). Although Eusebius speaks frequently elsewhere of the “Hebrew” proto-Matthew (III xxiv, 6; xxxix, 16; V viii, 2; x, 3; VI xxv, 4) he nowhere identifies it with the “Syriac” Gospel known to Hegesippus; this identification therefore ought not to be ascribed to him (against Schmidtke, *op. cit.*); the early Church historian was more sparing of such hypotheses than the moderns. From the fact that in the *H.E.* he gives no quotations from either of the two JG it ought not to be concluded that at the time he wrote the *H.E.* he did not know them (against Schmidtke and Waitz): he at least knew the GH if he identified the Papias story of the woman that was a sinner, and of the Syriac Gospel he knew at any rate the quotations in the Memoirs of Hegesippus.

In the *Theophania* (c. 333) Eusebius adduces two quotations from JG and introduces them in a peculiar way:

.. as we have found somewhere or other in the Gospel which is (in circulation) among the Jews in the Hebrew tongue... (*Theoph.* IV 12).

Since the Gospel that has come down to us in the Hebrew script turns the threat not against him who. . . , I put myself the question whether according to Matthew... (Mai, *Nova Patr. Bibl.* IV, I, 155).

In this JG it is clearly not a matter of the GH, for this is regularly given the fixed designation “Gospel according to the Hebrews”, but of a Gospel of no fixed name; Eusebius characterizes it by its tongue, script and constituency as an Aramaic gospel. He clearly puts a space between it and the Greek Mt., to which on both occasions he adduces it as a parallel; but nothing indicates that he considered it as its Aramaic original (against Schmidtke, pp. 55ff.). If in the *HE.* he treats the “Hebrew” Mt. as a bygone entity and as a curious fact records that an exemplar of it had survived among the Indians down to the time of Pantaenus (V x, 3), then in the *Theophania* he would assuredly have underlined the new appearance of the original Matthew otherwise than by the phrase “the Gospel that has come down to us in the Hebrew script”, had he seen the former in the latter. Again, he does not connect it with the Syriac Gospel known to Hegesippus; it is uncertain whether he regarded the two as identical, but likely that they were identical; for of the existence of two JG in the Aramaic tongue nothing is otherwise known.

Eusebius thus knew two JG: first the GH also mentioned by Hegesippus, Clement and Origen, which was already known to Papias and which was supposed to have been used as their only gospel by a particular group of the heretical Ebionites; and second an Aramaic gospel from which Hegesippus and he himself quote.

5. *Epiphanius* in his “Panarion” enlarges at great length regarding the Jewish-Christian sects of the Nazoraeans and Ebionites. *Haer.* 29 is devoted to the history and teaching of the Nazoraeans, the Syrian Jewish-Christians; Schmidtke (pp. 95-126) has analysed this conglomerate of tradition and phantasy and with regard to the home of this sect has come to the conclusion (pp. 98ff.) that the only substantiated piece of information is “this sect dwells in Beroea in Coelesyria” (29, 7.7). Their canon comprised not merely the New but also the whole of the Old Testament, and the latter the Nazoraeans read in Hebrew (29, 7.2.4). In conclusion Epiphanius speaks of the Gospels:

They have the Gospel according to Matthew complete and in Hebrew. For this is evidently still preserved among them, as it was originally written, in Hebrew script. But I do not know whether they have removed the genealogy from Abraham to Christ (*Haer.* 29, 9.4).

Two points are here worthy of note: (1) the Gospel of the Nazoraeans is the complete Hebrew original Matthew; (2) as his last observation shows, Epiphanius had not himself seen the book, and also he had not heard of anything (such as misrepresentation or abridgment) against it.

How is this note to be judged against the background of what has already been said? Eusebius had sharply distinguished between the “Hebrew” original of Matthew, which he knew merely as a forgotten entity of the past, and the “Gospel (written) in Hebrew letters which has come down to us” the “Gospel which is (in circulation) among the Jews in the Hebrew tongue”. If we are unwilling to assume that there were different “Hebrew” Gospels among the Jewish-Christian sects, then nothing stands in the way of the assumption that the “Jews” of Eusebius are the Nazoraeans of Epiphanius and that the Gospel composed in “Hebrew” of these latter is the Gospel composed in the Hebrew script and tongue of the former. The identification, which Eusebius has avoided, of this JG with the Hebrew original Matthew occurs for the first time in Epiphanius, but is probably to be accredited to his tradition. Since he can impute to it nothing heretical or non-Matthaeian, the Gospel of the Nazoraeans must - have been an Aramaic version of Mt. (and was possibly identical with the Syriac Gospel known to Hegesippus). It is to be underlined that Epiphanius as little as Eusebius designates this “Hebrew”, i.e. Aramaic JG as GH.

Epiphanius gives more numerous accounts of the Gospel of the - Ebionites (*Haer.* 30), and he also communicates a few

fragments from it. After relating a little about Ebion, the alleged founder of the sect, and his Christology, he says with regard to the Ebionites:

And they too receive the Gospel according to Matthew. For this they too use, as do the followers of Cerinthus and Merinthus, to the exclusion of all others. But they call it (the Gospel) according to the Hebrews, for, to speak truthfully, Matthew alone of New Testament writers presents and proclaims the gospel in Hebrew and in the Hebrew script (*Haer.* 30, 3. 7).

