

CHAPTER VI

THE MEANING OF PAPIAS

THE meaning, therefore, of the extract from Papias is, 'Matthew wrote the inspired words in the Hebrew language,' the context probably implying the qualification 'of or concerning the Lord.' The question is what was the intendment. That there was some special intendment there can be no question, and we have three intendments to choose from—books or passages from the Old Testament; words of Jesus; and books or passages from the New Testament. The last is not supported by any instance earlier than two generations or upwards after the time of Papias. For words of Jesus, we have two instances a generation or more after Papias; while for the Old Testament being intended, we have nine, or, counting the citations from Philo and Josephus, twenty-six instances, including four passages in his contemporary, Clement of Rome.

I submit, therefore, there can be no doubt that by the word *λόγια* Papias should be taken to intend the Old Testament Scriptures, if that interpretation will satisfy the context. Taking this then to be so, the title of the work of Papias will be, 'An exposition of Old Testament Scriptures relating to the Lord,'

that is, of Messianic prophecies. The passage about Matthew will be, 'Matthew made a collection of the (Messianic) prophecies in the Hebrew language, or Matthew wrote on the (Messianic) prophecies in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted them as he was able.' I think the original will bear either of these constructions, but that the former is the true one. If the former construction be adopted, the word *ἡρμήνευσε* interpreted will mean 'expounded,' that is, showed how they were fulfilled; the same signification in which the cognate word *ἐρμηνείας* is used by Papias in the first extract quoted by Eusebius. If the latter construction be adopted, it will mean 'translated.'

I must now consider how the interpretation, Messianic prophecies, will apply to the phrase *κυριακῶν λογίων*, dominical oracles, in the remaining place, that is to say, what reason is it for the imperfection of Mark's work that Peter did not teach as if he were making a syntax or systematic exposition of the Messianic prophecies? The answer is, the primitive Christians were interested in the life and teaching of Jesus, not so much as an example of conduct, or for the sake of what he taught, *per se*, but as a means of proving that he was the Messiah, by showing that he fulfilled the prophecies. So much only of his life and teaching as answered that end was of considerable interest. In order, therefore, to pursue that subject thoroughly, it would be necessary systematically to narrate what was known of his life and teaching, but for no other purpose. In proof of these assertions I would refer—*First*, to the absence in any of the epistles in the New Testament of any reference to the teaching of Jesus, or of any moral drawn from

any incident in His life. *Secondly*, to the instances given in the New Testament of the opposite procedure: e.g. we read, Acts viii. 35, 'Philip . . . began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus.' Again, Acts xvii. 11, that the Jews of Berea, hearing the preaching of Paul, 'searched the scriptures daily whether these things were so;' again, Acts xviii. 28, that Apollos 'mightily convinced the Jews . . . showing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ;' again, Acts xxvi. 22, 23, Paul is made to say:—

'I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the Prophets and Moses did say should come, how that Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light, both to the people and the Gentiles.'

Again, 1 Peter i. 9, *et seq.*:—

'Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls; concerning which salvation the prophets taught and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, teaching what time or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them. To whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto you did they minister these things which now have been announced unto you through them that preached the Gospel unto you.'

In all these places, and I have no doubt more could be found,¹ we have allusions to teaching of the sort I have mentioned.

¹ E.g. Luke i. 1. As Dr. Lightfoot remarks (*Colossians*, 9th edit. p. 238), there is in the usage of the word no justification for translating τῶν πεπληροφημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων 'those things which are most surely believed among us.' We ought, therefore, with the revised ver-

I may add that works of the kind of which that of Papias must have been, if the foregoing inferences are correct, were by no means unknown in the primitive Church. Thus Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the middle of the second century, wrote a book which he described as 'Selections from the Law and the Prophets about the Saviour and our whole faith' (ἐκλογὰς ἐκ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν).

I will now pass on to consider a peculiar statement of Irenaeus, which is not without its weight in supporting the conclusion that the work of Papias consisted of the exposition of Old Testament prophecies. There is no doubt, I think, that Irenaeus made a good deal of use of Papias, and this has been remarked especially of his fourth book, in the beginning of which he promises some proofs by the words of the Lord, *per sermones domini* in the Latin version. In the Greek 'sermones domini' was probably λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου. At all events λόγια was sometimes translated into Latin by 'sermones,' as has been shown above.

But a little further on he makes the following curious statement: 'But since the writings of Moses are the words of Christ, he himself says to the Jews, as John has recorded in his gospel: "If you had

sion, to translate 'those matters which have been fulfilled among us.' To narrate the fulfilment of prophecy would appear then to have been the object an evangelist set before him. The use of this phrase is the more peculiar in the case of Luke, as that is not the view unfolded in his gospel, the prophecies stated to be fulfilled being by him left out. Unless, therefore, his gospel underwent a revision which did not extend to the preface, it would seem that the custom of looking upon the life of Jesus as a narration of the fulfilment of prophecy had become so much a matter of course, that it would be so described by a writer who himself took a different view of it.

¹ Irenaeus, lib. iv. c. 2, s. 3.

believed Moses you would have believed me also, for he wrote of me, but if you do not believe his writings, neither will you believe my words"—most clearly signifying that the writings of Moses were his own words. Therefore, if the writings of Moses, so also the writings of the other prophets, without doubt are his own words (i.e. Christ's) as we have shown.¹ Now this is exactly the remark 'a man of the mental calibre of Irenaeus might be supposed to make upon finding a work entitled like that of Papias to contain an exposition of Old Testament prophecies. He would interpret the title 'An exposition of the sayings of the Lord.' It does not occur to him that Papias used the words in a different sense, and he accordingly finds a reason for describing extracts from Moses and the prophets as sayings of the Lord.'

The word *λόγια*, it must be remembered, always means inspired words or utterances, or revelations. The differences which arose were not as to its meaning, but as to its application or intendment. By the first generations of Christians the word was ordinarily applied, as it had been by the Greek Jews before them, to the Old-Testament Scriptures; afterwards its application was extended to the sayings of Jesus, and finally, when the writers of the books in which those sayings were contained came to be considered as themselves inspired, to the books themselves and all they contained.

The oracles of the Lord, or revelations of the Lord, might, therefore, mean either the oracles or revelations delivered by the Lord, or the oracles or reve-

¹ With this passage from Irenaeus may be compared the various reading I have noticed in the above quotation from the Epistle of Polycarp.

lations delivered about the Lord; and in the latter case, either by way of prophecy as in the Old Testament or by way of an inspired narrative as in the New. Of these three possible meanings of the phrase I have already considered the one which I contend to be correct. I will now notice how the other two can be applied to the fragments of Papias, and I will take first that which obtained currency next in point of date, and which, therefore, stands next in point of probability—'The oracles or inspired sayings of the Lord.' It must be noticed that if this meaning be adopted, it follows equally with the theory I have been contending for, that the book ascribed to Matthew is not the first canonical gospel. No one would ever think of describing a book, the form of which is historical, 'The sayings of the Lord,' or by any similar title.

But however this may be, if we suppose these sayings to be sufficiently oracular to require interpretation, the meaning we are now considering gives a sufficiently intelligible meaning to the passage about Matthew, *per se*. When, however, it comes to be applied to the passage about Mark, the case is different. The fact that Peter did not speak as if he were making a syntax of the sayings of the Lord, does not give any intelligible reason why his interpreter, Mark, should write the things done by Christ, as opposed to what he said, without order or arrangement. In other words, if this meaning of *λογίων* be adopted, we get into the same difficulty of interpretation which besets the alternative reading *λόγων*. We see, therefore, that the interpretation of the context affords an independent reason for rejecting the meaning 'sayings of the Lord.'

The last of the three meanings of which the phrase is capable assumes the existence of a New Testament canon, the writers of which were supposed not merely to be the recorders of inspired sayings of Jesus, but to be themselves inspired. As there is no reason to suppose that any other books acquired this reputation before those of the present canon, the adoption of the meaning we are now considering involves the application of the fragments of Papias to our canonical Matthew and Mark. Now adopting this sense, *κυριακὰ λόγια* would mean the Scriptures of the Lord or the New Testament Scriptures, or might be confined to the gospels.

Now what can be meant by saying that Peter did not speak as if making a syntax of the New Testament or of the gospels? The supposition is that the New Testament, or at all events the second gospel, did not then exist, and that Peter's discourses were the materials out of which it was to be constructed. It is scarcely necessary to go further and consider why, if Papias had in view the canon as we now have it, he should deny to Mark, who he says distinctly and repeatedly was accurate as far as he went, that inspiration¹ which he accorded to Matthew, or even why he should deny that Mark's gospel formed a syntax of the New Testament or the gospels. If by a syntax he meant a synopsis, the canonical gospel of Mark does in fact present some features of a synopsis of Matthew and Luke, so that some critics have contended that that was its origin. If, on the other hand, he

¹ Perhaps I should say rather: Why should Papias deny this inspiration, &c., to Peter? But if he denied it to Peter, it seems to follow that he must have denied it to Mark.

meant a harmony, why, it may be asked, should Mark's work be expected to present this character? Why should the absence of this character be a reason for describing it as without order or arrangement? Finally, why should it be described as without order or arrangement at all?

The many learned writers who have interpreted the fragments of Papias as applicable to our present gospels, appear to have fallen into the following misconception. The writings of an historian believed to be inspired might be described as his *λόγια* or inspired utterances, but that does not make the word *λόγια* mean history, so that *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* could not, much less could *τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια*, mean the history of the Lord. What the words may mean is, the inspired utterances of Matthew or some one else about the Lord, but the reference to the historian whose *λόγια* they are, is always necessary. By adopting this mistranslation, and rendering *λόγια* history,¹ no doubt the fragments may in some sense be interpreted as applying to our present gospels, though even then the difficulty remains why Mark should be described as being without order. On the whole, the difficulties of applying any other meaning so as to give an intelligible interpretation of the context, support not a little the view that by *λόγια* Papias referred to passages in the Old Testament, and by *λόγια κυριακὰ* meant Messianic prophecies, which I have shown by citations from I think all the extant authorities to have been the usual application of the word among Christians or Greek Jews in his day.

