

SWEET GOSPEL HAWK money.com
Part I

THE
ORACLES ASCRIBED TO MATTHEW
BY
PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS

A CONTRIBUTION TO
THE CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

WITH APPENDICES ON THE
AUTHORSHIP OF THE DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA,
THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION, AND THE DATE OF THE
MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET
1894

All rights reserved

PREFACE

THE following monograph is a contribution to the criticism of the New Testament. The views put forward in it are shortly these. That the famous work, *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, by Papias of Hierapolis, about which so much has been written, was upon the interpretation of Messianic prophecies, and that the work referred to in it, and attributed to Matthew, consisted of a collection of Messianic prophecies in Hebrew, extracted from the Old Testament, and perhaps from other books.

I was led to conclusions which differ so much from those put forward by most critics, in the following way. After reading the argument in the work entitled 'Supernatural Religion,' upon the gospel quotations in Justin Martyr, I was desirous of testing the matter by examining the quotations as they stood in the text of that father. After examining a considerable number of these quotations, I came to the conclusion that while there were many short passages, which, considered by themselves, might well be supposed to have been quoted from the canonical gospels, it was not reasonable to suppose that any of Justin's long quotations came

from the canonical gospels. All of them I have examined exhibit the following peculiarities. They consist of phrases, resembling sometimes one and sometimes another of the canonical gospels, and of other phrases not found in any of them, woven together, so as in each case to form a perfectly coherent whole. No quotation ever follows any one of the canonical gospels consecutively for more than a line or two. There is nothing about the quotations that in the least suggests that they are paraphrased or quoted merely from memory. Between them and the canonical gospels must be interposed the labour of some one who has deliberately cut a text to pieces and rearranged it. It is impossible to suppose that Justin, by merely quoting from the canonical gospels, would have made this mosaic.¹ After examining a consider-

¹ Dr. Sanday has endeavoured to set against this argument the mixed quotations found in the Fathers from the Old Testament. I am disposed, on the other hand, to draw from these mixed quotations the inference that the Fathers quoted the Old Testament in such cases from secondary sources, that is to say, that collections of texts upon particular topics were made either by the persons making the quotations or other authors, and that such collections were the immediate source of the quotations. These mixed quotations are not a probable result of loose citation or of unconscious cerebration. It must be remembered that evidence which is conclusive that the citation, mediately or immediately, is derived from the Old Testament, is not in a parallel case in a writer as old as Justin at all conclusive that an evangelical quotation came from one of the canonical gospels. For, as regards the Old Testament citations, we know that, however devious may have been the road, the Old Testament is the ultimate source of them; but as regards evangelical quotations, on the other hand, we know from internal evidence that the canonical gospels are not original books; in fact, that they are many removes from original books.

The probability, therefore, of an evangelical citation in a writer before the time of Irenaeus coming, not from the canonical gospels, but from some one of the works upon which they are founded, or from some parallel work derived from the same materials, is very great.

able number of gospel quotations, I determined to test Justin's habits of quotation by comparing some of his Old Testament quotations with the LXX. I readily found long quotations which followed the LXX verbatim, sometimes with a various reading or two, through whole chapters. On the other hand, there were short quotations which were very different from the LXX. These latter I noticed to consist of passages explained as Messianic prophecies, some but not all of which were also quoted to a great extent in the same words in Matthew. I hence drew the conclusion that Justin got the Old Testament quotations which did not come from the LXX out of his gospel, and I accounted for those which are not found in any of the canonical gospels, by supposing that his gospel cited more Messianic prophecies than the present canonical gospels do. It was not till some years afterwards that, on reading Davidson's 'Introduction to the New Testament,' I became acquainted with Bleek's analysis of the Old Testament quotations in the synoptic gospels; I was then struck by its agreement with the phenomenon I had noticed in Justin Martyr. Putting the two things together, the explanation suggested itself to me of a work in Aramaic, upon the interpretation of Messianic prophecy, which had been part of the materials out of which the canonical gospels were compiled. Now I had already formed the conclusion that the books attributed by Papias to Matthew and Mark were rather materials out of which the canonical gospels had been partly compiled, than any of those gospels. The consideration, therefore, suggested itself whether this book on Messianic prophecy could be the book written in Hebrew which was attributed by Papias to Matthew.

It was after this that I carefully studied Dr. Lightfoot's essays in the 'Contemporary Review.' I here saw that in all the instances given by him, that were before or not long after the time of Papias, the word *λόγια* was applied to the Old Testament. This suggested to me the interpretation I have maintained in the following essay, and I accordingly set to work to collect all the instances I could of the use of the word, with the result of confirming the suggestion. As I have said, the conclusions I have come to differ from those of most critics, orthodox and unorthodox; but as they are based upon a considerable induction, I have determined to publish them.

I ought to add that I am not under any direct obligation to Credner in respect of the portion of this monograph which deals with the Old Testament quotations from Justin Martyr. I did not become acquainted with the nature of Credner's work until I had well-nigh done, when I learned about it from Dr. Sanday's 'Gospels in the Second Century.' If I had obtained the knowledge earlier I should have endeavoured to avail myself of the assistance which no doubt could have been derived from that source.

February 1894.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY	1
II. THE DATE OF PAPIAS	6
III. JOHN THE ELDER	33
IV. THE VARIOUS READINGS <i>λόγος</i> AND <i>λογίων</i>	45
V. THE MEANING OF THE WORD <i>λόγια</i>	48
VI. THE MEANING OF PAPIAS	82
VII. BLEEK'S ANALYSIS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPELS	129
VIII. THE SYNOPSIS GOSPELS PARTLY FROM GREEK AND PARTLY FROM ARAMAIC SOURCES	134
IX. SOURCE OF MESSIANIC PROPHECIES COMMON TO MATTHEW AND JUSTIN MARTYR	146
X. SOURCE OF SOME MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN JUSTIN MARTYR NOT FOUND IN MATTHEW	185
XI. CONCLUSIONS	203
XII. MESSIANIC PROPHECIES NOT FOUND IN CANONICAL BOOKS	206
APPENDIX	
I. REMARKS UPON THE TRANSLATION OF THE FRAGMENT OF PAPIAS RELATING TO MARK	225
II. PLACES IN THE LXX CONTAINING THE WORD <i>λογίων</i>	227
III. PHILO, THE AUTHOR OF THE 'DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA'	227

APPENDIX		PAGE
IV.	VARIOUS QUOTATIONS AND RENDERINGS OF ISAIAH XLII. 2-4	230
V.	TRANSLATION OF EUSEBIUS'S 'ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,' BOOK III. CAP. 39.	232
VI.	DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS	236
VII.	EXTRACT FROM GEORGE HAMARTOLUS AND NOTE FROM THE CODEX BAROCCIANUS AS TO THE MARTYRDOM OF JOHN	242
VIII.	EXTRACTS FROM ANASTASIUS OF SINAI	245
IX.	THE NOTICE OF PAPIAS BY JOHN MALALAS	246
X.	EXTRACTS FROM DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE AND MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR	246
XI.	THE DATE OF THE MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP	247
INDEX	269

THE ORACLES ASCRIBED TO MATTHEW BY PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

PAPIAS, who, according to Eusebius, was Bishop of Hierapolis in the first decade of the second century, wrote a work in five books, entitled *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, which, to avoid begging the question I have to consider, has been translated, An Exposition of Dominical Oracles. This work is lost, all but a few extracts. One of these extracts, preserved by Eusebius, relates to a book written by Matthew, and another to a book written by Mark. The question I propose to consider is what relation (if any) the former work bears to the canonical gospel ascribed to Matthew.

The extract, which is very short, is as follows: 'Matthew wrote the Oracles (*τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο*) in the Hebrew language, and each man interpreted them as he was able.'

The extract relating to Mark is longer :—

'and this is what the Elder said, Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, but without arrangement (οὐ μὲν τοι τάξει), as many things as he related (ἐμνημόνευσεν) either said or done by Christ.

'For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterwards, as I said, he followed Peter, who used to make his teaching according to the occasion, and not as making a systematic disquisition (σύνταξιν) upon the Dominical oracles (or discourses, according as the reading is λογίων or λόγων), so that Mark did not act wrongly when he thus wrote some things as he related them. For of one thing he took care, not to pass by any of the things which he heard, or to falsify anything in them.'¹

These extracts were long taken (by Paley, for example²) as evidence that the canonical gospels of Matthew and Mark were known to Papias, and ascribed by him to the authors whose names they now bear. Of late years, however, another theory has been put forward: that the canonical gospels were first circulated anonymously; that Christians became curious to ascertain the names of their authors; and that these passages of Papias were laid hold of for the purpose, and the anonymous books in use in the Church identified with the books mentioned by Papias.

There is considerable reason to think that the gospels were, in fact, originally circulated anonymously.

For instance, when Clement of Alexandria wishes to describe the two gospels which in his opinion were written first, he says, not Matthew and Luke, but

¹ See Appendix i.

² *Evidence*, ix. 6.

'those which contain the genealogies,' προγεγράφθαι τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας¹—an inconvenient circumlocution, which he would scarcely have used had he not known that the manuscripts in the hands of many of his readers had no names attached by which they could be cited.²

When we look closely at the words of Eusebius, we see that he does not say that the books referred to were the canonical gospels. The one extract he says was about Matthew, doubtless meaning the apostle, and the other about Mark, who wrote the gospel, not about the gospel written by Mark. This is only material in considering how far the lost context of the passages cited may have borne out the current opinion, and we see that Eusebius does not pledge himself that it did.³

But to come to the passages themselves. The statement as to Matthew is on all sides understood to mean that he wrote, not in Hebrew properly so called, but in the language called Aramæan or Aramaic. Taking this to be so, it is utterly inapplicable to the

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. vi. cap. 14.

² According to Semisch, Clement of Alexandria in his very numerous citations from the Gospels names John but three times, Matthew twice, Luke twice, and Mark once. See *The Fourth Gospel: External Evidence of Authorship*, by Ezra Abbot, p. 72.

³ In another place, *H. E.* lib. ii. cap. 15, Eusebius tells, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, a story of Mark writing his gospel at the request of hearers of Peter; which reads very like a version of the account contained in the foregoing extract, referred to the canonical gospel of Mark, and amplified; and then says that Papias corroborates Clement. This, however, by no means deprives of its significance the fact that when Eusebius was actually quoting Papias, and may therefore be supposed to have had his book before him, he refrained from saying explicitly that the extract related to the gospel. In another place, *H. E.* lib. iii. cap. 24, Eusebius says that Matthew wrote his gospel in his native tongue. But he might have got this from Irenæus. See *H. E.* lib. v. cap. 8.

canonical gospel. For the passage implies that the interpretation of the book was a task of which everybody was in some measure capable, but only with difficulty. Now the word *ἡρμῆνευσε* (=interpreted) may be taken to mean either 'explained' or 'translated.' If the former, there is nothing about the gospel of Matthew which could make it difficult to be understood by a contemporary who understood the language in which it was written. If the latter, the statement is equally unintelligible. Aramaic was not a learned language. The Christians of Palestine, whose mother-tongue it was, understood it perfectly. The Greek Christians did not understand it at all. Where then is the meaning of saying that everyone interpreted it as he was able?

When we come to the passage referring to Mark, we see a book described of a character altogether different from the canonical gospel: 'Things said and done by Christ without arrangement'—such a book as a man might have written who had listened to teaching, not in itself containing a consecutive narrative.

In order, however, to ascertain exactly the meaning of Papias, it is necessary to ascertain the sense in which he used the word *λόγια*, or oracles. Now the subject of his work being 'An Exposition of Dominical *λόγια*, or oracles,' the obvious motive he would have in making the remarks cited by Eusebius would be to collect what other writers had done with regard to the same topic. It is, therefore, probable that the word *λόγια* is used in the same sense throughout the citations. It, therefore, becomes material to determine whether it was cited twice or thrice, for in the latter case we have three equations, so to say, for

determining its meaning, and in the former only two. In order to do this it will be necessary to consider whether *λογίων* or *λόγων* is the preferable reading in the passage relating to Mark; and finally, as the intendment of the word *λόγιον* varied from time to time, it is necessary to determine as accurately as may be the date of Papias. I will consider these questions in the opposite order to that in which I have stated them, that is to say: first, the date at which Papias wrote; secondly, the question concerning the text; thirdly, the meaning of the word *λόγιον*.

CHAPTER II

THE DATE OF PAPIAS

THE first question to consider then with regard to these extracts from Papias is at what time they were written. The commonly received account, based on the Paschal Chronicle, is that Papias suffered death by martyrdom in the year 164 A.D.; in which case it would be improbable that he could have written a book of the sort attributed to him before the third decade of the second century. But I think Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham,¹ has proved, from remarkable coincidences of language, that this story of the martyrdom of Papias arose from the writer of the Chronicle applying to him a statement made by Eusebius as to one Papyrus; and we may therefore disregard it, and pass on to the other evidence as to the date of Papias.

The direct evidence upon the subject is contained in the following notices in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius:—

Book III. cap. 34.

'In the third year of the reign of the above-mentioned emperor (that is, Trajan) Clement, Bishop of Rome, departed this life. . . .'

¹ *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 147; originally published in the *Contemporary Review*.

Cap. 35.

'But Symeon also having ended his days in the way I have declared, a Jew of the name of Justus received in his stead the throne of the bishopric at Jerusalem. . . .'

Cap. 36.

