

BULLETIN
OF THE
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

No. 29

1969

I PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Apocryphal Correspondence of St. Paul with the Church at Corinth
- George Taylor

The early history of the Corinthian Correspondence is closely linked with that of the apocryphal Acts of Paul. This apocryphal Corinthian Correspondence contains a letter from the elders at Corinth to the apostle Paul who is in jail at Philippi. Their concern is certain heretical teaching being promulgated in their city by two peripatetic preachers - Simon and Cleobius by name. Their request is that Paul might come and deal with these men himself - just how he was to be released from prison for this purpose is never mentioned - or failing that they sought a letter from him which would counter this pernicious teaching. The reply purported to be from the apostle is also in your hands. Some copies of this Correspondence have a connecting historical narrative, describing something of the bearers and the situation which has arisen. The speaker did not feel that this material was of sufficient import for our purposes this evening to provide copies for you. One further point that has to do with the caption for this apocryphal Correspondence - sometimes Paul's reply is called III Corinthians, and sometimes that label is attached to both letters - and I will so use it in the latter sense tonight.

Over the years a majority of scholars who have studied the Armenian, Coptic, and Latin manuscripts of III Corinthians, was convinced that this literature first existed as an integral part of the Acts of Paul. With the appearance of the Greek text in 1959, known as Papyrus Bodmer X and dating from at least as early as the third century A.D., a fresh evaluation of the relationship of these two pieces of literature had to be made. The speaker, along with Michel Testuz who published the Bodmer manuscript, and A.F.J. Klijn, among others, believes that the facts which arise from a history of the manuscripts can best be accounted for by positing a prior independent existence of III Corinthians, which was only later incorporated as one episode in the Acts of Paul.

To document this view of the relationships between III Corinthians and the Acts of Paul three areas will be studied; first - the manuscript history itself, with a brief summary of the textual relationships that obtain between these manuscripts; second - a brief comparison of the theological contents of the two writings to see whether the evidence points to an "indigenous" or "alien" existence of III Corinthians in the Acts of Paul; thirdly - we will attempt a brief survey of the heretical teaching described in III Corinthians and relate it to known forms of such teaching to see whether its date and provenance provide additional support for the position taken in this paper.

What are our witnesses to the apocryphal Acts of Paul: Tertullian wrote,

But if the writings which wrongly go under Paul's name claim Thecla's example as a license for woman's teaching and baptizing, let them know that in Asia the presbyter who composed them as if he were augmenting Paul's fame from his own store, after being convicted and confessing that he had done it from love of Paul, was removed from his office.¹

Such was the status of the Acts of Paul in Asia Minor about 190 A.D.

Origen(185-253/4 A.D.) refers twice to the Acts of Paul. He writes:

If you are willing to admit that it is written in the Acts of Paul, how it was said by the Saviour "I am about to be crucified again"² and therefore that language which is found in the Acts of Paul where it is said that "here is the Word a living being" appears to be rightly used.³

Jerome(325-420 A.D.) reveals his own estimate of this writing by the statement that the Acts of Paul and all the fable about the lion baptized by him, "we reckon among the apocryphal writings."⁴

Hippolytus(170-235 A.D.) wrote:

For if we believe that when Paul was condemned to the beasts the lion that was set upon him lay down at his feet and licked him, how shall we not believe that which happened in the case of Daniel.⁵

¹Tertullian (De bapt.c.17)

²Origen (Comm. in Ioannem t.20.12)

³Origen (De princ.1.2.3)

⁴Jerome (De vir.ill.c.7)

⁵Hippolytus (Comm. on Daniel iii.29)

Eusebius(263-340 A.D.) was quite forthright, "Among the rejected writings must be reckoned also the Acts of Paul..."¹

It is plain that there is no specific reference to III Corinthians as being part of the Acts of Paul in the above, yet two more recent finds seem to point in that direction. A Coptic text of the Acts of Paul, now known as Heidelberg Coptic Papyrus Nr. 1 and bearing the symbol K, was published in 1905. It contained III Corinthians and was attributed to the fifth century. It seemed to be a direct translation from the Greek for it contained many Greek words. It has a lacuna in 3:13-15 and stops completely in the middle of the twenty sixth verse.² A second find was published in 1935 by Schmidt and Schubart.³ It was the Hamburg Papyrus containing a Greek text of the Acts of Paul. It lacks III Corinthians, but a comparison of this text with the Coptic discloses a lacuna in the Greek text just where III Corinthians appears in the Coptic and just large enough to contain it. This would seem to be evidence for a Greek text containing III Corinthians; but it is still an argument from silence and hence not a very strong one. The one sure piece of evidence we possess that III Corinthians did, at least at one time, form part of the Acts of Paul is our fifth century Coptic manuscript. It remains, however that in the Bodmer Papyrus we have the earliest extant manuscript of III Corinthians and there it is quite on its own. This concludes our witnesses to the Acts of Paul.

