



Type: Journal Article

Evangelium Quadraginta Dierum

Author(s): Hugh Nibley

Source: *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (March 1966), pp. 1-24

Published by: Brill

Abstract: No abstract available.

EVANGELIUM QUADRAGINTA DIERUM

BY

HUGH NIBLEY

While those who ponder the historical relevance of Acts 1:3 concern themselves almost exclusively with the evidence of the canonical writings, we now possess in the early apocryphal texts, both those recently discovered and those being reappraised in the light of new findings, an impressive body of evidence that has direct bearing on the problem of the historicity of the Forty Days. It is the purpose of the present study to indicate briefly the nature of this evidence.

The theme of the 40 Days has always been a disturbing one. For many scholars the possibility of such an event as that indicated in Acts 1:3 is not even to be discussed,¹ for others such things are tolerable only as myths,² while some are frank enough to admit that they simply don't like the story.³ It is astonishing how many writers on the Resurrection pass by the 40-Day interval in studied silence,⁴ and indeed churchmen since Clement and Origen have

¹ "... we are bound to conclude that such an occurrence is not only improbable but impossible," J. G. Davies, *He Ascended into Heaven* (New York, 1958), pp. 56, 54ff. Cf. E. Grässer, in *Theol. Rundschau*, 26 (1960), 101. "So hat die Gemeinde . . . gedichtet und gewoben . . .," W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen, 1926), pp. 74, 26ff.

² To be taken "seriously, but not literally", M. J. Suggs, quoting R. Niebuhr, in *Encounter*, 24 (1963), 18f. ". . . das können wir zwar nicht zusammendenken, aber die Evangelisten konnten es," D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 9th ed. (Leipzig, 1864), II, 151f. ". . . we can only know Jesus clad in the garb of myth," J. Jeremias, in *Expository Times*, 69 (1958), 334f.

³ "Half of it I like, and half of it I don't," P. Scherer, in *Interpretation*, 12 (1958), 56. "The point is, do we or do we not like the answers?" M. E. Dahl, *The Resurrection of the Body* (London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 92.

⁴ E.g., Severus of Antioch fails to mention the 40 Days in his exhaustive treatise on the Resurrection, *Homil.* 77, in *Patrol. Oriental.*, 16: 794–862, as does W. Bousset, *op. cit.*, and M. E. Dahl, *op. cit.*, also F. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, *Commentary on Acts* (London, 1939), and E. Grässer in his long survey, *op. cit.*, pp. 92–167. Even J. F. Walvoord's carefully prepared list of 17 post-resurrection appearances of Jesus fails to mention the 40 Days, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 117 (1960), 298–300.

employed all the arts of rhetoric and logic to evade its crass literalism.⁵ It is claimed that the story is insufficiently attested,⁶ or that the language⁷ or the thought-forms of the ancients elude us,⁸ or that the writers themselves are confused – e.g., in maintaining that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom” while asserting “the very opposite” in the doctrine of the resurrection.⁹ We are often reminded today that we are here dealing with prefigured types and images that need not be taken literally, 40 itself being a well-known symbolic number in sacred writings.¹⁰

But on the other hand, Luke may well have chosen the round number precisely because everybody knew of like 40-day periods of spiritual discipline and preparation;¹¹ ancient thought-forms can be checked by the words and behavior of an Ignatius, willing to give his life to show how *he* interpreted the 40 Days;¹² and contradictions may well have their source in the minds of readers rather than writers – the “flesh and blood” issue, in fact, seems to be of our own making.¹³

⁵ Discussed by C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, in *T.U.*, 43 (1919), 524ff.

⁶ So J. G. Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–60; S. M. Gilmour, in *J.B.L.*, 81 (1962), 63f.

⁷ Ed. Schweitzer, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 48 (1957), 250–3; B. Holt, in *Encounter*, 24 (1963), 88, 90.

⁸ “It is unlikely that the Apostle’s (Paul’s) logic bore any resemblance to ours, whether deductive or inductive,” M. E. Dahl, *op. cit.*, p. 23; R. Bultmann, *Sitzber. d. Heidelberg Ak. d. Wiss.*, 1960, No. 3, p. 24; J. G. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 57; G. Lindeskog, in *Novum Testamentum*, 5 (1961), 144.

⁹ K. Lake, *Introduction to the N.T.* (New York, 1937), pp. 46f. John and Paul were both confused about post-resurrectional realities, S. Gilmour, *op. cit.*, pp. 62f.

¹⁰ Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 52f. On 40 days as a symbol, F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Acts* (in the Moffatt N.T. Commentary, 1931), V, 2; P. Miguel, in *Theology Digest*, 9 (1961), 68. See below, n. 98.

¹¹ P. A. van Stempvoort, in *N.T. Stud.*, 5 (1958), pp. 33f, 39–41, shows that for Luke the designation of 40 days signifies simply “that the appearances of Christ after Easter had a certain duration”. Most commentators note that the *παρέστησεν ἑαυτόν* of Acts 1:3 indicates occasional appearances over a period of time. Hence it would be impossible and foolish to calculate the exact length of the post-Resurrectional sojourn. Even Hilary, *Comm. in Mt. 3*, in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, 9: 928, is quite aware of the symbolic propriety of the 40-Day expression.

¹² Ignatius, *Ep. ad Trall.*, 10; *ad Smyrn.*, 2–3.

¹³ The contradictions are discussed by C. F. D. Moule, in *Expos. Times*,

Yet even those who accept the reality of the 40-Day Ministry are at a loss to explain it. Plainly the key is missing when serious commentators can describe the event as a mere “example of condescension and friendship” by one who had more urgent business elsewhere,¹⁴ or as a magnanimous recompense for the 40 *hours* of anguish occasioned by the Lord’s absence in the tomb,¹⁵ or as a long lingering farewell,¹⁶ or as “forty-odd days of frustration and inaction”¹⁷, or as a strategic and psychological holding back of forces for a more effective charge on the enemy.¹⁸ It is often claimed that a full 40 days were necessary to demonstrate the reality of resurrected flesh,¹⁹ and if that seems odd (40 seconds were sufficient to convince Thomas) we are told that the Apostles had to *over-learn* their lesson in order to persuade an over-skeptical world.²⁰ The 40 Days are also described as a weaning process, to draw the disciples away from undue attachment to each other,²¹ or to the person of the Lord—lest they be too upset by his departure,²² or, strangest of all, to wean their minds away from corporeal concepts to the pure realms of disembodied intellect.²³ In short, if anything like “The Great Forty Days” occurred, the enormous portent of it, which Luke puts at the very root of the Christian faith, quite escapes the commentators, who view it as an odd and rather “interesting” interlude,²⁴ but admit that in the end we do

68 (1957), 205–9. “The blood is the life”, but specifically the earthly life, Hastings *Encyclop.*, II, 715f, and mention of blood is pointedly omitted in Lk. 24:39, being nowhere ascribed to resurrected beings. Cf. Hippolytus, *Serm. frg.* 1, in *P.G.* 10: 861.

¹⁴ C. a Lapide, *Commentaria in Scripturam sanctam* (Paris, 1877), XVII, 51.

¹⁵ Hildebert, *Serm. de tempore*, c. 48, in *P.L.* 171: 579; a Lapide, *op. cit.*, p. 48f, gives other sources.

¹⁶ a Lapide, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

¹⁷ F. R. Hancock, in *Hibbert's Journal*, 57 (1958/9), 223.

¹⁸ John Chrysostom, *In acta Apost. homil.* 1, in *P.G.* 60: 19f; Theophylactus, *Expos. in acta Apost.*, c. 1, in *P.G.* 125: 508.

¹⁹ St. Leo, *Serm.* 73 (71), in *P.L.* 54: 394–6; Ernardus, *De carnal. operib. Christi*, c. 11, in *P.L.* 189: 1667f; a Lapide, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

²⁰ J. Chrysostom, *l.c.*, and F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (London, 1962), pp. 67f.

²¹ P. Miguel, in *Theology Digest*, 9 (1961), 71.

²² W. Jenks, *Compreh. Comm. on the H. Bible* (Brattleboro, Vt., 1838), V, 4.

²³ Ernardus, *l.c.*; a Lapide, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

²⁴ “The conversations of the Great Forty Days must have been of

not know what Christ did or said during the 40 Days but can only conjecture.²⁵

The argument most confidently put forth today for the post-resurrectional activity of Jesus is the behavior of the Apostles, who before the Resurrection were by all accounts unready not only to preach but even to hear "the things of the kingdom", and yet presently went forth into the world fully laden.²⁶ But is it not remarkable that *nothing* has come down to us from that wonderful time when the Church is supposed to have received all its knowledge and training? Why have we only the opening words of the Lord's discourse, declaring how badly the disciples needed the instruction that followed (Lk. 24:25-27), of which nothing is preserved in the canon (v. 45)? Those early apocryphal writings which purport to tell the rest of the story may not be ignored by the serious student. These writings take a position of conscious resistance to the rising tide of skepticism regarding the reality of the Resurrection.²⁷ Luke had made it perfectly clear at the outset of his history that he was dealing with solid reality; like his other prologue, the story of Zacharias, this one is a forthright factual account that leaves no margin for speculation. Unlike the related themes of the Resurrection and Ascension, the 40 Days has had

intensest interest, yet . . . these things are wrapped about with thickest darkness," *Exposition of the Bible* (Hartford, 1904), V, 302. ". . . a great deal more passed on these most interesting subjects . . . than is anywhere recorded," T. Scott, *Commentary* (London, 1866), Vol. 5, s.v. Acts 1:3.