'About their time Polycarp, a pupil of the Apostles, was eminent in Asia, having had put into his hands the bishopric of the Church at Smyrna, from those who were eye-witnesses and assistants of the Lord. About whose time Papias was becoming known, being himself Bishop of the see of Hierapolis.' (Καθ' ὃν ἐγνωρίζετο Παπίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεραπόλει παροικίας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος.)

The next date given by Eusebius, that of the accession of Primus, Bishop of Alexandria, is the twelfth year of Trajan. This is at the very beginning of Book IV. of the Ecclesiastical History, and immediately follows the notice of the writings of Papias which concludes Book III.

Eusebius, therefore, says that Papias was not merely Bishop of Hierapolis, but getting into note about the year A.D. 101, or a few years after. The inference would be that the only work by which he was known was written before that date.

In coming to this conclusion I have not thought it necessary to enter into an investigation of the date of the martyrdom of Symeon. It is a question too obscure to throw light on anything else. A Syriac Chronicle, perhaps on the authority of this very passage, places it A.D. 104, and M. Waddington has assigned the date when Herodes Atticus, by whose order it is alleged to have taken place, was Consular Legate of Palestine to the years A.D. 105-107, his

reason for this being that these are the only years about that time when he has not evidence that other persons held that office.¹ When one couples the difficulty of assigning a date to Herodes Atticus with the statement that Symeon was a hundred and twenty years old at the time he was martyred, one is apt to suspect that the whole story is a fable. However this may be, no inference can be drawn from it that will seriously affect the above conclusion as to the date of Papias.

Irenaeus describes Papias as the hearer of John, meaning the apostle, the companion of Polycarp, and a man of primitive times, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ. Now I think Eusebius is successful in showing that Irenaeus is wrong in describing Papias as a hearer of the apostle John; still the fact that he describes him in the way above stated is not without weight in determining his date. It is language a man would not use of his own contemporary, even of a man who had flourished in his youth. We may therefore safely, on the testimony of Irenaeus, put the period of living memory, or sixty years at the least, between the time at which Irenaeus was writing and the date of the work of Papias he had in view. This would make the latest date to which the work of Papias could be assigned about A.D. 130; but of course the testimony of Irenaeus would favour a much earlier date.

Eusebius also speaks of ecclesiastical writers generally having been induced by the antiquity of Papias to adopt his opinions concerning the millennium. This would seem to show that he had evidence before him, by reason of the notices contained in different writers,

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. ii. part 2, sect. i. pp. 445, 450.

by which to fix the date of Papias, and that these notices favoured an early date. Such a writer, for instance, as Melito, who wrote about A.D. 150, would scarcely be induced by the antiquity of a writer who wrote only five-and-twenty years earlier to adopt his views.¹

We will now turn to consider what internal evidence the extracts afford as to the date at which they were written; for which purpose I must cite another extract from Papias, preserved by Eusebius, with his comments on it:—

‘But I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you, with the interpretations, whatever things at any time I well learned from the elders and well remembered, having thoroughly established the truth concerning them. For I did not, as most men, take pleasure in those who say most, but in those who teach what is true, nor in those who relate the commandments of another man (τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς), but in those who relate the commandments given by the Lord to the faith and coming from the truth itself. But if anywhere anyone came who had been a follower of the elders, I used to enquire after the words of the elders. What Andrew or what Peter said? (εἶπεν), or what Philip? or what Thomas or James? or what John or Matthew? or any other of the disciples of the Lord? and the things which Aristion and John the Elder (ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης), the disciples of the Lord, say (λέγουσιν). For I did not apprehend that things out of books profited me so much as what was said by the living and abiding voice.’

¹ This must be taken as an illustration merely, as I am not aware that there is direct evidence that Melito held millenarian views. Though as he wrote a treatise on the Revelation of John (Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. iv. cap. 26) and Eusebius does not say anything to the contrary, it is probable that Melito ought to be included in the general statement of Eusebius above noticed.

On this extract Eusebius makes the following comment:—

‘Where also it is worthy to be noticed that he twice mentions the name of John, and the man of that name first mentioned he associates with Peter, James, and Matthew, and the rest of the Apostles, clearly meaning the Evangelist; but the other John he puts in a separate clause, and classes with others outside the number of the Apostles, placing Aristion before him. And he clearly names him “the Elder.” So that through these things also is shown to be true the account of those who have said that there were two in Asia who bore the same name, and that there were two sepulchres at Ephesus, and that each is still to this day called John’s.’

It has been argued that the interpretation put by Eusebius upon the words of Papias is not correct: that Papias wanted to distinguish between disciples as to whom he could get secondhand information and disciples from whom he could get direct information; and that he names John twice because he could get in his case information of both sorts, and that he applies the title Elder to him in the second place to distinguish him from Aristion, in the sense of apostle, which it is contended that he has previously applied in that sense to Andrew, Peter, &c.

On this last assumption, which is necessary for this interpretation, I think it fails. *Πρεσβύτερος*, or Elder, may be used in two senses: one its ordinary sense, as implying age; the other its technical sense, as the name of an office in the Church. In the latter sense I do not think it is ever applied specially to the Apostles. In the passage under consideration, Papias begins by using the word as importing age, that is, not men advanced in years, but men of the former

generation. This is what he means when he speaks of the things he learned from the elders. He uses the word in the same sense when he speaks of questioning those who had been followers of the elders. He then as elders instances a number of apostles and other disciples of the Lord, and then he goes on to instance Aristion and John the Elder. I can see no meaning to put upon this last phrase except that put upon it by Eusebius, that he now uses the word in a special sense, as a designation of a particular man, who for some reason or other, probably by reason of his office, had come to be known as the Elder (e.g., Cato the censor). Why else among a number of men, all named as instances of ‘elders’ from whom he had collected traditions, should he single out one to call him the Elder? This I think would be the proper interpretation of the language, even if no other John had been mentioned; but a person of the name John having been previously mentioned, there can be no doubt that the designation is added for the purpose of distinguishing two men, and that the first named is the apostle. John the Elder, therefore, is a different man from John the Apostle. Eusebius continues:—

‘To which things it is necessary to pay attention. For it is likely that the second, if one would not admit the first, beheld the revelation which is in circulation under the name of John. Papias, also, of whom we are now speaking, acknowledged that he took the words of the Apostles from those who had followed them, but says that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and John the Elder. At least he frequently mentions them by name, and places their traditions in his writings.’

A little further on, Eusebius mentions a story

which was told Papias by the daughters of Philip. From this we gather that while Papias was able to relate traditions which he had received personally from Aristion and John the Elder, who had been disciples of Jesus,¹ and also from the daughters of Philip, he was not able to report any traditions which he had gathered from any of the apostles personally. There can be no doubt on the latter point. Had Papias, who set so great store upon oral tradition, ever heard any of the apostles speak, he would certainly have mentioned it in such a way as to leave no room for doubt.

There is a more precise indication of time in that in speaking of the traditions gathered from the Apostles, Papias speaks in the past what Andrew, Peter, &c., said (*εἶπεν*); but in speaking of Aristion and John the Elder he uses the present, the things which Aristion and John the Elder say (*λέγουσιν*). The obvious inference from this change of tense is that John the Elder and Aristion were alive at the time, while the apostles he mentions were all dead. This is the opinion of Dr. Westcott, the present Bishop of Durham.² Dr. Lightfoot, indeed, suggested that *λέγουσιν* should be taken as the historic present used for the purpose of variety, but it is difficult to suppose that this can be the case with a present pointedly opposed to an aorist, as in this case.

I shall therefore assume that Papias wrote after

¹ As Papias in two consecutive clauses of the same sentence applies the word *μαθητής* to Andrew, Peter, &c., who had been disciples of Jesus in the proper sense of the word, and to Aristion and John the Elder, I think the proper inference is that it is applied to the latter also in the proper sense of the word, and that they had been actual hearers of Jesus. This is further borne out by his object, to get evidence of what Jesus had said.

² *Canon of the New Testament*, 5th edit. p. 70, note 1.

the deaths of the apostles he mentions, and during the lives of Aristion and John the Elder. The next matter to determine will be when the deaths of the two latter took place.

As regards Aristion, we are without means of information, except what may be inferred from the statement of Papias that he was a disciple of the Lord, which will place his death at some period within the duration of human life after the death of Jesus, and from the fact that it is stated in the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 46) that one Ariston, probably the same man, was a Bishop of Smyrna before Polycarp, from which we might probably infer that he was dead before Polycarp became Bishop of Smyrna—that is, before A.D. 101.

As regards John the Elder, we have, I think, means of more exact determination. It will be noticed that Irenaeus tells us that Papias was a hearer of the apostle John. This, Eusebius points out, is a mistake; he was a hearer merely of John the Elder, and not of the apostle. From this mistake of Irenaeus, we may assume that he confounded John the Elder with John the Apostle, and generally applied to the latter traditions which reached him about the former. Now Irenaeus tells us, apparently on the authority of certain elders of Asia, that John the disciple of the Lord lived to the time of Trajan.¹ The context, coupled with his failing to make mention of John the Elder as a distinct man from John the Apostle, shows that he means John the Apostle. So interpreted, John the Apostle must have lived to the age of ninety, or, more probably, ninety-five years. For Trajan began

¹ *Adv. Haer.* lib. ii. cap. 22, sect. 5.

his reign A.D. 98, or sixty-five years after the received date of the death of Jesus. Now John the Apostle can scarcely have been less than twenty-five years old at the time of his Master's death—that is to say, we can hardly suppose a younger man chosen to be an apostle. This would give him a minimum age of ninety at the accession of Trajan.¹ But it is evidently rather straining the point to suppose John so young as twenty-five at the former epoch. He would be therefore rather over than under ninety at the latter.

We must here note that Irenaeus, in the same passage in which he states that John lived to the time of Trajan, states, on the authority of all the elders of Asia, whom he describes as professing to speak on the direct testimony of John and other apostles, that Jesus lived to beyond the age of forty or fifty. If this were so, it would increase the probability that the Apostles were men of mature age.

As I have said, Irenaeus appears to have meant his statement to apply to John the Apostle, but he says John the disciple of the Lord, probably using the words of the elders on whose authority he made the statement; and when we bear in mind the fact, which is proved, that he confounded the two Johns, there can be little doubt that the statement ought to be applied to John the Elder. Such an application will render it much more probable, for though John the Elder was a disciple of Jesus, there is no reason from that to suppose he was a grown man at the time of his Master's death: he might, for instance, have been but a boy of fifteen; in that case he would be eighty at the time of the accession of Trajan, and

¹ See Appendix vi.

his surviving to that time would involve no improbability.¹ If, however, we suppose that the statement of Irenaeus is properly referred to John the Apostle, we are involved in this further difficulty. It is a necessary inference from the statement of Papias that John the Elder and Aristion must have survived John the Apostle by all the time which must have elapsed while Papias was collecting his traditions and writing his book; else, as both Johns lived at Ephesus, he would have got traditions direct from the apostle. Now this must have been some years—say, ten years or thereabouts. If, therefore, John the Elder and Aristion must have been eighty or thereabouts at the accession of Trajan, and survived John the Apostle by a time sufficient for this purpose, we should arrive at the conclusion that they, too, lived to an age approaching ninety. Now it would be not a little remarkable that there should be three disciples of Jesus in the same neighbourhood, two bearing the same name and living in the same city, who attained this great age. I think, therefore, that it may be safely concluded that John the disciple of the Lord who lived to the time of Trajan was John the Elder. This, I rather gather, is the opinion of Dr. Abbott, expressed in his article on the gospels in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.'

I ought here to notice an authority bearing upon the age of Papias, cited both by Dr. Lightfoot and

¹ Dr. Salmon remarks that, on the assumption that John the Elder was distinct from the apostle, 'we can hardly help identifying him with the John who is said to have lived to the reign of Trajan, and to have been the teacher of Polycarp and the early Asiatic bishops.' *Introduction to the New Testament*, 6th edit. p. 290. Dr. Salmon, however, doubts the distinction between John the Elder and John the Apostle.

by Dr. Westcott. It is an introduction prefixed to a Latin MS. of the fourth gospel found in the Vatican library, and assigned by Tischendorf to the ninth century. It is as follows:—

‘Evangelium Johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto; sicut Papias nomine Hierapolitanus, discipulus Johannis carus, in exotericis, id est in extremis (externis) quinque libris retulit. Descripsit vero evangelium dictante Johanne recte. Verum Martion haereticus, cum ab eo fuisset improbatus, abjectus est ab Johanne. Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.’¹

This passage is thus rendered by Dr. Lightfoot:—

‘The Gospel of John was made known and given to the churches by John, while he yet remained in the body, as (one) Papias by name, of Hierapolis, a beloved disciple of John, has related in his exoteric, that is, in his last five books; but he wrote down the Gospel at the dictation of John correctly.

‘But Marcion, the heretic, when he had been censured by him because he held heretical opinions, was cast off by John. Now he had brought writings or letters to him from the brethren that were in Pontus.’²

From the passage interpreted in this way it has been supposed that there were five spurious books annexed to the genuine books of Papias, which were known as the exoteric books to which reference has been made. This theory was originated by Overbeck, and has since been adopted by Hilgenfeld. If it be accepted, of course the passage is of no account. The theory adopted by Dr. Lightfoot is an earlier theory of Hilgenfeld—that *exotericis* is a mistake for

¹ Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, 5th edit. p. 77.

² *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 210.

exegeticis, which would make the passage run ‘as Papias . . . has related in his expositions in five books,’ for of course the words *id est in extremis* are merely a gloss of some editor or transcriber to explain the word *exotericis*, which he did not understand.