We have the following witnesses to III Corinthians:

Aphraates "the Persian Sage" is our first Syrian witness. His main work "the Demonstrations" was produced between 337-345 A.D. In his Homily XXIII he cites 3:15 of III Corinthians, "And the apostle witnessed that (Our Lord) Jesus Christ was from the seed of David's house through the Holy Spirit." He also refers to 3:8 and cites both passages as of genuine apostolic worth.⁴

¹Eusebius H.E. 3.25.

²Carl Schmidt, Acta Pauli(Leipsig:J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1905), pp.1,2.

³Carl Schmidt and Wilhelm Schubart, Praxeis Paulou (Gluckstadt und Hamburg: J.J. Augustin, 1935), p.85.

⁴Aphr. Homily XXIII.

Ephraem (306-373 A.D.) that great exponent of orthodox Syrian Christianity deals with III Corinthians in his Commentary on the Pauline Epistles (only extant in Armenian).¹ In that work III Corinthians follows II Corinthians, and is obviously accepted as canonical. Surely this fourth century Syrian Saint would have been loathe to esteem this writing so highly, if he knew it to be part of the inauthentic Acts of Paul.

Armenian witnesses indicate the presence of this writing in their scriptures. There are clear references too in the "History of Agathangelos", a fifth century writing. Agathangelos was apparently the nom de plume for the royal secretary of Tiridates II, King of Armenia. In his Catechism we read, "because he was an evil ruler he wished to make himself God, he laid hands on them and conquered all men".² This direct quote from III Corinthians 3:11, is followed by one from 3:13. No distinction was made between these passages and canonical scripture- mute testimony to the exalted position of this writing in the Armenian church.

In the fifth century Bishop Eznik quotes 3:11 in his Tract against the sects,³ as does Theodore Khertenvor Abbot Otnaragat two centuries later when he confronted the Marigomenser with their heretical teaching.⁴

Mekhithat d'Airivank wrote a "Chronological History" in the thirteenth century in which he cites a biblical canon which he discovered in the writing of a Jean le Diacre of the eleventh century. In that canonical list III Corinthians follows II Corinthians, further evidence of its esteemed status. Jean Zohrab's great edition of the Armenian Bible of Venice in 1805 still contained that writing.

The earliest extant latin manuscripts of III Corinthians are from the tenth century. In 1890 S. Berger found a latin bible in the Ambrosian Library of Milan in which III Corinthians followed the

¹ Paul Vetter, "Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief neu ubersetzt und nach seiner Entstehung untersucht," Theologische Quartalschrift, LXXII (1890), 610-39.

² Agathange, Histoire des Armeniens (Edition critique: Tiflis, 1909), p.147.

³ S. Lyonnet, Les Origines de la Verion Armenienne et la Diatessaron (Biblica et Orientalia, Nr.13; Roma Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1950), p.75.

⁴ Wilhelm F. Rinck, Das Sendschreiben du Korinther an den Apostel Paulus und das dritte Sendschreiben Pauli an die Korinther (Heidelberg: C.F. Winter, 1823), p. 16.

Epistle to the Hebrews, in other words at the end of the Pauline epistles. Berger informs us that he filled in the lacunae of the text from the Armenian. It is known as "M", and lacks the historical narrative section.¹

Von Bratke came upon the second latin manuscript in 1891 at Laon. It was part of a Codex of one hundred and fourty-one pages, and was in a very defective state. The lacunae of this manuscript, were also filled from the Armenian text. In this thirteenth century text, now known as "L", the historical narrative is absent. III Corinthians is placed at the end of the biblical writings, the normal place for writings judged to be inauthentic.²

Two fragmentary latin manuscripts of III Corinthians were found by de Bruyne in the same year 1908. The first of these came from the National Library of Paris, and hence received the label "P". It contains only Paul's reply to the elders. De Bruyne considered it to be a better text than "M", and dated it in the eleventh century.³ The second fragmentary text "Z" was part of four pages of a bible discovered in Zurich and coming from the tenth century.⁴ This manuscript lacked Paul's reply to the Corinthian elders.

In 1952, H. Boese, discovered in Berlin what is now known as the Hamilton Codex.⁵ It contained almost a complete bible in the vulgate text. In this "B" text from the thirteenth century third Corinthians follows Second, and it lacks the historical narrative. Thus we have three latin manuscripts M, P and Z, from the tenth century and L and B from the thirteenth. How or where these five latin manuscripts were first written we have no way of knowing, and

¹ A. Carriere and S. Berger, "La Correspondance apocryphe Saint Paul et des Corinthiens" Revue de theologie et de Philosophie, p. 341.

² S. Von Bratke, "Ein Zweiter lateinischer Text dew apokryphen Briefwechsels zwischen dem Apostel Paulus und den Korinthern," Theologische Literatur Zeitung, Vol. XVII (November 1892), Col. 585-588.

³ D. de Bruyne, "Un Nouveau Manuscrit de la troisieme lettre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens," Revue Benedictine, XXV (1908).0431-2.

⁴ D. de Bruyne, "Un quatrieme Manuscrit latin de la correspondance apocryphe de S. Paul avec les Corinthiens," Revue Benedictine, XLV (1933), 189.