In the opinion of this Church father the only Gospel which the Ebionites use is the Gospel of Matthew; but evidently they call it - not the Gospel of Matthew but the Gospel according to the - Hebrews and do so, as he adds in an aetiological comment, because Matthew wrote his Gospel "in Hebrew". It is striking that in giving this description he does not identify the Gospel of the Nazoraeans with that of the Ebionites; he neither states that the latter was still read in Hebrew as he has said of the former, nor does he call the former GH as he names the latter. That the two [124] cannot be identical and are not so for Epiphanius, is shown by another note on the Gospel of the Ebionites:

In the Gospel used by them, that called "according to Matthew", which however is not wholly complete but falsified and mutilated- they call it the "Hebrew (Gospel) "-it is recorded . . . (*Haer.* 30, 13.2).

As title Epiphanius no longer gives GH but the Hebrew Gospel. But both mean the same thing: the book composed originally in Hebrew in accordance with *Haer.* 30, 3.7. Ml the same as regards the Gospel of the Ebionites it is not a question of the Hebrew original Matthew; whilst the Gospel of the Nazoraeans is the Hebrew and complete Mt., that of the Ebionites is merely a "so-called Matthew" and as compared with the real Mt. is falsified and abridged. Over these abridgments and falsifications the Church father very much loses his temper in the following:

They have cut away the genealogy in Matthew and, as has already been said, have let the Gospel begin in this way: It came to pass, it is said, in the days of Herod, the king of Judaea, when Caiaphas was high priest, that there came a certain man John by name and baptized with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan (*Haer.* 30, 14.3).

Since the Gospel begins with the appearance of the Baptist, it lacks the whole nativity narrative Mt. 1 and 2. The fragments adduced below may convey an impression of the distortions.

The statements of Epiphanius regarding the Gospel of the Ebionites agree with those of Irenaeus in this, that the Ebionites use only a single Gospel and that this is a Gospel of Matthew; further in this, that this sect denies the virgin birth. That the Gospel in question cannot then have been the canonical Mt., Irenaeus does not indeed say, but Epiphanius does so all the more clearly. New in Epiphanius as compared with Irenaeus is the communication of the title, the Gospel of the Hebrews or the Hebrew Gospel, and the aetiology of the Church father for this title. That the Ebionites themselves gave it that name is, however, more than doubtful. For on the one hand the earlier ecclesiastical writers never associate the GH with Mt. On the other hand Epiphanius bestows this title (GH) even on Tatian's Gospel Harmony which was rejected by the great Church:

It is said that from him [Tatian] there comes the Diatessaron, which is also called the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Haer.* 46, I).

On the motive of this identification see Schmidtke, pp. 167f. This assuredly false statement casts suspicion on the entitling also [125] of the Gospel of the Ebionites; it certainly does not rest on trust-worthy tradition, but is a combination made by Epiphanius. He may have been inspired to associate the two documents by the comment of Eusebius (*H.E.* III. xxvii, 4) that a special school of thought among the Ebionites used only the GH; a further link in the equation is his own aetiological explanation of the title.

Whence Epiphanius obtained his knowledge of the Gospel of the Ebionites, is disputed. The assumption that he had it in his hands and made excerpts from it (Waitz, *Apokr.* 2, 14f.) is the one nearest at hand and least cumbered with hypotheses. Whilst he knows the Gospel of the Nazoraeans only from hearsay and with regard to the GH is aware of little more than the title, the Gospel of the Ebionites is familiar to him, as his citations show. This last must be differentiated in accordance with his own statements from the Gospel of the Nazoraeans and also for the reasons already mentioned from the GH. We are concerned here with three different entities.

6. *Jerome.* The most numerous citations and the most numerous but also the most perplexing accounts of JG have been

handed down by Jerome. Critical investigations have not yet led to any generally recognized result. It is above all uncertain how far the statements of this Church father ought to be trusted and how far conclusions ought to be drawn from them as to the tongue, compass and literary character of the JG. The identification of the several fragments is a further problem; in the present state of research no complete certainty can be obtained in regard to either of these two questions. Only this is certain, that Jerome has always only one JG in mind. The styling varies: he calls it on seven occasions the Gospel according to the Hebrews, on two occasions the Gospel of the Hebrews, on three occasions the Hebrew Gospel, on two occasions the Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew, and on two occasions he tells us that this designation is an hypothesis of others; also on one occasion he calls it the Gospel according to the Apostles. Thus he means always the GH and regards it as the Hebrew original Matthew.

Jerome cites his JG for the first time in his *Commentary on Ephesians* (on 5: 4), which appeared in 386-387, and does so with the introductory formula: "As we also read in the Hebrew Gospel", without describing it more closely as later he always does; that seems to indicate that he took the citation not from the Gospel itself, but from one of his exegetical texts, which however can no more be identified. The next citation—the report by Jesus, adduced also by Origen, of His being carried away by His mother, [126] the Holy Spirit—is found in the *Commentary on Micah* (on 7:6) written between 390 and 392 and is introduced:

He who... believes in the Gospel according to the Hebrews which I have recently translated.

