THE NEED OF A NEW EDITION OF HERMAS

Since the great critical edition of Gebhardt-Harnack (1877), the last attempt to revise the text of the *Shepherd of Hermas*[1] was by Kirsopp Lake in his Loeb Library edition in 1913. Although Lake incorporated many of the new readings from the papyri, there has been, since then, a considerable number of new discoveries, not the least among them being the Michigan papyrus codex published by Prof. Campbell Bonner in 1934, and the two Coptic codices published by Canon Lefort in 1938–39. Prof. C. H. Turner of Oxford had been gathering together material for a new edition of the two ancient Latin Versions, the Vulgate and the Palatine; but the work was left uncompleted at his death.[2] It is still possible, of course, that more fragments may be forthcoming from existing collections of unedited manuscripts and papyri in England and the United States; but in any case it would not seem too early to lay the foundations for a new and complete critical edition of the Greek text of the *Shepherd*.

Many might argue that the results would hardly repay the effort involved in controlling all the various fragments and versions. Hermas the dreamer[3] (they might argue), a freedman who flourished at the time of Trajan and tried to pass off his work as an inspired apocalypse of apostolic times, has

---

[1] For bibliography on Hermas, see G. Bareille, *DTC*, VI (1921), 2268–88; W. J. Wilson, *Harvard Theological Review*, XX (1927), 21 ff.; Campbell Bonner, *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas with a Fragment of the Mandates* (Univ. of Michigan Press, 1934), p. 32 ff.; B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (2te Aufl.; Freiburg: Herder, 1950), p. 63 ff. Cf. also M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (in *Handb. zum N. T.*, Ergänzungsband; Tübingen, 1923), and his *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (International Library of Christian Knowledge; London, 1936).

[2] See C. H. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXI (1920), 193 ff. This work, I have been informed, has been taken up by Prof. D. A. B. Mynors of Pembroke College, Cambridge, while the preparation of the Greek text has been undertaken by Miss M. Whittaker of the University of Nottingham. During the writing of this article I have had the advantage of frequent discussions with Mr. C. H. Roberts of St. John's College and Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick of Queen's College, Oxford.

[3] Among the sources of the *Shepherd*, scholars have suggested a lost Jewish apocalypse (Spitta); the Greek erotic novel (Dibelius); the Egyptian Hermetic literature and, in particular, *Poimandres* (Reitzenstein). There is, I think, some truth in all of these suggestions, at least in the sense that many types of non-Christian literature exercised, directly or indirectly, a strong influence upon Hermas' imagination. For my own part, I cannot resist the impression that the author of the *Shepherd*, if he was not himself an Egyptian, was influenced by Gnostic teaching of the kind we find in the Hermetic Corpus. Contact between the Egyptian Gnostics and the Hermetic circle has again been recently confirmed by the discovery of the Coptic Gnostic library at Nag-Hamadi; for an account, see J. Doresse, "La bibliothèque gnostique copte," *Nouvelle Clio*, I (1949), 59–70.

very little to offer us save an odd assortment of false visions[4]—some original and some plagiarized—, a rigorist doctrine of repentance, and some dubious statements about the divinity of Christ. But yet it must be borne in mind that the *Shepherd* was one of the most widely read of the "popular" writings of ancient Christianity. One of the Greek manuscripts has come down to us in the great *Codex Sinaiticus*, tacked on after the canonical books (as though to utilize the remaining pages of the codex) together with the so-called *Epistle of Barnabas*. The distribution of the manuscripts of the Latin versions, and of the Coptic, Ethiopic, and Middle Persian versions, reveals how widely Hermas was read in Egypt, Europe, and Asia. And it must be recalled that despite the *démenti* of the Muratorian Canon, Tertullian, Origen, and even (we must take the good with the bad!) Irenaeus, all seem to have considered the *Shepherd* as one of the inspired books. Study of the *Shepherd*, then, I think one may reasonably submit, does indeed throw light upon the temperament of ancient popular Christianity—as well as the important process of the diffusion of ancient religious texts. And for this a thorough critical edition is of prime importance.[5]