²⁵ "Just what does a spiritual body do? We do not know," E. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apotres* (Paris, 1926), pp. 7f. ". . . we can only reverently conjecture," C. D. Ellicott, *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Grand Rapids, 1954), Acts 1:3. ". . . nowhere set forth in the Scripture . . . impertinent to inquire and over-bold to specify," a Lapide, *op. cit.*, p. 49. See below, note 105.

²⁶ Discussed by J. Schneider, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 87 (1962), 401ff.

²⁷ *Papyrus Bodmer*, X, 51, 55f: the same in *Acta Pauli*, 7; cf. Polycarp, *Ep. ad Philip.*, 7: 1; *Evang. XII Apostol.*, frgs. 13, 14, in *Patrol. Or.*, 2: 168f; *Gospel of Philip*, 105: 9-14; I Clem., *Ep.*, 24-27; II Clem., *Ep.*, 9, 12; Ignat., *Magnes.*, 11; *Trall.*, 9-10; *Smyrn.*, 2f; *Epist. Barnab.*, 5f; *Hermae Pastor*, *Sim.* 5: 7; *Const. Apostol.*, 6: 26; *Reveln. to Peter*, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 23: 14; *Epist. Apostolorum*, c. 19 (30), 21 (32), 25 (36) (Copt. xii, xiv, xix); *Apoc. Petri*, in M. R. James, *Apocr. N.T.* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 512f; *Apoc. Thomae*, *ibid.*, p. 561; *Apocryphon of James*, 11: 35-12: 17; cf. Athenagoras, *De resurr.*; *Odes of Solomon*, No. 22: 9ff.

no appeal to artists and orators, for it offers the imagination nothing to play with—it is not a subject for discussion but an end of discussion, not something to be proven but the proof itself, the unshakable cornerstone of the edifice Luke is about to construct.²⁸ In this spirit the bulk of the early apocryphal writings make of the 40 Days the foundation of their own teachings, and when Ignatius wants an unanswerable argument for the resurrection of the flesh he appeals not only to the 40 Days but to a non-canonical witness for them.²⁹

It is significant that the *favorite* theme of the early apocrypha happens to be “the teachings of the Lord to the Apostles after the Resurrection”, often directly indicated as such,³⁰ and often indirectly.³¹ This has often been interpreted as both a bid for

²⁸ “St. Luke . . . gives to his narrative something of the seal of a medical statement,” J. Tissot, *Life of . . . Christ* (New York, 1899), IV, 257. “. . . no metaphysical or psychological explanation can be given,” H. V. White, in *Encounter*, 22 (1961), 56f.

²⁹ Ignat., *Smyrn.*, 3: 2, from an old Gospel of the Hebrews, according to Jerome, *De vir. illust.*, c. 16, in *P.L.* 23: 665, though Eusebius, *H.E.*, III: 36: 11, does not know the source.

³⁰ *Le Testament en Galilée*, opening lines and Ch. 45 (Texte Ethiopien éd. & trad. L. Guerrier, being the Ethiopian version of the *Epistola apostolorum*), in *Patrol. Or.*, 9: 177, 216, also in C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 26f; *Apocryphon of James*, 2: 19–26, 8: 1–4, discussed by H. Puech and G. Quispel, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 8 (1954), 8; *Acts of Thomas*, 1; *Test. Dom. n. J. Ch.*, 1, prologue; *Evang. XII Apost.*, Frg. 14, in *P.O.* 2: 169f; *Evang. Barthol.*, in *P.O.* 2: 190f, 194; and fragments in *Rev. Biblique*, N.S. 10 (1913), p. 185; *Oxyrhynchus Logia*, No. 8 (1); *Freer Logion*, in M. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 34; *Book of the Resurr. of Christ*, in James, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

³¹ It has been shown that the term “the Living Jesus” (and even “kyrios”) refers specifically to the risen Lord, C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu*, p. 264, cf. R. Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge, 1909), p. 73. Thus the same value must be given to the opening line of the *Gospel of Thomas*, 80: 10, as to the *Oxyrh. Logion*, No. 8 (1): “. . . sayings which Jesus who liveth *and was dead* spake to Judas Thomas . . .,” cf. *Gosp. Thos.*, 99: 7f. The conversational and questioning form of discourse is another clue, C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 206; Puech and Quispel, *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 3; *Gosp. of Thomas*, 81: 14–17; *Oxyrh. Logia*, 4–5, 13 (6), 8 (1); a large number of the pseudo Acts in E. A. W. Budge, *Contendings of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1935), begin with the Apostles questioning Christ after the Resurrection. Where an account of the Resurrection or Descensus is included in the report the setting is naturally post-resurrectional: this refers to all the apocrypha mentioned

prestige by the various authors and a claim to immunity from criticism.³² But the tradition could only offer such security if it enjoyed unquestioned acceptance in the Church, and if we examine the actual teaching purveyed under the frank of the 40 Days it soon becomes apparent that they were never designed to be popular, but represent old and very unpopular doctrines in retreat. Even among the first disciples belief in a literal resurrection was only enforced after long resistance,³³ and it proved an *horrendum* to the churchmen ever after.³⁴ But the most conspicuous teaching of all in the 40-Day repertoire is a picture of the future which cannot be surpassed for unrelieved pessimism and gloom. Here surely is no product of wishful thinking or sly invention:

In a standard 40-Day situation the Apostles, deeply worried, ask the Lord what lies ahead from them and their work,³⁵ and receive an appalling reply: They are to be rejected by all men and take their violent exit from the world,³⁶ what time corrupters and false shepherds will appear within the Church, where a growing faction of the worldly-minded will soon overcome and annihilate what remains of the faithful saints.³⁷ The sheep turn into wolves

below, notes 63–66. The 40-Day situation is implied where the resurrection of others is described, as in the Akhmin frg. of the *Evang. Petri*; *Evang. XII Apost.*, frg. 2, in *P.O.* 2: 135, and *Acts of Thomas*, 54f. The Prologue to the *Discourse on Abbaton* purports to offer documentary evidence from the hands of the Apostles for the typical 40-Day situation it describes, in E. Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms* (Br. Mus., 1914), pp. 225f, 474f.

³² C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 201ff.

³³ Mt. 28: 17; Mk. 16:8, 11–14; Lk. 24:11, 21ff, 36–43; Jn. 20:9, 25–29.

³⁴ C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 346f.

³⁵ “Let us know what is the end of the aeon, for we stand in the midst of scandals and offenses,” *Ev. XII Apost.*, in *P.O.* 2: 160; *Apocr. of James*, see Puech and Quispel, *op. cit.*, pp. 12–15; *Gosp. of Thomas*, 82: 25; *Test. in Galilee*, 1: 4, 40, 43, 45, 47f, 51, 61; *Reveln. to Peter*, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 23: 12; *Epist. Apostol.*, 17 (28); 19 (30); cf. *Assumption of Moses*, c. 11; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 2; *Apocal. Petri*, in M. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, pp. 510f.

³⁶ For a general treatment, H. Nibley, in *Church History*, 30 (1961), 2–5.

³⁷ “The two parties are the righteous *thlibomenoi* and the wicked *thlibontes*,” H. Braun, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 44 (1952/3), 152–4. “. . . they will combine against those who love me, to hate them and push them aside as nothing,” *Epist. Apostol.*, c. 50 (61); *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 1: 13. “The idea that the just are going to be persecuted by the wicked,” is found in *Test. in Galilee* and I Clement, *Ep.*, 1, 3–6, 45–47, 57; see A. Guerrier, in *P.O.* 9: 145.

as the Wintertime of the Just settles down;³⁸ the lights go out and the long age of darkness begins under the rule of the Cosmo-planes, disastrously usurping the authority of Christ.³⁹ There is indeed a promise of comfort and joy, but it is all on the other side and in the distant return of the Lord.⁴⁰ The Apostles protest, as we do today: Is this a time for speaking of death and disaster?⁴¹ Can all that has transpired be but for the salvation of a few and the condemnation of many?⁴² But Jesus remains unyielding: that is not for us to decide or to question.⁴² The grim picture is confirmed by the Apostolic Fathers, who are convinced that they are beholding the fulfilment of these very prophecies, and are driven

³⁸ On the wolves, Ignat., *Philad.*, 2; II Clem., *Ep.*, c. 5; *Didache*, c. 16; *I Enoch*, 89: 13–27, 51–75, 90; cf. *Epist. Apost.*, 50 (61), discussed by C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu*, etc., pp. 197ff. On the Wintertime, *Hermae Pastor*, *Sim.* 3–4, and fragments in *P.O.* 18: 469ff; *Epist. Barnab.*, 15: 5; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 21: 24; *Gospel of Philip*, 100: 25ff, cf. 112: 5ff. The same imagery of the seasons in Eusebius, *De laudib. Const.*, c. 17, in *P.G.* 20: 1432f; Cyrill. Alex., *In Joh. Ev.* iv, 14, in *P.G.* 73: 617f, 620; *Epist. Severi*, No. 81, in *P.O.* 14: 130; *Gospel of Thomas*, 84: 22f; *IQS* 4: 18–19 (D. S. Scrolls); Tal., *Pesahim*, Fol. 2a.