In considering the question whether Papias used our present canonical gospels, there are several matters

¹ As for instance was done by Mr. Crusé.

which ought not to be overlooked. The first is the way in which Eusebius disparages him, which, it must be noticed, is not merely on account of his millenarian tendencies. He says he related one extraordinary thing after another, as having come to him from tradition (*παράδοξά τινα ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἄλλα ὡς ἂν ἐκ παραδόσεως εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα*); and again, that he reported as having come to him from unwritten tradition, certain strange parables of the Saviour, and teachings of his, and other things rather fabulous (*ξένας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τινα ἄλλα μυθικώτερα*); and again:—

‘In his own book he hands down other statements of Aristion before described of the words of the Lord and traditions of John the Elder, to which referring those eager to learn, we will, &c. (*ἐφ’ ὧς τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς ἀναπέμψαντες*).’

X All this shows that the book of Papias contained statements about Jesus inconsistent with those contained in the canonical gospels, and which Eusebius was, therefore, unwilling to mention, and which, therefore, afford a certain amount of evidence that Papias did not use those books. Now the Church endorsed the verdict of Eusebius upon Papias in a way not a little remarkable, in allowing his books to be lost. Remarkable when one considers how little is known of Christianity in the first century, and how interesting, therefore, the statements of a writer must have been, who had conversed with persons who had seen and heard not merely the Apostles, but Jesus himself. That the writings of such a writer should be permitted to perish, can be explained only upon the assumption that they contained something inconsistent with the

fundamental assumptions upon which the teaching of the Church was based, so that though an individual here or there might be taken with them, no considerable number of Christians would care to read and therefore to multiply them. Now we see that Papias had peculiarities relating to the parables, teaching, and words of Jesus, which Eusebius describes as strange, and refrains from quoting, and which we must therefore suppose not merely to be not contained in the canonical gospels, but to be inconsistent with what is contained there. But though this was plain to Eusebius, Papias did not acquire in his own times the name of a heretic. On the contrary, Eusebius tells us that his authority was very high in the Church. It is, therefore, to be rather inferred that the standard by which the teaching of the Church was afterwards measured, that is to say the canonical gospels, did not exist in his day. The fact of these peculiarities of Papias does not rest simply on the statement of Eusebius. Particulars of sayings attributed to Jesus by Papias, of a character distinct from any contained in the canonical gospels, have been preserved by Irenaeus, and there has been preserved in other places an account of the death of Judas altogether different from that in Matthew; but these matters will be gone into afterwards.

I will now consider how the interpretation I have put on the word *λόγια*, or oracles, agrees with the other portions of the extracts from Papias contained in Eusebius. He says: ‘I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you with the interpretations, whatever things, &c.’

Why should he hesitate to confront these traditions

with his interpretations? Taking his interpretations to be interpretations of prophecy, the answer is obvious: lest they should be contradicted by the facts. But Papias says that he has such confidence in his interpretations, that he will not hesitate to put beside them the reported facts. Again, it follows from the interpretation I have put on the word *λόγια*, that the book he ascribes to Matthew is something different from our gospel, probably a mere set of extracts from the Hebrew Scriptures. It required to be interpreted, and could lend no aid to the interpreter beyond saving him the trouble of searching for the passages, and also incidentally from the risk of being disturbed in his work by the inconvenient suggestion of an inconsistent context. We can understand, therefore, how the oral traditions of what was said by Matthew assisted Papias more than the things out of his book.

But before going further, it will be well to consider what is the meaning of this extraordinary statement of Papias about things out of books; why did he, alone of all men, put more confidence in oral tradition than in written records? There can, I think, be no doubt that he was pressed in controversy by books, and that he had not books of equal weight to use in return. Therefore he rails against books generally. His remarks can scarcely be credited of a man accustomed to rely as Christians have since done upon the canonical gospels, and generally on the New Testament. But what were the books with which he was pressed? He has contrasted 'those who relate the commandments of another' with those who relate the commandments of the Lord himself. He then speaks of collecting traditions of the sayings of seven apostles, that is

with the natural omission of James, the son of Zebedee, and Judas Iscariot, of all the apostles except Bartholomew, as to whom the synoptic gospels are agreed, but of none of those about whom they differ. But there is one name left out, not a little remarkable in a man collecting traditions in Asia Minor, that is the apostle Paul; nor can this be rendered the less significant by pointing out that Paul had no personal intercourse with Jesus. It rather points to the conclusion that he is the person whose teaching is contrasted with that coming directly from the Lord, and that the books from which Papias did not derive assistance were his epistles, which must have formed the most important part of Christian literature at the time Papias wrote.

The passage in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius, which we have been considering, contains the most considerable extracts from Papias and by far the most extensive notice of his work that are extant, and the only notice that bears directly upon the purpose we have in hand; but several notices of Papias by other writers have come down to us, containing among them three citations from his work. These notices I shall now proceed to consider; they are material to our present purpose so far as they afford evidence of the general character of his work, and therefore of the meaning of his title, and in particular of the word *λογίων* contained in it.

An extract from Apollinarius has been preserved in an ancient catena, which in turn contains a citation from Papias:—

'Judas did not die in the halter, but survived, having been taken down before he was strangled; and this the

Acts of the Apostles show, that falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst and his bowels gushed out ; and this Papias, the disciple of John, relates more plainly, saying thus in the fourth book of the Exposition of the Dominical words (τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων). "But Judas walked about in this world, a great example of impiety, his flesh blown out so much that he was not able to pass even where a wagon passes easily, nay, not even the bulk only of his head. The lids of his eyes, they say, were swollen so much, that he did not see the light at all, that his eyes could not even be seen by a physician with an instrument, they were so much below the outward surface. Other organs were distorted to an unnatural size, and he suffered from foul discharges of matter and worms (τὸ δὲ αἰδοῖον αὐτοῦ πάσης μὲν ἀσχημοσύνης ἀηδέστερον καὶ μείζον φαίνεσθαι, φέρεσθαι δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος συρρέοντας ἰχώρας τε καὶ σκώληκας εἰς ὕβριν δι' αὐτῶν μόνων τῶν ἀναγκαίων) ; but after many torments and retributions having died, they say, on his own estate, the estate became deserted and uninhabited until now from the smell, and not even until this day is anyone able to go by that place unless he stop his nostrils with his hands, so great a discharge was excreted upon the earth through his flesh." ¹

Another version of the same passage from Papias is given by Oecumenius, in his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles :—

'And this, Papias the disciple of John the Apostle, relates more plainly, Judas walked about in this world a great example of impiety, his flesh blown out so much that he was not able to pass though a wagon would pass easily by the wagon was he squeezed so that his entrails were poured out.' ²

¹ For Greek of this passage see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, abridged edit. p. 523.

² For Greek of this passage, which is perhaps corrupt, see Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, English translation, 1846, vol. iii. p. 236.

The agreement in language shows that this passage is ultimately derived from the same written source as the quotation in the catena, but several reasons go to show that the latter should be taken as the correct statement of Papias. It is taken from Apollinarius, probably one of the writers of that name of the fourth century ; it cites the particular book of Papias from which it is taken, and it is more coherent with itself. The wagon remains a simile merely, while in Oecumenius the wagon introduced as a simile suspiciously develops into a fact. Moreover, the exceedingly disgusting and grotesque nature of the details as given in the catena affords a reason why an equally exemplary, but more presentable, account should be furnished.

The bearing the passage has on our present inquiry is this : it shows that Papias gave an account of the death of Judas inconsistent with the accounts given by Matthew and the Acts. Different as those accounts are from one another, they agree in this. The death of the traitor is made impressive by the rapidity with which it follows upon his treason. According to Matthew it took place even before the crucifixion of Jesus. According to the Acts, it was a matter which was already some time past on the day of the Ascension. Now, according to Papias, the fate of Judas is made impressive by its prolonged agony. Though no definite marks of time are given, a considerable interval is implied. This story, therefore, must have had its origin among people who were ignorant of either the account in Matthew or the account in the Acts, and its acceptance by Papias raises an inference that he was also ignorant of those accounts.

The accounts of the death of Judas both in Matthew

and the Acts, are represented as the fulfilment of prophecies. Strauss¹ is of opinion that other verses of the same Psalms cited in the Acts suggested the story preserved by Papias :—

'He clothed himself with cursing as with his garment,
'And it came into his inward parts like water,
'And like oil into his bones.'²
'Let their eyes be darkened that they see not, and make
their loins shake continually.'³

It would appear, therefore, most probable that the story of the death of Judas was related by Papias as the fulfilment of Messianic prophecies.

Andreas, who was Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia about the end of the fifth century, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which contains two notices of Papias. In the first of these notices, speaking of the Apocalypse of John, he says :—

'About, however, the inspiration (τοῦ θεοπνεύστου) of the book we believe it superfluous to speak at length, since the blessed men, Gregory I mean the theologian and Cyril, and besides, those who are more ancient, Papias, Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, bear further witness to its trustworthiness (τὸ ἀξιόπιστον).'

The second notice is as follows :—

'But thus Papias verbatim (ἐπὶ λέξεως). "But to some of them" (clearly the angels that were of old divine) "he gave also to rule the arrangement about the earth (τῆς περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως), and bade them rule well." And next he says, "But it happened that their order (τὴν τάξιν) issued in nothing good, and the great Dragon was cast down—the old serpent,

¹ *Life of Jesus*, p. 237.

² Psalm cix. ver. 18.