This translation must therefore have appeared shortly before 390. In spite of the certainty with which Jerome speaks of it, doubt cannot be suppressed; for Origen cites this passage of the GH twice without giving any hint that the GH was not composed originally in Greek, and it cannot be understood why Jerome should have translated a book that already for a long time had been available in Greek.

In the *de viris illustribus* (392-393) he speaks repeatedly of the GH.

Also the Gospel which is called "according to the Hebrews" and which was recently translated by me into Greek and Latin speech, which Origen also used frequently... (*vir. inl 2*).

According to that the original of the GH was composed in a Semitic tongue. The reference to Origen indicates that Jerome took the citation from him and not from the GH itself (Schmidtke 135; Bardy 9f.). The Semitic original is for him the "Hebrew" proto-Matthew.

Matthew in Judaea was the first to compose the gospel of Christ in the Hebrew character and speech for the sake of those who came over to the faith from Judaism; who he was who later translated it into Greek is no longer known with certainty. Further the Hebrew text itself is still preserved in the library at Caesarea which the martyr Pamphilus collected with great care. The Nazaraeans in Beroea, a city of Syria, who use this book, also permitted me to copy it. In it it is to be noted that wherever the evangelist adduces testimonies from the OT—be this done by himself or by our Lord and Saviour—he follows not the Septuagint translation but the Hebrew original text (*vir. inl 3*).

Jerome can hardly have seen the Hebrew original of Mt. in the library at Caesarea, for Eusebius never says anything about such a treasure in his library and never identifies an unknown JG with the Hebrew original of Matthew. What we are concerned with here must be an Aramaic Gospel—the one from which come the citations in the *Theophania*—and this Jerome equates with the original Matthew. Whether he knew the Caesarean exemplar from having himself seen it, is open to question. At all events he does not imply that he derives his information from it. For he notes—in order of course to show his familiarity with this work—that this Gospel was used by the Nazaraeans in Beroea and that [127] he had copied it with their permission. Since in his citations from JG he again and again refers to the Nazaraeans (or Nazarenes), he obviously implies that he obtained his information amongst them. The Coelestrian Beroea near Aleppo was in fact a centre of the Nazaraeans, i.e. of the Syrian Jewish-Christians (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29, 7.7; 30, 2.7; Bardy ii). Jerome can have had contact with them only during his stay in the desert of Chalcis, i.e. between 373 and 376 (Bardy ii); but then it is altogether inconceivable that he kept the Gospel of the Nazaraeans so long to himself and was silent about it, and cited it for the first time in 386. It is equally *inconceivable* that the *differences* between the Gospel of the Nazaraeans and the canonical Matthew can have struck him so little that he could consider the latter to be the translation of the former. The conclusion is inevitable that it was not the Nazaraeans who communicated to him his knowledge of this Gospel.

In critical examination of the JG the paragraph *de viris inlustribus* 16 has played a decisive role. In it Jerome asserts that Ignatius quotes the GH in his *Epistle to Polycarp*:

Ignatius . . . writes in particular (an epistle) to Polycarp . . . , in which he also adduces a testimony about the person of Christ from the Gospel which was recently translated by me; he says: “And I have also seen him in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is. And when he came to Peter and to those who were with Peter, he said to them: Behold, handle me and see that I am no bodiless demon. And forthwith they touched him and believed.”

Years later (in 408-409) in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (XVIII, preface) he cites the saying about the bodiless demon, but without reference to Ignatius:

Since that is to say the disciples took him for a spirit or according to the Gospel of the Hebrews, which the Nazaraeans read, for a bodiless demon...

The statement of *de viris inlustribus* 16 is much disputed; whilst it serves Waitz as basis for far-reaching constructions, Bardy categorically calls its accuracy in question. The fact cannot be denied that in this passage Jerome makes two solid mistakes. In the first place the passage cited from Ignatius stands not in his epistle to Polycarp but in that to the Smyrnaeans; and then Jerome understands the first sentence (“and I have also seen him in the flesh after the resurrection” etc.) as part of the fragment said to be quoted by Ignatius, whereas it is actually an avowal on the part of Ignatius. Ignatius writes:

And I know and believe that even after his resurrection he was in the flesh. And when he came to those about Peter, he said to them: [128]

Lay hold, handle me and see that I am no bodiless demon. And forthwith they touched him and believed, being closely joined to his flesh and spirit (*Smyrn.* 3, If.).