³⁹ This is the most conspicuous theme in all the Apocrypha: *Test. in Galilee*, 1: 3–6; *Logion*, No. 115, in *P.O.* 19: 542; *Miracles of Jesus*, in *P.O.* 17: 827–9; *Od. Sal.*, 38: 9–15; *Ascension of Isaiah*, 3: 19–4: 5 (*Test. of Hezekiah*, a Christian work); I Clem., *Ep.*, 2–5; Ignat., *Ephes.*, 17; *Philad.*, 2f; *Ep. Barnab.*, 16: 9ff; *Const. Apostol.*, 7: 32; *Didache*, c. 16; *I Enoch*, 89: 10–27; *Sibyll.* III, IV, 49; *Secrets of Enoch*, 34; *Apoc. Baruch*, 27ff; 48: 32–43; 70; *IV Ezra*, 5: 1–13; 9: 32; 10: 1ff; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 8; *Assumption of Moses*, 5: 1ff; *The Second Coming of Christ*, in *P.O.* p. 145; *Epist. Apostol.*, 36 (47) ff; *Apocr. of Thomas*, 1, in M. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, pp. 556–8; Akhmin & Freer frgs., *ibid.*, pp. 507f; *Book of John the Evangelist*, in James, *op. cit.*, pp. 191–3.

⁴⁰ “To these afflictions on earth corresponds the song of triumph in Heaven,” E. Fascher, in *Numen*, 4 (1957), 113. “. . . through their faithfulness unto death they will attain to the glory of God, which is their true destiny,” W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (Stud. in Bibl. Theol., No. 10, 1960), p. 84. “. . . joyeuses promesses mêlées de menaces affligeantes, trop de sentiments contradictoires . . .,” H.-Ch. Puech and G. Quispel, in *Vigil. Christ.*, 8 (1954), 15.

⁴¹ Puech and Quispel, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 6, 10, on *Apocr. James*, 5: 28–16: 11; *Epist. Apostol.*, 36 (47, Copt. viii–ix); II Clem., *Ep.*, 5 (Peter protests), cf. *I Enoch*, 89: 68–71; *Reveln. to Peter*, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 23: 12: “. . . Thou comest and tellest us a tale of death!” *Test. in Galilee*, c. 2ff.

⁴² *Test. in Galilee*, 51, 54, 56; *Apoc. Baruch*, 55: 2–8; just so Moses in *Acta Pauli*, in E. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts* (Br. Mus., 1915), pp.

by a tragic sense of urgency and finality.⁴³ After them the early Patristic writers accept the pattern with heavy reluctance,⁴⁴ and only the surprising and unexpected victory of the Church in the 4th century enabled Eusebius's generation to turn the tables and discredit the whole pessimistic tradition.⁴⁵

Nobody would willingly invent such a depressing message or accept it without the highest credentials. The picture though full of familiar elements from the earlier Jewish apocalypses is not derived from them. The actors are not prophets and kings of other ages but the very men sitting before the Master; the predictions are not for distant ages but limited to a scope of two generations; ⁴⁶ and what is described is not the fate of the world or even of Israel, nor titanic upheavals of nature, but the undoing of the Christian society by perverters and corrupters in its midst.⁴⁷ The more grandiose imagery is not missing, but it is kept distinct from the

553f, 1074; *I Enoch*, 89: 69, 75–77. There is a special treatment in *IV Ezra*, 5: 28–40; 6: 59; 7: 46; 8: 1–3, 14f. The answer is always the same: *Test. in Gal.*, 1: 42f, 56; *I Enoch*, 89: 75; *Ap. Baruch*, 69: 2–4, 75; *IV Ezra*, 5: 40; 7: 60f; 8: 47, 55f; *Epist. Apostol.*, 19 (30).

⁴³ To the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers (H. Nibley, *op. cit.*, pp. 4–5) add *Logia*, Nos. 108, 115, in *P.O.* 19: 539, 542; *Ps. Sol.* 8 (*Od. Sal.*, 51/50), 15ff; *Papyr. Bodmer.*, X: 52; *Apocr. Pauli*, in Budge, *op. cit.*, pp. 540f, 1060f; *Acta Theclae (Acta Pauli)*, cit. C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 196; the “Testament of Hezekiah” describes “the worldliness and lawlessness which prevailed” in the Church, R. H. Charles, *Apocr. and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.* (Oxford, 1913), p. 155; Ephraim, *Asketikon*, in E. Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms, etc.*, (Br. Mus., 1914), pp. 163f, 415f, is very close to I Clement and Hermae Pastor; *127 Canons of the Apostles*, No. 12, in *P.O.* 8: 582f; *Test. in Galilee*, 1: 3, 6–9; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, c. 8.

⁴⁴ So Justin, *Dial.*, 110; Origen, *In Matth. comm.* 36ff, in *P.G.* 13: 1650–3; Hippolytus, *Fragmenta*, in *P.G.* 10: 581, 664f, 688; Lactant., *Div. Inst.*, 4: 30; 5: 6; 7: 17; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, V: 30: 1, cf. IV: 34: 4; Ephraim, *loc. cit.* “It is as if the Main Church had a premonition of its demise which constantly and ceaselessly resounds through the early writings,” R. Abramowski, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 35 (1936), 69, note 41.

⁴⁵ Nibley, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–16.

⁴⁶ These things happen not to the Apostles but to the second generation after them, *Test. in Galilee*, c. 4; so *Hermae Pastor*, *Sim.* 9: 14; 10: 4; cf. *Logion*, No. 224, in *P.O.* 19: 610; Hegesippus in Eusebius, *H.E.*, III: 32; *Epist. Apostol.*, 34 (45). Paul is “the last of the last who will preach to the heathen,” C. Schmidt, *Gespr. Jesu*, p. 187, cf. I Cor. 4: 9–13, and Origen, *C. Cels.*, 4: 22, in *P.G.* 11: 1056f; W. Nestle, in *Ztschr. f. Relig. u. Geistesgesch.*, 4 (1952), 118f.

⁴⁷ C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 385, notes that there is no mention whatever

story of the Church, which is concrete, specific, and utterly gloomy.⁴⁷

All the 40-Day teaching is described as very *secret*, delivered to a closed cult group.⁴⁸ There is no desire to intrigue and mystify, however, as with the Gnostics, but rather the clearly stated policy that knowledge should be given always but only to those who ask for it,⁴⁹ with the corollary that the higher and holier a teaching the more carefully it should be guarded.⁵⁰ As “the last and highest revelation”, the teaching of the 40 days was top secret, and has not come down to us.⁵¹ Since Irenaeus churchmen have strenuously denied that there ever was a secret teaching or that anything really important has ever been lost.⁵² To profess otherwise would

of the pagans as a source of danger or discomfort; it is the believers themselves who “turn into betrayers and enemies of righteousness,” *Epist. Apostol.*, 35 (46), 37 (48), 44 (55). A clear distinction is made between the immediate end and the end of the world 34 (45); *I Enoch*, 1: 2; Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 102, 339, 484 comments on this.

⁴⁸ E.g., “These are the secret words which the living Jesus spake . . .,” *Gospel of Thomas*, 80: 10. Since apocrypha are by definition secret writings citations are not necessary. Even the “canonical traditions record appearances only to believers” during the 40 Days, E. C. Rust, in *Jnl. of Bible and Religion*, 29 (1961), 27f.

⁴⁹ Mt. 7: 8 following 7: 6; so *Gospel of Truth*, IX, 4ff; *Clem. Recog.*, 3: 53, 58; *Gospel of Thomas*, 96: 30–34; 80: 12–19; 81: 10–14; 88: 16–18; 91: 34–92: 1; Tatian, *Orat.* 6. See next note.

⁵⁰ It can only damage even Christians who are not prepared for it, I Cor. 3: 2; Heb. 5: 12f; Ignat., *Trall.*, c. 5; *Clem. Recog.*, 2: 60; Clem. Alex., *Stromat.*, 1: 1, in *P.G.* 8: 704. The highest is achieved by the fewest: *Gosp. of Thomas*, 94: 9–13; *Gospel of Truth*, XI, 3–6; *Gospel of Philip*, 105: 32–106: 10; *Clem. Recog.*, 1: 23, 28, 52; 3: 3, 34; 4: 25; *IV Ezra*, 14: 44–46; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 1: 18; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 5: 10; *Evang. Barthol.*, 66–68, in M. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, pp. 179f; *Apoc. Petri, ib.*, pp. 520; *Apocryphon of James*, 1: 8–25.