³ Psalm lxix. ver. 23.

he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world—he was cast down to the earth, and his angels.'¹

From these passages several things may be learned about Papias—that he was acquainted with the Apocalypse, and cited a passage from it now to be found verbatim in chapter xii. 9. This is also to be gathered that he thought it trustworthy (ἀξιόπιστος) and probably also inspired (θεόπνευστος), probably also the work of the apostle John. We further see that he held some doctrines having some resemblance to the cruder forms of gnosticism. There were certain angels of old divine to whom God gave the rule over the heavens which they ruled to so little purpose that they let the devil down on to the earth. Papias seems to look upon this transaction in a different light from that in which it is exhibited in the Apocalypse. There the action of Michael and his angels is represented as a success which occasioned great rejoicing in heaven. They were so glad there to be rid of the devil, that they did not care where he went to or who might suffer by his presence. Papias rather takes the view of a dweller upon earth, that it was the duty of the angels to keep the devil out.

The direct bearing of this passage upon the purpose we have in hand is small.

Anastasius of Sinai, a Greek monk, who lived towards the end of the seventh century, among other works wrote a book called 'Anagogicæ Contemplationes in Hexaëmeron.' The book, which consists of a mystical interpretation of the account of the

¹ For Greek, see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, abridged edit. p. 521.

creation in Genesis, makes mention of Papias in two places, the first of which is as follows:—

‘But since we have not found the end of those doubts which we have suggested, and we are wholly entangled in them, and are altogether at a loss, relying on the mouth of the holy spirit, the tongue, I mean, of Paul, which says that all things which are in the law were written beforehand for a type of Christ and his Church, having taken a start, if it behoves to speak truly, from Papias the Great of Hierapolis, who attended the teaching of the bosom disciple, and Clement, Pantaenus a priest of Alexandria, and the very learned Ammonius, the ancient and first interpreters, who agree with one another in having understood of Christ and his Church the whole of the six days (*πᾶσαν τὴν ἑξαήμερον*), after truly the sensible creation according to the letter, observing without any doubt a sense for the Church, on behalf of which is the whole aim of our contest, to this work we apply ourselves.’¹

The doubts mentioned are doubts concerning the interpretation of the narrative in Genesis of the creation in six days, the mystical interpretation of which forms the subject of the work of Anastasius.

The second passage is as follows:—

‘The more ancient of the expounders of the churches, I mean Philo, the philosopher and contemporary of the Apostles, and Papias the Great of Hierapolis, the disciple of John the Evangelist, and Irenaeus of Lyons, and Justin the Martyr and Philosopher, and Pantaenus of Alexandria, and Clement the Stromatist (*Στροματεύς*), and their followers, viewed the things about Paradise spiritually, transferring them to the Church of Christ, of whose number are also the two Gregories of Cappadocia, who are all wise about everything, all these men saying from the following causes

¹ See Appendix viii. For Greek of part see Lightfoot, *A. P.*, abridged ed. p. 521.

that there is also a spiritual paradise. First because if Adam was not subject to destruction when he was made, it is evident that he was not a partaker of earthly food on which destruction falls. For if he could be a partaker of earthly food it is also evident that destruction falls on him, for whatsoever goeth into the mouth is cast out into the draught; but if destruction fell on him he was altogether mortal; and if he was created mortal, death was not in any way made through disobedience. And this, indeed, is the first cause of the expositors, &c.’¹

After this Anastasius continues at a considerable length to propound other analogous reasons as if they were the conjoint opinions of the various authors he has mentioned. He afterwards cites a work of Justin on the Hexaëmeron, which is not now extant. As there is no means of ascertaining how far anything Anastasius says is taken accurately from Papias, it is not worth while to follow him further, but notwithstanding this doubt the passages cited are evidence that Papias wrote upon the interpretation of the Old Testament—i.e. upon the Messianic prophecies.

Another mention of Papias is the following. Certain extracts in a manuscript discovered by Cramer in the Bibliotheca Regia at Paris are introduced by the following words:—

‘From the exposition of John of Antioch, which he worked out about the chronology and creation of the world (*περὶ χρόνων καὶ κτίσεως κόσμου*), as he says, from the books of Moses, Africanus Eusebius, Papias (*Παππίου*) and Didymus, and others.’²

¹ See Appendix viii.

² Cramer, *Anecdota Græca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum regiarum Parisiensis*, vol. ii. p. 379. For Greek, see Appendix ix.

By John of Antioch is here meant John Malalas, and the extracts which follow may be presumed to come from the lost commencement of his chronicle. They begin, 'Adam had from God the measure of mankind—a stature of six feet, &c.' The fables which follow contain a curious mixture of incidents from the Old Testament and the mythology.

The connection would appear to show that Papias of Hierapolis is intended, though from the spelling the name might perhaps as well be Pappus, especially as Eusebius always gives the genitive of Παπίας, Παπία; Andreas of Caesarea, however, gives it Παπίου. Supposing then, as I think we ought, Papias to be meant, the notice raises an inference that his work contained an account of the creation of the world and therefore dealt with the Old Testament.

This confirms the inference to be drawn from Anastasius of Sinai.

Maximus the Confessor, who, after having been secretary to the Emperor Heraclius and abbot at Chrysopolis, suffered many tortures by order of the Emperor Constans II. by reason of his opposition to the monothelite heresy, among numerous works wrote scholia upon some of the writings attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite. Two of these scholia make mention of Papias. In the book on the Celestial Hierarchy Dionysius is made to address Timothy as child (παῖ), and upon this passage Maximus writes the following scholium:—

'It must be enquired how the great Dionysius calls the divine Timothy a child. Either, as I think, as being advanced beyond him in years he says this, and as excelling him in philosophy, as the writings in our hands show, for

even if the holy Timothy believed before the divine Dionysius, as the Acts of the Apostles show, yet at least as regards his outside training the great Dionysius was the stronger, or he calls him child as imitating the Lord saying, 'Children, have ye aught to eat?' or because they used to call those who practise guilelessness before God children, as Papias shows in the first book of his Dominical expositions (τῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεων), and Clement of Alexandria in his "Pedagogue."¹

The question then arises whether this passage throws any light upon the contents of the work of Papias. It will be noticed that Maximus distinguishes four grounds upon which Timothy might be addressed by Dionysius as child, first on account of the superiority of Dionysius in age; second, on account of the superiority of Dionysius in learning; thirdly, as imitating the Lord; and fourthly in accordance with a bygone practice which was explained by Papias and Clement. The point which we have to determine is whether the usage referred to was that of the writers of the Old or of the New Testament Scriptures, and upon this point the work of Clement, which is extant, may throw some light upon the work of Papias, which is not. When we turn to the 'Pedagogue' of Clement, we find that the passage referred to is probably chapter x. of book i. entitled 'That all who concern themselves about the truth are children before God' ("Ὅτι πάντες οἱ περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καταγιγνομένοι παῖδες παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ).

In this chapter Clement undertakes to justify the title of his book 'Paedagogus, or the Instructor of Children,' by showing that Christians are properly described as children, and this he does by citing

¹ For the Greek, see Appendix x.

passages of both the Old and New Testaments, beginning with the passage from John xxi. cited by Maximus. So far, then, when Maximus refers to the usage of Clement, he might refer either to his interpretation of the New or of the Old Testament, but we see that Maximus opposes the usage of Clement and Papias to the imitation of the Lord, that is, he considers that one reason why Dionysius might address Timothy as child would be because he imitated the Lord, and another because he followed a practice that was shown by Clement and Papias. Now the passages cited by Clement from the New Testament are nearly all utterances of Jesus (John xiii. 33; xxi. 4, 5; Matthew x. 16; xi. 16, 17; xviii. 1, 3; xix. 14; xxi. 9, 16; xxiii. 37; xxv. 33). The usage of Clement therefore, as based on these passages, would scarcely be seen to be anything different from the imitation of the Lord. We are, therefore, drawn to the conclusion that Maximus refers to the principle of interpretation applied by Clement to the passages from the Old Testament according to which the word 'children,' or other words which might be taken as equivalent to it, had some hidden sense not apparent from the context. In such passages, for instance, as Psalm cxiii. 1, according to the LXX, 'Praise, oh children, the Lord;' or Isaiah viii. 18, 'Here am I and the children whom God hath given me;' or Leviticus xv. 29, xii. 8, where a mystic allusion is seen in the two young pigeons and the pair of turtle doves; or Isaiah lxv. 15, 16, 'But my servants shall be called by a new name;' or the reference to the lambs in Isaiah xi. 11; or the humble and meek in Isaiah lxv. 2, it is not obvious where Clement finds any reason for the proposition by

which he justifies his title. In other cases his interpretation is more decidedly mystical, as where conversely he interprets the words in Psalm v. 6, 'The Lord abhors the bloody man,' as applying to the Devil, who is there called man as perfect in wickedness, on the ground that 'man' in prophecy signifies perfection, or where he interprets the words of Genesis xlix. 11, 'and he bound his foal to the vine,' to mean 'having bound this simple and childlike people to the Logos, figuratively represented as a vine,' or when he says:—

'The child is, therefore, gentle (*ἡπιος οὖν ὁ νήπιος*), and on this account the rather tender, delicate, and simple, without deceit and hypocrisy, upright in mind and straightforward, which is the foundation of simplicity and truth. "For," he says, "to whom shall I have respect but to the humble and meek?"'