[4] For an understanding of Hermas' "visions," it has been suggested that more attention might be paid to the fact that much of Hermas' imagery seems to have been drawn from his own (sleeping or waking) dreams. Some of the visions, for example, are alleged to have taken place during sleep: e.g., *Vis.*, II, 4; and cf. *Vis.*, III, 1; III, 10, 6 and 7; V, 1. This aspect of the *Shepherd* has been studied almost exclusively by non-patristic scholars. Preliminary investigations into the subconscious basis of Hermas' work had already been made by Jung in his *Psychologische Typen* (1st ed., 1921; Zurich, 1937), p. 315 ff. Jung thought he saw in the *Shepherd* a characteristic example of the "transition from the service of Woman (*Frauendienst*) to the service of the Soul (*Seelendienst*)"—a phenomenon which he thought was also to be seen in Dante and in other secular and Christian literature. Jung's hypotheses were further developed by Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (Oxford, 1934), p. 174 ff. In this connexion it may be noted that the French literary critic, Remy de Gourmont, in his *Dante, Béatrice et la poésie amoureuse* (Paris, 1923), actually advanced the view that Dante had borrowed from Hermas. Mr. T. S. Eliot in his famous essay, *Dante* (1929), rejected de Gourmont's theory, but admitted that "a certain *habit* in dream-imagery can persist throughout many changes of civilization"; in the case of Hermas, as well as Dante, it was "a more significant, interesting, and disciplined kind of dreaming." But Dante's mind was stocked with curious bits of information, and taking into consideration the distribution of the MSS of the Vulgate translation of Hermas, it is not impossible that Dante did have second- or third-hand knowledge of the opening vision of the *Shepherd*.

[5] There is also urgent need of a judicious numbering of the smaller divisions of the text, so that one would be able to quote, e.g., *Pastor* 15 simply, instead of the cumbersome, and sometimes confusing, *Pastor*, *Vis.*, I, 3, 2. I hardly think that the *chorizontes*—if any still persist—would cavil at a consecutive numbering from beginning to end, although, by way of concession, a major division might be indicated between "Part I" (i.e., *Vis.*, I–IV) and "Part II" (*Vis.*, V, to the end). "Part I" certainly seems to have been omitted in the Michigan Codex as well as in Lefort's first Coptic codex.

Neither of the Greek MSS of the *Shepherd* is complete. ℵ, the *Codex Sinaiticus* (*saec.* IV), now in the British Museum, contains little more than a quarter of the whole, i.e., from the beginning up to *Mand.*, IV, 3, 6. Facsimiles have been published by Kirsopp Lake (Oxford, 1911). *A*, the *Codex Athous* (from *saec.* XIV or, more probably, I think, early *saec.* XV)—of the original ten leaves, the last has unfortunately been lost (from *Sim.*, IX, 30, 3—end); three were (at least before the last war) in Leipzig; the remaining six are still (apparently) in the Library of the Monastery of Hagios Gregorios on Mt. Athos. Fortunately the Athos leaves were carefully collated by Lake; see the facsimiles published by him (Oxford, 1907).

The most important addition, however, to our knowledge of the text has come from the papyrus and vellum fragments discovered within the last half-century. They are:

1) *P. Amherst II, 190*, ten small fragments from a papyrus codex of about *saec.* VI, first published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1901 from Lord Amherst's collection (later purchased for the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York). The fragments contain *Vis.*, I, 2, 2—3, 1; *Vis.*, III, 12, 3—13, 3; *Mand.*, XII, 1, 1-3; *Sim.*, IX, 2, 1-3; 12, 25; 17, 1-2; 30, 1; 30, 2-4.

2) *P. Berol. 5513 (Berl. Klass. Texte*, VI, 13–17), from a papyrus roll of *saec.* III: *Sim.*, II, 7–10; IV, 2–5.

3) *P. Berol. 6789 (Berl. Klass. Texte*, VI, 17–20), from a papyrus codex of *saec.* VI: *Sim.*, VIII, 1, 1–12.

4) *P. Berol. 13272*, from a parchment codex of *saec.* IV *ex.*, first published by O. Stegmuller, *Aegyptus*, XVII (1937), 456–59: *Sim.*, V, 1, 5—2, 2, and 2, 4–6.

5) *P. Hamburg*, from a parchment codex of *saec.* IV–V, first published by K. Schmidt and W. Schubart, *Sitzungsb. Preuss. Ak. Wiss.*, phil.-hist. Kl. (1909), pp. 1077–81: *Sim.*, IV, 6–7, and V, 1–5.