This passage is quoted both by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Lightfoot to show that Papias was acquainted with the gospel of St. John; but if it proves anything, it proves that Papias actually wrote that gospel at the dictation of John, and stated this in his five books. Papias therefore must have been, if the passage can be relied on, a contemporary of John who wrote the gospel, and this is why I mention the passage here. Now these statements are directly contradicted by Eusebius when he says, having special reference to John, that Papias by no means asserts that he was a hearer or eye-witness of the holy apostles. It is difficult to reject this statement of Eusebius in favour of that of an anonymous Latin writer of the ninth century who had probably never seen the writings of Papias, and could probably not read a word of them, and who shows his ignorance of ecclesiastical history by relating a story which implies that Marcion had published his heresy in the time of the apostle John. But I venture to doubt whether either the German or English critics I have mentioned have found out the true meaning of the passage. The words *id est in extremis* may be rejected as a mere gloss, but these words show that the word *exotericis* puzzled one of the later editors. This word was therefore not introduced at the last stage, and may more probably have come down from the

earliest form of the statement. Now the word *exotericus* has a recognised meaning which appears very apt for the interpretation of this passage. It means that which is contained in writing as opposed to mere oral instruction. The backbone of the assertion, then, will appear to be this: that what Papias received orally from John he reduced to writing in five books. Understanding by John, John the Elder, this statement is accurate, agreeing exactly with Eusebius. The blunder which has been made is in assuming that the traditions which were thus reduced to writing by Papias constituted the fourth gospel. There can be little doubt that the passage in question is a mere amplification and embellishment of some such statement about the traditions received orally from John, and reduced to writing by Papias in five books, misapplied to the fourth gospel. The passage therefore has no value whatever.

In connection with this passage from the Vatican MS. should be considered the Greek passage contained in the 'Catena' published by B. Corder, which I will quote from the translation of Dr. Lightfoot or Mr. Harmer, whichever it is:—

'For last of these, John, surnamed the Son of Thunder, when he was now a very old man, as Irenaeus and Eusebius and a succession of trustworthy historians have handed down to us, about the time when terrible heresies had cropped up, dictated the Gospel to his own disciple, the virtuous Papias, of Hierapolis, to fill up what was lacking in those who before him had proclaimed the word to the nations throughout all the earth.'

We have here the same story that the fourth gospel was written by Papias at the dictation of the

apostle John, but the writer, instead of citing as his authority the lost books of Papias, cites the extant works of Irenaeus and Eusebius. What could be learnt from those works is, that Papias committed to writing traditions he had received from a disciple of the Lord called John, whom the former writer supposed to be the apostle of the same name and the later writer did not. Some statement of this fact, made by some one of the trustworthy historians mentioned in the extract and distorted by some other of them, must be the basis of the fable contained in the extract; it is therefore of no value at all.

In considering whether the statements of Irenaeus as to John the disciple of the Lord ought to be applied to John the Apostle, we ought not to pass over the statement of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, that John the Apostle was a martyr, a fact unknown to Irenaeus, or at all events not mentioned by him, and which therefore, if accepted, must raise considerable doubt as to the accuracy of the information furnished by Irenaeus with regard to the apostle.

There can be no doubt that the expression of Polycrates, 'John who lay upon the bosom of the Lord . . . both martyr and teacher' (*καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος*),¹ amounts to a statement that the apostle John suffered death by martyrdom. In the next sentence the same word is applied by Polycrates in exactly the same way to Polycarp, and in the succeeding sentences to Thraseas and Sagaris, in whose cases there can be no doubt of the meaning. Moreover, in the time of Polycrates the word appears to have been already restricted to those who suffered death for their faith,

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 24.

as we learn from the letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienna. When their fellow-Christians applied the name 'martyrs' to the prisoners who had suffered repeated tortures, but were still alive, the sufferers refused the title, saying, 'They are already martyrs whom Christ has thought worthy to be taken up in their confession, and has sealed their martyrdom by the issue, but we are mean and poor confessors.'¹ *Ἐκεῖνοι ἤδη μάρτυρες, οὓς ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ Χριστοῦ ἡξίωσεν ἀναληφθῆναι, ἐπισφραγισάμενος αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς ἐξόδου τὴν μαρτυρίαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁμολογοὶ μέτριοι καὶ ταπεινοί.*

The next question then to consider is the weight to be attached to the statement of Polycrates. It is contained in a letter addressed to Victor, Bishop of Rome, upon the Paschal controversy. Victor became Bishop of Rome, as we learn from Eusebius, in the tenth year of Commodus, that is, A.D. 189, and continued until about the ninth year of Severus, that is, A.D. 201. If, therefore, we take A.D. 195 as the date of the letter, we shall not be far wrong. In it Polycrates says that he was then sixty-five years in the Lord (*ἑξήκοντα πέντε ἔτη ἔχων ἐν Κυρίῳ*), which I suppose means that he was sixty-five years old. He was therefore born about A.D. 130. He professes to speak concerning the Paschal controversy according to the tradition of his family, seven of whom were bishops. He writes as having that acquaintance with the sentiments of the people of Ephesus and that part of Asia that would be possessed by a man who had spent his life there. Now the question is, What is the value of his statements concerning the apostle John? Suppos-

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 2.

ing Polycrates could understand and remember historical statements made to him when he was ten years old, and taking the duration of living memory to be sixty years, he might have heard the testimony of eye-witnesses to events as early as the year A.D. 80 about, but not earlier. Now, on the supposition that the statements of Irenaeus as to John the disciple of the Lord ought not to be applied to the apostle, we have no information as to when the apostle died beyond that he was alive in the year 68, the date of the Book of Revelation, at which time he would be sixty years of age or upwards. If he lived to the year A.D. 80, he would be seventy-two years old or upwards. It would be rather more probable that he would die, in the ordinary course of nature, before that date than after it; and if his life were cut short by martyrdom, it would therefore be more likely to be before that date than after it.

We have therefore no reason to think that Polycrates could speak from the testimony of eye-witnesses as to the martyrdom of the apostle John. The event, however, is one of a class likely, so far as the main fact was concerned, to be accurately transmitted by the tradition of two generations. The statement of Polycrates is therefore one which it would appear we ought to accept, and its acceptance discredits the testimony of Irenaeus.

In considering the weight to be attached to the two men, it must be remembered that, though about the same age and born in the same locality, Irenaeus left Asia when a boy (*παῖς*), while Polycrates resided there all his life. Now children, though they remember clearly things they witnessed themselves, do not usually

pick up clear or accurate accounts of historical facts from the statements of others.

I will now consider two passages which support very strongly one of the conclusions for which I have contended—viz., that the apostle John suffered martyrdom—but one of which offers an argument in favour of a later date for Papias than I have assigned him. The first passage is found in the 'Chronicon' of George called Hamartolus, or the Sinner, a monk of the ninth century. This writer, after remarking that John survived the rest of the twelve, and then suffered as a martyr (*μαρτυρίου κατηξίωται*), continues as follows:—

'For Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis, who was an eyewitness of him, says in the second book (*λόγῳ*) of the "Dominical Oracles" (*τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*) that he was killed by the Jews.'¹

The other is from an anonymous note lately found by De Boor in the Codex Baroccianus and conjectured to have been extracted from the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Philip of Side, which was published about A.D. 427. It is as follows:—

'Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews. The aforesaid Papias has narrated as having received it from the daughters of Philip that Barsabas, who is also called Justus, being tested by the unbelievers, drinking the poison of a viper in the name of the Christ, was preserved harmless. And he narrates also other wonders, and especially that concerning the mother of (Manaimus?), who was raised from the dead, about those raised from the dead by the Christ, that they lived until Hadrian (*ἵστορεῖ δὲ καὶ*

¹ For the context of this passage see Appendix vii.

ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μητέρα Μαναίμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν· περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων ὅτι ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων).'

It appears, therefore, from these two authorities, that the works of Papias contained a direct statement that John the Apostle was killed by the Jews. That is a very strong confirmation of the conclusion I have drawn from other sources, that the apostle John suffered death by martyrdom, and was a different person from John the disciple of the Lord, who continued to the time of Trajan. Some writers have argued from these passages that the apostle John was put to death in Palestine, and, therefore, was never in Asia at all. It does not at all follow, because John was killed by the Jews, that he was killed in Palestine.

He might have been killed in a riot, or have died from the effects of corporal punishment inflicted upon him by his countrymen as one of their own community; or even, if put to death by the Roman authorities at the instigation of the Jews, he might, without any very great inaccuracy, be said to have been killed by the Jews. Dr. Lightfoot refused to believe on the authority of the passage in George Hamartolus,¹ and Dr. Salmon² has refused to believe on the authority of both passages, that Papias made any such statement; but there is no reason to be adduced to the contrary, except the silence of Eusebius as to Papias having made any such statement. Now had Eusebius desired to prove that the apostle John suffered martyrdom, this argument would have great weight, but it is very doubtful whether Eusebius would desire to bring this

¹ *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 211 *et seq.*

² *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4th edit. p. 319.

fact into prominence. The stand he takes is this. In Book III. chapter xxiii. of his 'Ecclesiastical History' he cites from Irenaeus the statement that John remained until the time of Trajan, and in chapter xxxi. of the same book he cites from Polycrates the statement that John, who was both a martyr and a teacher, rested at Ephesus. Eusebius does not put together these testimonies in his own words, but the natural inference is that he accepted both statements, and believed that John survived to the time of Trajan, and afterwards suffered death by martyrdom. That Eusebius did not want to give prominence to the fact of the martyrdom of John is shown by his leaving the statement of Polycrates to speak for itself. It is therefore not surprising that he did not quote another testimony to the same effect from Papias.

I will now pass on to the bearing of the latter quotation upon the date of Papias. It appears to state that Papias made a statement about those who were raised from the dead by Christ, that they lived till Hadrian. If Papias made such a statement, he must, of course, have written after the accession of Hadrian, and after the death of John the Elder and Aristion.

But in this aspect the passage is open to the following observations: (1) The passage appears to be very awkwardly constructed. The sentence would come to a natural stop after the word *ἀναστᾶσαν*, making it read: 'And he narrated also other wonders, and especially that concerning the mother of Manaimus, who was raised from the dead.' If the sentence is supposed to run on further, it must be construed thus: 'And he narrated also other wonders concerning those raised from the dead by the Christ, that they

lived till Hadrian, and especially concerning the mother of Manaimus, who was raised from the dead,' the latter clause being in the original an awkward parenthesis. (2) The statement about those raised from the dead by Christ living till Hadrian excites great suspicion that it is derived from a passage in an apology addressed to Hadrian by Quadratus, in which, speaking of the long lives of those healed or raised from the dead by Christ, he says, 'So that some of them reached even to our times.' It will be noticed that the statement of Quadratus (*ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο*),¹ except so far as it affirms that Christ healed persons and raised them from the dead, has nothing miraculous or even improbable about it. He does not state that any such persons were alive at the time he was writing, probably soon after the accession of Hadrian. Using the aorist (*ἀφίκοντο*) he implies the contrary, and by the phrase 'to our times' he implies that such persons survived to some period within the lifetime of himself as well as Hadrian, but not that they survived until the accession of Hadrian to the Empire. Hadrian was born A.D. 71, and Quadratus probably about the same time, that is, thirty-eight years after the death of Jesus. There is no improbability in some persons who were brought to Jesus when young living beyond this period. In the quotation the statement is made somewhat remarkable, though not at all miraculous, by making these persons survive until the accession of Hadrian, for that is what it must be taken to mean. The accession of Hadrian was eighty-three years after the death of Jesus, and therefore it is just within the

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 3.

bounds of ordinary possibilities that some person who was brought to Jesus in infancy might survive till that period. This difference does not make it the less likely that the statement is taken from Quadratus. Stories have always a tendency to assume a more marvellous tone on being repeated, but the marvel is not sufficient for it to be classed as such along with the raising of persons from the dead. (3) There is again the consideration that Eusebius does not notice any such statement on the part of Papias. Now in this case the silence of Eusebius is of weight, for he desired to depreciate Papias, and it would have tended to do so as a retailer of traditions, could he have shown that he did not write until after the accession of Hadrian.

Putting all these things together, I think the proper conclusion is that the extract has broken off in the middle of a sentence; that the statement as to what was said by Papias ends with the word ἀναστῆσαν, which ought to be followed by a full stop, and the following words are the commencement of another sentence, which, when complete, was a statement about what was said by Quadratus. Such an error is not at all improbable in a marginal note.

We may, therefore, disregard this passage as having any bearing upon the date of Papias.

Before dismissing the subject of the end of the apostle John, we ought to consider the curious remark made by Tertullian, who apostrophises the church of Rome in these words:—

‘Happy Church, for which Apostles poured forth the whole doctrine with their blood, where Peter equals the passion of the Lord, where Paul is crowned with the death of John (i.e. the Baptist), where the Apostle John, after

that having been plunged into boiling oil he suffered nothing, is banished unto an island.’¹

This story of the miraculous deliverance of the apostle John must have been current at Rome at the end of the second century. The most probable explanation of it is, that there were current different traditions about two different men of the name of John: of John the Apostle, that he suffered martyrdom, and of John the Elder, that he died a natural death at extreme old age in the reign of Trajan. These two men being confounded, the accounts were reconciled, as nearly as might be, by the story preserved by Tertullian.

Little reliance can be placed upon the scene of the martyrdom being at Rome; the passage in Tertullian sufficiently explains the origin of this part of the story. It was for the aggrandisement of the Roman Church to be the place of martyrdom of as many apostles as possible.