But perhaps the most striking instance of mystical interpretation is to be found in the use of the story of Abimelech seeing Isaac sporting with Rebecca, Genesis xxvi. 8. Of this passage Clement gives two interpretations. He begins:—

'I refer Isaac also to a child. Isaac is interpreted laughter. The inquisitive king saw him sporting with his wife and helpmeet Rebecca. The king, whose name was Abimelech, seems to me a supermundane wisdom looking down upon the mystery of training; but Rebecca they interpret patience, *Ῥεβέκκαν δὲ ἐρμηνεύουσιν ὑπομονήν.*'

According to the second interpretation, Rebecca, from meaning patience, passed on to mean the Church, which is called Patience because she remains to all generations, subsisting by the patience of believers, and both the King and Isaac mean Christ, the former,

apparently, as in heaven, and the latter as manifested on earth. In this interpretation neither the allegory nor its interpretation is otherwise than very obscure, and it will be noticed that both turn upon the meaning patience given to Rebecca. This is taken from Philo, as is the whole of the first interpretation, except so much of it as makes Isaac mean child as well as laughter (see Lib. II., 'De Plant. Noe,' 40, 41). But it will be noticed that Clement speaks in the plural—'they interpret'—from which it would appear that he follows some other authority as well as Philo. It is therefore not at all improbable that one of the interpretations is taken by him from Papias. This is the more probable as we have seen that Anastasius of Sinai couples the name of Papias with that of Philo. On the whole, the inference appears to be that Maximus refers to some mystic system adopted by Papias of interpreting the Old Testament, and therefore supports the view that his book was upon the interpretation of Old Testament Scriptures. Again, in Chapter VII. of the 'Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,' Dionysius, while dealing with the resurrection, is made to say as follows:—

'But others turning aside, I know not how, to material ideas have said that the most holy and blessed lot announced to the saints is of the same kind as the life here, and have unlawfully cast food which pertains to a changeable life to those equal to the angels. But no one of the most holy men will ever fall into such errors.'¹

Upon this passage Maximus writes the following comment:—

¹ For the Greek, see Appendix x.

'He says this, I think, hinting at Papias who had then become bishop of Hierapolis in Asia and who flourished together with John the divine Evangelist. For this Papias, in the fourth book of his Dominical Expositions, spoke of enjoyments in the resurrection through things eaten: in which opinion, which some call the Millennium, Apollinarius subsequently believed, as appears in his writing. How then are the writings of the holy Dionysius, as some foolishly say, which answer Apollinarius the work of Apollinarius? And Irenaeus of Lyons in his fifth book against heresies says the same, and adduces the aforesaid Papias as a witness of the things said by him.'¹

Photius also has a notice of Papias and Irenaeus to a similar effect, whom he describes as saying—

'That the enjoyment of eating certain sensible things is the Kingdom of the Heavens, αἰσθητῶν τιῶν βρωμάτων ἀπόλαυσιν εἶναι τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν.'²

The passage in Irenaeus referred to is the following:—

'These things are to take place in the times of the kingdom, that is on the seventh day, which was sanctified, on which God rested from all works which he did, which is the true Sabbath of the just, in which they shall not do any earthly work, but shall have beside them a table prepared by God, feeding them with all kinds of dishes. As the blessing of Isaac, with which he blessed his younger son Jacob, also imports, saying, "Behold the smell of my son as the smell of a fruitful field which God has blessed." Now the field is the world, and therefore he added, "God give thee of the dew of heaven and of the fatness of the earth, plenty of corn and wine, and let nations serve thee and princes bow down to thee, and be lord over thy brother, and thy father's sons shall bow down to thee. Whosoever

For the Greek, see Appendix x.

² See Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, abridged edit. p. 523.

shall curse thee shall be cursed, and whosoever shall bless thee shall be blessed." Whoever then will not receive these things as prophecies of the kingdom will fall into great contradiction and contrariety, in which the Jews, falling into utter perplexity, are placed. For not only in this life the nations did not serve this Jacob, but after the blessing he himself set out and served his uncle Laban the Syrian twenty years, and not only was he not made lord of his brother, but he himself bowed down to his brother Esau when he returned from Mesopotamia to his father, and offered him many gifts, and how did he inherit plenty of corn and wine who, on account of a famine in the land in which he dwelt, migrated into Egypt, being made subject to Pharaoh who then reigned in Egypt? So, the foretold blessing without doubt pertains to the times of the kingdom, when the just rising from the dead will reign, when also creation renewed and liberated will bring forth plenty of all sorts of food from the dew of heaven and from the fatness of the earth, as the elders who saw John the disciple of the Lord have related, that they heard from him how the Lord used to teach about those times and say, Days shall come in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand stems, and on each stem ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give twenty-five measures of wine, and when one of the saints shall lay hold of one of these bunches another will cry out, I am a better bunch; take me; through me bless the Lord. Likewise also that a grain of wheat shall bear ten thousand ears, and each ear shall have ten thousand grains, and each grain ten pounds of fine white wheaten flour, and that the rest of the fruits, seed, and herbs shall bring forth in similar proportions, and that all animals using those foods which are obtained from the earth shall become peaceable and agree with one another, being subject to men with all subjection. But these things Papias also,

a man of primitive times who had been the hearer of John and the companion of Polycarp, testifies in writing in the fourth of his books, for there are five books composed by him. And he added these words, These things are credible to those who believe, and he says that when Judas the traitor did not believe, and asked the question, How will such fruitful stocks be produced by the Lord? the Lord said, They shall see who shall come to those times. Prophesying then these times, Isaiah said, And the wolf shall feed together with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, &c.'¹

One is under no grammatical compulsion to suppose that Irenaeus quoted the authority of Papias for anything more than the sayings of Jesus handed down by the elders, and so far we find Papias an authority for attributing to Jesus teachings of a different cast from any in the canonical gospels. The doctrines to which this teaching gave rise appear to have been held, not merely by Papias, Apollinarius, and Irenaeus, but, as Eusebius tells us, by very many of the ecclesiastical writers who came after Papias (*τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις . . . τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν*). Their prevalency, therefore, points to a time when the doctrines of the church were not governed by the canonical gospels, and is therefore favourable to Papias at all events, having written at a time when these gospels did not exist. But, apart from the mere grammatical import of the reference made by Irenaeus to Papias, the reference of Maximus leads us to the surmise that the teaching of Irenaeus upon the topic in question is founded upon the teaching of Papias. If that is so, the whole passage above quoted,

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 33, 1 Stieren, pp. 808-810.

from the quotation of the blessing of Isaac downwards, may be taken from Papias, and if that is so, we see an exact illustration of the use Papias said he would make of his traditions.

'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.'

Papias began with the prophecy from the Old Testament. Of this he gave his interpretation, and he then added in confirmation the saying of Jesus he had learned from the elders. In this aspect the passage confirms the view that Papias was writing on the interpretation of Old Testament prophecies. The words 'for the field is the world,' which interrupt the statement of the prophecy, quoted perhaps from Matthew xiii. 38, may very well (on this supposition) be an addition of Irenaeus.

Proceeding further, there is a probability rather more remote, but still not inconsiderable, that the whole argument of Irenaeus upon the Millennium is based upon Papias, and it therefore becomes important to consider its nature in order to see whether it throws any light upon the nature of the books of Papias. Irenaeus begins the topic as follows:—

'Since the opinions of certain men are taken from the discourses of the heretics, and they are ignorant of the dispositions of God and the mystery of the resurrection of the just, and of the kingdom, which is the beginning of incorruption, by which kingdom those who shall be worthy become accustomed little by little to put on the God¹ (*capere Deum*), it is necessary to speak about these things, since, rising again at the appearance of God, the just ought first in this condition,

¹ I.e. to become sons of God or gods by adoption.

which is renewed to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers and to reign in it (*recipere promissionem hereditatis quam Deus promisit patribus*), and then the Judgment to take place afterwards. For in the same condition in which they laboured or were afflicted, being proved in all ways through suffering, it is just that they should receive the fruits of their suffering, in the same condition in which they were slain for the love of God that they should be made alive, and in the same condition in which they sustained slavery that they should reign. For God is rich in all things, and all things are his. It is right, then, that that very condition made whole again to its pristine state should without a prohibition be at the service of the just.'¹

Upon this passage two remarks are to be made. The first is that Irenaeus states that the opinions he is controverting, which he acknowledges were very prevalent in the Church, were derived from the discourses of the heretics, by whom he means the Gnostics. This is in agreement with the statement of Eusebius that very many of the ecclesiastical or Church writers who followed Papias agreed with him about the Millennium. We are therefore led to the conclusion that Irenaeus is correct in stating that he is maintaining the ancient opinion of the Church, and that the contrary opinion, which was growing in his time and which subsequently prevailed, was really owing to the Church having approximated its teaching to that of the Gnostics. The second remark is that Irenaeus contends that the 'just ought first . . . to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers.' He therefore expressly bases his case upon Old Testament prophecies, and

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 32, s. 1, 1 Stieren, p. 806.

this is borne out by the details of his arguments. The general substance of them is this: such and such promises were made to Abraham and his seed, to Isaac, Jacob, and the Jewish people. These promises have not been fulfilled as yet; therefore they have yet to be fulfilled to the Christian Church in the Millennium. By far the greater part of the bulk of the portion of Irenaeus dealing with this topic—that is, of the last four chapters of his fifth book—is taken up by citations from the Old Testament, including one from an Apocryphal book, and the Revelation and the interpretation of those citations. Besides this, however, Irenaeus makes citations from or allusions to the gospels, Acts, and epistles which are not merely less numerous, but not nearly so bulky. In all he makes sixty-seven citations or allusions—i.e. thirty-three from the Old Testament, seven from the Revelation, thirteen from the Acts and epistles, and fourteen at the utmost from the gospels, of which twelve are to discourses of Jesus, and two to words spoken by John the Baptist, which are mentioned twice. Of the twelve citations from discourses of Jesus three occur in a passage quoted from the elders, to which it will be necessary to give separate consideration, and of the remaining nine five are short sayings cited to explain something else, not themselves the subject of any exposition. ‘Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.’ ‘Now the field is the world,’ a statement that the Lord styled Gehenna ‘eternal fire.’ ‘Heaven and earth shall pass away,’ a mention of the first resurrection of the just. I mention the last as it is sometimes marked as an allusion to Luke xiv. 14, but it is more likely

an allusion to Revelation xx. 4. There is nothing in Luke to distinguish between a first and a second resurrection. The context in the Revelation shows that the first resurrection is a resurrection of the just. Of the remaining four citations from the gospels one is a passage of some length, apparently cited from Luke xii. 37, 38.