⁵¹ At this time the Apostles with some embarrassment ask questions which they have never asked before, *Test. in Galilee*, 31, 35; *Epist. Apost.* 20 (31), 24 (35), 25 (36); *Ev. Barthol.*, 4–5; *Ev. XII Apost.*, in *P.O.* 2: 135; cf. Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.*, 2: 15. They are chided for asking too much, *Apocr. James*, 2: 33–39; *Ep. Apost.*, 25 (36); but are told “the last and highest teachings”, *Discourse on the Abbaton*, in Budge, *Copt. Martyrd.*, pp. 231f, 480; *Ev. XII Ap.*, in *P.O.* 2: 160f; *Epist. Apost.*, 12 (23): “. . . great and amazing and real things.” *Acta Thomae*, 36; *Ev. Barthol.*, frg. in *Rev. Biblique*, N.S. 10: 185. On the ignorance of the Apostles before the Resurrection, R. Latourelle, in *Gregorianum*, 44 (1963), p. 257.

⁵² Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, Proem. 2; 2: 27; 3: 14; 3: 1: 1. It was all to be taught “from the housetops”, H. Rahner, *The Mysteries* (New York, 1955),

be perilously close to an admission of bankruptcy; yet Christian scholars do concede that the Apostles had information that we do not have,⁵³ allow the existence of an unwritten Apostolic tradition in the Church,⁵⁴ and grant that there was a policy of secrecy in the early Church—though insisting that it began with the catechetical schools.⁵⁵ The catechists, however, appeal to a much earlier tradition of secrecy,⁵⁶ and when the Fathers attempt to reproduce the unwritten tradition which they claim for the Church they have nothing to offer but the commonplaces of the schools.⁵⁷ Plainly things *have* been lost.

pp. 357f; at least nothing *important* has been lost, Latourelle, *op. cit.*, p. 258. Yet it is quite possible to publish some things while withholding others, *Gosp. of Thomas*, 87: 10–17; *IV Ezra*, 14: 6.

⁵³ So Latourelle himself, *loc. cit.*, and A. de Bovis, in *Nouvelle Rev. Théol.*, 1963, 12f. Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 1: 1, insists that his own teachings sound imbecile beside those of the Apostles, as does Ignatius, *Trall.*, 5 (long version), cf. Polycarp, *Ad. Phil.*, 3. Clem. Alex. tells how early teachings inevitably become lost, in *P.G.* 8: 704; and J. Chrysostom, *In Ep. I Cor. homil.* 7, in *P.G.* 61: 58, and Basil, *Ep.*, 1: 8, in *P.G.* 32: 257, note that many sacred writings have been lost. Irenaeus himself puts the knowledge of the Apostles in a special category, 1: 13: 6, and when pressed admits that the Bible does *not* explain everything, and so falls back on tradition, 3: 3: 1; and when this fails him he appeals to the oldest churches, 3: 4: 1, and when these disagree to the most outlying ones, 3: 4: 2.

⁵⁴ A favorite teaching of Basil, A. Thomasius, *Die Dogmengesch. der alten Kirche* (Erlangen, 1886), I, 279f. The greatest teachings were not trusted to writing, *Clem. Recog.*, 1: 21; *Epist. of Paul and Seneca*, 6; J. Chrysostom., *De laudib. Pauli, homil.* 5, in *P.G.* 50: 500, and *De Melchis., homil.*, c. 1, in *P.G.* 56: 257f.

⁵⁵ A. Schweitzer, *G.L.F.* (Tübingen, 1913), I, 396, admits the secrecy though at a loss to explain it. An awkward attempt to explain the secrecy of the 40 Days is made by J. Chrysostom, in *P.G.* 60: 19, and borrowed by Oecumenius, in *P.G.* 118: 45, and Theophylactus, *ib.*, 125: 505. On the *doctrina arcana* and the catechetical schools, J. Baum, in *The Mysteries*, p. 261; O. Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge Univ., 1957), p. 68.

⁵⁶ Discussed by A. Adam, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 88 (1963), 10f for Origen and Clement of Alexandria. Cf. *Clem. Homil.*, 19: 20; Lactant., *Div. Inst.*, 7: 26, in *P.L.* 6: 815; *Clem. Recog.*, 3: 74. Baum himself is seeking to explain why representations of the Lord's supper in art are "shunned down to the fifth century," *op. cit.*, p. 262.

⁵⁷ Irenaeus can only use the feeble arguments of the Gnostics against them, *Adv. haer.* 2: 2: 4; 2: 8: 3; 2: 22: 6; 2: 25: 3; 2: 28: 2f., etc. "When, however, we come to inquire into the nature of this sublime knowledge, we find that it consists of subtle explanations . . . allegorical and mystical

After the alarming gap in the record following the fall of Jerusalem the curtain rises on a 2nd-century Church seething with conflict and split into factions hotly debating the reality of the Resurrection.⁵⁸ The Gnostic exploited both the ignorance and the knowledge of the time – the knowledge that the answers to the great questions of existence were known and treasured by “the Elders” of another day, and the ignorance of just what that knowledge was. The oldest definition of the Gnosis specifies that it was the knowledge imparted secretly by the Lord to the Apostles after the Resurrection.⁵⁹ The Gnostics claimed to have that very knowledge,⁵⁹ and their tremendous initial success shows how hungry the Christian world was for it – the “Main Church”, in fact, had to invent a counter-Gnosis of its own to meet the threat and ended up with a compromise that has left a Gnostic stamp on Christian thinking ever since.⁶⁰ The Gnostics did not invent the 40-Day situation, as has been claimed, for they were the last people in the world to imagine a return of the Savior in the flesh, and any tinkering would have been readily exposed in a quarrelling and hyper-critical society; but they did exploit it because it was there and they had to: at a time when everything else was being questioned, it is one of the few things that is never challenged.⁶¹

interpretations . . . and of moral precepts . . .,” John Bp. of Bristol, *Eccl. Hist. of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries* (London, 1894), p. 16f.

⁵⁸ Justin, *Dial.*, 80: 2–5. This remains the question of questions, to distinguish Christians from pagans and true Christians from false: Augustine, *Enarrat. in Ps. 88*, in *P.L.* 37: 1134; *Serm.* 109, in *P.L.* 39: 1961; *Append.*, in *P.L.* 35: 2345.

⁵⁹ Eusebius, *H.E.*, II: 1: 3, cf. III: 32: 8.

⁶⁰ Gnosticism “left a mark upon the Christian Church which has persisted . . . right up to the present day,” W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Disc. Gn. Writings.*, p. 43. Even Irenaeus’s rebuttal is but “a commonplace presentation of ordinary Gnostic beliefs”, W. Förster, in *N.T. Studies*, 9 (1963), 235. The opening lines of the *Clementine Recognitions* posit the “great questions” as the legitimate object of all human search to which, it is later explained, the Gnostics had the wrong answers and Peter the right ones.

⁶¹ The charge of Irenaeus against the Gnostics is not that they invent new absurdities, but that they misrepresent true and familiar doctrines; so also Polycarp, *Ep. Phil.*, c. 7; *Papyr. Bodmer*, X: 52: 3. Their teachings are very convincing to Christians, for they use *genuine logia* but give them a false twist, I *proem.* 1; their teachings look perfectly orthodox, *ib.* 2; their fault is not in appealing to non-canonical writings, but in counterfeiting such, 1: 20; 1: 8: 1; they imitate the Sacrament, 1: 13: 2; they fake prophecy,

The apocryphal teachings of the 40 Days taken together comprise an imposing doctrinal edifice, totally unlike the patchwork systems of the Gnostics. It begins with the most natural question to ask anyone returning to earth after being away: Where did you go and what did you see? The Lord's discourse in reply recalls the journeys to worlds above and below recounted by the prophets and patriarchs of the old Jewish apocrypha.⁶² And yet the picture is quite different: They go as observers and report what they have seen, while He goes as a missionary and reports what He has done. The central theme is the *Descensus*, a mission to the spirits below closely resembling the Lord's earthly calling.⁶³ He brings the kerygma to all, and those who accept it follow him out of the depths into the light,⁶⁴ receive baptism,⁶⁵ and hence mount up 1: 13: 3-5; they counterfeit revelation with potions and drugs, *ib.* 5; they parody marriage rites, 1: 14: 1; 1: 21: 3, and baptism, 1: 21: 3, and anointing, 1: 21: 4f; they feign miraculous healings, 1: 23: 1. They do *not* (except for Marcus) change the Scriptures but misinterpret them, 1: 27: 4; their teachings are a patchwork taken from the schools, 2: 14: 2ff; they claim to have the secret teachings of the Lord to Matthew, but when challenged all they can produce is the Categories of Aristotle, says Hippolytus, *Philosophumena*, 7: 20. Ignatius brings the same charges: they are bad interpreters of the good word, mixing poison with good wine, *Trall.*, 6, as Irenaeus says they mix chalk with milk, 3: 17: 4.