⁵ H. Boese, "Uber eine bisher unbekannte Handschrift des Briefwechsels zwischen Paulus und den Korinthern," Zeitschrift Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952/3), 66-76.

although the Roman Catholic Church never accepted III Corinthians as canonical it is rather interesting to see the variety of places it occurs in the latin bibles.

As far as Coptic witnesses are concerned, I need only remind you that we do have a fifth century Coptic manuscript of the Acts of Paul in which III Corinthians is found.

Michel Testuz published the Bodmer Papyrus Manuscript X-XIII in 1959. Martin Bodmer has disclosed nothing as to the circumstances surrounding its discovery. The text is well preserved, needing only some emendation at 3:11 where it lacks half of a verse which is found in all the best manuscripts (AEKBMP), and in which verses 14, 22, and 33 of this same letter are missing. Testuz dates it as late second or early third century. Here, then, we possess the earliest known manuscript of III Corinthians, and it exists independently.

This concludes our survey of the witnesses to these writings. What have we found? Simply this, church fathers from the first four centuries reflect an awareness of the Acts of Paul, and a common conviction that it is apocryphal. Of the extant manuscripts of that writing only the fifth century Coptic manuscript included III Corinthians.

Our witnesses to III Corinthians reveal that both the Syrian and Armenian churches accepted it as canonical, the former until the fifth century when a new translation from the Greek omitted it, the latter throughout the centuries. The Latin witnesses reveal an amazing tolerance for this document even though most place it in the inauthentic category. We lack latin witnesses prior to the tenth century. Above all we have in the Bodmer text our earliest known manuscript of III Corinthians. When we turn to other sources of evidence, as we now do, we will find further support for the position that III Corinthians first lived an independent existence, and only later became incorporated in the apocryphal Acts of Paul.

Our second concern was the question of the theological relationship between III Corinthians and the apocryphal Acts of Paul. This we will do very briefly. The same concept of God illuminates the two writings. Such terms as the Creator, the Omnipotent, and the Father are common to both. The one significant difference in this area is the tendency of the Acts of Paul to equate Christ with God. "My God Jesus Christ" is one expression of this and "Christ Jesus the God" is another. This terminology is not found in III Corinthians.

When Christ is referred to in these writings there is again a significant difference. The Acts of Paul stresses how Christ delivers us from sin (a word used but once in III Corinthians 3:10). III Corinthians speaks rather of Christ coming in the flesh to deliver us from the "Archon". We will hear more of this later.

Celibacy is so stressed in the Acts of Paul that it becomes the "sine qua non" of the Christian life. Only the chaste will experience the resurrection. Paul's preaching is described in these terms, "he defraudeth the young men of wives and the maidens of husbands, saying, Ye have no resurrection otherwise, except ye continue chaste, and defile not the flesh but keep it pure".¹ This strain does not appear in III Corinthians, nor does the emphasis on works which is characteristic of the Acts of Paul. Granting that the two works were written for different purposes - the Acts for edification, III Corinthians for polemical warfare-sufficient significant theological differences are evident so that it is difficult to see III Corinthians happily incorporated in the Acts of Paul. Vetter,² working on these texts prior to the turn of the century, recognized these differences and suggested that some author had gleaned antignostic material from the Acts and produced it separately as III Corinthians. In our judgment the differing christologies, the emphasis on celibacy, works, and sin in the Acts of Paul make it highly unlikely that it provided the native habitat for III Corinthians.

Our third concern was the nature of the heretical teaching as outlined in III Corinthians. Can this be related to known forms of teaching, and can the date of such be of some help in determining whether III Corinthians antedated the Acts of Paul? In 1:10-15 we have a summary of the heretical teaching: it is not necessary to heed the prophets; God is not Omnipotent; there is no resurrection of the flesh; God did not create man; the Lord did not come in the flesh, nor was he born of Mary; the world was made by angels. A clear picture of this teaching emerges. It is a cosmological dualism, strongly tinged with docetism, and possessing a virulent bias against the Old Testament. We will look at each element of this teaching; but not necessarily in the order in which they appear.

¹M.R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford at the Clarendon Press 1924), p. 275.

²P. Vetter, Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief (Tubingen: Universitäts-festschrift 1894), p. 13.

The source of this teaching is not difficult to locate. Simon of Gitta, whom the early fathers describe as "the father of all heresies", speaks of "the angels who formed the world."¹ Menander, another native of Samaria held the same doctrine.² Saturninus or Satornilus of Antioch attributes the creation of the world and everything in it to "seven angels". He also adds that these seven special angels, of whom the God of the Jews is one, created man as well.³ Basilides, who began his work in Syria and moved to Egypt, taught that the last of his three hundred and sixty-five evolving heavens was inhabited "by the angels who made the world whose leader is the God of the Jews".⁴ Carpocrates, who did most of his work in Egypt, makes the same statement.⁵ Cerinthus and Cerdon (the latter of whom began his work in Syria and moved to Rome) do not ascribe creation to the angels but to a power or powers not the first God but one removed far from him. And Marcion taught that the good God was the father of Christ. The latter's function was to save man from the just God who created the world. Thus we seem to be in the presence of a Syro-Samaritan stream of thought in which angelic creation played a central role.