The statement of the Church father that the passage stood in the Gospel of the Nazaraeans which he had translated is wrecked on the fact that the decisive notion “bodiless demon” cannot be the translation of a Semitic original.¹ That eliminates an Aramaic gospel as source; a Greek text, perhaps the GH as such, is at most what can be considered. Moreover it has long been recognized and acknowledged that when writing the *de viris inlustribus* Jerome had before him neither the text of the apocryphal Gospel nor that of the epistles of Ignatius, but the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius who (III. xxxvi, II) adduces Ign. *Smyrn.* 3, if.; Jerome cites the text only as far as Eusebius gives it; his assigning of it to the epistle to Polycarp finds its explanation in cursory reading, and his misunderstanding of the first sentence in the fact that he did not take in the context of the Ignatian expositions. Two points tell against the derivation of *Smyrn.* 3, 2 from a

- (i) Eusebius says expressly that he did not know the source of the Ignatian sentence (*H.E.* III. xxxvi, ii); since he knew the GH and an Aramaic JG and the latter according to Jerome was at hand in the library at Caesarea, Eusebius could have identified the passage in question without more ado, had it stood in a JG; that he came to know the Aramaic JG only after he had written the *H.E.* is a way out of the difficulty with which Schmidtke and Waitz would vindicate Jerome’s statement about the source and make Ignatius a witness of the Gospel of the Nazaraeans.
- (ii) Origen (*de princ.* I prooem. 8) says that the word of the risen Jesus “I am no bodiless demon” stood in an apocryphal “Teaching of Peter”. That speaks decisively against Jerome’s statement about the source and eliminates also the GH known to Origen and cited by him. We may leave aside the question whether the expression “Petri doctrina” is Rufinus’ rendering of κηρυγμα Πητρου (so above all Bardy, 13f.); the attribution of the sentence to this Kerygma or to a lost Teaching of Peter remains an assumption.

What makes the identification of the Ignatian sentence uncertain is simply the expression “bodiless demon”; otherwise Eusebius would not have hesitated to see in *Smyrn.* 3, 2 a free rendering of Lk. 24:36-41, where the risen Jesus says: “Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have”

¹

1 Neither in Hebrew nor in Aramaic is there an equivalent for the Greek *ἄσoματα*. On the other hand this Greek vocable, as a loan word ('asomata' incorporalia and 'asomataja' = incorporalis) taken over into the Syriac, is attested for the first time in Ephraem and in the *Breviarium Chaldaicum* (Broekelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum* 2nd ed., 1928, 35b). Cf. also on this logion H. Koster, *Synoptische Ueberlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vatern* (TU65), 1957, pp. 50ff.

(vs. 39). It is true that Walter Bauer also is of opinion that Ignatius does not formulate Smyrn. 3, 2 independently but follows here a strange context, since he connects vs. 2 to what goes before it with 'and when' instead of; as the logical procedure would have been, with 'then when' (Lietzmann, *Handb. zum. NT, Die Apostolischen Vater* 1920, 266). Nevertheless, as argument for the derivation of the tradition cited by Ignatius this not quite correct linkage seems to me to have less weight than the similarity of the passage with Lk. 24 :36ff.; the situation is the same, and the emphasis on Peter answers to the estimate of him in the 2nd century and is besides justified by Lk. 24 :33f. The word of the risen Jesus in vs. 39b:

"Handle me and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have is given a Greek formulation in *Smyrn.* 3, 2 and above all, as the context shows, is pointed against Docetism. Immediately before (in *Smyrn.* 2) Ignatius calls the docetic heretics "bodiless and demonic". The latter term is a polemical distortion of the term pneumatic" which the Gnostics applied to themselves, and the former refers to the Gnostic understanding of redemption as the liberation of the spirit from the matter of corporeality. The characterization of the Docetics in *Smyrn.* 2 and the logion in *Smyrn.* 3, 2 harmonize terminologically the one with the other, and this they do in using and distorting the Gnostic terminology.

In my opinion the antidocetic tendency of Ignatius and the actual front-line in which he stood sufficiently explain the formulation of the saying of the Lord and make the assumption of any source other than Lk. 24 36ff. unnecessary. In the Ignatian rendering, which was easier to remember and of greater striking power than the Lucan, the logion passed into the Teaching of Peter. The dommatmg position of Peter and the absence of any reference to doubt on the part of the disciples do not in any way show that the Ignatian text is original, but that from the point of view of tradition-history it is secondary as compared with Luke (against Waltz, *Apokr.* 2, 10f. and *ZNW* 36, 1937, 67). Jerome was led to make his false identification simply through the uncanonical formulation of the saying and through the comment of Eusebius that he did not know Ignatius' source. Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 3, 2 drops out as a fragment of an apocryphal JG and therefore as an index to its dating.

In the *Commentary on Matthew* written shortly before 398 Jerome adduces the majority of his quotations from his JG. Of the formulae of introduction only the one to the story of the healing of the man with the withered hand is noteworthy:

In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and the Ebionites use, which we recently translated out of the Hebrew tongue into the Greek and which is called by most people the authentic (Gospel) of Matthew...

In contrast to *de vir. inl.* 2 and 3 there is no more mention of a translation into Latin, and that this JG is to be equated with the "Hebrew" proto-Matthew is no longer described as an individual opinion but as that of "most people", who these are being left open; and this change in emphasis occurs later still (*In Ps. cxxxv tract.*: in the Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew; *adv. Pelag.* III, 2:..... as most assume, according to Matthew; see below). The mentioning of the Ebionites as readers of this Gospel is singular in Jerome and probably a literary reminiscence from his reading of Epiphanius.