6) *P. Harris 128*, from a papyrus codex of *saec.* V (or possibly early *saec.* VI), edited by Powell but first identified by Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick in *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLVII (1947), 204 f.:*Vis.*, V, 5, 7.

7) *P. Michigan 129*, twenty-six leaves from a papyrus codex of *saec.* III containing (with lacunae) *Sim.*, II, 8—IX, 5, 1: see C. Bonner, *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas with a Fragment of the Mandates* (1934).

8) *P. Michigan 130*, also edited by Bonner (cf. the previous number), is a fragment from a papyrus codex perhaps from the third quarter of the second century —and hence the earliest known fragment; it contains *Mand.*, II, 6—III, 1.

9) *P. Oxy. I, 5*, from a papyrus codex of late *saec.* III or early *saec.* IV, now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, as MS Gr. theol. f. 9 (P); it contains a passage from a Greek homily which quotes *Mand.*, XI, 9–10.

10) *P. Oxy. III, 404*, from a papyrus codex of late *saec.* III, now in the Bodleian as MS Gr. theol. f. 10 (P): *Sim.*, X, 3, 2–5; 4, 3.

11) *P. Oxy. IX, 1172*, from a papyrus codex of *saec*. IV, now in the British Museum (P. Lond. Inv. 2067): *Sim.*, II, 4–10.

12) *P. Oxy. XIII, 1599*, from a papyrus codex of perhaps early *saec*. IV, in the British Museum (P. Long. Inv. 2467): *Sim.*, VIII, 6, 4—8, 3.

13) *P. Oxy. XV, 1783*, from a parchment codex of early *saec*. IV, now in the Library of the University of Glasgow: *Mand.*, X, 2, 4.

14) *P. Oxy. XV, 1828*, from a parchment codex probably of *saec*. III, first identified by Cardinal Mercati, *Biblica*, VI (1925), 336–38, as *Sim.*, VI, 5, 3 and 5.

THE LATIN VERSIONS

First, there is the so-called *Vulgate Version*, of which at least eighteen MSS are known (cf. Gebhardt-Harnack, p. xiv ff.). One of the most important is a twelfth century codex in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Laud. miscell. 488).

Second, there is the so-called *Palatine Version*, existing in a manuscript in the Vatican Library (*Codex Palatinus 150, saec*. XIV), and in one other recently discovered by Prof. Mynors.

Of these, the *Palatine Version* probably goes back at least to the fifth century and perhaps arose in Italy; the more widespread *Vulgate* seems to have been known to Tertullian and may therefore have originated in the African community of the late second century.

THE (SAHIDIC) COPTIC VERSION

Owing to the untiring researches of Canon L. Th. Lefort of Louvain, we now know of two distinct Coptic codices.

One was published by Lefort in *Muséon*, LI (1938), 239–76—a parchment codex of *saec*. VI (or, at latest, *saec*. VII), of which only 13 leaves remain. Of these, 7 had already been edited by J. Leipoldt and L. Delaporte; all the fragments, with the exception of two, are in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

The second was published by Lefort, *Muséon*, LII (1939), 223–38—a fragment containing *Sim.*, VIII, 5, 6—6, 4, from a small parchment codex of *saec*. V–VI.

THE ETHIOPIC VERSION

The Ethiopic version, derived perhaps from the Coptic, is known only from a single MS discovered in 1847 and published (with a Latin translation) by A. d'Abbadie in the *Abh. deutsch. morgenland. Ges.*, II. 1 (1860). Besides the fact that the version has come down to us complete, it is interesting for the curious addition which argues that the work was written by St. Paul.

THE MIDDLE PERSIAN PARAPHRASE

This version is known only from one leaf (containing excerpts from *Sim.*, IX) found in Chinese Turkestan and preserved (at least at one time) in the Berlin *Museum für Völkerkunde* (M. 97). The text with translation and commentary was published by F. W. K. Müller, *Sitzungsb. Berl. Ak. Wiss.*, 1905, pp. 1077–83. The codex, containing excerpts from the *Shepherd* rather freely paraphrased, was probably part of the library of a Manichaean sect.