⁶² Such cosmic tours are described in *Jubilees*, *I Enoch*, *Secrets of Enoch*, *Apoc. of Abraham*, *Odes of Solomon*, *Apocalypse of Moses*, *Apocal. of Isaiah*, *Ascension of Isaiah*, *Apocal. of Baruch*. In the *Testaments of Abraham*, *Isaiah*, *Isaac*, *the XII Patriarchs*, *Adam*, *Enoch*, etc., the saint gives blessings and prophecies to his (12) descendants or disciples before mounting to heaven and immediately *after* his return from a cosmic tour: the parallel to the 40 Days is obvious; see M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (Assen, 1953), p. 120.

⁶³ C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu*, pp. 481-6. On the present-day "rediscovery" of the *Descensus*, O. Rousseau, in *Recherches des Sciences Relig.*, 40: 273; M. Scharlemann, in *Concordia Theol. Monthly*, 27 (1956), 81. Bo Reicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism* (*Acta seminarii neotest. Upsaliensis*, No. 13, 1946), p. 14f, asks why the *Descensus* is not treated in the earliest literature even though it "was clearly developed already in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers". Obviously because it was a secret teaching, though very popular in the early Church, A. Dell, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 15 (1914), 31-33.

⁶⁴ For a general treatment, J. A. MacCulloch, *The Harrowing of Hell* (Edinburgh, 1930), Chs. 15 & 16. On the Jewish background, M. Philonenko, *Interpolations chrétiennes des Tests. des XII Patriarches*, etc. (Paris, 1960), pp. 22-24. (See for note 65 following page.)

by degrees to realms of glory, for as in the Jewish apocrypha the picture of other worlds is not a simple one.⁶⁶ This mounting up is depicted as the return of the spirit to its heavenly home, where it existed in glory before coming to earth.⁶⁷ This is not the Gnostic idea of pre-existence, however, for the soul is not sent down as punishment nor imprisoned in the flesh, nor does it fly directly to God after its release from physical confinement;⁶⁸ rather it is sent to be tried and tested in “the blessed vessel” of the flesh whose immortality is guaranteed by the resurrection.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ O. Rousseau, *op. cit.*, pp. 273–297, declares the Descensus to be nothing less than “the soteriological foundation of Christian baptism”, and Bo Reicke, in *Archiv f. Kirchengesch.*, N.S. 27: 2–3, notes that early Christian baptisms were consciously dramatized to represent a release from the underworld. R. Harris, *Odes of Sol.*, p. 123, identifies Christ’s own baptism with the Descensus. On the baptism in the Acherusian Lake, J. B. Frey, in *Biblica*, 13 (1932), 145f; E. Peterson, in *Vigiliae Christ.*, 9 (1955), 1–20.

⁶⁶ The doctrine by which “the soul mounts up continually from topos to topos” was thoroughly orthodox, C. Schmidt, in *T.U.*, 8: 193f; *Gespräche Jesu*, pp. 496f, 512f; Eusebius found it in the Gospel of the Hebrews, *Theophan.*, 4: 12, and Irenaeus got it from “the Elders”, *Adv. haer.*, 5: 30: 1f, 5: 1, as did Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 6: 107: 2; cf. Origen, *In Jesu Nave homil.* 25, in *P.G.* 12: 944; cf. *Gospel of Thomas*, 90: 5–7; *Gospel of Truth*, XXI: 23–34; *Gospel of Philip*, 133: 17f; *Apoc. Pauli*, in Budge, *Miscel. Copt.*, pp. 1027f, 1055; Ignat., *Trall.*, 5; *Ephes.*, 19; *Epist. ad Polyc.*, 7, calling Polycarp theodromos; *Epist. Apost.*, 13 (24)–14 (25); 19 (30); 29 (40); *Secrets of Enoch*, 61: 2; *Acts of Thomas*, 136f, the same in *Gospel of Thos.*, i.e., *Oxyrh. Logion*, 1 (8), 2 (9); Euseb., *l.c.*; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 2: 9; 5: 14: 96. Cf. the doctrine of “stages of ascent”, i.e., three levels of enlightenment to which the Christian can aspire even during this life, H. P. Owen, in *N.T. Stud.*, 3 (1957), pp. 243ff.

⁶⁷ An old and orthodox idea. According to W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christl. Schulbetrieb*, etc. (Göttingen, 1915), p. 269, Clement of Alexandria was the first to reject it. Though it was condemned by the Council of Cp. in 553, A. Méhat, in *Vigil. Christ.*, 10 (1956), 196, Pius XII himself in *Mediator Dei* refers to this life as “an exile”.

⁶⁸ Iren., *Adv. haer.*, 1: 25: 4; *Clem. Recog.*, 2: 57. Augustine condemns the idea that the soul sinned in its pre-existence and is being punished on earth, without condemning the doctrine of pre-existence itself, M. Leusse, in *Rech. des Sciences Relig.*, 29: 236, n. 1; 237, n. 1. So also Cyril of Jerus., *Cathech. de X dogmat.*, 19, in *P.G.* 33: 480; while Origen even suggests that earth-life is a reward rather than a punishment, *Peri archon*, 1: 8: 4; 2: 9: 6–8.

⁶⁹ Quote is from *Ep. Barnab.*, 21: 7–8; cf. *Test. in Galilee*, 47; *Gosp. of*

There is a strong emphasis in early Christian literature on the doctrine of the Two Ways, depicting life as a time of probation, a constant confrontation with good and evil and the obligation to choose between them.⁷⁰ This is conceived as part of a plan laid down "in the presence of the first angels" at the creation of the world,⁷¹ according to which through Adam's fall the human race would be placed in the position, envied by the angels, of being perfectly free to choose good or evil and thereby fully merit whatever rewards would follow.⁷² Satan rebelled against the plan, refused obeisance to Adam, and was cast down upon the earth with his cohorts, to fulfill divine purpose by providing, as "the serpent", the temptation necessary for an effectual testing of human beings.⁷³ Through inspired prophets men from time to time are taught the rules of the game, but are prone to cheat, fall away into darkness,

Philip, 124: 32–36; 125: 1ff; *Psalms of Thomas* (in *Z.N.T.W.*, Beih. 24), 9: 1, 8–10; *The Pearl* (*ibid.*), 12–15; 53–59; *Apoc. Baruch*, 15: 8, 16; 19: 1; 21: 13, 16; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 1: 13; Tertull., *De bapt.*, 20: 2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 4: 12: 85.

⁷⁰ Sources listed in M. de Jonge, *op. cit.*, pp. 119f, to which add 127 *Can. of the Apost.*, No. 2, in *P.O.* 8: 575; *Logia*, 145, 193 in *P.O.* 19: 562f, 583; *Clem. Homil.* 7, in *P.G.* 2: 221, 240ff; II Clem., *Ep.*, 6; Ignat., *Mag.*, 5; *Ep. Barnab.*, 5, 19–20; *Clem. Recog.*, 2: 24; *Ps. Thomae*, 2: 2ff, 7, 28–32, often in the Serekh Scroll, *IQS* 3: 2–4, 13ff; 4: 1ff, 22–26; cf. *Psalm I*.

⁷¹ On the Council, Justin, *Dial.*, 102, 141; *I Enoch*, 48:2–6; 62:7; Ignat., *Ephes.*, 19; *IV Ezra*, 9: 18; *The Pearl*, 11, 35–39; *The Hypostasis of the Cerchons*, 135: 23–25. A genuine biblical motif, H. W. Robinson, in *Jnl. Theol. Stud.*, 45 (1944), 151ff; F. M. Cross, in *J.N.E.S.*, 12 (1953), 274ff. Cf. C. N. Dahl in W. Davies & D. Daube, *op. cit.*, ch. 22, on the importance of protology in early Christian thought; M. Sekine, in *Z.A.T.W.*, Beih., 77 (1958), 220f. That the Two Ways is part of the Plan is specified by *Clem. Recog.*, 1: 24, 28; 3: 26; 5: 9; cf. *Od. Sal.*, 7: 11f; 31, and Harris' comment, p. 129; *Apoc. James*, 4: 27–5: 6; *Ps. of Thomas*, 8: 16–18 (the demons have a counter-plan); Justin, *l.c.* and *Apol.*, 10.

⁷² Irenaeus calls this "the ancient law of liberty", *Adv. haer.*, 4: 37: 1–6, 39: 3. It is explained in *Clem. Recog.*, 2: 23–25; 3: 26, 49, 59; 4: 24, 34; *Apocr. Pauli*, in Budge, *Miscel. Copt.*, p. 1066; *Test. in Galilee*, 50; *Gospel of Philip*, 114: 10–29; *Apocr. of James*, 4: 27–5: 6; 5: 35–6: 21; II Clem., *Ep.*, 7; *Hermae Pastor*, *Sim.* 10: 2; *Clem. Recog.*, 1: 7–8, 16, 27, 51; 2: 21, 40; 4: 14; 5: 5; *I Enoch*, 69: 11; *Apoc. Baruch*, 54: 15; *IV Ezra*, 7: 72; 8: 55f; 9: 10f; Tatian, *Orat.*, 7.