In his writings composed after the *Commentary on Matthew* Jerome no longer states that he had translated the JG. The introductory formulae characterize it as "written in Hebrew letters" (*Epist.* 120, 8 *ad Hedib.*) or as composed "in the Hebrew speech" (*Com. in Is.* on xi. 2) and usually also as read among the Nazaraeans. The most detailed citation formula is found in the *Dial. ad'. Pelag.* III, 2, which appeared towards the end of 415; it introduces two citations:

In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is in the Chaldaean and Syriac tongue, but written in Hebrew letters, and which the Nazarenes use to this day as (the Gospel) according to the Apostles or, as most people suppose, according to Matthew, which is also in stock in the library of Caesarea, the story tells...

after the citation:

And in the same volume:...

What in these statements goes beyond what Jerome has already said about his JG is first the precise statement regarding the tongue and secondly the identification of it with a “Gospel according to the Apostles”. As the original tongue he no longer gives Hebrew but the “Chaldaean and Syriac dialect”, by which he clearly means Aramaic; in these different statements we are concerned not with a fundamental antithesis or with an indication that Jerome was informed only in 415 about the actual tongue of the JG, but with a terminological difference which finds its explanation in the fact that where Jerome speaks of a “Hebrew Gospel” he makes use of the inexact, popular designation (Bardy 19)—by the “Gospel according to the Apostles” he certainly understands the Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles which he also mentions in the prologue to his *Commentary on Matthew* side by side with other apocryphal gospels, which Origen in his *Homily on Lk.* i calls the “Gospel of the Twelve” (in Jerome’s translation: “Juxta duodecim apostolos”), which is also mentioned elsewhere (by Ambrose and Theophylact) but never cited.

131

The statement that the Aramaic Gospel of the Nazaraeans was identical with this is supported, however, by no other evidence and is for that reason unreliable. Also we do not know whether Jerome knew more than the name of the Gospel of the Apostles and therefore we have no occasion to assign the two citations or one of them to a Gospel other than that of the Nazaraeans, and we had better renounce the conjecture that he had these fragments of the Gospel of the Twelve from the writings of Origen; for there is no citation of the kind in the preserved portions of his writings and their lost portions are no proper basis for a credible hypothesis. The mention of the Gospel of the Apostles rests in all likelihood upon the Church father’s wish to let his erudition shine forth “en disant tout ce qu’il savait ou croyait savoir au sujet de l’ouvrage qu’il allait citer. Il en a trop dit et sa mémoire l’a trompé” (Bardy, 27f.).

This detailed review made in chronological order of the learned framework within which Jerome sets his citations has been necessary in order to find out what measure of confidence ought to be put in the Church father’s statements. It is a very small measure. But the recognition of this should give no occasion to daring hypotheses; these can only increase the confusion which Jerome has brought about. In the following summary it is a question merely as to what can in a measure be counted as certain.

It is clear that Jerome has always only one Gospel in mind, that he designates this as the GH and that he equates it with the Aramaic Gospel of the Nazaraeans. But this equation is false and does not make head against the clear distinction between the GH - (drafted in Greek) and an Aramaic JG, particularly since Clement and Origen say nothing of a Semitic original form of the GH. Jerome thus reluctantly confirms the existence of two JG, the GH and an Aramaic Gospel.

That the latter was at hand in the library in Caesarea, is not to be disputed; it is at any rate likely on the ground of the citations of Eusebius in his *Theophany*. It will likewise be correct that the Nazaraeans used such an Aramaic Gospel, since Epiphanius also testifies to this. That the Aramaic Gospel, evidence of which is given by Hegesippus and Eusebius, is identical with this Gospel of the Nazaraeans, is possible) even very probable, but not absolutely certain.

The following statements of Jerome are, however, open to question: first that he got to know the Gospel of the Nazaraeans among the Nazaraeans of the Syrian Beroea, secondly that he copied it there and thirdly that he translated it “recently”, i.e. between 386 and 390. As has already been said, the chronology tells against the first two of these assertions. He must have got to [132] know the book at another time and in another way; Bardy even thinks that he did not actually know the Nazaraeans, for he speaks of them almost in stereotyped phrases and what he records about them he may have read in Epiphanius (so Schmidtke also). Several arguments tell against the third assertion. No one has seen or mentioned the translation, and Jerome himself mentions it only between 390 and 397 and thereafter no more. It is true that the different statements regarding the original tongue (Hebrew, Chaldaean, Syriac) do not prove that he was not quite certain about that; the fact, however, that in 392-393 he speaks of a translation into Greek and Latin but in

397 only of a translation into Greek, is puzzling. The fact that in the texts which he demonstrably came upon in Greek and assuredly did not translate out of Aramaic he speaks of a translation, must intensify to skepticism our doubt as to his statements. It is therefore widely recognized that Jerome did not translate the Gospel of the Nazaraeans. He had obviously only purposed to translate it; and although unable to carry out this purpose, he spoke of it as an accomplished fact (Bardy, 32f.).