Ephraem attributed this heretical teaching to Bardesanes, who was born in 154 in Edessa, and brought up at the court of King Abgar VI. Bardesanes too taught that the world was made by "one of the angels", according to Ephraem's comment on III Corinthians 1:15. When commenting on 3:19 he accuses Bardesanes of ascribing the creation of the heavens and the earth to the "archon".⁶ III Corinthians never ascribes creation to the "archon"; his was a different task that of enslaving mankind. Yet, it needs to be remembered, that much of the heretical teaching of the day subscribed to the conviction that to create the world was in fact to enslave man. The relationship between the angels who made the world (1:5) and the "archon" is never really spelled out in III Corinthians.

¹Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, i.23.3.

²Ibid i.23.5.

³Ibid i.24.1.

⁴Ibid i.25.1.

⁵Ibid i.25.1.

⁶P. Vetter, *Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief* (Tubingen: Universitäts-festschrift 1894), p. 13.

In the heretical teaching described in III Corinthians the creation of man and the world are both attributed to the angels. In the teaching outlined above only that of Saturninus meets that condition. At any rate we have ascertained that such teaching was abroad in the early second century.

The Bodmer text of III Corinthians does not contain the first part of 3:11 "but the ruler (archon) because he is unjust" which is found, as indicated, in the AEKBMP texts. The text has so much support, however, that we felt with Testuz and others, that this was an omission on the part of the Bodmer scribe. It contains the only reference to the "archon" with whom we must now deal. Into his biography in the Pauline writings, or in Apocalyptic thought in general, we cannot venture now. Suffice it to say that in much gnostic thought a firm equation is drawn between matter and evil. Salvation thus becomes redemption from this world of matter which the "archon" or "demiurge" has created. Our information about the "archon" in III Corinthians is skimpy indeed. There is much that our text does not tell us. How does he relate to the "evil one" (3:2) whose pernicious doctrines spread like wildfire? Or, again, how does he relate to the angels who created the world - are they his agents? However, our text, does supply some information about him. He is unjust, wants to be God, and binds all flesh for his own pleasure (3:11). In and through the flesh of Christ he was defeated, became convinced that he was not God, and lost his sovereignty (3:15). The "demiurgical conceit", as Hans Jonas describes it, in which the "archon" or "demiurge" believes that he is God and painfully learns to the contrary appears in the Ophite system where Jaldabaoth (the archon) boasts "I am the Father and God, and there is none above me."¹ Hippolytus describes the same element in the teaching of Basilides, "For there ruled the great Archon, whose dominion extends to the firmament, who believes that he is the only God, and that there is nothing above him."² These references tally with the description of the "archon" in III Corinthians- he too has to learn that he is not God. Once again we see an idea contained in III Corinthians, appearing as common coinage in some heretical teaching of the early second century. We do not yet seem to be in the presence of what we know to be later Valentian Gnostic developments such as "emanations", "pleroma", "sophia", the different categories of men etc. Rather this thinking seems closer to the distinction of the good God and the just God of Marcion. We cannot rule out the possibility that it was indeed the teaching of Bardesanes as Ephraem insisted. Indeed it seems to coincide with it for Eusebius tells us that Bardesanes was a Syrian writer, attached first to the school of Valentinus, but who later condemned and refuted the Valentinian mythology.³

¹Irenaeus *op. cit.*; i.30.6.

²Hipp. *Ref.* vii.25.4.

³Eusebius *H.E.* 4.30.

Whereas the heretical teaching identified above bore an inherent and implicit antagonism to the Old Testament with its denial of God as Creator and of his Omnipotence, the bias becomes explicit in the words "it is not necessary to follow the prophets". Paul's reply (3:10) stresses the significant role of the prophets in God's redemptive work, thus refuting the argument. Hans Jonas comments on the character of the teaching from the Syro-Samaritan area with the words "One recurring feature is the assertion that the prophecies and the Mosaic law issued from the world-ruling angels, among whom the Jewish God is prominent."¹ This takes little documenting. Simon of Gitta taught, "Moreover, the prophets uttered their predictions under the inspiration of those angels who formed the world..."² Saturninus is reported as teaching, "Some of the prophecies were uttered by those angels who made the world, and some by Satan..."³ Irenaeus wrote of Basilides, "He declares, too, that the prophecies were derived from those powers who were the makers of the world..."⁴ R.M. Grant commenting on the writings of these three men points out, "All three agree that some savior descended in order to defeat the angels, and that when he descended he did so", and this defeat brought "the power of the Jewish law to an end".⁵ Thus when Simon and Cleobius proclaim that "it is not necessary to heed the prophets", they are in a long, if not worthy, tradition.

The strong docetic element in the heretical teaching needs to be underlined. Simon and Cleobius deny that the Lord came in the flesh (1:13); that he was born of Mary (1:14); or that there is any fleshly resurrection (1:11). Irenaeus enumerates three types of docetic heresy.⁶ First the type that considers Jesus as a mere receptacle for Christ, who came upon him at baptism and left before the crucifixion. J.B. Lightfoot⁷

¹Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 133.