⁷³ *Papyr. Bodmer*, X, 53–54; *Ps. of Thomas*, 9: 7–16; *The Pearl*, 9–15; Theodosius, *On St. Michael*, in Budge, *Miscel. Copt.*, pp. 339f, 906f; *Discourse*

and require painful correction before returning to divine favor and a new dispensation of heavenly gifts and covenants.⁷⁴ The historical picture is a complicated one, culminating in the final return of the Lord, but not before he has made other appearances, notably to a few “righteous and pure souls and faithful”, preparatory to the ultimate and glorious parousia.⁷⁵

What gives substance to this peculiar doctrinal structure is the imposing body of rites and ordinances that goes with it.⁷⁶ Ritual and doctrinal elements are inextricably interwoven in a complex in which everything is oddly literal and all fit solidly together: The kerygma, whether above or below, is real and must have a “seal”, which is baptism, though the word is also used to designate rites of washing and anointing that go with it ;⁷⁷ after such rites

on the *Abbaton*, in Budge, *Copt. Martyrdoms*, pp. 240, 488; *Gospel of Philip*, 102: 29–31; 123: 4–14; *Clem. Homil.* 9, in *P.G.* 2: 241ff; Ignat., *Ephes.*, 13, 19; *ad Polycarp.* 3. Satan rules the earth, *Ep. Barnab.*, 2, 4, 18; *Ps. of Thomas*, 1: 17–37; 3: 5–8; *I Enoch*, 6–7; 44: 2; *Secrets of Enoch*, 18, 31: 4; *Acts of Thomas*, 32f, 44f; Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.*, 2: 15, citing an old apocryphon. Cf. the “rule of Belial” in the D. S. Scrolls, *Zadok. frg.*, 3: 4; *Jubilees*, 10: 5ff; 11: 5, etc.; *Apokryphon on the Creation* (P. Labib’s collection, 1956), 150: 27–151: 28.

⁷⁴ The rules were first explained to Adam, *Secrets of Enoch*, 30: 14f; it is the business of the True Prophet to announce them, *Clem. Recog.*, 5: 10. The image of the games is familiar from the N.T. and the Apostolic Fathers, e.g. II *Clem.*, 7; and *IV Ezra*, 7: 57–61. The cycle of revelation — apostasy — punishment — restoration is well-known, M. de Jonge, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–86.

⁷⁵ *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 8: 12ff; 12; 13; *Akhmim Frg.*; this is a 40-Day teaching, according to A. Harnack, in *T.U.*, 9: 16f. Cf. *Test. in Galilee*, 7; *Apoc. Baruch*, 29: 2f; 70: 7; Hippolytus, *Frg. in Dan.*, 10, 12, in *P.G.* 10: 685, 688; *Clem. Recog.*, 5: 11. The preliminary coming is not to be confused with the later coming, M. Feuillet, in Davies & Daube, *op. cit.*, pp. 262–269, and L. Guerrier, in *P.O.* 9: 151.

⁷⁶ R. Abramowski, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 35 (1936), 60: “. . . die Formeln klingen eschatologisch . . . aber real kultisch gemeint.” A. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas* (Leiden, 1962), p. 54ff.

⁷⁷ Types of “seals” are discussed by R. Harris, *Od. Sol.*, p. 78f, and A. Klijn, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–59. In *Od. Sal.*, 42: 25, the seal is a name, in 4: 8 it is a garment, in 8: 16 it is a mark, in 23: 8ff it is an actual seal on a letter. In *Hermae Pastor*, *Sim.* 8: 1–2, all receive seals and garments; in *Sim.* 9: 16 “the seal is the water”; in *Const. Apostol.*, 7: 22 it is an anointing; in *Ep. Barnab.*, 9: 23 it is circumcision; in *The Pearl* it is both on a letter, 48f, and a garment, 78; in the *Assumption of Moses*, 12: 9 God wears a seal or ring on his right hand, cf. *127 Can. Apost.*, No. 10, in *P.O.* 8: 580. As the soul

the initiate receives a symbolic but real and tangible garment,⁷⁸ and then sits down to a sacral meal, a real repast celebrating the perfect unity of the participants with each other and with the Lord, who is present in spirit.⁷⁹ Recent findings indicate unusual emphasis placed on a perfect unity of the sexes in marriage ordinances which were real enough and secret enough to excite the scandalized speculations of outsiders⁸⁰ and the fantastic imitation of the

mounts up "all these stations have their taxeis and their seals and their mysteries", C. Schmidt, in *T.U.*, 9: 193f. Anointing is conspicuous in the Gospel of Philip; there is anointing after baptism in *Const. Apostol.*, 7: 22; *Acts of Thomas*, 27, 121, 132, 157f; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 2: 9; *Vitae Adae & Evae*, 42; *Secrets of Enoch*, 21: 8; 56: 2; *III Baruch*, 15: 1-2. The rites are often confused, H. Achelis, in *T.U.*, 6: 96ff; *Evang. Nicodem.*, 13: 1-3; *Apoc. Moses*, 37: 1.

⁷⁸ Without the clothing the rite is invalid, *Hermae Pastor*, *Sim.* 9: 13, cf. 8: 2. The Resurrection itself is conceived as the putting on of a new garment, C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources* (Edinburgh, 1912), p. 173. Beside the familiar white robe of baptism the sources speak of a garment of repentance, a skin coat worn by the prophets in the desert in the manner of John the Baptist, R. Eisler, *Iesus Basileus*, etc., (Heidelb., 1930) II, 33-38. I Clem., *Ep.*, 17: this advice was taken literally, *Reveln. to Peter*, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 23: 17, where the whole community on the Mt. of Transfiguration are so clothed; cf. *Ascens. of Isaiah*, 4: 16; 11: 40, and *Life of Onnophrius*, in Budge, *Copt. Martyrd.*, pp. 219, 469. Adam lost his garment of holiness and put on a garment of humility, Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, 3: 23: 5; *Jubilees*, 3: 31; while Enoch reversed the process, *Secrets of Enoch*, 22: 8; cf. *Acts of Thomas*, 6f; 146; *Acts of Philip*, in Tischendorf, *Apocal. Apocr.*, 1866, p. 147.

⁷⁹ The meal taking place after baptism marked the death and resurrection, *Const. Apostol.*, 8: 12; C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu*, pp. 492ff; O. Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst* (Zürich, 1950), p. 18, notes that this consciously goes back to "those meals where Jesus after his Resurrection appeared to the disciples". The mystic unity is emphasized in *Evang. XII Apost.*, in *P.O.* 2: 132-5; *Gospel of Thomas*, 98: 28-30; *Gospel of Philip*, 106: 11-14; *Od. Sal.*, 41: 5ff; *Epist. ad Diognet.*, 5; Ignat., *Philad.*, 4; *Didache*, 9; *Test. D. n. J. Ch.*, 1: 23 (p. 44, Rahmani). The Jewish parallels are many, e.g., "the table of the community", in *IQSa* 2: 18; cf. A. Adam, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 88 (1963), 9-20.

⁸⁰ Aristides, *Apol.*, 17: 2; Minuc. Felix, *Octav.*, 8-10. The charges were "not altogether without foundation", R. M. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (New York, 1962), p. 21f, though the nature of the rites cannot be surmised either from the anti-Christian scandal stories or from the Gnostic distortions. The famous passage about the "two becoming one," etc., is

Gnostics.⁸¹ After all allowances have been made, there remains a definite residue of early Christian ritual that goes far beyond anything known to later Christianity, which admittedly got its liturgy from the Synagogue and the Hellenistic world, while the rites just mentioned all look to the Temple and belong to the instructions of the 40 Days.⁸²

While the schools have their methods for dealing with unwelcome doctrines and traditions, the populace also has ways of absorbing and adapting teachings it does not understand, and the 40-Day tradition left a bold imprint on vulgar Christianity. The fact that the Christian liturgy has always allowed a 40-day interval, and

not the abolition of the sexes (the later Fathers often puzzle about the survival of the sexes in the resurrection), but the overcoming of all prurient distinction and rivalry, the two becoming one "in the Lord" (I Cor. 11:11): *Gosp. of Thomas*, 85: 25–35; *Gosp. of Philip*, 113: 1–26; 118: 13–22; *Acts of Thomas*, 14; *Oxryrh. Frg.* 655; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 3: 13: 92; 3: 9: 63; II Clem., *Ep.*, c. 12.

⁸¹ R. M. Grant, in *Vigil. Christ.*, 15 (1961), 140, argues that this consisted in "literalizing" the orthodox ideas. But Irenaeus's stock charge against the Gnostics is that they *de*-literalize everything, their marriages of the Aeons being a good example, *Adv. haer.*, 1: 21: 3; cf. 1: 14: 1; 28: 1. Tatian, *Orat.*, 8, maintains that marriage is defilement, as in the *Acts of Thomas*, 12. In a conversation of the 40 Days Salome *wrongly* "imagined that it is wrong to have children," Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 3: 9: 66.