The erroneous equation of the Greek GH and the Aramaic Gospel of the Nazaraeans shows at all events that Jerome knew accurately neither of these two Gospels, for otherwise the differences in their content and character must have struck him. Apparently he worked only with fragments, a fact which also explains how he could ascribe them all to one and the same book. Whence he had the fragments cannot be said with certainty. It is disputed whether he himself had looked into the Aramaic GN and had made a note of some things that he found in it (so Waits, *Apokr.* 2, 15) or had not done so (so Schmidtke, 66ff.; 246ff.); this question cannot by any means be settled. On his visit to Caesarea the opportunity was at all events afforded him of examining the exemplar in the library there. He certainly drew citations from literature of second rank, especially from commentaries. Origen can be identified as the source of some of his citations; as regards the others no certain or probable statement of their source can be made; all conjectures which would assert more about it are futile. That holds good in particular of the hypothesis, brought forward with as much drive as constructive power by Schmidtke, that Jerome borrowed the fragments of the GH from the commentaries of Origen and those of the GN from the commentaries of Apollinaris of Laodicea; for in the first place in the literary remains of Apollinaris nothing is found which justifies such a conjecture (Bardy, 6 note 2; 30), and besides in no citation does Jerome appeal to him as his authority, as anyhow he appeals once to Origen. The fact that he had heard and [133] read Apollinaris is no cogent reason for the assertion that he had from him the citations in question. At all events the thesis of Schmidtke, which many have accepted, is not indisputable because the opposite cannot be proved; even as a working hypothesis it is not suitable.

Such being the state of affairs, no complete certainty can be arrived at in the matter of the identification of the several fragments. The canon drawn up confidently by Waitz (*Apokr.* 2, 15): “The question merely is in what cases Jerome has followed either Origen or Apollinaris or has obtained them on his own”, does not suffice, after what has just been adduced, for a decision as to whether a fragment belongs to the GH or to the GN. It has already been said that the citation twice repeated about the “bodiless demon” is to be eliminated since it did not originate in any JG. As this instance shows, the possibility must be reckoned with that Jerome has also elsewhere attested certain texts which appealed to him and handed them down as coming from a JG; this element of uncertainty cannot be eliminated.

The trustworthy testimony of Origen must pass as evidence of membership in the GH. According to it the story of the carrying away of Jesus by His mother, the Holy Spirit (*in Mich.* vii. 7; *in Is.* xl. 9; *in Ezek.* xvi. 13), belongs assuredly to the GH, and also in all likelihood the appearance of Christ to James (*vir. inl.* 2), for which Jerome refers to the authority of the Alexandrian.

Criteria for derivation from the Aramaic GN must be: (a) indications that the text has a Semitic basis and (b) the Synoptic character of the text or its affinity in particular with Mt., since the GH, according to all that we know of it, diverged very much from the Synoptic type. According to (a) we shall be inclined to refer to the GN the Aramaic readings and the corrections of evangelic OT—citations made to bring them into accord with the original text of the OT. But here also a warning must be given against a too great certainty: the explanation of the name Barabbas as “son of their teacher” is in a Semitic text extremely questionable (Waits, *Apokr.* 2, I 9f.); the assertion that instead of **ἐπιουσιος** in the petition for bread in the Lord’s Prayer there stood “mahar” *crastinus* may be a conjecture on the part of Jerome; and that at the time of Jesus’ death according to the GN it was not the veil of the temple that was rent but the lintel that collapsed is according to Schmidtke “Jerome’s own invention” (p. 8b), according to Bardy a gleaner by Jerome from Eusebius’ *Chronicon* (19-22). If, however, the tradition in question comes from a JG, it may be ascribed to the GN rather than to the GH, for the collapse of the lintel can be understood as a coarsening of the Synoptic motif of the rending of the veil of the temple.

In view of its Synoptic character one will ascribe the story of the man with the withered hand (*in Matth.* on xii. 13) to the GN. So also in the case of the two citations in *adv. Pelag.* III 2 we do well to handle them as variants of Synoptic and indeed Matthaean texts. The first, the conversation of Jesus with His mother and brethren before His baptism, is connected in theme (the baptism of Jesus in spite of His sinlessness) with the conversation with the Baptist in Mt. 3: 14f. The second, the conversation about forgivingness, is, as the dialogue form shows, a colouring of the dialogue in Mt. 18:21f. (and not of the single saying Lk. 17:4); moreover the last sentence has been handed down in Greek as the

version of the Judaikon (see No.7 below). Since there are neither formal nor material reasons for a different derivation of the two fragments, they are to be referred to the GN.

Ordinarily the other baptism story (in *Is.* on xi. 2) is also reckoned to the GN. For that Jerome's statement that the story came from the Gospel composed "in the Hebrew speech" is not a sufficient reason, particularly as it is wanting in his *Commentary on Matthew*, in which he cites the GN five times; but a characteristic trait—the sounding forth of the voice after Jesus has left the water—which is found only here and in Mt. 3:16, goes to prove the derivation of the passage from the GN. But there are also considerable differences: the "resting" of the Spirit on Jesus has no parallel in the Synoptics, although it has one in the "abiding" of the Spirit upon Him in Jn. I :32f.; further it is not a voice from heaven that speaks but the Spirit resting on Jesus, and it speaks not in the third person as in Mt., but in the second person as in Mk. and Lk. And above all the content of the saying is a great deal more mythological than it is in the Synoptics; it assumes the notions of the pre-existence and the transfiguration of the Redeemer and in its motif of the eschatological "rest" ("that I may rest in thee": "thou art my rest") it points to the GH (cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* II ix, 45; V xiv, 96). These peculiarities make it in my opinion questionable whether this passage belongs to the same baptism story as does the conversation of Jesus with His mother and His brethren (*adv. Pelag.* III 2); accordingly I would—with reserve—assign it to the GH.