²Irenaeus, op. cit; i.23.3.

³Ibid i.24.2.

⁴Ibid i.24.5.

⁵R.M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 16.

⁶Irenaeus op. cit; iii.16.1.

⁷J.B. Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers (London: Macmillan and Co., 1885) Pt.11,1, 364-5.

associated the name Cerinthus with this teaching. For the latter there was no difficulty about Jesus being truly born, living in the flesh, and truly dying; for his docetism was solely related to Christ, not Jesus. Nowhere in III Corinthians does this type of docetism appear.

Second, there is a form of Docetism which considers the whole life of Jesus as an apparition and not real. Simon, Saturninus, and Marcion seem to be connected with this strand of teaching which resembles the teaching refuted in III Corinthians. Simon spoke of Jesus "appearing a man among men, when he was not a man, and seemed to have suffered in Judea, when he had not suffered".¹ Curiously III Corinthians never mentions the suffering of Christ. Both Irenaeus² and Hippolytus³ report Saturninus teaching "that the Saviour was without body and without figure, but that in semblance he appeared as a man". Lightfoot wrote "Marcion was a pure Docetic. He too postulated a phantom body of Christ. With the human birth of the Saviour he did not concern himself at all".⁴ We know, too, how Marcion expurgated the Lukan birth story and had Jesus appear on earth as a grown man.

Third, is the type of docetism which Irenaeus related to Valentinus - a type which said that Jesus Christ had a visible body and was capable of suffering, but the body was neither material, nor of Mary, "Christ came through her without receiving anything from her". Bardesanes may be related to this type for he uses the same phrase in his comment in his commentary on 1:14- at least according to Ephraem. This type of docetism has some relevance for our quest, but the second type seems much more closely related to it.

Lightfoot⁵ sees Basilides as teaching a fourth type of docetism in which Simon the Cyrenian became the substitute for Christ on the cross and was crucified. This line of thinking is not reflected in III Corinthians.

¹Irenaeus, op. cit., i.23.3.

²Ibid i.24.2.

³Hippolytus, op. cit., vii.16.

⁴Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 366.

⁵Ibid p.364-366.

From the above survey of the docetic element we can see that it emanates from the Syro-Samaritan area, and from teachers such as Simon, Saturninus, and Marcion. Once again the chronological period is the first half of the second century.

We submit that the evidence presented above is good grounds for challenging the commonly held view that III Corinthians was originally part of the Acts of Paul. Some of the reasons which have led us to affirm the prior and independent existence of III Corinthians are as follows:

1. The existence of the Bodmer Greek text of III Corinthians is an independent edition dating from late second or early third century A.D. Further this text has no connecting historical narrative such as would have been necessary if it had been incorporated into a larger work.
2. The canonical history of III Corinthians reveals its acceptance in the Syria canon in the early centuries, only to be displaced in the fifth century, when a new translation of the New Testament from the Greek. It is still accepted as part of the Armenian canon. Is it likely that the Syrian and Armenian fathers would have extracted a portion from the Acts of Paul, known to be inauthentic, and accepted it into their canon?
3. The fact of the existence of III Corinthians in a fifth century Coptic manuscript of the Acts of Paul cannot be considered to deny the possibility of a previous isolated existence such as we find in the Bodmer Papyrus.
4. As Michel Testuz points out the five Latin manuscripts are helpful to the view put forward in this paper for they are copies of different works. MLPB are manuscripts of the bible with no need of the connecting narrative. Z is a fragmentary copy of the Acts of Paul and is furnished with the narrative section. So we have witnesses of III Corinthians in two traditions, textually parallel, but different.
5. The style and purpose of the Acts of Paul and III Corinthians, they are "bathed in a different atmosphere"; the former written for purposes of edification, the latter for theological warfare.
6. The emphasis of the Acts of Paul on asceticism, celibacy, and works - elements finding no place in III Corinthians, helps underline its "orphan" or "alien" existence in the larger document.

7. The proven existence of the heretical type of teaching promulgated by Simon and Cleobius and widely circulating in Syro-Samaria in the first half of the second century A.D., is another piece of cumulative evidence in favor of the earlier existence of the document we know as III Corinthians.

Hence, the appearance of the Bodmer Papyrus of III Corinthians in 1959 has necessitated the reversal of a previously held opinion. Such is the nature of scholarship.