We thus get to the commencement of the reign of Trajan, or—as in the absence of evidence it would be rash to assume that Aristion lived to eighty as well as John the Elder—some years earlier, as the latest date to which the work of Papias can be assigned.

The next question is, what evidence there is for determining an anterior limit to the date of its composition.

There are three considerations which may assist us in this: First, the impression of lapse of time during which Papias was collecting his traditions; which could not begin to run till after the death of the last of the apostles he named, or, at all events, of John. As regards the apostles named by Papias, we have no

¹ *De Prescript. Haeret.* 36.

evidence when or where they died, with the exception of Peter, James, and John. James, supposing the Lord's brother to be meant, was put to death A.D. 63, and Peter is commonly supposed to have perished in the Neronian persecution, A.D. 64. As regards John we have, as I have shown, considerable reason to suppose that he was alive in the latter part of the year A.D. 68, the date of the composition of the Book of Revelation. At that time he would be sixty years of age or upwards. Assuming the inference that the John the disciple of the Lord who lived to the age of Trajan was not John the Apostle, but John the Elder, is correct, we have no further information about him except the statements already noticed, that he was a martyr and was killed by the Jews, and that he died at Ephesus.

We should get the earliest date for the work of Papias by supposing John the Apostle to have died soon after A.D. 68, which, supposing him to have suffered martyrdom, would be by no means improbable, such an event being more likely to happen during the commotions preceding the establishment of the authority of Vespasian, or the excitement against the Jews occasioned by their insurrection, which must gradually have subsided after the destruction of Jerusalem, than at a later period. Moreover, it must be remembered that martyrdom was rarely attained by one who did not court it, and that the frame of mind of the writer of the Revelation was that of a man likely to court martyrdom. It is therefore not improbable that John did not very long survive the publication of his book: in fact, he writes as if he were already in the hands of the authorities.

Taking this early date for the death of John, and making some allowance for Papias to collect his traditions or write his book, we should get about A.D. 80 as the earliest date at which that book could be written.

However, without assigning an early date for the death of the apostle John, there can be no reason to suppose that he survived the year A.D. 80, which would make him attain the age of seventy-two years or upwards. If we allow fifteen years for Papias to collect his traditions, this would bring us to the year A.D. 95 as the date of the composition of his book.

Another way of fixing the date of Papias is by reference to the time at which he collected his materials.

This was after the seven named disciples of Jesus—Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew—and the great bulk of the disciples of Jesus were dead; but at a time at which there was no difficulty in finding people who could narrate, from their own knowledge, what these seven named and other disciples of Jesus had said.

Papias, it must be noticed, does not speak as if he had, by some particular good luck, come upon some person who had been a hearer of the Apostles, but implies that he had lived at a time when hearers of the Apostles were commonly to be met with, and he had questioned them and noted what they said.

Now when any event has been known to a large number of people of different ages, it will commonly be easy to find witnesses of it for about forty years after it happened. After this period the number of witnesses will rapidly fall off, till after sixty years they will ordinarily be all gone. This follows from

the consideration that after the lapse of forty years the witnesses must have been either under twenty at the time of the event witnessed, or over sixty at the time of giving their testimony, and that young persons ordinarily do not sufficiently comprehend the import of events which do not immediately concern themselves to treasure them up in their memories, whilst the memories of old people frequently fail also, especially as to events which did not immediately concern themselves.

We ought, therefore, to place the time for Papias collecting his traditions within the period of forty years after the events—that is, after a time at which the seven disciples named, and many other disciples of Jesus, were living. One of these disciples, James, we know died A.D. 63; another, Peter, is generally supposed to have died A.D. 64. Matthew must, from the tradition in the Gospels, have been a man of middle age in the lifetime of Jesus. He would, therefore, be a man of seventy or upwards A.D. 63. There would, therefore, be no probability that he long survived that date. We do not know when Andrew, Philip, or Thomas died; it is, however, more probable than otherwise that some one of them would be dead before, say, A.D. 68. After A.D. 70 we may be certain that persons who had been disciples of Jesus would be scarce. Now for persons to have been able to narrate what they had heard from the apostles and disciples of Jesus, we must allow the witnesses to have been hearers of these apostles and disciples for some period of time. We cannot suppose that the informants of Papias simply recorded dying confessions. If, therefore, we suppose that they must

have been able to remember events as early as A.D. 60, we shall not be requiring too much. This would make the period during which Papias was collecting his traditions coincide with some part of the last forty years of the first century; but he might, so far as this branch of the argument is concerned, have written his book early in the second century—that is, supposing the date assumed for the traditions collected (A.D. 60) is sufficiently early. But it is not so. To assume it is to assume that Papias only collected traditions of the last few years of the lives of the disciples of the Lord. We ought, therefore, to put that date a little earlier, and this will bring us to the last decade of the first century as the date for the work of Papias.

The remaining considerations arise from the books we know Papias quoted. These comprise, as we are told by Eusebius, the first epistle of Peter and the first epistle of John, and, as we learn from Andrew and Arethas,¹ who were both bishops of Caesarea, the Apocalypse. The latter fact merely places the composition of Papias's work later than A.D. 68.

So little is ascertainable about the date of the first epistle of John and the first epistle of Peter, that they are more likely to be determined by, than to aid in, determining the date of Papias. We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that the work of Papias must have been written not earlier than about A.D. 80, or later than about A.D. 98; but that about A.D. 90 would seem to be its most probable date.

This is an earlier date than that generally assigned

¹ See *post*, p. 96; also Cramer, *Catena*, p. 350 *et seq.*; Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 201.

to the book; but so far as concerns the tenor of my argument—that is, so far as bears upon the meaning of the word *λόγιον*—I do not think it would make any difference if it were put fifteen or twenty years earlier or later.

CHAPTER III

JOHN THE ELDER

As the foregoing argument turns, to some extent, on the distinction between John the Elder and John the Apostle, it may be as well, before leaving it, to collect the evidence for and against that distinction.

The evidence against that distinction is, that Irenaeus does not appear to be cognisant of it—that is to say, any one ignorant of the distinction reading Irenaeus would not have the distinction suggested to him, but if any one reads Irenaeus with the distinction in his mind, there is much in Irenaeus which leads to the inference that Irenaeus was aware of the distinction, and purposely wrote in such a way as to enable him to ignore his acquaintance with it without telling any direct untruth. Thus Irenaeus habitually describes John as the disciple of the Lord (*ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς, μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν*, 'discipulus domini,' e.g. book ii. cap. 22, ss. 3, 5; book iii. cap. 1, s. 1; cap. 3, s. 4; cap. 2, s. 1; cap. 16, s. 5; book v. cap. 33, s. 3; Eusebius, 'II. E.' book v. cap. 24) never as an apostle, though he once refers to him by that name, and, of course, he includes him with others as apostles, and he does not speak of any other apostle singly as a disciple of the Lord. When Ire-

naeus has occasion to mention an apostle, he does so most frequently simply by his name, without any title, and this is the case with John as well as the others; but he occasionally applies the title apostle to other apostles singly, *e.g.* to Peter, book iii. cap. 12, s. 1, or to Paul, book iii. cap. 6, s. 5, and book iv. cap. 26, s. 4.

It is evident, as regards John, that if Irenaeus had intended to confound two men, both of whom were disciples of Jesus, and of whom only one was an apostle, he could not have adopted a terminology better fitted for the purpose. Now nothing is more probable than that Irenaeus would desire to confound the two men. He had been accustomed, all his life, to plume himself upon having been in youth a hearer of Polycarp, who in turn had been a hearer of one John, a disciple of the Lord. Irenaeus had, no doubt, grown up in the belief that this John was none other than the apostle, and had derived consideration in the Church from his reputed connection with him. It would not be until Irenaeus came to study the works of Papias and other ancient writers that he would see anything to cast a doubt on this cherished belief. When he did see anything to suggest this doubt, it is not at all surprising that he resolutely determined to cast any such doubt away from him, and to make John the disciple of the Lord, who lived to the time of Trajan, one person with the apostle.

He could do this without to the letter falsifying his authorities by applying, in all critical passages, to both men indifferently the title which they had in common, and neglecting ever to use any mark of distinction between them.

Justin spoke of John as one of the apostles ('Dial.' cap. 81).

Writers subsequent to Irenaeus often speak of the apostle John as the disciple of the Lord, perhaps following Irenaeus, but by no means habitually as he did. Thus Clement of Alexandria, in the passage preserved by Eusebius, 'H. E.' lib. iii. cap. 23, speaks of John as the apostle; so does Tertullian ('De Praescr. Haer.' cap. 36).

With the language of Irenaeus may be contrasted that made use of by the writer of the Muratorian fragment, generally thought his contemporary, who seems to imply that he considered the John who wrote the Fourth Gospel to have been a disciple of the Lord but not an apostle. He says—I quote the translation in the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library':—

'The Fourth Gospel is that of John, one of the disciples ('ex decipolis,' no doubt correctly restored 'ex discipulis'). When his fellow disciples and bishops entreated him ('cohortantibus condiscipulis et ep̄s suis') he said, Fast ye now with me for the space of three days, and let us recount to each other whatever may be revealed to each of us. On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles ('ex apostolis'), that John should relate all things in his own name,' &c.

The story told in this passage is, of course, a fable, but the contrast so pointedly drawn between John, one of the disciples, and Andrew, one of the apostles, implies the belief in a John who was a disciple, but not an apostle of sufficient note for the Fourth Gospel to be attributed to him, and supports the theory of the separate existence of the Elder. In fact, the antithesis between John the Apostle and John the Disciple which is concealed by the language of Irenaeus is here

brought out by the juxtaposition of the words. This, of course, is not necessarily the original language of the author of the fragment, it may be the language of some writer from whom he borrowed the fable.

From what Eusebius says in the twenty-fifth chapter of his seventh book, he evidently refers, when he mentions 'the account of those who have said that there were two in Asia who bore the same name, and that there were two sepulchres in Ephesus, and that each was still called John's,' to Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, who flourished in the middle of the third century, from whom he quotes the following words: 'They say there are two monuments in Ephesus and each is called John's.' Besides this, in chapter 46, of book iii. of the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' in the enumeration of bishops stated to have been ordained by apostles, is the statement: 'Of Ephesus, Timotheus, ordained by Paul, and John by me John.' What is the exact historical value of a statement contained in the last-mentioned fiction it may be hard to say; it may probably be sufficient evidence of a generally accepted tradition that there were two Johns at Ephesus in apostolic times, one the apostle and another younger man whom he ordained bishop. Moreover, the statement in the 'Apostolic Constitutions' does not appear to be derived from either Dionysius or Eusebius, neither of whom states that the second John was ever a bishop, though, according to the ancient interpretation of the term, this may be implied by the title 'Elder' (πρεσβύτερος) given him by Papias.

A piece of evidence as to the existence of John the Elder, as distinct from John the Apostle, the weight of which deserves to be considered, is to be found in

the two letters commonly known as the second and third epistles of John, and attributed to the apostle. When the books of the New Testament came to be collected, or, perhaps rather I should say, when these letters came to be inserted among the collected books of the New Testament, they were probably designated second and third, for convenience of reference,¹ and the first letter being attributed to the apostle, this designation produced the belief that they were all by the same author, and this no doubt was the opinion of many of the Fathers. For instance, Irenaeus (iii. 16, 8) quotes the second epistle as the work of John the disciple of the Lord, meaning no doubt the apostle. But Jerome tells us, that the opinion handed down by most writers was that the two later letters were written, not by John the Apostle, but by John the Elder.²

The earliest certain evidence we have of the existence of the second epistle is the quotation of it by Irenaeus above mentioned, and the earliest certain evidence we have of the existence of the third epistle is the mention of it by Origen, who does not appear to have thought either it or the second epistle the work of the apostle.³

We have evidence, therefore, that the second

¹ Clement of Alexandria distinguishes the first as the larger (μελίων) epistle (*Strom.* ii. 38, cited Bleek's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 226).

² *De viris illust.* cc. 9, 18, *ibid.*

³ 'He (the apostle John) has also left an epistle of very few lines. Let it be that he left also a second and a third, since not all say these to be genuine. However, both of them do not make a hundred lines' (Καταλείπει καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πᾶν ὀλίγων στίχων. Ἐστὼ δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας, πλὴν οὐκ εἰσι στίχων ἑκατόν). Origen, cited Eusebius *H. E.* lib. vi. cap. 25.

It will be noticed that while Clement speaks of the 'larger' epistle, Origen speaks of the second and third. This points to the collection in the interval of the three letters into one volume.

epistle was in existence at the time of its quotation by Irenaeus, say A.D. 185, and that the third epistle was in existence a generation afterwards.

In addition to this, there is the evidence of the Muratorian fragment. It is difficult to estimate the effect of this evidence, as well as the weight which ought to be given to it, from the exceedingly corrupt state of the document and from its author being unknown, and from the doubt that exists as to its age. The fragment, which is mutilated at the beginning, makes mention of the third book of the Gospel according to Luke, who, it says, began to speak from the birth of John. It then apparently states that John, one of the disciples, wrote the fourth book of the Gospels and tells the fable we have noticed above, and proceeds :—

‘quid ergo mirum si Iohannes tam constanter sincula etiā in epistulis suis proferam dicens in semeipsu quae uidimus oculis nostris et auribus audimus et manus nostrae palpauerunt haec scripsimus nobis sic etiam non solum uisorem sed auditorem sed et scriptorē omnium mirabiliū dñi per ordinem profetetur.’