CONCLUSION

This list of texts and versions will give some idea of the task which confronts the modern editor of Hermas. And not the least among his difficulties will be the method of presentation of the text and *apparatus criticus*. For the various versions, as far as I have been able to discover, cannot be related to any known Greek text. And the Greek MSS and papyri often differ so widely—not so much in thought as in the precise manner of expression, in the use (or omission) of particles and prepositions, in the choice of variant forms of nouns and adjectives—that it seems questionable whether the *Shepherd* should be edited in the traditional way. A few examples will illustrate this difficulty.

On the Spirit of Prophecy: Mand., XI, 9:

Athos	P. Oxy. 5
ὁ κείμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν	ὁ κείμενος ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ
πληροῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον	πληροῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον
καὶ πληρωθεὶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος	καὶ πλησθεὶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος
τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ	τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ
λαλεῖ εἰς τὸ πλῆθος	λαλεῖ
καθὼς ὁ κύριος βούλεται.	καθὼς ὁ κύριος βούλεται.

The Ideal of Fasting: Sim., V, 3, 4–5:

Athos	P. Mich.
μετὰ πάντων δὲ ἔσομαι,	μετὰ πάντων δὲ ἔσομαι,
φησίν, ὅσοι ταύτην τὴν προθυμίαν	ὅσοι ἐάν, φησί, τὴν αὐτὴν προθυμίαν
ἔχουσιν. ἡ νηστεία αὕτη, φησί,	ἔχωσιν. ἡ νηστεία, φησίν, αὕτη,
τηρουμένων τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ κυρίου,	τηρουμένων τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ κυρίου,
λίαν καλή ἐστιν. οὕτως οὖν	λίαν καλή ἐστιν. οὕτως οὖν
φυλάξεις τὴν νηστείαν ταύτην,	φυλάξεις τὴν νηστείαν.
ἣν μέλλεις τηρεῖν	

The Parable of the Branches: Sim., VIII, 8, 1:

Athos	P. Oxy. 1599
οἱ δὲ ἐπιδεδωκότες τὰς ῥάβδους	τῶν δὲ ἐπιδεδωκότων τὰς ῥάβδους
ἥμισυ μὲν χλωράς, ἥμισυ δὲ ξηράς,	ἥμισυ χλωράς, ἥμισυ ξηράς,
οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς πραγματείαις	οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς πραγματείαις αὐτῶν
ἐμπεφυρμένοι καὶ μὴ κολλώμενοι	ἐμπεφυρμένοι καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις μὴ
τοῖς ἁγίοις· διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἥμισυ	κολλώμενοι· διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἥμισυ
αὐτῶν ζῇ, τὸ δὲ ἥμισυ	αὐτῶν ζῇ καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ
νεκρόν ἐστι.	ἀπέθανεν.

These three examples are typical of the divergences which exist between the text of the Athos and the papyri fragments. Emendation, it is true, will help in some of the cases. But, from a consideration of the others, one gains the impression that perhaps the *Shepherd* is not to be treated according to the system customary for classical texts, the system whereby the editor tries to discover, as far as he can, the archetype from which all other MSS descended. Then from the archetype he attempts to restore, by one means or another, the "original," or the author's authoritative copy. But to apply this system to the text of Hermas at the present stage—I mean, of course, in those places where MSS and papyri differ—would appear to involve us in the familiar error of the vicious circle, since in such a welter of variant readings we presume we can "know" what the author has, or *should* have, written. The truth is that, judging from the papyrological evidence, it would appear extremely doubtful whether an "authoritative text" of Hermas ever existed, or whether the author himself ever intended his own text to be, in our modern sense, the "definitive" one.

It is my belief, then, that the future editor of Hermas should not, where the MSS and papyri differ widely, construct his own "eclectic" text, relegating all the variants to the sepulchre of the *apparatus criticus*. Besides the fact that such a process would, as I have suggested, appear to be arbitrary and circular, it involves the additional disadvantage that one is never able thus to form an adequate picture of the complete text as given by any individual witness, but is forced to reconstruct it for himself from the editor's potted version. Would it not then be better, in the case of Hermas (and in other patristic texts), when the various witnesses differ so widely, to print the divergent texts in parallel columns? In this way scholars could fully utilize the labors of the editor, and at the same time could, with a minimum of difficulty, make their own judgment on the variants without having to rake through the *disiecta membra* at the foot of the page.

Campion Hall, Oxford   HERBERT A. MUSURILLO, S.J.