Manuscripts of III Corinthians

| | <u>Date</u> | <u>Contains</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| A Armenian | 4-5 C. | 1,2,3. | Unknown |
| E Syriac -Ephraem | 5 C. | 1,2,3. | after II Cor. before Galatians |
| K Coptic | 5-6 C. | 1,2,3. | in Acts of Paul |
| M Latin - Milan | 10 C. | 1 & 3. | after Hebrews |
| L Latin - Laon | 13 C. | 1 & 3. | end of bible |
| P Latin - Paris | 10-11 C. | 3 | unknown |
| Z Latin - Zurich | 10 C. | 1 & 2. | unknown |
| B Latin - Berlin | 13 C. | 1 & 3. | end of bible |
| Bodmer Greek | 2-3 C. | 1 & 3. | isolated |

1 - Letter of the Corinthian Elders to Paul

2 - Connecting historical narrative

3 - Letter of Paul to the Corinthian Elders

The Corinthians to Paul

Translation

1. Stephen and the elders with him, Dephnus, Eubulus Theophilus, and Zenon, to Paul who is in the Lord, greeting.
2. Two men have come to Corinth, Simon and Cleobius by name, who are destroying the faith of some with corrupt teaching;
3. test them for yourself.
4. For we have never heard such words from you, or the others;
5. Nevertheless we keep what we have received from you and them.
6. Since the Lord, in that you still live, has had compassion upon us, that we might hear from you again,
7. come in person, or reply by letter.¹
8. We believe, as it was revealed to Theonas, that the Lord delivered you from lawless hands.
9. Such are the things they speak and teach:
10. it is not necessary to heed the prophets;
11. God is not omnipotent;
12. there is no resurrection of the flesh;
13. men were not created by God;
14. the Lord neither came in the flesh nor was born of Mary;
15. the world was not created by God; but by angels.
16. So, brother, come here as quickly as possible, that the Corinthian church may remain without offence, and the folly of these men be revealed. Farewell in the Lord.

¹The latter part of this verse is found in verse eight; but rearrangement was necessary for smoother translation.

Paul to the Corinthians (Concerning the Flesh)

Translation

1. Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus, in much tribulation, to the brethren at Corinth, greeting.
2. I am not surprised that the doctrine of the Evil One makes such rapid progress,
3. for this reason the Lord Christ will suddenly make his appearance, although rejected by those who counterfeit his words.
4. As for me, from the very beginning, I delivered to you what I had received from those who were apostles before me and were with Jesus Christ the whole time;
5. namely, that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of Mary, of Davidic seed, of the Holy Spirit, sent to her from heaven by the Father;
6. that he might come forth into the world and deliver all flesh by his own flesh, and raise us up from the dead bodily, as he has shown himself an example;
7. and that man was created by the Father;
8. therefore, even while he was perishing he was sought out, to be quickened through adoption.
9. In fact, the God of all things, the Omnipotent, He who made the heavens and the earth, sent prophets to the Jews first to withdraw them from their sins,
10. for He wished to save the House of Israel; having divided the Spirit of Christ He sent (it) to the prophets, who preached the true religion for a long time.
11. (But the Prince, because he is unjust, and wished to be) God, laid violent hands upon them and bound all human flesh for his pleasure.¹
12. The Omnipotent (God), however, because He was just, and did not wish to disavow His own creation,
13. sent the Spirit through fire to Mary the Galilean,

¹Testuz, *op. cit.*, *Papyrus Bodmer X-XII*, p. 36. This suggested interpolation, which the writer has adopted from Testuz, is supported by manuscripts AEKBMP.

- 14,¹15. that the Evil One having been conquered through this very perishing flesh by which he ruled, might be convinced that he was not God.
16. For by his own body Christ Jesus saved all flesh,
17. to manifest in his own body a temple of righteousness,
18. by which we are set free.
19. These men who reject the providence of God, saying that the heavens and the earth and all that is therein are not the work of the Father, are, therefore, children of wrath, not children of righteousness;
20. they have the cursed faith of the serpent.
21. Avoid such and flee their teaching.
- 22,23.²
24. There is no resurrection for those who tell you there is no resurrection of the flesh,
25. they do not believe the one who thus rose.
26. Neither do they know, O Corinthians, the example of the grain of wheat or of other grain, how you cast (it) naked into the ground, it dies there, then is raised again in one body and clothed by the will of God.
27. So that it is not only the body which was sown which is raised, but a greater, more upright, and blessed one.
28. But, if we may not use the parable of the seeds,
29. You know that Jonah, the son of Amathia, because he did not want to preach at Nineveh, was swallowed by a sea monster,
30. and (how) after three days and three nights, God heard Jonah praying from the depths of Hades, and no part of him was harmed, not even his hair, nor his eyelashes,
31. how much more, O Ye of little faith, will he raise, as he was raised, those who have believed in Christ Jesus.
32. And if, when the Israelites threw a corpse upon the bones of Elisha the prophet, it was raised up, how much more will you,

¹This verse does not appear in the Bodmer text.

²These verses do not appear in the Bodmer text.

having been cast upon the body, bones, and spirit of Christ,
be raised up with sound flesh on that day.

- 33.
34. If you accept any other (teaching), trouble me no more,
35. for I wear bonds on my hands to obtain Christ, and marks on
my body that I may attain to the resurrection of the ~~dead~~.
36. If anyone abides in the rule which he received through the
blessed prophets and the holy gospel; he will receive a reward.
37. But if anyone transgresses these (teachings), the fire is with
him and those who associate with such godless men,
38. who are the offspring of vipers,
39. whom flee by the power of the Lord.
40. And may peace be with you.

II ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS

(a) Fresh Light on William Wrede

All the criticism directed against Wrede and his hypotheses have only lessened his importance minimally. The fact remains unchallenged that Wrede's historical-critical investigations led to new knowledge that in our day still determines the direction of much New Testament research.

S. MacLean Gilmour, Newton Centre, Mass.

(b) The Transmission of Semitic Words in the Gospel Tradition

This paper seeks to examine a series of eleven or twelve passages in the Gospels in which Aramaic or Hebrew words have been preserved.

The transmission of this material in the period of written Gospels is first studied, then an attempt is made, using form-critical techniques, to determine the motives which led to the preservation of the Semitic words during the period of oral transmission. The words are analysed as healing formulae, liturgical formulae, personal names, controversy material, narrative and teaching.

In the light of this survey the question is raised as to whether or not the survival in a narrative of a Semitic word is a guarantee of the historicity of the incident. This question is finally related to recent discussion concerning the aims and methods of a "new quest of the historical Jesus."

Charles H. H. Scobie, Pierrefonds, Quebec.

(c) L'Universalisme Religieux Dans Les Chapitres 40-55 Du Livre D'Isaïe

Plusieurs études récentes sur le Deutéro-Isaïe minimisent à l'excès l'universalisme religieux qui s'exprime pour la première fois dans ses pages (cf. travaux de DE BOER, MARTIN-ACHARD, ORLINSKY, SNAITH). Si toutefois on reprend l'analyse littéraire d'Is., 40-55, on peut constater que les différentes couches rédactionnelles de ce vaste ensemble traduisent des attitudes assez différentes à l'égard des nations païennes: malgré bon nombre d'oracles nettement revanchards, la strate fondamentale du "Livre de la Consolation" laisse déjà pointer un dessein de salut embrassant tout le monde païen, et selon lequel

Israël jouera un rôle-clé en témoignant (collectivement) des merveilles opérées pour lui par la fidélité de Yhwh. Dans les deux premiers "Chants du Serviteur", les préoccupations universalistes passent décidément au premier plan, et le Serviteur est envoyé enseigner aux païens "le droit", c'est-à-dire la Loi, de Yahweh. Déjà dans le quatrième Chant, oeuvre d'un disciple, l'universalisme semble mis en veilleuse; deux additions aux "Chants du Serviteur", Is., 42: 5-9 et 49: 7-11(12), basées sur des oracles deutéro-israéliens primitivement adressés à Israël, remettront clairement l'accent sur la restauration du peuple de Dieu, sans sacrifier pour autant l'acquis des "Chants". Enfin, une autre addition plus tardive (51: 4-6) réaffirmera fortement le dessein universel de Yahweh, mais passera délibérément sous silence la mission de son Serviteur.

Paul-Eugene Dion, O.P., Ottawa, Ontario.

(d) Jeremiah 50 and 51: Grand Finale Or Irrelevant Appendix?

First, an outline of scholarly appraisals of these oracles will be presented, with particular reference to Budde, "Ueber die Capitel 50 and 51 des Buches Jeremiah", Jahrbuecher fuer deutsche Theologie, 23 (1878), Schwally, "Die Reden des Buches Jeremia gegen die Heiden", ZAW, 8 (1888), and Bardtke, "Jeremia der Fremdvoelkerprophet", ZAW, 53 (1935) and 54 (1936), in addition to a brief statement concerning present evaluations.

Next, a form-critical overview will be given, in which the various literary types will be indicated, and an attempt will be made to ascertain their place in the history of these Gattungen.

On the basis of the previous, the place of these oracles in the Jeremian oracle collection (chapters 46-51) will be considered, as well as their relationship to the whole of the book of Jeremiah, in which attention will be paid to the question as to why the position of these oracles is diametrically opposed to the record of Jeremiah's consistent counsel that Judah submit to the power of Nebuchadrezzar.

Finally, the significance of the oracles against Babylon will be assessed in the light of their Sitz im Leben and Sitz im Kultus.

Martin Kessler, Potsdam, New York.

(e) Was Ibn Ezra A Bible Critic? A Critique And Revision Of The Traditional View

Abraham ibn Ezra, the celebrated commentator of the 12th century, is regarded by many to be the father of modern Bible-criticism. The first to propose this view and popularise it is Spinoza in his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, mainly with reference to Ibn Ezra's cryptic remarks on Genesis 12:6 and Deuteronomy 1:2. It is a view still generally held, witness O. Eissfeldt's Introduction to the Old Testament.

I propose to show that: a) Spinoza's interpretation was already anticipated by several centuries; b) internal evidence from Ibn Ezra's commentary refutes this interpretation; c) there are several, more plausible alternative interpretations or approaches to the problem; and d) there is sufficient evidence to indicate that Ibn Ezra's commentary has been tampered with and is in dire need of a thorough scholarly edition.

J. Immanuel Schochet, Downsview, Ontario.

(f) One Family Of Semitic Roots

Most Semitic roots are either secondary or tertiary, consisting of both bases and determinatives. A family of such roots consists of those that have the same base. The roots of the RP family are identified and their basic meaning established.