This passage is thus translated in the ‘Ante-Nicene Christian Library’ :—

‘What marvel is it, then, that John brings forward these several things so constantly in his epistles, also saying in his own person : “What we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, that have we written” ? For thus he professes himself to be not only the eye-witness, but also the hearer, and besides that the historian of all the wondrous facts concerning the Lord in their order.’

This translation depends upon a restoration of

the text, by which ‘singula’ is put for ‘sincula,’ and ‘proferat’ for ‘proferam,’ not to mention less important restorations.

It is not easy to put any meaning at all upon the text in its unrestored state, or to suggest any less extensive restoration. But it is obvious that, though epistles are mentioned in the plural, the writer is referring to the first epistle only. The fragment then goes on to mention the Acts as the work of Luke, and then the Epistles of Paul, who is said to have followed the example of his predecessor John, in only writing by name to seven churches. The fragment then mentions that there were in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, and another to the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, addressed to the heresy of Marcion, and several others which could not be received in the Catholic Church, and proceeds as follows : ‘Epistola sane inde et superscriptio iohannis duas in catholica habentur et sapientia ab amicis salomonis in honore ipsius scripta.’ In this passage ‘Judac’ is, of course, restored for Jude, and I think all critics would read ‘duae’ for ‘duas.’ ‘Superscriptio’ may be variously restored as ‘superscripti,’ ‘superscriptae,’ or ‘superscriptione,’ of which the last appears to me the most probable. These restorations would make the passage run : ‘The epistle, indeed, of Jude, and two with John’s name superscribed, or superscribed as (the work) of John, or with the superscription of John, are held in the Catholic Church, and Wisdom written by the friends of Solomon in his honour.’ These renderings are all equivalent. Critics who adopt the restoration ‘superscripti’ have rendered the passage, though not, as I think, accurately : ‘The epistle, indeed, of

Jude, and two of the above-named John, are held in the Catholic Church,' but this is improbable. The phrase 'above-named' is not used anywhere else in the fragment, though there is occasion for it, if the writer affected the sort of precision of language which it implies, Luke as well as John being mentioned more than once in the fragment, and as regards John it is useless, as two persons at least of that name have been previously mentioned.

The fragment continues: 'We receive the Apocalypses of John and Peter only which' (in the singular) 'some of us are unwilling to read in the church.' The fragment then comments on the degree of respect to be paid to the 'Pastor of Hermas,' and after some corrupt lines, in which the only thing intelligible is the non-reception of some works of Valentinus and Marcion, breaks off abruptly.

It is obvious that the writer is commenting on a New Testament part of which, at all events, had got a definite order, and that he mentions epistles of John twice. The first notice, which occurs between the notice of the Fourth Gospel and the Acts, is only applicable to the first epistle, and probably was in the original form of the document explicitly confined to it. The second notice, which follows the epistles of Paul, and is only introduced after the writer has begun to comment on doubtful books, speaks only of two epistles, and is probably intended to refer to the second and third. If this is so, we arrive at the conclusion, from the study of the fragment, that at the time it was written the first epistle was placed next after the Gospel and treated as undoubtedly genuine; but the second and third, though generally read in

the churches, were considered of uncertain authorship, and placed among doubtful books at the end of the New Testament. The mention made of the Wisdom of Solomon shows that it was consistent with the views of the writer to reckon in the Canon a book which he thought undoubtedly spurious.

The date of the Muratorian fragment is generally given as a little after 170 A.D. Dr. Salmon places it not earlier than the beginning of the third century; I am inclined to be of that opinion, for the following reason. The language of the fragment appears to show that the books of the New Testament, or at all events the Gospels, had been collected in a volume, so that the third and fourth books can be spoken of. I am not aware of any writings so early as the second century which would suggest this inference. The language of Clement of Alexandria at the end of it, describing the Gospels of Matthew and Luke as those which contain the genealogies, and the first epistle of John as the 'larger,' is in strong contrast.

The inference to draw from the fragment is that the second and third epistles, as late as the beginning of the third century, were placed in a different category from the first, and this is very unfavourable to their being by the same author as the first.

As against the two epistles being by the author of the first, another weighty fact is their non-inclusion in the Peshito-Syriac version, which contains the first epistle. This is not explicable like their non-quotation by writers like Papias and Justin, who quote the first epistle, on the ground that no need arose for it. The object of the framers of the version would be to include all books of similar authority. We may,

therefore, conclude that at the time of the making of the Peshito version, or rather of the old Syriac on which it was founded, there was a well-marked difference between the authority accorded to the first epistle and the two others, if, indeed, they were then in existence, and this, I think, is conclusive that they ought not to be attributed to the author of the first epistle. If they had been his workmanship, all three letters would have been collected long before the making of that version, would have circulated together, and would have appeared equally authentic. The framers of the version inserting one would, as of course, have inserted the others also. But the resemblance in style between the second and third epistles on the one hand, and the first on the other, is so great, that if they are not by the same author, it must be the result of intentional imitation, which would be strong evidence of forgery.

Assuming, however, the letters to be a forgery, it may nevertheless be urged that they show a general belief, at the time they were written, in a John who was supposed to be understood by the title 'The Elder,' of sufficient repute to have letters forged in his name, and as this cannot well be later than A.D. 185 and may be much earlier, it affords a powerful confirmation of the interpretation placed by Eusebius on the passage in Papias showing the existence of the same person.

As against this, it may be remarked that one of the peculiarities of the style of the first epistle is the application of the phrase 'Little children' to the persons addressed, and the effect of this is imitated

not the less effectively because indirectly by the application of the correlative term 'The Elder' to the supposed author, in the second and third epistles. The use of this term would therefore be explicable by reason of the intention of the author to imitate the first epistle, and any inference that might be drawn from it as to the belief in any John known as the Elder would fall to the ground.

It would appear, therefore, probable that the second and third epistles of John were intended to be attributed to the writer of the first epistle, assumed to be John the Apostle, as the second epistle, at all events, was in fact attributed by Irenaeus. No inference can, therefore, be drawn from the writing of these epistles to the existence of John the Elder. From the fact, however, narrated by Jerome, that the epistles had been very generally attributed to John the Elder, such an inference may be drawn, and the exclusion of the letters from the Peshito version is not at all inconsistent with the prevalence of such a belief as to their authorship. On the contrary, the existence of such a theory would be of itself a reason for not attributing them to the apostle, and therefore excluding them from the canon.

On the whole, though the evidence, apart from the extracts of Papias, might not of itself be sufficient to establish the separate existence of John the Elder, it is sufficient to confirm to a considerable degree the interpretation placed by Eusebius upon these extracts and altogether to rebut any positive objection that might be raised to that interpretation—that such a person had not otherwise been heard of, but was a

subtlety evolved from the brain of Dionysius for the purpose of discrediting the Apocalypse, though that, but for this purpose, we should have heard nothing about such a person from Eusebius at all events, there may be no manner of doubt.

CHAPTER IV

THE VARIOUS READINGS *λόγων* AND *λογίων*

I WILL now pass on to consider the question with regard to the text of Eusebius, or rather of Papias. In the extract relating to Mark, it is said that Peter did not speak as if he were making a syntax—whatever that may mean—of the Dominical oracles. The word translated oracles is *λογίων*. Instead of *λογίων* some manuscripts read *λόγων*, which would make the passage run that Peter did not speak as if he were making a syntax of the Dominical discourses, which there could be no doubt, I think, would mean the Lord's discourses.

The reading *λόγων* is adopted by Burton and Valesius, but Stephens, Stroth, Zimmermann, Routh, and more recently Laemmer, have adopted the reading *λογίων*.

To turn from the names of the editors to the grounds by which they have been influenced. These I can only gather from the critical apparatus of Burton, the only critical edition I have seen, which is not perhaps so perfect as it might have been, owing to his death before the book was published, but, as the work of an editor who adopts the reading *λόγων*, may

be supposed to present the facts in the most favourable aspect for that reading. It appears from this that five manuscripts read *λόγων* and five *λογίων*, the latter being supported by the paraphrase of the historian Nicephorus Callisti.

The manuscripts which read *λόγων* all belong to what is called the 'other' recension, or at all events all except one, about which the statements of Burton are not sufficiently explicit to make the matter entirely free from doubt. Of the manuscripts which read *λογίων*, one designated by Burton by the letter 'A' belongs to what has been called the 'former' recension; as to the other four, he makes no statement that I can distinctly follow. As regards the authority of 'A' he makes the following remarks:—

'It exhibits a certain peculiar recension of the text, not indeed the best, as Stroth thinks, but sufficiently ancient. It often agrees with Rufinus, often also with Nicephorus, and then for the most part should be thought to exhibit the true reading, as Stroth testifies.'¹

We see that in favour of the reading *λογίων* there is this agreement of 'A' with Nicephorus, which Burton follows Stroth in acknowledging to be a general indication of the true reading, together with whatever weight ought to be assigned to the agreement of the other four codices, one of which is of the tenth century. In support, therefore, of the reading *λόγων* there appears to be the authority of one recension only, in support of *λογίων* of two recensions, or probably more.

¹ I gather from this remark that the recensions used by Rufinus and Nicephorus were different from the recension contained in 'A,' and that therefore the agreement of either of these writers with 'A' amounted to the agreement of two recensions.

If one turns from the authority of different codices to the context, the reading *λόγων* has to contend with this difficulty. It can only mean discourses, and it is not easy to see why the fact that it was not the object of Peter to make a syntax of the discourses of the Lord should be a reason why Mark should fail to relate in order what the Lord had done, as opposed to what he had said. I think I shall be able to give a meaning to the word *λογίων* which will obviate this difficulty.

CHAPTER V

THE MEANING OF THE WORD *λόγια*

THE next question to consider is the meaning to assign to the word *λόγια*, which I have translated oracles, when Papias says Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew language. There can be little doubt that the oracles which Matthew wrote, or wrote on, are the same as those of which it was the object of Papias to make an exposition, as shown by the title of his work, 'An Exposition of Dominical Oracles' (*Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*), and of which Peter did not speak as if making a syntax (*οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων*).

In other words, the word *λόγιον* may be taken to be used in the same sense in all three places, the title of Papias's book, the reference to Peter, and the reference to Matthew.

As the meaning of the word *λόγιον* as used by Papias is disputed by the learned, there is little use in citing names of modern authorities for one view or the other; the only satisfactory course is to collect the passages in which the word is used by writers before and about the time of Papias.

From them we may be able to infer the meaning

of the word at that time, and consequently the meaning we ought to give it in Papias.

The first authority to refer to is undoubtedly the LXX, which did more than anything else to form the ecclesiastical Greek.

By the aid of Kircher's Concordance, I have been able to find the word *λόγιον* in twenty-six passages in the LXX,¹ of which fourteen occur in the 119th Psalm. The meaning is always 'word,' and except in one passage it is clearly applied to the word of God, by which I do not mean that the word *λόγιον* standing alone is used to mean the word of God, but that it is used in such phrases as *λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*, &c., in which the context requires that it should have that signification. The one place where it might possibly have another application is in the 14th verse of the 19th Psalm: 'Let the words (*λόγια*) of my mouth &c. be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord.'

It is, therefore, impossible in the English version to distinguish the places in which the LXX uses '*λόγιον*' from the places in which it uses '*λόγος*.'

Thus in the 119th Psalm, verses 147 and 148:—

'I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried: I hoped in thy words.

'Mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might meditate in thy word.'

As rendered in the LXX, 'thy words' is represented by *τοὺς λόγους σου*, and 'thy word' by *τὰ λόγια σου*. So in Isaiah xxviii. 13th and 14th verses:—

'Therefore shall the word of the Lord be unto them precept upon precept,' &c.

¹ For a list of these passages see Appendix II.

'Wherefore bear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men.'

The 'word of the Lord,' where it first occurs, is represented in the LXX by τὸ λόγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, and when it occurs the second time by λόγον Κυρίου.¹

The next authority to which I would refer is Philo Judaeus.

Richter, in the preface to his edition of the works of Philo Judaeus, promised his readers that he would add an index of words to the sixth volume; that promise, however, was not kept,² and I am not aware that any one has ever made such an index. In order, therefore, to ascertain the use made by Philo of the word λόγιον, I can only cite such passages as I can lay hands on.

He sometimes uses it in the same sense as the LXX, meaning generally, inspired words or revelations. Thus in his 'Life of Moses' (lib. iii. cap. 21), speaking of Moses, he says: 'He had chosen his brother high priest, according to the oracles revealed to him' (κατὰ τὰ χρησθέντα λόγια).

So again in his treatise 'On Nobility,' cap. 5, speaking of the oldest of the nation of the Jews, by whom, I suppose, is intended Abraham:—

'At the same time also oracles revealed to him (λόγια τὰ χρησθέντα) fanned up the more the desire he had to know that which is (τὸ ὄν), guided by which (the oracles) he went with most fearless zeal in search of the one (τοῦ ἐνός).'

But more usually, where Philo uses the word, he

¹ Possibly these passages show that the LXX applies λόγια to the written, λόγος to a spoken word.

² At least I cannot find any such index in my copy (Lipsius sumtibus E. B. Schwickerti, 1829).

intends specially the Old Testament Scriptures, or some part of them. Thus in the 'Life of Moses' (lib. iii. cap. 23), having described Moses as the most approved of prophets (δοκιμώτατος), he goes on to say:—

'I am not, indeed, ignorant that all things which have been written in the sacred books are revelations (χρησμοὶ) revealed through him. But first having said that, I will speak with more particularity, for of his oracles (τῶν λογίων) some are spoken in the person of God, through the divine prophet as an interpreter, others were delivered by question and answer, others in the person of Moses inspired and possessed.'