The derivation of the citations in *Eph.* v.4 and in *Ezek.* xviii. 7 is altogether uncertain. Jerome has probably taken the first—it is also the earliest which he adduces—from one of his exegetical sources, but from which cannot be made out, and for that reason it cannot be concluded to which JG the fragment belongs (Schmidtke, 75-79: Apollinaris and the GN; Bardy, 5f.: Origen and the GH); since on the one hand the association of Apollinaris with the GN rests solely upon conjectures on the part of Schmidtke [135] which admit of no proof; and since on the other hand Jerome can have obtained his knowledge of an Aramaic GN only after the writing of his *Commentary on Ephesians* (Bardy, 7ff.), the assignation proposed by Bardy has a little more likelihood. Since moreover the saying exhibits no Semitisms and shows no close relationship to a Synoptic saying of the Lord, it may be entered among the fragments of the GH. For the identification of the second citation no evidence that is at all likely can be adduced. Only because actual Synoptic parallels are wanting, because Jerome in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* (on xvi. 13) gives a genuine GH-citation, and because of the material relationship of this saying to the one just discussed, it may be assigned with it to the GH.

7. The so-called "Zion Gospel Edition". In the *subscriptions* of thirty-six Gospel manuscripts dating from the 9th to the 13th centuries there is a reference to a Gospel described as *το 'Ιουδαϊκον*, and two of these manuscripts (codices 566 and 899) adduce readings of the Judaikon as marginal notes to Mt. Codex 1424, which does not have the subscriptions, presents the largest number, namely ten of the thirteen Judaikon readings on Mt., and for eight of them it is the sole witness. The subscriptions refer to the standard exemplar on the "holy mount", Zion, in Jerusalem.

Schmidtke (1-32) has investigated this group and shown that it goes back to a Gospel edition that was preserved in a basilica on Zion in Jerusalem and which he has accordingly called the "Zion Gospel Edition". He puts its origin in 370-500 (this is disputed by Ernst von Dobschutz in Nestle's *Einführung in das griechische NT*, 4th ed. 1923, 51). His statement that the Judaikon readings given in this Gospel edition go back to the lost *Commentary on Matthew* by Apollinaris of Laodicea, cannot be proved. The designation *το 'Ιουδαϊκον* characterizes the book as a JG which cannot be one of the four canonical Gospels. But neither can it be identified with the GH, for otherwise the latter common title would certainly have been given. Since it is nowhere characterized as heretical, we cannot here be concerned with the Gospel of the Ebionites. Moreover it is nearly related to Mt. and is clearly a variant of the Gospel of Matthew. The title Judaikon may also point to the "Jewish" speech, the Aramaic. The Greek citations from the Judaikon are certainly ad hoc renderings. The relationship to Mt. and to many JG citations in Jerome (especially the identity of the reading for Mt. i8 :22 with the concluding sentence of the second fragment in *adv. Pelag.* III 2) suggests the conclusion that the Judaikon and the GN were closely related to one another, if not identical.

[136]

8. *Cyril of Jerusalem*. In the Coptic translation of a discourse of Cyril of Jerusalem he (Cyril) puts a citation from the GH into the mouth of a heretical monk from "the neighbourhood of Maioma near Gaza" (ed. by E. A. W. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts* 1915, Coptic p. 60, English p.637). We are concerned here with a fragment of the story of the birth of Jesus: When Jesus wished to come into the world, God the Father entrusted Him to a mighty power which was called Michael; this came into the world and was named Mary. In the Greek writings of Cyril this discourse is not

preserved; V. Burch (*JTS* 21, 1920, 310ff.) regards it as a sort of excursus on the twelfth Catechesis. But it is questionable whether it actually goes back to Cyril, and above all whether the citation really comes from the GH. This question forces itself upon us in view of the different conceptions of the mother of Jesus in the GH fragment on the carrying away of Jesus (Origen and Jerome) and in the present passage. Whilst there the mother is designated the Holy Spirit, here she passes as the incarnation of a “mighty power” which in its pre-existence is called Michael; our hesitations are strengthened if Burch’s thesis is correct, that the “mighty power” denotes a star and that Michael is to be understood as a star angel.¹ But we know the GH too little to be able to deny this fragment to it; we are possibly concerned here with a corrupted fragment of the GH or with a fragment of a corrupted GH.

9. *Nicephorus*. In the Stichometry of Nicephorus (*Nicephori opusc. hist.* ed. de Boor 1880, 134; see pp. 49ff. above) it is recorded under the rubric New Testament Antilegomena: “4. The Gospel according to the Hebrews: 2200 lines”. For the Gospel of Matthew there are reckoned 2500 lines.