‘Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching. Verily I say unto you that he shall gird himself, and make them sit down to meat, and shall come and serve them. And if he shall come in the evening watch and find them so, blessed are they since he shall make them sit down and shall serve them. And although he should come in the second or third watch, happy are they.’¹

This quotation is wedged in between a quotation from Isaiah lviii. 14 and a quotation from the Apocalypse xx. 6, and has no separate exposition.

The remaining three quotations are as follows; they immediately precede the passage above cited, in which Papias is mentioned by name.

‘But, on account of this, coming to the passion (*ad passionem veniens*) that he might announce to Abraham and those who were with him the good news of the unfolding of the inheritance, when he had given thanks, holding the cup, and had drunk of it and given to his disciples, he said to them, Drink ye all of it. This is my blood of the New Testament which will be shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of this vine until that day when I shall drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom. Undoubtedly he will himself renew the inheritance of the earth,

¹ Stieren, Irenaeus, p. 812.

and restore the mystery of the glory of his sons, as David says, "Who has renewed the face of the earth." He promised to drink of the fruit of the vine with his disciples, showing both things, that is to say the inheritance of the earth in which the new fruit of the vine is drunk and the resurrection of his disciples in the flesh. For the flesh which rises again new is the same which also receives the new cup. For neither placed on high in a place above the heavens with his disciples can he be understood as drinking the fruit of the vine, nor again are they without flesh who drink it, for the drink which comes from the vine belongs to the flesh and not to the spirit. And on this account the Lord said, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, do not call rich men or thy friends, neighbours, and kinsmen, lest they call thee in return, and a recompense be made by them; but call the lame, the blind, and the beggars, and thou shalt be blessed because they have not wherewith to recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just. And again he says, Whosoever shall have left lands or houses or parents or brethren or sons because of me shall receive in this world an hundred fold, and in that to come shall inherit eternal life. For what are the dinners given to the poor and suppers which are in this world returned a hundred fold? These things are to take place in the times of the kingdom,' &c. (as in the previous quotation).¹

In these cases, therefore, we get expositions of discourses of Jesus, but the rest of what Irenaeus has written does not in any wise assume the form of an exposition of these passages. He does not begin with them. He has previously dealt with the promises to Abraham, and in commencing the topic he expressly puts it upon the fulfilment of the promises which God promised to the fathers. It would take up too much

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 33, 1 Stieren, p. 808.

space to deal with the prophecies from the Old Testament and Revelation as I have done with the citations from the gospels. The bulk of them may be judged from the fact that the portion of the works of Irenaeus under consideration takes up in Stieren's edition sixteen pages of printed matter. Supposing now that Irenaeus in this portion of his work copied Papias verbatim, it may be asked, Would the work properly be described as 'An exposition of the discourses of the Lord'? It must be answered No, it would be much better described as an exposition of the Messianic prophecies. But even if Irenaeus copied Papias at all we have no reason to suppose that he copied Papias verbatim, and that being so, we may ask which portion of the work of Papias is he most likely to have enlarged—the references to the Old Testament, or the references to the New Testament? It must be answered that, having regard to the ages of the writers, Irenaeus would be nearly certain to increase the New Testament element; *a fortiori*, therefore, we conclude, that if this part of Irenaeus is based on Papias, the work of Papias was an exposition of Messianic prophecies, and not of the discourses of Jesus. It is impossible to draw any conclusion whether any of the passages from the gospels or from other canonical books of the New Testament, except the Revelation, were taken from Papias; all such passages, and all allusions to such passages, might be omitted from this part of the works of Irenaeus without materially affecting his arguments. If any of the New Testament quotations, other than those from the Revelation, come from Papias, the three passages appearing to be quotations from the canonical gospels which I have cited last,

and which alone have separate interpretations, are most likely to have been used by Papias, and especially the first of the three, as to drinking of the cup at the last supper. Papias must have been acquainted with this incident in some form or other, either from tradition or the usage of the Christians at their love feasts, or from the book which he mentions as written by Mark. The same book probably contained other matter which was adopted by the writers of the canonical gospels; things recorded by Papias from tradition may also have found their way into the canonical gospels. Many writers are of opinion that the story of the woman taken in adultery, in the fourth gospel, comes from Papias, and it has been printed as one of the extant fragments of his works in a posthumous work bearing the name of the late Dr. Lightfoot. This, I think, was an error, for there does not appear any evidence that this particular story is taken from Papias, but the process is a perfectly possible one, and in all probability some portions of the canonical gospels are based upon the traditions he collected, though we have no means of pointing to any particular passage as having been so based. Still, though there is no improbability in these passages being mentioned by Papias, we have no ground to infer that he did mention them, for they are passages that Irenaeus might not improbably add himself, and it must be noticed that the quotation as to the taking the cup has no such connection with the preceding words as the 'propter hoc,' with which the sentence is introduced, would lead one to suppose. It does not appear intelligible that Jesus took the cup and spoke to his disciples in order to preach the gospel to Abraham and

those that were with him. The omission of the quotation as to the cup would, therefore, rather improve the sense of the passage; the opening words of which would then be 'on account of this enduring the passion that he might preach to Abraham and those who were with him the good news of the opening of the inheritance.' This is good sense. It might be contended that unless Jesus suffered death, he could not go to the place of departed spirits to preach to Abraham, and the words, 'undoubtedly he will himself renew the inheritance of the earth and restore the mystery of the glory of his sons, as David says, who has renewed the face of the earth,' will follow without greater abruptness than in their present context. After this, omitting all the intervening words, the context would run quite naturally. 'These things are to take place in the times of the kingdom, &c.,' that is to say, it is in the times of the kingdom that the face of the earth is to be renewed. We see, therefore, it is not at all improbable that these quotations from the gospels have been interpolated into a text which did not originally contain them. Supposing, therefore, Irenaeus based this part of his work upon Papias, these quotations from the gospels and their interpretations are probably additions of his own.

I will now pass on to consider the passage I omitted in which Irenaeus quotes from the elders. It is as follows:

'For when this form passes away, and man is renewed and flourishes to incorruption, so that he cannot any longer grow old, the heaven will be new and the earth new. In these new places man will remain always new and holding intercourse with God. And since these things

shall always remain without end Isaiah says, "For as the new heaven and the new earth which I make remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name continue." And, as the elders say, then also those who have been thought worthy of the spending of their time in heaven (τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ διατριβῆς) shall go there, others shall enjoy the delight of paradise (τῆς τοῦ παραδείσου τρυφῆς), and others shall possess the brightness of the city (τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πόλεως); for everywhere the Saviour [or, according to the reading of the old Latin version, God] shall be seen, as they shall be worthy who see him. And that this is the difference of the habitation of those who bring forth a hundredfold and those who bring forth sixtyfold and those who bring forth thirtyfold (τῶν τὰ ἑκατὸν καρποφορούντων καὶ τῶν τὰ ἐξήκοντα καὶ τῶν τὰ τριάκοντα): of whom the first will be taken up into the heavens, the second will pass their time in paradise, and the third will dwell in the city, and that on this account the Lord said, "In the realms of my Father (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου) are many stations (μονὰς, translated mansions, John xiv. 2)." For all things belong to God, who affords a fit habitation to everyone; as his Word says (*quemadmodum verbum ejus ait*), that it has been distributed by the Father to all men, according as each is worthy or will be. And this is the banqueting couch on which those shall recline who are called to the marriage and feasted. The elders, the disciples of the Apostles (*presbyteri apostolorum discipuli*), say that this is the arrangement and disposition of those who are saved, and that they progress through stops of this sort, and that through the Spirit indeed they ascend to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, the Son in turn yielding his work to the Father, as it has been said also by the Apostle (*quemadmodum et ab apostolo dictum est*), "For he must reign until he putteth all his enemies under his feet." The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For in the times of the kingdom the just man existing on the earth shall already forget to die.¹

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 36, 1 Stieren, p. 817.

The words here quoted from the elders stand for the purpose we have in hand in a different position from the context in which they occur. That context purports to be the work of Irenaeus, but it is plausibly conjectured that it is based upon Papias, and may, therefore, throw some light upon the nature of his work. The words in question may, as has been argued, be a quotation from Papias; in that case, so far as they go, they afford direct evidence of the nature of his work, of which they form a portion; on the other hand, they may not be a quotation from Papias, and in that case, as they have come from a different source, will throw no light, or but very faint light indeed, upon the nature of his work. The argument in favour of the quotation coming from Papias consists in this: Irenaeus expressly cites Papias as his authority for the last previous quotation he makes from the elders, whom he describes as the elders who had seen John the Disciple of the Lord (*presbyteri qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt*). In the present instance he describes them first, simply as 'the elders' (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*), and in the second place, as the elders, the disciples of the Apostles, 'presbyteri, apostolorum discipuli.' This distinction is, of course, by no means conclusive of a separate source, as Papias might record one tradition on the authority of the elders who had seen John and another on the authority of the elders the disciples of the apostles, though we have no knowledge that he did so, and one would rather expect from what he promises, that he would cite the particular apostle upon whose authority the tradition rested.

In this passage it must be noticed, the elders are not describing the millennium which was to take place

before the judgment, but the state of those who are saved after the judgment. This has some little bearing upon the question whether the passage came from Papias, in that we know from Eusebius that Irenaeus held views similar to those of Papias concerning the millennium, but we have no evidence what may have been the views of Papias as to what took place after the judgment. The probability, therefore, of the passage coming from Papias is rendered a little more remote.