Here by his oracles Philo means the books of the Old Testament ascribed to Moses.

Again in his book 'Concerning Rewards and Punishments,' cap. 1, Philo says:—

'It has happened, then, that there are three kinds of the oracles (λογίων) through the prophet Moses, some about the making of the world, others historical, and the third class legislative.'

Here again the reference is to the Old Testament Scriptures.

Again in his work 'Concerning Meeting for Seeking Knowledge,' cap. 24, we have: 'An oracle (λόγιον), in which it is said "The Lord himself is his lot," pledges me the promise,' where the word is applied to a text from Deuteronomy.

Again in his book 'On Fugitives,' cap. 11, we find:—

'But there is also an oracle (λόγιον) revealed upon him (Cain) to this effect, The Lord God set a mark on Cain, lest any one finding him should kill him.'

Here we find the word applied to a text from Genesis.

Again, in his book¹ 'On a Contemplative Life,' cap. 3, speaking of the Therapeutae, he says:—

'But in each dwelling is a temple which is called a holy place and a place for retirement (*μοναστήριον*), in which, being alone, they fulfil the offices (*μυστήρια*) of the holy life, not taking in anything, either food or drink or anything else necessary for the wants of the body, but laws and oracles (*λόγια*) uttered by prophets, and hymns and the other things by which knowledge and piety are increased and fulfilled.'

There can be no doubt from the context that these Therapeutae were Jews, though of a very Hellenising turn. They meet for religious exercises and rest from work on the seventh day. They are described as the pupils of Moses (*οἱ Μωϋσέως γνώριμοι*). Taking up the sacred Scriptures, they philosophise, making an allegory of their national philosophy (*τὴν πατριὸν φιλοσοφίαν ἀλληγοροῦντες*). There can be no doubt, therefore, that the *λόγια*, or oracles, before referred to, mean some part of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Again, Philo calls the Ten Commandments the Ten Oracles (*τῶν δέκα λογίων*). This he does at least three times, once in the title of his book 'De specialibus legibus quae referuntur ad duo decalogi capita sextum septimumque &c.,' once in the second chapter of the same book, and again in the title of his book 'De Decalogo' (*Περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων ἃ κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσὶ*). Again, at the very commencement of the former

¹ Some authorities dispute the genuineness of this book, but as I think without reason. See, further, Appendix iii.

book, Philo speaks of himself as at one time 'always moving among Divine oracles and ordinances' (*ἀεὶ θείοις λογίοις συγκινούμενος καὶ δόγμασιν*), where, no doubt, the Old Testament Scriptures are meant.

In other places Philo uses the word *λόγιον* of things contained in the Old Testament but not intended to have been cited from it by the persons of whom he is speaking. Thus in the 'Life of Moses,' book i. chapter 15, in narrating the journey of Moses to Egypt after the incident of the burning bush, he says: 'He persuades his brother to accompany him, having repeated the Divine oracles' (*τὰ θεῖα λόγια*). Here the Divine oracles are to be found in Exodus, but Philo does not intend that Exodus was then written or that Moses cited them out of it. So, again, in book iii. chapter 35 of the same work, he says: 'But the Father thoroughly established the oracle (*λόγιον*) of the prophet by two very clear proofs.' The oracle here is the command of Moses taken from Exodus xvi. 19: 'Let no man leave of it till the morning.' But it is referred to as spoken by Moses, not as cited from Exodus. A little further on, chapter 36, he says: 'Not long after, being inspired, he (Moses) utters a second oracle (*λόγιον*), the one about the holy seventh day,' and again, after remarking that men were then ignorant of the natural pre-eminence of the seventh day, Philo proceeds: 'Which being unknown he (Moses), being inspired, showed by an oracle (*λογία*), which was borne witness to by a clear sign.' The oracle here referred to is the statement of Moses contained in the same chapter of Exodus that the sabbath is a holy rest, and the clear sign the not finding the manna in the field on the seventh day. Again, in chapter 38 Philo proceeds:—

'But I have a more significant oracle (λόγιον) to report . . . which he himself uttered, being again inspired, and which was accomplished not a long time afterwards, but immediately when it was being delivered.'

Philo proceeds to narrate the story of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; the words spoken by Moses (Numbers xvi. 28-38) being much paraphrased, and in particular Moses being made to say in verse 29: 'then I have fabricated the oracles' (τὰ λόγια) instead of 'then the Lord hath not sent me.'

In all these passages Philo applies the word λόγιον to what he himself derives from the Old Testament Scriptures, though he does not intend to represent the persons to whose utterances he applies it as having so derived it.

We see, therefore, that, in fifteen out of the seventeen passages containing the word λόγιον I have been able to find in the writings of Philo, the word is applied to the Old Testament Scriptures or what is contained in them. It will be noticed that in both passages in which Philo does not intend the Old Testament Scriptures he uses the adjective χρησθέντα, revealed, showing that by the word λόγια standing alone the Old Testament Scriptures or something contained in them would be intended.

I will next consider the use of the word in the New Testament.

The word λόγιον occurs in the New Testament in four places; thus in Acts vii. 38 it is said of Moses: 'This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received living oracles (λόγια ζῶντα) to give unto us;' and

again, Romans iii. 2, it is said of the Jews: 'They were entrusted with the oracles of God' (τὰ λόγια Θεοῦ); and again, Hebrews v. 12:—

'For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God' (τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ).

In all these places the word refers to the Old Testament Scriptures, or some part of them.

The remaining passage is 1 Peter iv. 11:—

'According as each has received a gift, ministering it amongst yourselves as good stewards of the manifold grace of God; if any man speaketh as oracles of God (ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ); if any man ministereth as of the strength which God supplieth; that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ.'

I have ventured here to keep a little closer to the original than either the old or revised version. I understand the meaning to be that if any one has the gift (χάρισμα) of speech, he is to attribute it to Divine inspiration, and so give God the glory.

In this case, therefore, the word λόγια would not be applied specially to the Old Testament, but to any oracles inspired by God.

The next author I will consider is the historian Flavius Josephus.

His 'Jewish War' is certainly later in date than the Epistle to the Romans, but possibly earlier than any of the other New Testament books I have cited. As, however, the dates of these books are uncertain, I take him in this place.

He uses the word λόγιον twice in the following

passage in his 'Jewish War,' book vi. cap. 5. 4, which I cite from Whiston's translation :—

Now, if any one consider these things, he will find that God takes care of mankind, and by all ways possible foreshows to our race what is for their preservation, but that men perish by those miseries which they madly and voluntarily bring upon themselves; for the Jews, by demolishing the tower of Antonia, had made their temple foursquare, while at the same time they had it written in their sacred oracles (ἐν τοῖς λογίοις ἔχοντες) that then should their city be taken, as well as their holy house, when once their temple should become foursquare. But now what did most elevate them in undertaking this war was an ambiguous oracle that was also found in their sacred writings (χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐρημένος γράμμασιν), how, about that time, one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth. The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed Emperor in Judea (ἀρα περὶ τοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ τὸ λόγιον ἡγεμονίαν ἀποδειχθέντος ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας αὐτοκράτορος).

The first prophecy referred to I presume to be that contained in Ezekiel xlii. 15 to xliii. 3, which, according to the Revised Version, is as follows :—

'Now, when he had made an end of measuring the inner house, he brought me forth by the way of the gate, whose prospect is towards the east, and measured it round about. He measured on the east side with the measuring reed, five hundred reeds with the measuring reed round about. He measured on the north side five hundred reeds with the measuring reed round about. He measured on the south side five hundred reeds with the measuring reed. He turned about to the west side, and measured five hundred

reeds with the measuring reed. He measured it on the four sides. It had a wall round about, the length five hundred and the breadth five hundred, to make a separation between that which was holy and that which was common. Afterwards he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looketh toward the east, and behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east, and his voice was like the sound of many waters, and the earth shined with his glory, and it was according to the appearance of the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city.'

Instead of the words 'when I came to destroy the city,' the Vulgate has '*quando venit ut disperderet civitatem*' ('when he came to destroy the city'). These words must indicate either a possible rendering of the Hebrew or else a different reading current in ancient times.

If we substitute them for the words of the English version, we get what reads very like a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem consequent upon the ascertainment that the temple was exactly square. Of course, when the whole passage is looked at, this does not appear to have been the meaning of Ezekiel. But as prophecies were interpreted in the days of Josephus, and for that matter are often still interpreted, such a sense would very likely be put upon it.

The other prophecy is generally supposed to be the famous prophecy of the seventy weeks, contained in Daniel ix. The same process by which Christians have applied this prophecy to Jesus of Nazareth would excite in the Jews the expectation of some other Messiah a few years afterwards. Whatever opinions, however, be entertained as to the particular passages Josephus had in view, there can be no doubt that by the words ἐν τοῖς λογίοις he meant 'in the Old Testa-

ment Scriptures,' and by the words τὸ λογίον a particular prophecy contained in them.

This is the only passage I have been able to find in Josephus which contains the word *λόγιον*.

It will be noticed that the word as used by him has more the sense of prophecy than as used by Philo, and, bearing in mind that he was a man of affairs while Philo was a philosopher, this is probably an indication of the more common use of the word among Greek-speaking Jews.

Clement of Rome, whom I will now consider, uses the word four, or, at all events, three, times.

The first place is in chapter 13, but as there the word occurs in a quotation and there is, moreover, a difference of reading, I will for the present pass it over.

The second place is in chapter 19, in which, after quoting largely from the fifty-first Psalm, concluding with the words 'a sacrifice unto God is a contrite spirit, a contrite and humbled heart God will not despise' (I quote from the translation of Dr. Lightfoot), he continues:—

'The humility, therefore, and the submissiveness of so many and so great men, who have thus obtained a good report, hath through obedience made better not only us but also the generations which were before us, even them that received His oracles in fear and truth (οὐ μόνον ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πρὸ ἡμῶν γενεὰς βελτίους ἐποίησαν, τοὺς τε καταδεξαμένους τὰ λόγια αὐτοῦ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ).'

The oracles (τὰ λόγια) from which the generations before Clement as well as his own generation had received benefit are here evidently the Old Testament Scriptures.

The passage quoted above follows notices of Elijah, Elisha, Ezekiel, Abraham, Job, Moses, and David.

The next passage where Clement uses the word is in chapter 53, and runs thus, according to the same translation:—

'For ye know and know well the sacred Scriptures, dearly beloved, and ye have searched into the oracles of God (καὶ ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ). We write these things, therefore, to put you in remembrance. When Moses went up into the mountain, and had spent forty days and forty nights in fasting and humiliation, God said unto him,' &c.

Here again the word oracles (*λόγια*) evidently refers to the Old Testament.

The portion of the Epistle of Clement following the last quotation is full of quotations from the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Testament; in particular mention is made of the preservation of Israel by reason of the intercession and self-sacrifice of Moses, Judith, and Esther. In chapter 62, Clement again uses the word *λόγια* in the following passage:—

'We have written fully unto you, brethren, . . . putting you in remembrance that ye ought to please Almighty God . . . even as our fathers, of whom we spoke before, pleased Him . . . and as we have put you in mind of these things the more gladly since we knew well that we were writing to men who are faithful and highly accounted, and have diligently searched into the oracles of the teaching of God (ἐγκεκυφόσιν εἰς τὰ λόγια τῆς παιδείας τοῦ Θεοῦ).'

Here, again, it is plain that the word oracles (*λόγια*) refers to the Old Testament.

I will now return to the passage which I passed

over and which presents more difficulty. It is therefore necessary to cite it at length:—

‘Let us, therefore, be lowly-minded, brethren, laying aside all arrogance and conceit and folly and anger, and let us do that which is written (τὸ γεγραμμένον). For the Holy Ghost saith, Let not the wise man boast in his wisdom, nor the strong in his strength, neither the rich in his riches; but he that boasteth let him boast in the Lord, that he may seek Him out, and do judgment and righteousness; most of all remembering the words (τῶν λόγων) of the Lord Jesus which He spake (οὗς ἐλάλησεν), teaching (διδάσκων) forbearance and long-suffering: for thus He spake (οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν), Have mercy, that ye may receive mercy; forgive, that it may be forgiven to you. As ye do, so shall it be done to you. As ye give, so shall it be given unto you. As ye judge, so shall ye be judged. As ye show kindness, so shall kindness be showed unto you. With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured withal to you. With this commandment and these precepts (ταύτη τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασιν) let us confirm ourselves, that we may walk in obedience to His hallowed words (τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ) with lowliness of mind. For the holy word saith, Upon whom shall I look save upon him that is gentle and quiet and feareth mine oracles (μὲν τὰ λόγια)?’

The first remark to make upon this passage is that the word *λόγια* occurs in a quotation from Isaiah lxvi. 2. This quotation is made nearly in the words of the LXX, but instead of the words *μου τὰ λόγια* the LXX has *τοὺς λόγους μου*.

In making the quotation, therefore, the word *λόγια* or ‘oracles,’ with which we are at present concerned, has been substituted for the word *λόγους*, or ‘words,’ made use of in the LXX.

The next remark to make is that, though this

is the reading of the Alexandrine MS., the Constantinopolitan MS., which is the other Greek authority for the text, agrees with the LXX. Dr. Lightfoot adopts the reading of the Alexandrine MS. on, no doubt, good grounds, for it appears that it is one of the peculiarities of the Constantinopolitan MS. to assimilate the quotations to the LXX.