F. S. North, Long Island, New York.

(g) Expectations Concerning The Future In The Third And Fourth Gospels

It has long been held by some that in St. John's Gospel the expectation of an early parousia is modified, and that the author begins to adjust Christian thinking to the possibility that this present age may continue for some time. More recently Congelmann has claimed that a similar tendency can be detected in St. Luke. This paper compares Luke and John in this respect, and maintains that they did begin, whether consciously or not, to make this adjustment in some measure. In different ways they both put a slightly increased emphasis on the believer's present possession as compared with his hope re the future. It is claimed that material for this adjustment lay ready to hand in earlier Christian thought and in some words of Jesus.

Frank H. Allen, London, Ontario.

(h) The Psalter Arranged For Worship In The United Church Of Canada

The different roles of Scripture and Liturgy. The justification of the Psalter as contemporary Liturgy. The embarrassments of the Psalter as Liturgy. The freedom to select and to amend. The language of a contemporary Psalter. The liturgical patterns adopted. Some sample selections.

S. B. Frost, Montreal, Quebec.

(i) Eis Ten Hypakoen Tou Christou

Modern translations of eis ten hypakoen tou Christou in II Corinthians compared with those of earlier periods; implications for Pauline theology.

Helen I. Milton, Windsor, Ontario.

Read by title:

- (1) The Significance Of The Angels In Hebrews 1-2 - Charles P. Anderson,
Vancouver, British Columbia.
- (2) 'Humility' As An Aspect Of Old Testament Religion - Peter F. Gilbert,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

The 37th annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held concurrently with the 30th annual meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, June 9-10, 1969, at York University, Toronto, Ontario. Also meeting at this time were the Canadian Society of Church History and the Canadian Theological Society.

The business meeting was opened by the President, Principal George Taylor, at 4:30 p.m., June 9, 1969.

The minutes of the 1968 meeting were adopted.

The following members had sent regrets at not being able to attend: William O. Amy, George A. Cheatle, Jr., Robert M. Clark, Guy Couturier, P.F. Gilbert, L.C. Gilbertson, Julien Harbey, David W. Hay, Eldon R. Hay, Sidney Jellicoe, H.W. Lang, Andre Legault, M.R.B. Lovesey, R. Sheldon MacKenzie, James MacLean, John Macpherson, H.J. McAvoy, Vernon E. McEachern, R.E. Osborne, W.C. Paisley, Ulysse E. Pare, J. Brian Peckham, George Ramsey, Donald B. Redford, Wolfgang W.W. Roth, G. Strothotte, G. Parke-Taylor, Norman Threinen, Lawrence E. Toombs, Allison A. Trites, Arthur Van Seters.

Professors Williams, Taylor and Brunet were appointed to the Nominating Committee.

Professors Toombs and Van Seters were appointed Auditors.

The Secretary and Professor Beare outlined developments in SBL and study of religion generally in North America today. Establishment of a Council for the Study of Religion in the USA was described and implications for Canada brought out.

Relationship among the various societies in Canada, including the relatively new CSSR was discussed. A motion was made and carried that we do everything possible to continue to meet concurrently and also try to find ways of increasing cooperation among the Societies in Canada, including publications.

The November 1969 meeting of SBL in Toronto was discussed. A motion was made and carried authorizing expenditure up to \$200.00 for convention costs and entertainment.

John Van Seters presented the auditor's report indicating that the books are in good order. The report was adopted and is included here as information. -

| | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Carried forward | \$274.35 | |
| 1968 dues | 70.00 | |
| 1969 dues to June 7 | 131.00 | |
| <u>Canadian Biblical Studies</u> | | |
| Sales | 16.00 | |
| Interest | 5.97 | |
| | \$497.32 | \$497.32 |

\$497.32

Expenses

Secretary help \$ 25.00
 Sub-sectional meetings 100.00
 Mailing & printing etc. 76.22

\$201.22 \$201.22

Bank balance as of June 6, 1969 \$296.10

The following new members were received:

- Rev. Dr. John Berridge, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.
- Dr. John Brizendine, Canton, New York.
- Mr. Peter C. Craigie, Hamilton, Ontario.
- Professor Mitchell, Toronto, Ontario.
- Mr. U.E. Pare, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.
- Professor Cyril Williams, Ottawa, Ontario.

Member noted with sadness the passing of the Rev. Roy Pounder, who for so many years contributed actively to the society.

The members assembled also desired to send a letter of greeting to Professor John Macpherson, former President and for some years Secretary-Treasurer.

Professor R. J. Williams presented the report of the Nominating Committee resulting in the election of the following Executive Committee:

- President- Professor Robert F. Schnell,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.
- Vice-President- Professor Robert E. Osborne,
Ottawa, Ontario.
- Secretary-Treasurer- Professor Robert C. Culley,
Faculty of Divinity,
McGill University,
Montreal, Quebec.
- Members-at-Large- Professor Charles Scobie, Montreal
Principal George Taylor, Winnipeg.

Respectfully submitted,
 Norman E. Wagner,
 Secretary-Treasurer.