We will next consider whether we can trace in Irenaeus any other probable source from which he could have derived knowledge, or supposed he could have derived knowledge, of what was said by elders who were disciples of the apostles, except from Papias. In his third book he makes the following remarks:—

‘And Polycarp also, not only having been made a disciple by Apostles, and having lived among many who had seen the Christ, but also having been appointed by Apostles bishop in Asia in the church in Smyrna, whom we also have seen in our early youth (for he survived for a long time, and being very aged, gloriously and most conspicuously having suffered martyrdom, he departed this life), always taught these things which he learned from the Apostles, which also the church hands down, and which only are true. All the churches which are in Asia bear witness to them, and those who till now have succeeded Polycarp, who is a witness of the truth much more worthy of credit and reliable than Valentinus and Marcion and the rest of those who are wanting in judgment. Who also having come to Rome in the time of Anicetus, turned many of the heretics before mentioned to the church of God, having proclaimed that he had received from the Apostles as the one and only truth, that which has been handed down by the church. And there are some who heard from him (καὶ εἰσὶν

οἱ ἀκηκόοντες αὐτοῦ) that John the disciple of the Lord having gone to bathe at Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus within, sprang out of the bathing house without having bathed, but exclaiming, Let us flee lest the bathing house should fall since Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is in it. And Polycarp himself once answered Marcion when he came into his sight, and said, Do you recognise me? I recognise the firstborn of Satan. So great caution the Apostles and their disciples (οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν) had in not holding communication even so far as a word with one of those who falsify the truth, as Paul also said, “A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition, refuse, knowing that such a one is perverted and sinneth, being self-condemned.”’¹

We see from this passage that Irenaeus had, or thought he had, means of knowledge of what was said and done by the disciples of the apostles, by reason of statements made to him by persons who had heard Polycarp when he visited Rome in the time of Anicetus, who had been bishop of Rome before Soter (the predecessor of Eleutherus), who was, as Irenaeus tells us, the bishop of Rome at the time he was writing. According to Eusebius, Anicetus was bishop for eleven years, Soter for eight, and Eleutherus for either thirteen or fifteen. The visit of Polycarp to Rome would therefore be not less than eight years, and not more than thirty-four years, before Irenaeus was writing. This possible source of traditions, supposed to be derived from disciples of the apostles, goes a long way to weaken any inference that the passage we are considering is derived from Papias; but the matter can be pursued further. Irenaeus makes mention of elders who were the disciples of the

¹ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* lib. iii. cap. 3, s. 4, 1 Stieren, p. 433.

apostles in an earlier part of his fifth book (chapter v.) which is as follows:—

‘Where, then, was the first man placed? Obviously in paradise, as it is written, And God planted a garden (*paradisum*) eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed. And thence he was cast out into this world, having been disobedient. Wherefore the elders, the disciples of the Apostles (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί, presbyteri qui sunt apostolorum discipuli*), also say that those who were translated were translated there. For paradise was prepared (*ἡτοιμάσθη ὁ παράδεισος, prae-paratus est paradisus*) for just men and those who have the spirit; into which also Paul the Apostle was carried and heard words unspeakable (*εἰσκομισθεῖς ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα*) as regards us at present; and that those who have been translated remain there until the consummation as a prelude to incorruption.’¹

As paradise is the subject of both quotations, there can be little doubt that the elders, the disciples of the apostles, are the same in both cases. It will also be noticed that in both cases a quotation is made from Paul which may be an addition made by Irenaeus, or may, which is perhaps more probable, come from the authority from whom he quotes. If that is so, one object of that authority would seem to be to show that the elders he quotes from agree with Paul.

The last previous mention of elders as the sources of information made by Irenaeus is in chapter xxvii. of his fourth book, and is in this wise: Irenaeus is endeavouring to controvert the contention of the Gnostics that the God of the Old Testament was not the same God as the God of the Christians; and in so

¹ *Adv. Haer. lib. v. cap 5, s. 1, 1 Stieren, pp. 727, 728.*

doing he backs up his argument by the authority of an elder, whom he does not name.

‘As I have heard from a certain elder who had heard from those who had seen the Apostles and from those who had learned (*Quemadmodum audiivi a quodam presbytero qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant et ab his qui didicerant*).’¹

What Irenaeus means by those who had learned may not be quite certain. I understand the term to mean from those who had learned what the apostles taught, not necessarily from the apostles themselves, but from others who might know. There is a probability, therefore, that these persons are the persons whom he afterwards describes as the elders, the disciples of the apostles, and that the source of his knowledge as to what was said by the last-named elders was the unnamed elder who had heard those also who had seen the apostles. Irenaeus makes various statements on the authority of this elder:—

‘That that reproach which would be from the Scriptures was enough for those of old time for what they did without the counsel of the Spirit.’¹

After this, after some other examples, Irenaeus quotes from 1 Kings xi. 1, as to Solomon and his wives, according to the LXX, winding up

‘And the Lord was angry against Solomon, for his heart was not perfect towards the Lord as was the heart of David his father,’²

and proceeds,

‘The Scripture sufficiently rebuked him, as said the elder, that no flesh may boast in the sight of God; and that on account of this the Lord descended to those places

¹ 1 Stieren, p. 648.

² *Ibid.*, p. 650.

which are under the earth, preaching for them also the good tidings of his coming, there being remission of sins to those who believe in him. Now all those who were hoping for him believed in him, that is all those who announced beforehand his coming and were subject to his directions, the just men, both prophets and patriarchs, to whom like as to us he remitted their sins, which we ought not to impute to them if we would not despise the grace of God.'¹

We see here the elder deals with a topic akin to those dealt with by the disciples of the apostles in the two previous extracts; the state of the prophets or patriarchs who died before the coming of Christ naturally leading up to the state of those who were translated, as the state of those who were translated leads up to the consideration of the resurrection of the just. After more to the like effect, Irenaeus proceeds:—

'We ought not, therefore, saith that older man (senior), to be proud nor to blame the ancients, but ourselves to fear lest by chance after the knowledge of Christ doing something which does not please God, we may not have further remission of our sins, but may be excluded from his kingdom. And that Paul therefore said. "For if he spared not the natural branches perchance neither may he spare thee, who when thou wast a wild olive wast grafted into the fatness of the olive and wast made a partaker of its fatness." Similarly also you see that the misdoings of the people were described, not on account of those who then transgressed, but for our rebuke, and that we might know that the God against whom they offended and against whom certain of those who are said to have believed now offend, is one and the same. And that the Apostle showed this very plainly in his epistle which is addressed to the

¹ 1 Stieren, p. 650.

Corinthians, saying, "For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant how that our fathers were all under the cloud," &c. (quoting 1 Corinthians x. 1-13).'¹

Irenaeus then proceeds further to enforce his position in words not necessarily those of the elder, making two quotations from the gospels, and seven from Paul, and one from the Psalms when in the twenty-eighth chapter he makes the following remark:—

'Truly the elders (*presbyteri*) showed those to be senseless who from those things which happened to them who formerly obeyed God try to introduce another Father.'²

We see here that Irenaeus, from speaking of the unnamed elder, suddenly jumps to the elders. It may be presumed that these elders are those who had learned, who are referred to as the sources of the information communicated to Irenaeus by the unnamed elder. We see also that the unnamed elder had a habit of winding up his statements with an appeal to the authority of the apostle Paul. This appears, certainly, from the passages which Irenaeus expressly quotes from the unnamed elder, and is suggested by the abundance of quotations from Paul occurring in places which, though not expressly quoted from the unnamed elder, are not improbably derived from him. Again, in the thirtieth chapter Irenaeus cites an elder (*presbyter*) in justification of the spoiling of the Egyptians, and in support of the position that we ought not to upbraid the patriarchs and prophets about those things which the Scriptures themselves lay to their charge. The similarity of the

¹ 1 Stieren, pp. 651, 652.

² *Ibid.* p. 654.

topic shows that the same unnamed elder is meant. Again, in the beginning of the thirty-second chapter Irenaeus remarks:—

‘Thus also an older disciple of the Apostles used to contend about the two testaments (*hujusmodi quoque de duobus testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat*), showing that both were by one and the same God,’ &c.¹

Here we see Irenaeus, instead of describing the elder as one who had heard from those who had seen the apostles, describes him as a disciple of the apostles; but the identity of the topic raises the inference that the same man is meant, and we ought not to correct the former and more precise description by the latter and vaguer. The former description rather shows in what sense the latter is to be taken—that is, that by disciple of the apostles Irenaeus merely meant a man who held the apostolic doctrine, which he had derived from others who had themselves derived it, but not immediately, from the apostles. The next reference we get to elders is to the elders the disciples of the apostles, mentioned in the fifth chapter of the fifth book. There cannot be any reasonable doubt that they are the same elders as were previously mentioned in the twenty-eighth chapter of the fourth book, and that they are the authorities upon whom the unnamed elder makes his statements: that is to say, they are men who had learned the apostolic doctrine, not from the apostles directly, but from other persons, who were, as Irenaeus supposed, able to teach it. We see Irenaeus makes the same change in referring to these elders as he does in referring to the unnamed elder.

¹ 1 Stieren, p. 664.

The unnamed elder is first presbyter, or senior, and afterwards becomes senior apostolorum discipulus. The elders, his authorities, are first presbyteri, afterwards presbyteri apostolorum discipuli.