It is, however, necessary to notice this variation of reading, for if the reading of the Constantinopolitan MS. were adopted the word *λόγια* would not occur in the passage at all.

Assuming, then, that the reading of the Alexandrine MS. is right, we have to consider what light the passage throws upon the meaning of the word *λόγια*, and this must to a great extent turn upon the motive which induced Clement to depart from the language of the LXX.

It is possible, but not very probable, that the particular text which he used may have had the reading. If that were the case, the passage would be consistent either with the application of the word to the quotations from the Old Testament or to the words of Jesus, and would, therefore, not assist us much. But supposing, what is more probable, that Clement intentionally altered the word, we get a more distinct indication of its meaning. For if he had made the citation in the words of the LXX, ‘Upon whom shall I look save upon him that is gentle and quiet and feareth my words?’ (*τοὺς λόγους μου*), the application of the quotation to the words of Jesus would have been necessary. It would, therefore, appear probable that it was in order to obviate this application that he substituted the word oracles (*λόγια*) and in consequence

that the use of the word at that time, in the absence of a controlling context, was not consistent with its application to anything else than the Old Testament. This would agree with the use made by Clement of the word *λόγια* in the other three places in which he uses it. It may be asked, Why should Clement desire to avoid the application of the citation to the words of Jesus? One answer might be that in so doing, though he altered the language, he preserved the sense of the document he was citing. Having regard to the wresting of the language of texts which was common at that day (though I have not noticed that Clement is chargeable with it), this reason may not be of great weight.

Another reason that suggests itself is that in the LXX the words cited are put into the mouth of the Lord (*Κύριος*). Now, there was a school in the Church which contended that the word *Κύριος*, where it occurs in the LXX, referred to the second person of the Trinity as opposed to the first, and Clement, by making the citation apply to the words of Jesus, would be adopting the doctrine of this school. This Clement may not have wished to do. His object in writing his epistle was to inculcate, not any abstract doctrine, but the practical duty of obedience to the constituted authorities in the Church. He had before him a great object, no less than the building up of that vast edifice of ecclesiastical dominion which has overshadowed the earth. To have put forward any doctrine which, without forwarding his main aim, might have proved offensive to any class of his readers, would have been foreign to his purpose. By confining the application of the passage to the Old Testament,

to which nobody would dispute it was applicable, he avoided a possible cause of offence. But without any such special object the use of the word 'oracles' may simply indicate a return to the sentiment with which the chapter commences:—

'... let us do that which is written. . . . For the holy word saith, Upon whom shall I look save upon him that . . . feareth mine oracles? Therefore it is right and proper, brethren, that we should be obedient unto God,' &c.

When, therefore, this passage is looked into, it affords evidence of the special application of the word *λόγια* to the Old Testament Scriptures. We see, therefore, that Clement of Rome, in the four places in which he uses the word *λόγια*, intends by it the Old Testament. This is the more noticeable because in another place, as well as in the passage above cited, he quotes words of Jesus, calling them *λόγοι*, not *λόγια*.

It must be noticed that, besides applying to them the term oracles (*λόγια*), Clement uses many formulas of respect in citing the Old Testament, e.g. 'it is written' (*γέγραπται*), cc. 4, 13, 17, 29, 36, 39, 46, 48, 50; 'the writing (*τὸ γραφεῖον*) saith,' c. 28; 'the scripture (*ἡ γραφή*) saith,' cc. 34, 35; 'the Holy Ghost (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) saith,' cc. 13, 16, 22; 'the holy word saith' (*φησὶν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος*), cc. 13, 56; 'the All-virtuous Wisdom saith' (*λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία*), c. 57, while he uses no similar phraseology in citing books of the New Testament. This indicates clearly that the writer did not think fit to accord to the New Testament that position which was held by the Old Testament; and when we realise the official nature of the letter written in the name of the Church

of Rome to the Church of Corinth, and the practical object it had in view, we may take this as an index to the usage generally prevalent in the Church at that day.

The Epistle of Clement, therefore, affords a strong argument against applying to any book in the New Testament any of the phraseology which had been customarily used to indicate the Old Testament Canon, in any book written before the second century was well advanced.

Justin Martyr, whom I will next consider, as I find by the index of Otto, uses the word twice. In one place he applies the word *λόγιον* to a passage in the Old Testament, which, he contends, was a prophecy fulfilled in Jesus. In the other place, he calls sayings of Jesus *λόγια*; but though he often quotes evangelical writings of some sort, he never refers to them as *λόγια*. So in other places where he has to mention sayings of Jesus, he calls them *λόγοι*, not *λόγια*, as in the well-known passage, 'Short and concise were his words (*λόγοι*), for he was no sophist.' The first passage in which Justin uses the word *λόγιον* is in his first Apology, chapter 32, and is as follows:—

'And Isaiah also, another prophet, prophesying the same things in other language, thus said: "A star shall rise out of Jacob, and a flower shall go up from the root of Jesse, and in his arm shall the Gentiles hope." And a bright star arose, and a flower went up from the root of Jesse, this Christ. For by the virgin who was of the seed of Jacob, who was the father of Judah, who has been shown to be the father of the Jews, through the power of God he was brought forth, and Jesse has become his forefather, according to the oracle (*κατὰ τὸ λόγιον*); and of Jacob and Judah, by successive descent, he was a son.'

Many remarks might be made upon this passage, and may have to be made before we have done, but one thing is certain, that Justin applies the word 'oracle' (*λόγιον*) to a text, or rather texts, which he supposes to come out of Isaiah, and which are, in fact, contained in the Old Testament.

The second place in which Justin uses the word is in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' chapter xviii. He has wound up a series of citations from the Old Testament, and passes on to quote certain words of Jesus, which, he says, he cried out on the occasion of his overthrowing the tables of the money-changers in the Temple, and which, with some differences, resemble a mixture of sayings stated in Matthew to have been uttered by Jesus in the Temple on a subsequent occasion, with other sayings stated in Luke to have been uttered by Jesus when at dinner in a Pharisee's house—'Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, &c.' Justin then proceeds as follows:—

'For since, Trypho, you have read, as you yourself acknowledge, the things which were taught by that Saviour of ours, I do not think that I have acted out of place in adding short oracles (*λόγια*) of his to those of the prophets.'

The application of the word in this place to the sayings of Jesus is of course clear, but it does not indicate a usual use of the word. On the contrary, its unusual application to the denunciations of Jesus gives the passage its force, being in the nature of a hit at Trypho.

This last citation from Justin, which is at least fifty years subsequent to the date I have assigned to Papias, is the earliest passage extant in which the word *λόγιον* is applied in any way to the New Testa-

ment Scriptures, and it is noteworthy that in this case it is applied merely to the sayings of Jesus, and not to the books which contain them; and that even so, the context tends to show that the use of the word was at the time unusual.

The word occurs again in the Epistle to the Philippians, attributed to Polycarp, c. vii. I quote the passage from Dr. Lightfoot's translation:—

'Let us, therefore, so serve Him with fear and all reverence, as He Himself gave commandment, and the Apostles who preached the Gospel to us, and the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of our Lord, being zealous as touching that which is good, abstaining from offences, and from the false brethren, and from them that bear the name of the Lord in hypocrisy, who lead foolish men astray.

'For everyone who shall not confess that Jesus is come in the flesh is antichrist, and whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου) to his own lusts, and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan.'

This version follows the extant Greek manuscripts, but an extract contained in the work of an old Syriac writer has preserved the reading 'oracles of God' instead of 'oracles of the Lord.' Now, to quote the words of Dr. Lightfoot, 'the extant Greek manuscripts have all descended from one faulty and, probably, not very early archetype.'¹ Their authority is, therefore, not at all high, even when, as in the present case, they agree with the Latin version, for the two again—to quote Dr. Lightfoot—'are closely allied.'²

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. p. 531.

² *Ibid.* vol. ii. sect. ii. p. 901.

It will, therefore, be doubtful whether the older reading is not that preserved by the old Syriac writer.

Whichever reading be adopted, there will be seen to be a parallelism in the passage I have quoted, which will point with sufficient clearness to what was intended by the word λόγια.

Let us, therefore, serve Him as He himself gave us commandment.	For everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist.
---	--

And the Apostles who preached the Gospel to us.	And whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil.
---	---

And the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of our Lord.	And whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord (or God) to his own lusts, and say there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan.
--	--

Observing this parallelism, it is plain that by 'the oracles of the Lord (or God)' were intended the Old Testament Scriptures.

If the reading 'of (concerning) the Lord' be adopted, the intendment will be the Messianic prophecies; if the reading 'of God,' the Old Testament Scriptures generally.

The same follows from the consideration of the passage itself, for the doctrine condemned, denying the resurrection and the judgment, was that of the Sadducees, and was not held, so far as I am aware, by any sect of Christians.

I have pointed out that the context compels the same intendment to be given to λόγια, whether we

adopt the reading *Κυρίου* or *Θεοῦ*; but it must be noticed that if we suppose the original reading to have been *Κυρίου*, the change to *Θεοῦ* points to a difficulty in the sense, and that just such a difficulty would be occasioned by a change in the usual intendment of the phrase *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* from Messianic prophecies to New Testament Scriptures. If, therefore, *Κυρίου* be the true reading, the existence of the various reading is favourable to the true reading requiring an archaic interpretation of the passage.

Dr. Lightfoot, who holds the epistle of Polycarp to be genuine, places the date of it A.D. 110. Being inclined myself to consider it spurious, I should place its date shortly after the time when, the name of Polycarp having acquired great weight by his martyrdom, it was considered desirable to provide evidence of his adhesion to the teaching of the apostle Paul. That is some time in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, or not many years before Irenaeus wrote his work on heresies.

The word *λόγιον* occurs again in the ancient homily, commonly known as the second epistle of Clement, chapter xiii., which I quote from Dr. Lightfoot's translation:—

‘Therefore, brethren, let us repent forthwith. Let us be sober unto that which is good; for we are full of mad folly and wickedness. Let us wipe away from us our former sins, and let us repent with our whole soul and be saved, and let us not be found men-pleasers. Neither let us desire to please one another only, but also those men that are without, by our righteousness, that the Name be not blasphemed by reason of us. For the Lord saith (λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος), *Every way My Name is blasphemed among all the Gentiles*; and again, *Woe unto him by reason of whom My Name is blasphemed*. Wherein is it blasphemed? In

that ye do not the things which I desire. For the Gentiles, when they hear from our mouth the oracles of God (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*), marvel at them for their beauty and greatness; then, when they discover our works are not worthy of the words which we speak, forthwith they betake themselves to blasphemy, saying that it is an idle story and a delusion. For when they hear from us that God (ὁ Θεός) saith, It is no thank unto you if ye love them that love you, but this is thank unto you, if ye love your enemies and them that hate you (*Οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς*); when they hear these things, I say, they marvel at their exceeding goodness; but when they see that we do not only not love them that hate us, but not even them that love us, they laugh us to scorn, and the Name is blasphemed.’

The passage, quoted as an oracle of God, may possibly be an abridged and rather free rendering of Luke vi. 32-35:—

‘If ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? . . . But love your enemies . . . and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High (*εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν*; . . . πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν . . . καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου).’

But, if not, it probably comes from some other gospel.

We have, therefore, the word *λόγιον* applied to words put into the mouth of Jesus in some gospel; this, however, is a very different thing from so describing the gospel which contained those words. The usage of the word is, therefore, similar to that by Justin Martyr in the passage quoted above from the Dialogue with Trypho, with the exception that there is nothing in the context to suggest that it was uncommon.

In considering the importance to be attached to this quotation it is necessary to consider the date of the homily in which it occurs.

The first notice we have of it is in the 'Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius' (iii. 38), who appears to have doubted its genuineness, and says that he did not know of any mention of it by ancient writers. Nevertheless, the archaic style of reference to evangelical literature, especially the quotation of sayings of Jesus, contained only in apocryphal gospels, without any note that they were of doubtful authority, shows the homily to be of a date anterior to the time at which the four canonical gospels came to be regarded as of peculiar authority. This archaic style of reference is one ground why Dr. Lightfoot fixes the date as early as the second quarter of the second century.¹ This is by comparing the style of its author in such matters with Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, and assuming that the style of the two latter writers may be taken as typical of what would be tolerated in the church at their age. This, however, I venture to contend, is a mistake. These writers were leaders of opinion, and were forerunners of the age that followed them, rather than representatives of their own. The quotation from Dr. Lightfoot's own writings in the case of the acts of the Scillitan martyrs cited below² will show that the archaic way of referring to New Testament writings continued as late as the accession of Commodus, A.D. 180.

There can be no reason, therefore, on this ground, to refer the homily we are now considering to an earlier date.

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. ii. p. 202.

² P. 79, *post*.

The other ground alleged by Dr. Lightfoot is, that the homily contains expressions which might be thought to savour of Valentinianism, notably the reference to the spiritual church begotten before the sun and moon, and that an orthodox writer would have avoided such expressions after the Valentinian system had been promulgated and publicly branded as heresy.¹ But Dr. Lightfoot has to admit that it is not certain that the writer of the homily was reckoned altogether orthodox in his own day, and even if he were, the system of Valentinus was not one which succumbed immediately it had been pronounced to be heretical. On the contrary, it troubled the church for several generations, and was in the end embraced by a large sect. The philosophical principles upon which the system of Valentinus was based were prevalent among a large number of the thinking men of the second century, and it was not until those principles were discredited by the revived Platonism of Plotinus, that the system based on them began to give way. There is therefore no reason to think that principles more or less approximating to those of Valentinus were less rife in the church in the generation succeeding the promulgation of his doctrines than they had been in the generation before. We must therefore look for some other grounds than those alleged by Dr. Lightfoot if we would place the homily earlier than the latter part of the second century. I am not aware of any. The best indication of the date of the homily which I am aware of, is to be found in the following passage from cap. xvii., which I cite from the translation of Dr. Lightfoot:—

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. p. 203.