10. *Testimonies from the Middle Ages*. References are also found in writers of the Middle Ages to the GH or the GN. Haimo of Auxerre (c. 850) in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (on 53:12) cites the word of Jesus: “Father, forgive them” (Lk. 23:34) and adds: “For as it is said in the Gospel of the Nazaraeans”, many thousands of the Jews who were standing round the cross became believers. Here it is deserving of notice that what is spoken of is a Gospel of the Nazaraeans, therefore one with a title which Jerome never uses. It is questionable whether this citation actually comes from the GN; the GN is clearly a working up of Mt.) but Haimo’s citation

¹Burch certainly does not examine this difficulty. The *main* fault of his religio-historical investigation consists in his giving to affinity of motives the value of literary dependence. His statement that the Cyril fragment represents the beginning, the *Gospel of Peter* and Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 3, 2 the conclusion of one and the same book, the GH, is altogether inept.

is based on Lk. 23:48 and *Petr. Ev.* VII. 25. It is certain that another apocryphal dictum which according to Haimo’s *Commentary on Hebrews* (on 13:4) “the blessed apostle Matthew’ gives “somewhere” (Klostermann p. 12, No.28), does not belong to a JG.

In a 13th-century English ms. of the “Aurora” of Peter of Riga, a Bible put in verse (12th cent.), a marginal note on the cleansing of the temple gives a citation which may “be read in the books of the Gospels which the Nazarenes used”¹

In the “Celtic Catechesis” of the Breton Vaticanus Reg. lat. 49 of the 9th century a statement is made according to the “Gospel of the Hebrews” about the day of the last judgment (Dom A. Vilmart, “Analecta Regimensia” in *Studi e Testi* 59, 1933, 58). More recently Bernhard Bischoff has published two unknown fragments of the GH from Irish commentaries (*Sacris erudiri* VI 1954, I 89ff.): (i) a “Historical Commentary on Luke” mentions that the “Gospel according to the Hebrews” gave the miracles that Jesus had wrought in Bethsaida and Chorazin; (ii) in his *Commentary on Matthew* Sedulius Scotus adduces from the “gospel which is entitled according to the Hebrews” a fictional expansion of the episode of the Magi. Fictional development of Mt. is generally characteristic of the GN; we have before us a case such as we have many a time in Jerome, a text being ascribed to the GH which according to its literary character should be assigned rather to the GN. Moreover Bischoff conjectures that the statements regarding names in an Irish commentary on Matthew (in Bischoff p.252) and in the “Historical Commentary on Luke” (*ibid.* p.262) go back to the same apocryphal passage.

Finally in a theological miscellany manuscript (saec. XIV XV) of German origin Bischoff has discovered a “historia passionis domini” (saec. XIV, first half), in which the latest authority adduced is Nicolas de Lyra and which contains several citations from the “Gospel of the Nazaraeans”. In a letter Bischoff has in an extremely friendly and kindly way put the relative passages at our disposal.

As far then as into the 14th century we come across citations from the JG; the designation alternates between GH and

GN. Whether this alternation should be appraised as evidence for our distinction between the two JG seems to me to be open to question. For it is quite possible that we have to do not with direct citations from such Gospel books but rather with borrowings from catenae or commentaries. But the influence of Jerome on this exegetical tradition is unmistakable. This tradition was evidently carried

Cf. GN No.25 below. This observation is hardly a Citation from the GN, but a literary reminiscence on the part of the scholiast from Jerome, *Com. on Mt.* on 21:12: "A Certain fiery and Starry light radiated from his eyes and the majesty of Godhead gleamed in his face" (cf. James, *The Apocryphal NT*, p.8).

[138]

on in particular by the Irish, and Bischoff thinks probably rightly that the citation in Haimo of Auxerre and the scholion in the Aurora go back to Irish intervention. How far these citations and references are trustworthy testimonies for the content of the GN and the GH must remain open.

11. The result which the foregoing investigation gives is in agreement so far as concerns the number of the JG with that of H. Waitz, M. Dibelius and W. Bauer. According to it three JG have to be distinguished:

- (1) *The Gospel of the Nazaraeans*, a Gospel read in a Semitic speech (Aramaic or Syriac), which is attested by Hegesippus and Eusebius, Epiphanius and Jerome, which *according to the latter* was in use among the Nazaraeans, the Syrian Jewish Christians, and which showed a close relationship to the canonical Matthew.
- (2) *The Gospel of the Ebionites*, the Gospel of heretical Jewish Christians composed in Greek, of which Irenaeus knew and from which Epiphanius quotes, which was related more to Mt. than to any other of the canonical Gospels, but differed from it in essential respects.
- (3) *The Gospel of the Hebrews*, the JG that is mentioned most often, was perhaps already used by Papias and in the time of Eusebius still belonged to the Antilegomena; its most important witnesses are Clement of Alexandria and Origen. The few fragments that have been preserved indicate no special relationship to one of the canonical Gospels, but contain syncretistic elements and show the heretical character of the Jewish Christian users of the GH. In the present state of research it is not yet possible to fit these JG into place in the history of Jewish Christianity or in the history of its theology. O. Strecker's analysis of the pseudo-Clementines has shown how complex an entity Jewish Christianity was; the relevant accounts of the early Church heresiologists have not yet been sufficiently investigated; the clarification of the connection between the Qumran sect and the primitive Church and Jewish Christianity is still in full swing; it would then be premature to attempt to fix the JG historically. Here our only or main concern must be the clearing up of the literary question which these books occasion.