⁸² While in a sense the Synagogue is a shadow of the Temple and preserves or rather cherishes aspects of its rites and teachings, the essential qualities of the latter are lacking in the Synagogue, as we indicated in *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, 50 (1960), pp. 230–3, 239. The Temple's "rich cosmic symbolism which was largely lost in later Israelite and Jewish tradition" (W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, 1942), pp. 154f, 88f, 167) included, as A. Jeremias, S. Mowinckel and others have shown, such elements as its cosmic orientation, its significance as a place of contact with other worlds above and below, the ritual drama of Creation, Fall, and victory over Death, rites of initiation and purification, etc. These basic elements of Near Eastern "patternism" have been recently discussed with special reference to the Jerusalem cult by the authors of S. H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship* (Oxford, 1958). The relation of these things to early Christian thought and practice is discussed by N. A. Dahl, in W. Davies and D. Daube, *Background of the NT*, etc., pp. 422–443. Even the Christian sacral meal which O. Cullmann believes was meant to supplant the Temple worship (*N.T. Stud.*, 5 (1959), 171), is now traced to the Temple itself by A. Adam, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–20. The problem of just what went on in the Temple at Jerusalem at various periods calls for extensive investigation.

an important one, between the Resurrection and the Ascension is not to be lightly explained away,⁸³ but it is the popular literature of the pseudo-Acts of the Apostles and the legends of the Martyrs that most clearly indicates what was paramount in the teachings embraced by the newly converted masses of the age of Constantine.⁸⁴ Here we have the monotonous repetition of one standard miracle, the raising of the dead, performed to demonstrate to a skeptical world the reality of the Resurrection of Jesus.⁸⁵ As the saint performs this miracle, or has it performed on him, Jesus himself stands by, now in his own person, now in that of the Apostle, who is but his doublet or understudy.⁸⁶ This, it is often explained, is what Jesus meant when he said he would continue to be with the Apostles to the end—it is a series of real appearances continuing

⁸³ J. G. Davies, *He Ascended into Heaven*, p. 55. The *length* of the interval is not the significant thing, as van Stempvoort notes, *N.T. Stud.*, 5 (1958), 34, but its existence is.

⁸⁴ Though there is a trend in the legends away from history and doctrine towards “pure thaumaturgy” (M. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 474), the literature as a whole goes “back to standard themes in popular preaching and Apocryphal acts”, A. Klijn, *Acts of Thomas*, p. 25. “We must view the apocryphal Apostle-literature not as a presentation of vulgar Gnosticism, but rather cherish these as important documents of the old catholic popular Christianity,” C. Schmidt, in *T.U.*, 9: vi.

⁸⁵ The raising of the dead is an actual demonstration of the Resurrection, *Const. Apostol.*, 5: 7; Severus, *Ep.* 88, in *P.O.* 14: 153; the dead are raised in response to the challenge, “How could . . . Jesus Christ rise from the dead?” E. Budge, *Contendings of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 117–120. Upon raising a dead man Peter cries, “Ye men of Rome, it is thus that the dead are raised up!” M. R. James, *op. cit.*, p. 328; cf. *Ev. XII Apost.*, in *P.O.* 2: 135; Budge, *op. cit.*, pp. 580f; James., *op. cit.*, pp. 294–6.

⁸⁶ “I saw (Jesus) standing by thee at the moment when thou didst raise me up from the dead,” Budge, *op. cit.*, p. 86. “He saw our Lord Jesus Christ in the form of Judas Thomas sitting on the bed . . .,” *ib.*, p. 343; Thecla in the arena “saw the Lord sitting, like unto Paul”, in the audience, James, p. 276. After Philip’s death Jesus appears “at the end of 40 days in the form of Philip”, to teach his disciples, *ib.*, p. 450. The post-burial appearances and the ascension of Thomas are exactly like Jesus’, *Acts of Thomas*, 169. The closest identity is with Mary who is inseparable from Jesus during the 40 Days, and whose resurrection was “a greater miracle than the Resurrection of the Lord”, *Evang. XII Apost.*, end, in *P.O.* 2: 182. The 40 Days must even follow *her* resurrection! *Falling Asleep of Mary*, in F. Robinson, *Copt. Apoc. Gospels*, p. 65.

the personal tutelage and supervision of the 40 Days.⁸⁷ The secular equivalent to this is the recurring legend of a youthful military hero and convert who is repeatedly put to death with spectacular tortures, only to be visited by Christ or the angels in the night and restored to health, ready to deliver a lecture on the Resurrection and renew his painful demonstrations on the following day. His resuscitation is celebrated sometimes with the Eucharist and often with a great public banquet.⁸⁸ The Saints Victor, Theodore, George, Mercurius⁸⁹ and the Seven Sleepers,⁹⁰ as well as the first lady martyrs, Thecla, Felicitas, and Perpetua,⁹¹ belong to this illustrious

⁸⁷ Jesus "would appear to them in the form in which they used to know Him", give his instructions, and then "mount up into heaven in great glory", James, *op. cit.*, pp. 165, 246, 304, 308f, 317, 333, 441, 444f; Budge, *Contendings*, pp. 154-6, 158-162, 171, 185, 230, 247, 265-8, etc. He could appear "in any form I please", *ib.*, 318ff; *Acts of John*, in M. R. James, *Apocr. Anecdota*, 2nd Series (1897), ii, 5; iv.

⁸⁸ During the feast of St. George the Saint himself appeared, "multiplied the loaves and wine and brought all the sacrificed animals to life", F. Cumont, in *Jnl. of Roman Stud.*, 27 (1937), p. 71. This multiplying of loaves and fishes is a theme of the post-resurrectional meals with the Lord, e.g., *Ev. XII Apost.*, in *P.O.* 2: 132ff; *Gosp. Philip*, 103: 11-14. Tha'labi *Qissas al-Anbiya* (Cairo, 1340 A.H.), pp. 272, 276f, 280, cites a number of early Christian legends in which the raising of the dead is accompanied by a feast miraculously provided from heaven. The Apostles often celebrate a raising of the dead with a feast or the Eucharist, N. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 250, cf. 308f, 344; Budge, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁸⁹ For Victor, Budge, *Copt. Martyrdoms*, pp. 1-101; for Theodore, Budge, *Miscel. Copt. Texts*, pp. 1-48; the St. George cycle is in Tha'labi, *op. cit.*, pp. 299-305; for Mercurius, Budge, *Miscel. Copt.*, pp. 231-299; for Sebastian, Ambrose, *Acta S. Sebastiani*, in *P.L.* 17: 1111-1150, where after his final demise the saint still returns to give instructions, 1149f.

⁹⁰ "Toutes les versions des Sept Dormants servent à prouver la résurrection des morts," Bern. Heller, in *Rev. des Études Juives*, 49 (1904), p. 215. The identity of the Seven Sleepers with the seven heroic brothers of IV Maccabees 8: 3-11 has long been recognized, *Anal. Bolland.*, 57 (1939), p. 30. Though the latter tale is in praise of Philosophy, even there the resurrection motif occurs, as when the eldest brother appears "as if he were suffering a change by fire to incorruption", 9: 22.

⁹¹ A friend of Thecla's embraces her after one of her resuscitations crying, "Now do I believe that the dead are raised up!" James, *op. cit.*, p. 280. The seven sons of Felicitas repeat the story of IV Maccabees 8; see Peter Chrysolog., *Serm.* 134, in *P.L.* 52: 564f; Gregory, *Homil.* 3, in

company to which the names of most of the Apostles were added.⁹²

Recurrent motifs in the legends, such as their strongly erotic orientation and the prominence of feasting, games, holy springs, horses and chariots, etc. point unmistakably to popular pre-Christian hero-cults,⁹³ typical of which is the cult of the chaste Hippolytus, impaled on a tree and restored to life, whose "tragic death and triumphant resurrection made him a favorite theme alike on Greek and Roman sarcophagi".⁹⁴ It is well known that local heroes and their cults were often converted to Christianity, but why the emphasis on a particular type of hero to the neglect of others, and how could the Christians bring themselves to make such concessions to the familiar ways of heathen idolatry? It was not because the Christian tradition was derived from the other — we know now that the two were quite different — but because there were definite points of resemblance at which they could fuse. Thus Puech and Quispel have recently pointed to the pagan origin of the cloud and chariot of apotheosis, a conspicuous object in our 40-Day accounts.⁹⁵ But their well-known pagan affinities would have rendered them invincibly repugnant to the Christians had they not something of their own that closely matched the pagan version. And what that was is apparent on every other page of the legends, where Jesus himself breaks into the story to give his instructions and then mount up to heaven "in great glory". Again, how could the panegyrics and protocol of the Imperial cult, hailing the Christian Emperor as *praesens et corporalis deus*, appear as

P.L. 76: 107–8 treats the successive slayings as a repeated martyrdom of Felicitas herself. Perpetua's story is in *P.L.* 3: 17–46.

⁹² Thomas, who is repeatedly martyred, is called "Twin of the Messiah . . . our own true athlete who cannot be hurt and our holy General", *Acts of Thomas*, c. 39; John is repeatedly executed, M. R. James, *op. cit.*, pp. 228f; as are Philip and Paul, Budge, *Contendings*, pp. 530ff, 466, 470, 472, and Andrew, *ib.*, pp. 326–330, and Mark, *ib.*, pp. 258, 261–263, and Matthew, James, pp. 460–2; when Paul survived the fire "all the people believed", Budge, *op. cit.*, pp. 459f, 524.