'But the righteous, having done good and endured torments (*ὑπομείναντες τὰς βασάνους*), and hated the pleasures of the soul, when they shall behold them that have done amiss, and denied Jesus by their words or by their deeds, how that they are punished with grievous torments in an unquenchable fire, shall give glory to God (*ἔσονται δόξαν διδόντες τῷ Θεῷ αὐτῶν*), saying there will be hope for him that has served God with his whole heart.'

This part of the text is extant in two authorities only, the Greek MS., known as the Constantinopolitan, and the Syriac version.

The Syriac version, one of these authorities, adds *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* after *ἔσονται*, making the redeemed 'in exceeding joy' give glory to their God at the sight of the sufferings of the lost.

In the parts of the text which are extant also in the Alexandrine MS., which is deemed the best authority, the Syriac version most frequently coincides with Alexandrine MS., where it differs from the Constantinopolitan MS.¹

Upon the merits of this version as an authority, as contrasted with the Constantinopolitan manuscript denoted by the symbol C which forms the remaining authority, Dr. Lightfoot remarks as follows:—

'Of the two inferior authorities, S (the Syriac version) is much more valuable than C for correcting A (the Alexandrian MS.). While C alone corrects A in one passage only of any moment, S alone corrects it in several. In itself, S is both better and worse than C. It is made up of two elements, one very ancient and good, the other debased and probably recent, whereas C preserves a pretty fair standard throughout.'²

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. p. 138. ² *Ibid.* p. 144.

This character of the two witnesses C and S would seem to show a preponderance in favour of the reading supported by the Syriac version, especially when one recollects the tendency there would be to omit *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* in order to soften the harshness of the sentiment, and that C shows signs of critical revision.¹

Dr. Lightfoot gives as his reason for preferring the reading of the Constantinopolitan MS. in this place that the addition of the words *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* should be taken as an illustration of a tendency to introduce glosses and explanations characteristic of the Syriac version, or the Greek MS. from which it was derived,² but we may suspect that he was influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by a desire to soften the passage. This we see in his translation cited above, where, by omitting to translate *αὐτῶν* and so making the saints give glory 'to God' instead of to 'their God,' he makes a further change in the same direction.

But whether this expletive ought or ought not to be part of the text, the passage shows a great bitterness of feeling on the part of the Christians towards unbelievers, and following the previous quotation in which the preacher had pointed out how the Name was blasphemed, owing to the disregard, on the part of the Christians, of the divine injunction concerning loving their enemies, would have appeared in the nature of a practical bull, had not the outrageousness of the sentiment been disguised by its having become a religious commonplace. It is well known that it finally became an established doctrine of the church, that the redeemed would witness the sufferings of the

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. p. 124. ² *Ibid.* p. 141.

damned and derive pleasure from so doing,¹ and we see that this doctrine had already taken root at the time of the composition of this homily. Now we may be certain that this sentiment, so contrary to the express teaching of the gospel, would not become general, except in the minds of people embittered by a widespread and persistent persecution. A state of widespread persecution, either existing or in recent memory, is further implied in the reference to the having endured torments, as part of the common lot of the redeemed.

Such a persecution the Christians did not have to contend with until the reign of Marcus Aurelius, commencing A.D. 161.

Some time after that date, say about A.D. 170, is therefore the earliest probable date to which the composition of the homily we are considering can be assigned. Taking this as the date of the homily, it is too late to be of consequence for the purpose we have in hand, that is, of showing the usage of the word *λόγιον* before the age of Irenaeus. But even if an earlier date be assigned, it is an example of the application of the word to words supposed to have been spoken by Jesus, not to the document which contained them.

In Irenaeus, who wrote in the generation after Justin, and later than any of the works I have cited, with the possible exception of the second epistle of Clement, the books of the Old and New Testament are indifferently called *λόγια* or oracles.

¹ The peroration of Tertullian to his treatise *De Spectaculis* is a familiar expression of this doctrine in ancient times, but for the matured opinion of the Catholic Church see the commentary of Aquinas on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, Lib. IV. Distinctio L. Quæstio II. articulus IV. solutio I.: 'Respondeo dicendum . . . quod a beatis nihil subtrahi debet quod ad perfectionem beatitudinis pertineat. . . . Dantur eis ut poenam impiorum perfecte intueantur.'

It will be noticed that the meanings of the word *λόγια* appear to have been subject to a regular development. The primary meaning appears to be inspired words or oracles. When used by Jewish monotheists as in the LXX, it becomes confined to the words of the one God they worshipped. Subsequently, the whole of the books of the Old Testament canon being supposed to be inspired by God, the word became specialised to signify that canon, or anything contained in it, as constituting the whole of the inspired word of God, whether said to be expressly spoken by God or not, and this continued for a long time the ordinary use of the word in Christian writings.

When books began to be circulated among Christians purporting to narrate the sayings of Jesus, the word *λόγια* was after a time extended to such sayings, as we see it was by Justin Martyr in one instance only, though not by Clement of Rome. Finally when the books themselves which contained those words came to be reckoned canonical Scripture and inspired, the name *λόγια* was extended to the books and all that was in them, as appears to have been the case by Irenaeus.

Now the question is, in what sense was the word used by Papias?

As far as I know, the foregoing citations contain all the passages that are material for determining this question. No doubt a larger number of places might be found in which the word occurs in the works of Philo, but I do not suppose they would affect the question.

The passages I have cited may be divided into three classes, as they show the usage of

- (1) The LXX translators.
- (2) Greek Jews subsequent to the LXX.
- (3) Christian writers.

(1) The usage of the LXX is material, not merely as originally giving the word its ecclesiastical meaning, but as exercising a powerful influence in determining that meaning among all Greek Christians, who continued to use that version. The meaning 'inspired word,' adopted by that version, does not appear ever to have been departed from, though what would be intended by 'inspired word' varied from time to time.

(2) The usage of Philo and Josephus is material as showing that at the time of the introduction of Christianity the Greek Jews by 'the inspired word' usually intended the Old Testament Scriptures, though they sometimes used the word in the more general sense of the LXX.

(3) I have been able to find eleven or perhaps twelve passages in which the word is used by Christian writers other than Papias before the age of Irenaeus, i.e. :—

Paul	1
Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews	1
„ „ first Epistle of Peter	1
Clement of Rome	4
Writer of the Acts	1
Justin :	2
Writer of the Epistle of Polycarp	1
„ „ second Epistle of Clement	1
	12

In one of these passages, that is in 1 Peter, the word is used in the general sense of the LXX, and in

two others, one in Justin, at least a generation after Papias, and one in 2nd Clement still later, it is applied to the words of Jesus.

In the other nine passages the Old Testament Scriptures are intended. We see, therefore, that Christians continued to use the word with the same intendment in which it had been used by the Greek Jews, until the middle of the second century or later.

The first instance in which we find it used to intend the books of the New Testament is in Irenaeus, who cannot reasonably be supposed to have written before A.D. 180, that is more than eighty years after the date I have assigned to the work of Papias, and fifty years after the latest date that could reasonably be assigned to that work.

Now in most cases fifty or even eighty years would be a small matter in the history of a word. It is far otherwise when one is considering the language likely to be applied to a book in the New Testament canon, and those fifty or eighty years occur while that canon was gathering authority during the second century. That this is the case I will show by the authority of Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham. Arguing in favour of the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles, he says :¹—

'A primary test of age in an early Christian writing is the relation which the notices of the words and deeds of Christ and his Apostles bear to the canonical writings. Tried by this test, the Ignatian epistles proclaim their early date. There is no sign whatever in them of a canon or authoritative collection of books of the New Testament. The expression "It is written" (*γέγραπται*) is employed to introduce quotations from the Old Testament alone (Ephe-

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. pp. 388-389.

sians v., Magnesians xii.). In one passage it is used by Ignatius in controversy with his Judaizing opponents of the Old Testament, as distinguished from the New. In this passage the archives (*ἀρχεῖα*) are opposed to the gospel (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*) as the Old Testament to the New. Such language is highly archaic . . . there is not so much as a single reference to written evangelical records, such as memoirs of the Apostles, which occupy so large a place in Justin Martyr. Still less is there any quotation by name from a canonical gospel, though such quotations abound in Irenaeus. . . . I would ask any reader who desires to apprehend the full force of these arguments to read a book or two of Irenaeus continuously, and mark the contrast in the manner of dealing with the evangelical narratives and the Apostolic letters.'

Again in another place,¹ writing to establish the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp, he says as follows:—

'We are asked to believe that this letter was forged on the confines of the age of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. But how wholly unlike it is to the ecclesiastical literature of this later generation, whether we regard the use of the New Testament or the notices of the ecclesiastical order, or the statements of theological doctrine, a little consideration will show. The evangelical quotations are still introduced, as in Clement of Rome, with the formula "The Lord said;" the passages from the Apostolic epistles are still for the most part indirect and anonymous; not a single book of the New Testament is cited by name.'

In another place, speaking of the Scillitan martyrs who suffered at a town in Numidia called Scillium, or some similar name A.D. 180, just after the commencement of the reign of Commodus, he says:—

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. p. 577.

'Of the genuineness of the newly discovered Greek Acts there can be no reasonable doubt. They betray their antiquity by their mode of expression, as, for instance, when the writings which we call the New Testament are described as "the books in use among us, and in addition Epistles of Paul, the holy man" (*αἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίβλοι καὶ προσεπιτούτοις ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου τοῦ ὁσίου ἀνδρός*).'¹

Now for the purpose Dr. Lightfoot had in hand, that is, establishing the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the argument in the first two extracts, so far as it is derived from the way of speaking of New Testament books, is sufficiently answered by the last extract, which shows that the archaic way of referring to them continued among some people or places right up to the age of Irenaeus. But for the converse purpose I have in hand, that is of showing that a writer who cannot be put later than the early part of the second century would not speak of New Testament books as canonical scriptures, and that therefore words in such a writer importing canonical scripture ought not of themselves to be applied to New Testament books, all three extracts are consistent and support one another.

I need not remind my readers that upon the point now before us, that is, the meaning of Papias, Dr. Lightfoot supports the view that the book mentioned by Papias is the first canonical gospel. I should, however, attach more weight to what he says upon the Ignatian controversy, upon which he may have felt more free to express his opinions as a scholar.

I must here make another remark which appears to follow from the foregoing quotations from Dr.

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. p. 508.

Lightfoot, and that is, that in his way of regarding New Testament books, Irenaeus was in advance of his age, or perhaps rather I should say, belonged to the more advanced party in the church in his age, and is therefore a better index to the opinions of the generation that succeeded him, than of the generation that went before him; which is further borne out by the preservation of his books, when so many of his contemporaries have perished.

Some further light may be thrown upon the meaning of the word *λόγια* by the way in which it was translated into Latin. The words *λόγια ζώντα*, in Acts vii. 38, are in the Vulgate rendered by 'verba vitae,' and in codex d. (the Latin version of codex D.) 'eloquia viventium.' In the Vulgate the words *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Romans iii. 2, are rendered 'eloquia Dei;' the words *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Hebrews v. 12, 'elementa exordii sermonum Dei;' and the words *λόγια Θεοῦ*, in 1 Peter iv. 11, by 'sermones Dei.' Jerome renders the title of the book of Papias 'Explanatio Sermonum Domini,' and the old Latin translator of Irenaeus renders *τὰ λόγια Κυρίου*, in Lib. i. 1, by 'verba Domini;' and in Lib. i. 8, *κυριακῶν λόγων* by 'Dominicis eloquiis,' and *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ* by 'eloquia Dei.'

In the places in which the LXX has *λόγιον*, the Vulgate has one or other of the same three words, sermo, verbum, eloquium, but for the most part the latter. As by far the greater part of the places, i.e. nineteen out of twenty-six, in which the word occurs are in the Psalms, and as Jerome's version of the Psalms was based upon the old Latin which was translated from the LXX, we have here also

evidence of the current rendering of *λόγιον* into Latin.

Rufinus, the Latin translator of Eusebius, translates the word *λόγια* by 'oracula.'¹

These are all the authorities I can just now lay my hands on for the translation of the word into Latin by ancient writers. The words by which it is rendered by other writers than Rufinus—verba, eloquia, sermones—have the meaning 'words' or 'utterances' merely, leaving any other meaning it might have, such as 'words of God,' or 'inspired words,' to be gathered from the context, though the favourite rendering by the word 'eloquium' imports the meaning of eloquent words not found in the Greek. These renderings afford evidence that the sense of 'words' or 'utterances' must be taken to be the more prominent part of the meaning, and help to discountenance any rendering in which that sense should be allowed to fall into abeyance. The rendering of Rufinus, who by the bent of his mind as well as by his training was probably the most competent of the various translators, reproduces more nearly the classical meaning of the word. It conveys the meaning of prophecies, and therefore strongly supports my contention.

¹ Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, &c., p. 102; note 1, cited *Supernatural Religion*, complete edition, vol. i. p. 466.