The question now to determine is, who is the unnamed elder? He is, to begin with, some one with whom Irenaeus has come into personal contact; and Irenaeus professes to quote his oral teaching, not his books. Several persons have been suggested, such as Papias, Polycarp, Pothinus. It may be taken as certain that neither Papias nor Polycarp can be meant, for Irenaeus would not describe either of them as having heard those who had seen the apostles, and omit to mention what he believed of both of them, that they had actually heard the apostle John. This objection would not apply to Pothinus; but the fact that the elder is unnamed is a strong argument that he was not Pothinus. Irenaeus would have every motive to mention his predecessor in the see of Lyons, a bishop and a martyr, and this is a further reason why neither Polycarp nor Papias can be intended. The manner in which Irenaeus repeatedly refers to this elder without mentioning his name suggests that he must have had some reason for his reticence, which was probably that the elder in question was not a *persona grata* to the Church of Rome, and, having regard to the position taken up by Irenaeus, that may well have been. He was himself prepared to yield to the teaching of the Church of Rome and abandon the practices of his youth, as was shown in the matter of the celebration of Easter; but he was not prepared to excommunicate his old associates. He may therefore very well have been prepared to cite as an authority

some one whose peculiar views on some points may not have been at all acceptable at Rome. The opinion that the unnamed elder was not Papias is strengthened by the fact that he appears to be a man having a great reverence for Paul—in fact, he appears to cast his teaching into such a form as to show that the doctrines of the elders upon which it was based were the same as those of the apostle. Now we have shown that there is reason to suppose that Papias had an aversion to Paul, that Paul was the other man to whose teaching (*τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς*) Papias preferred that of the Lord, to whose books he preferred the oral traditions of the elders.

We may therefore conclude that the citations made by Irenaeus from the elders, the disciples of the apostles, do not come from Papias, and that, therefore, they have no bearing upon the present discussion. It is very probable that the unnamed elder is the authority from whom Irenaeus derived his information as to the visit of Polycarp to Rome. If so, we see another instance of his habit of teaching in the citation which shows that the conduct of John towards Cerinthus and of Polycarp towards Marcion was in accordance with the teaching of the apostle.

Papias is mentioned three times by Jerome. But Jerome appears to have derived all his information from the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius, for he mentions nothing that is not to be found there and repeats a portion of the commentary of Eusebius. In one place Jerome denies a report that he had translated the books of Josephus and of the saints Papias and Polycarp, saying that he had neither leisure nor strength to express such great works in another

tongue with the same elegance (*eadem venustate*), from which perhaps the inference ought to be drawn, that Papias had the reputation of writing in good Greek.

Another notice of Papias is the passage which has been interpolated in chapter xxxvi. of book 3 of the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius: 'A man in all things in the highest degree very learned, and knowing the Scripture' (*ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδὴμων*). Though not the words of Eusebius, these words proceed from some one who must have admired Papias and therefore it may be presumed have been acquainted with his writings. As the New Testament and especially the gospels are better known than the Old Testament, an acquaintance with the latter would be the more likely to furnish the occasion for the commendation.

I have now gone through the whole of the extant notices of Papias by writers who were acquainted with his works or, at all events, had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with them. In those notices we find evidence that Papias commented upon the Old Testament, but we do not find evidence that he used any books of the New Testament except the Apocalypse, the first epistle of John, and the first epistle of Peter. If the object of his work was to expound either the gospels or the discourses of Jesus, this is a very curious result, for in that event his work must have contained comments upon nearly every passage in the gospels, and it is strange that no one of those comments should have been preserved. It would not do from the scanty remains of Papias to draw the inference that he did not cite and comment upon some

passages parallel to those contained in the canonical gospels. As I have already noticed, it is highly probable that some such passages were to be found in his book, but on the other hand the nature of the extant notices makes it highly improbable that the bulk of his work was made up of comments upon such passages, that out of (say) twenty specimens taken at random no one should be a fair sample of the bulk.

The examination of the notices of Papias therefore supports the conclusion that his work consisted of comments upon the Old Testament and perhaps also of some on the Apocalypse which he may have regarded as equivalent to one of the prophets. That is to say, the investigation into the extant notices of the work leads to the same conclusion as the investigation into the usage of the name by which it is called. That is to say that by the word *λόγια*, or oracles, Papias meant the Old Testament or some part of it, and that when Papias says that Matthew wrote or compiled the oracles he means that he wrote a catena of Old Testament prophecies.

CHAPTER VII

BLEEK'S ANALYSIS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPELS

I WILL now pass on to consider whether any other traces can be found of a book such as I have inferred Papias attributed to Matthew, that is to say, a collection of Messianic prophecies in Hebrew, with or without their interpretation as applied to the life of Jesus.

There has been great controversy, as is well known, upon the question whether the canonical gospel of Matthew was originally written in Greek, or in Hebrew or Aramaic. And with a view of determining this question, the quotations of the Old Testament contained in it have been subjected to a rigorous scrutiny to try and ascertain whether they were taken from the Septuagint version, or are independent translations from the Hebrew. Of course if it could be shown that the quotations were independent translations from the Hebrew, it would be evidence so far that the book was originally written in Hebrew, or at all events in some language other than Greek. If, however, the quotations came from the Septuagint, that would tend to show a Greek original.

Now, examining the quotations with this object, the

German critic Bleek arrived at the following conclusions, which I will cite in the words of Dr. Davidson, through whom I am acquainted with them :¹—

‘According to him (Bleek) the citations in the Gospel are of two kinds, namely, those in which the Evangelist gives pragmatic indications respecting the fulfilment of expressions in the Old Testament, and those where the passages are quoted or used in the course of the narrative, as they occur in the discourses of persons who are introduced speaking. The latter are adduced according to the LXX, sometimes verbally even in cases where the LXX depart from the Hebrew, and sometimes with more freedom, but not in such a way as to lead to the supposition of the deviation being due to consultation of the Hebrew text. The former are adduced according to the writer’s own translation from the Hebrew, departing not merely from the words, but also the sense of the LXX, whose expressions are seldom seen through the places.’²

Davidson then makes the following remark :—
‘The fact that the Messianic passages are everywhere cited after the Hebrew is obviously favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramaic original,’ and he then proceeds to combat the argument in favour of a Greek original, which is deduced from the much larger number of quotations which follow the Septuagint.

At a subsequent place he sets out a list of sixty-one quotations, or rather quotations from and allusions to the Old Testament.³ Of these, eleven are marked as Old Testament statements, stated to be fulfilled, cited from the Hebrew. Thirty-two are marked as belonging to the second class, in which the LXX are

¹ In his introduction to the study of the New Testament, Bleek merely refers to the matter shortly. See the translation in Clark’s *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. i. p. 295.

² *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 378. ³ *Ibid.* p. 420.

followed, and twenty are not marked at all. It will be noticed that two quotations are marked both ways, and when looked at they are found to be mere allusions too vague to be of any account. Of the twenty not classed, some I think might be fairly set down as quotations from the LXX. The rest are allusions rather than quotations, but usually give sufficient indications of the LXX as their source.

Davidson, after some remarks, sums up the question in the following terms :—

‘But, notwithstanding the exceptions taken to the classification by Ebrard and Delitzsch, it is substantially a sound one. In the first class seven agree more or less closely with the Hebrew, and only two with the LXX ; in the second class there are three gradational exceptions to the derivation from the LXX.’¹

Davidson has only before mentioned one quotation of the first class as agreeing with the LXX, that in Matthew i. 23 :—

‘Behold, the virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us (Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ ὃ ἔστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον Μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός).’

This quotation agrees with the LXX according to the Alexandrine and Sinaitic Codices, with the exception that it has καλέσουσιν, in the third person plural active, instead of with the Alexandrine, καλέσεις, in the second person singular active, or with the Sinaitic καλέσει, in the second person singular middle or third person singular active, and that it adds the words μεθερ-

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 422.

μηνευόμενον Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, 'which is, being interpreted, God with us.' If it be compared with the common or Vatican text which agrees with the Alexandrine in the reading καλέσεις, there is the further difference that the word ἔξει is used instead of λήψεται,¹ in the phrase 'be with child' (literally, 'have in her womb'), instead of 'take in her womb.' The first impression produced is undoubtedly that Davidson is right and that the quotation came from the LXX. I shall, however, be able subsequently to adduce reasons which will make it probable that the quotation is taken from an independent translation, and that the resemblance to the LXX is produced by assimilation, whether by the original author of the gospel or a subsequent hand.

Passing on to the quotations of the second class which agree with the Hebrew—one of them, Matthew ii. 6, 'And thou Bethlehem,' &c., is a Messianic prophecy put into the mouths of the chief priests and scribes, and ought rather to fall into the first class, not occurring in the discourses of Jesus or his interlocutors. Another, 'Behold I send my messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way before thee,' put into the mouth of Jesus, Matthew xi. 10, occurs verbatim as part of the narrative in Mark i. 2. We have only to assume, with many critics, that Mark here represents the more ancient form of the text, and the quotation will fall into the first class. The remaining allusion, for it can scarcely be called a quotation, that in Matthew xxii. 24, 'Moses said, if a man die

¹ The reading of the Vatican codex, according to the edition published under the auspices of Pius IX, Pontifex Maximus, Romae, 1872, is λήψεται; according to Tischendorf, Lipsiae, 1850, it is λήψεται.

having no children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up seed unto his brother,' I must leave to Hebrew scholars. A comparison of the Greek and the English version of Deuteronomy does not disclose any reason why it should not come from the LXX as well as anywhere else.