⁹³ Many examples may be found in *Sitzber. Wien. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 182: 1–110; *A.R.W.*, 1907, pp. 41ff, 54; 1925, p. 142; 1930, pp. 381–3; *Rev. des Études Anciennes*, 31: 128ff, 122.

⁹⁴ A. B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1914ff), II, 303, n. 2. The seven brothers motif in notes 90 and 91 above is close to the archaic legend and cult of Niobe.

⁹⁵ In *Vigil. Christ.*, 8: 15–19. The problem of such radical borrowings is treated by E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols* (New York, 1953), I, 3ff.

anything but blasphemous unless there was a Christian precedent for them? ⁹⁶ We see that precedent in the constant intervention of Christ and his angels in the solemn assemblies of the Emperor and on the field of battle; the clouds and angels that surround the august personage are the familiar properties not of the schools but of the monks of the desert, who sought to recapture the ancient order of the Church, and who still thought of Christ as paying frequent and familiar visits to holy men.⁹⁷ In the safely theatrical displays of rhetoric and architecture the 40-Day idea of God mingling with men and supervising their affairs in person was carried over as a basic Christian concept into the new popular Christianity.

The easiest way of disposing of the 40-Day problem is to point out the numerous parallels and prefigurements to it, taking as evidence of fraud what the early Christians regarded as the sure stamp of authenticity. Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Transfiguration, and even Parousia are depicted today as "one undifferentiated experience", or at least as "different ways of describing the same occurrence", which naturally leaves no room for the awkward interruption of the 40 Days.⁹⁸

But a process need not to be instantaneous, indeed cannot be, and gaps and delays are required if only to allow some time for preaching to the human family, while the idea that the Messiah can appear only once denies the fundamental thesis of Christianity

⁹⁶ H. Nibley, in *Western Political Quarterly*, 4 (1951), 232, 249-251; 6 (1953), 641-6, for references.

⁹⁷ *Life of Apa Cyrus*, in Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms*, pp. 128-136, 381-9, is typical. Far from being unworldly, all the monkish writers in these two volumes of Budge are intrigued and bedazzled by the glory of the royal court, which is constantly brought into conjunction with the heavenly court. The heroes, military or clerical, are invariably of high birth, great wealth, and brilliant popularity. Regal pomp and circumstance are not decried but described with loving enthusiasm as the earthly counterpart of the heavenly order.

⁹⁸ S. M. Gilmour, in *J.B.L.*, 80 (1961), 251f, citing J. Knox, and *ibid.*, 81 (1962), 62-66. For some recent studies identifying these events see Davies, *op. cit.*, Chs. 2, 3; E. Grässer, in *Theol. Rundschau*, 26 (1960), 155; W. v. Loewenich, in *Z.N.T.W.*, Beih. 13, p. 16; C. E. Carlston, in *J.B.L.*, 80 (1961), 233-240; J. Jeremias, in *Z.N.T.W.*, 42 (1949), 194ff. J. Schulz sees an artistic unity in Descensus and Anastasis, in *Zt. f. kathol. Theol.*, 81 (1959), 1-66.

and was, in fact, the principal obstacle to the acceptance of Jesus by the Jews.⁹⁹ Moreover, if uniqueness is the mark of a historical event, the 40 Days command the highest respect. It is recognized today that the very oddness of Jesus' teachings is strong proof of authenticity. No group of men, it is argued, would come together and of their own volition fashion doctrines that were "a slap in the face . . . to everything that healthy human understanding has viewed as sound thinking from that day to this".¹⁰⁰ What is more, no one would *accept* the incredible reports about the risen Lord unless "facts forced them to it".¹⁰¹ The argument applies with particular force to the absolutely unparalleled situation of the 40 Days, when Christ, "immortal and glorious", condescends "to come to the table of illiterate and poor Apostles, partake of their coarse fare while he sits chatting with them" in a middle-class tenement or beside a smoky fire on the beach.¹⁰²

The one thing that has got a respectful hearing for the 40-Day Ministry is the need for such an episode to explain the founding of the Church. Catholic theologians especially favor it as a time for settling all doctrinal issues, establishing proper officials, and preparing the Apostles for a missionary activity which the world was to find irresistible.¹⁰³ But we have already noted that the progress of the Church was but a triumphal procession "out of the world",¹⁰⁴ and that nothing was ever handed down from that great time of instruction, conventional Christianity having rejected all the traditions of the 40 Days and turned elsewhere for its

⁹⁹ Justin, *Dial.*, 2: 31-34; 40: 4; 49: 2; 52: 1, 4; 111; *Clem. Recog.*, 1: 32f; 3: 61.

¹⁰⁰ K. Holl, in *Zt. f. system. Theol.*, 2 (1924), 403; cf. J. Jeremias, in *Expos. Times*, 69 (1958), 337f; J. Schneider, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 87 (1962), 401ff. The argument has been skillfully pressed by C. S. Lewis.

¹⁰¹ G. Lindeskog, in *Novum Testamentum*, 5 (1962), 149f, 145.

¹⁰² . . . ad rudium et pauperum Apostolorum mensam, escam et salinum vile et luteum se demittere, eis assidere, cum eis convivari . . . a Lapide, *Comment.*, 17: 51. On the nature of the coarse food, Tissot, *Life of Christ*, 4: 260.

¹⁰³ So J.-P. Migne, *Script. Sacr. Cursus Completus* (1840), 23: 1130; St. Leo, *Sermo* 73, in *P.L.* 54: 394-6; E. Jacquier, *Actes des Ap.*, p. 9; J. Sint, in *Ztschr. f. kathol. Theol.*, 84 (1962), 149-151.

¹⁰⁴ II Clem., *Ep.*, 5-8; *Didache*, c. 9; *Epist. Apostol.*, 36 (47); *Ev. XII Apost.*, in *P.O.* 2: 154; Logion, No. 129, in *P.O.* 19: 551; Justin, *Dial.*, 110: 6; 119: 5f.

doctrine and liturgy.¹⁰⁵ The Church can hardly claim the 40 Days as its franchise while confessing total ignorance of what was done and taught then.¹⁰⁵

To summarize, then, we have in the early apocryphal writings both direct and indirect evidence for the reality of the post-resurrectional activity of Jesus. 1) By uniformly supporting the clear and unequivocal language of Acts 1:3, and by making the 40-Day teaching their principal concern, these writers serve notice that this latterly despised and neglected theme had top priority among the early Christians. 2) Under the heading of the 40-Day conversations the same writings convey to us a consistent and closely-knit body of doctrine 3) accompanied by an equally organic structure of rites and ordinances — *not* a farrago of odds and ends in the Gnostic manner.¹⁰⁶ 4) The Gnostic phenomenon itself attests the universal awareness that such a teaching had formerly existed and been lost to the Main Church: the specific Gnostic claim to possess the secrets of the 40 Days shows what it was that was missing. 5) Furthermore, the apocryphal writings themselves fully explain that loss in terms both of secrecy and apostasy, while 6) the great impact of the 40-Day image on popular Christianity is clearly reflected in popular legends and cults.

As indirect evidence we must consider the extreme oddness and unpopularity of the 40-Day proposition, logically and artistically disturbing and burdened with a view of the future which is negative and frightening. It is anything but a product of wishful thinking or a bid for popular support. Yet the only arguments against it

¹⁰⁵ *Supra*, n. 25. Some insist that because we know the *subject* of the 40-Days' discourse we also know its *content*—which is far from being the case. J. Sint, *l.c.*, R. F. Bruce, *Commentary*, p. 34.

¹⁰⁶ The same association of ideas meets us in such venerable documents as the so-called Shabako Stone (K. Sethe, *Dramatische Texte zu altägypt. Mysterienspielen I* (Leipzig, 1928)) and the *Enuma Elish*, where we find the council and controversy in heaven, the creation of the world, the law of the Two Ways, the champion and redeemer of the race who overcomes the powers of death, and the obligation of the human race to participate in rites commemorating and dramatizing those cosmic events. The same motifs are conspicuous in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and form the foundation of what is sometimes designated today as "patternism". Whatever the significance of these resemblances, they do show that our apocryphal concepts are *not* the contrivances of undisciplined Oriental fantasy.

have been arguments of interpretation. Over against a facile manipulation of texts stands a massive array of phenomena which deserves more than the wave of the hand which we have given it here. Why is there no *Evangelium quadraginta dierum*? Its absence confirms the unreality of the 40 Days to those scholars who point out that the record speaks only of what Christ *taught* during that period rather than what he *did*.¹⁰⁷ But as Anselm observes, before the Resurrection Christ was human—after it he was God.¹⁰⁸ As such he came to teach and to teach only—all are agreed that even the eating and drinking had no other purpose—communing with men on a wholly different level from the man of sorrows in the Gospels. The 40-Day episode is indeed unique. If it never took place, what was it that produced the singular phenomena that have been attributed to it?

Provo (Utah, U.S.A.),

Brigham Young University, 532 B Library

¹⁰⁷ So C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu*, p. 205, and W. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*, p. 50.

¹⁰⁸ Anselm, *Homil.* 7, in *P.L.* 158: 628f.