In considering Bleek's classification of the quotations and Davidson's comments on it, it must be remembered that Bleek's contention is that the gospel comes from a Greek original and Davidson's that it comes from an Aramaic original, and that the classification of the quotations, in which they both substantially agree, supports neither theory effectively, but Bleek's better than Davidson's, by far the larger portion of the quotations coming from the LXX. It is therefore not surprising that the theory should hold rather better than Davidson allows it to do.¹

¹ This distinction between the quotations is recognised by Dr. Westcott, the present Bishop of Durham. He says, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 7th edit. p. 229 note a, speaking of the Old Testament quotations in Matthew: 'These may be divided into two distinct classes; the first consisting of such passages as are quoted by the Evangelist himself, as fulfilled in the life of Christ; the second of such as are interwoven into the discourses of the different characters, and form an integral part of the narrative itself. . . . The first class is made up of original renderings of the Hebrew text, while the second is in the main in close accordance with the LXX, even where it deviates from the Hebrew.' Dr. Salmon is also to the same effect. Speaking of the Old Testament quotations in the gospels, he says: 'Several such quotations are peculiar to St. Matthew, and are introduced by him with the formula "that it might be fulfilled." In these cases the ordinary rule is that the Evangelist does not take the quotation from the LXX, but translates directly from the Hebrew. It is otherwise in the case of quotations which Matthew has in common with the other Evangelists. As a rule they are taken from the LXX, and when they differ from our text of the LXX, all agree in the deviation.' See *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4th edit. p. 145.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS PARTLY FROM GREEK AND PARTLY
FROM ARAMAIC SOURCES

THE theory, *primâ facie* supported by the analysis of the quotations, is that the canonical gospel of Matthew comes from two different sources, one a work on the interpretation of the Messianic prophecies originally written in Hebrew, another containing the discourses of Jesus originally written in Greek.

If this theory can be sustained, it evidently supports and is supported by the interpretation I have put upon the extracts from Papias. The Hebrew book attributed to Matthew will be the origin of the portion of the gospel which deals in the interpretation of Messianic prophecies, and the Greek book attributed to Mark may be the nucleus of the portion of the gospel containing the discourses of Jesus.

Now is there anything to be said against this theory? I think there can be no doubt at all that the quotations which are independent translations from the Hebrew indicate a Hebrew or Aramaic original, but it is not so certain that the quotations agreeing with the LXX indicate that the work which contains them was not originally written in Hebrew or some language other than Greek, or did not contain Hebrew

quotations. For in translating into Greek there would no doubt be a tendency to assimilate the quotations to the LXX. Now the first thing to consider is—Can the resemblance of the quotations in the discourses to the LXX be explained on the supposition of intentional or unintentional assimilation? And now we are at once confronted with the difficulty—that the quotations from the LXX occur exactly in the places where assimilation would be difficult, and an independent translation where the assimilation would be easy. When a quotation is made in the course of a speech and its language worked up into the language of the speech, the temptation to make an independent translation must be very great.

For to adapt the language of the speech to an already existing version must be very difficult. Still greater must be the difficulty where there is a mere allusion and not a quotation, to preserve this allusion in the translation, not on the one hand obscuring it altogether or on the other turning it into a quotation. Yet many such allusions to the LXX are to be found in the gospels, and, with the doubtful exception I have mentioned, not one, as Davidson concedes, to the Hebrew.

This argument is strengthened when it is recollected that it is assumed on all sides that the gospel would not, properly speaking, be written in Hebrew but in a language having a relation to it, described as Aramaic or Aramaean; an allusion therefore would pass from Hebrew to Aramaic. As thus disguised, how very difficult would be the process of producing the resemblance to the LXX in a Greek version! Thus in Matthew xxvi. 64, Jesus says:—

'Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven (*ἀπ' ἄρτι ὀψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*).'

This contains an allusion to Daniel vii. 13, and also to Psalm ex.

Daniel vii. 13, according to the proper LXX version, may be rendered thus:—

'I beheld in a vision of the night, and lo, in the clouds of heaven one came as a son of man (*Ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁρίματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοῦ, ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο*).'

Or, according to the version of Theodotion, which in the case of the book of Daniel supplanted the LXX in the primitive church:—

'I beheld in a vision of the night, and lo, with the clouds of heaven one coming as a son of man (*Ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁραματί τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοῦ, μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος*).'

The words of Psalm ex., to which allusion is made, are as follows:—'The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' According to the LXX—*Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, κ.τ.λ.*

We see therefore that the passage in Matthew blends together allusions to two distinct passages in the Old Testament which have no connection whatever with each other; that as far as the allusion goes the very words of the LXX are used in both cases, that is, of course, allowing for the grammatical changes rendered necessary by the form of the allusion.

There are in this way repeated eight words out of

the passage in Daniel and three out of the passage in the Psalms. The allusion in one respect approximates more nearly to Theodotion than to the LXX, that is in the use of the participle *ἐρχόμενον*. But this is too natural a change to lay stress on. The parallel passage in Mark agrees with Theodotion in the use of the preposition *μετά* instead of *ἐπί*, that is according to the weight of authority, though one uncial G and some other authorities read *ἐπί*. However, this would not be enough to raise an inference of the use of Theodotion by Mark or even of an assimilation to his text, as the allusion to the same passage in Daniel in the Apocalypse (i. 7), which must be older than both Mark and Theodotion, has *μετά* instead of *ἐπί*.¹

Now there are several points to be noticed upon the production of a resemblance of this sort. What is to suggest to the supposed translator that the passage disguised in the Aramaic is an allusion to the particular text of Daniel or the Psalms? Having found this out by the process of turning it into Hebrew and Chaldee, he has to find what words are intended to reproduce the words of Daniel and the Psalm.

He must then further compare these with the LXX so as to get the corresponding rendering into Greek, being careful meanwhile not to quote exactly, and so turn the allusion into a quotation. Supposing this part of the gospel originally written in Greek, the resemblance arises naturally from the effect upon the mind of the writer of his recollection of the Greek version.

But when a quotation is to be made independently,

¹ As to the antiquity of the version of Daniel found in most copies of the LXX, and ascribed to Theodotion, see Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4th edit. p. 595.

not worked into the context of any speech, as in the case of the Messianic prophecies, which are quoted to show their fulfilment, the assimilation to the LXX might be made with ease.

But the strongest argument against the discourses having originally quoted the Hebrew, in whatever language they were written, is to be found in the fact that in places where the sense of the LXX differs from that of the Hebrew, the LXX agrees with the context of the passage, which the Hebrew does not.

I will give two illustrations. In the narrative of the temptation, when Satan tries to persuade Jesus to fall down and worship him, Jesus answers him, 'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'—Matthew iv. 10. *Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.*

This quotation follows the LXX. The emphatic word is 'only,' and is to be found in that version, Deut. vi. 13, according to the LXX, *Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.*¹

If we turn to Deut. vi. 13, we read in the revised version translated direct from the Hebrew, 'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God and serve him,' where that word is wanting. If this be substituted for the quotation from the LXX, it would make a comparatively flat answer. It would be strange that the force of the expression should be so much improved by a translation.

To take another illustration. In Matthew xv. Jesus accuses certain Pharisees and scribes of transgressing the commandment of God because of their

¹ The Alexandrine Codex reads *προσκυνήσεις* in place of *φοβηθήσῃ*.

tradition, instancing the permitting a son to make a gift to the temple instead of honouring, which I suppose means supporting, his father. He then goes on :—

'Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, "This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; but in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the commandments of men."'

This quotation is taken from the LXX, with, according to the better texts of Matthew, the omission of some phrases, and at all events fairly represents the meaning of that version, and as so construed describes the practice condemned by Jesus. It is indeed possible that the LXX ought to be construed 'Teaching the precepts and doctrines of men;' but still, even if the word *καὶ* is retained, as of course it should be, it is possible to construe the sentence as a double accusative, 'Teaching as their precepts even the doctrines of men.' But turning to the version of the passage translated direct from the Hebrew, we read :—

'For as much as this people with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men which hath been taught them, therefore behold I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people,' &c.

Here we see the charge is wholly different; it is not that the people substitute for the commandments of God the commandments of men which are inconsistent, but that they fear God, which no doubt is itself a commandment of God, not because it is such, but because it is a commandment of men. It will be seen, therefore, that the text, as appearing in the Hebrew, would not answer the purpose for which the quotation is

made; it would not describe the practice condemned by Jesus. It follows, therefore, that the passage must have been originally written by some one who derived his knowledge of Isaiah from the LXX version, and therefore, we may conclude, in Greek. There is no possibility here of avoiding this conclusion, by supposing the quotation to have been assimilated to the LXX. If this were done, the whole of the context must have been altered to fit the quotation, which under the circumstances is impossible.

We see, therefore, that an examination of the canonical gospel of Matthew strongly supports the conclusion that it is derived from two sources—one Hebrew, or at all events which quoted the Old Testament in Hebrew, and the other Greek, and the Hebrew source related exclusively to the Messianic prophecies, and might, therefore, be such a book as Papias attributed to Matthew, if I have interpreted his meaning aright.

It must be noticed that of the quotations we have been considering which show traces of being independent translations from the Hebrew, one only is to be found in any other of the gospels besides Matthew, that from Malachi iii. 3, 'Behold I send my messenger before thy face,' &c., which is found also in identical words in Mark and Luke. Now, assuming that the writers of the three synoptic gospels made use of common written materials, it is an interesting inquiry whether this difference is produced by the writer of Matthew having inserted these quotations in the text, or by the writers of Mark and Luke having struck them out. Of the eleven quotations to be considered, four occur in the early chapters of Matthew, and

another in the narrative of the repentance and death of Judas, where the narrative of Matthew is not parallel to Mark and Luke. This reduces the number to be compared to six, for of course whatever induced a variation in the facts recorded would account for the omission of the prophecies of which those facts were stated to be a fulfilment. Of these six, one is in fact contained in all three synoptic gospels. The contexts of the passages in which four of the remaining five occur, do not afford any certain indication whether the quotations have been inserted by the author of Matthew, or left out by the authors of Mark and Luke.

The remaining case, which is that of the quotation contained in Matthew xii. 18-21, I will consider at length.

Matthew and Mark both contain the account of the healing of the man with the withered hand in nearly the same words, from the conclusion of which they run as follows:—

Matthew xii. 18-21.

Then saith he to the man,
Stretch forth thine hand.
And he stretched it forth;
and it was restored whole,
as the other. But the
Pharisees went out and took
counsel against him, how
they might destroy him.
And Jesus perceiving it
withdrew from thence; and
many followed him, and he
healed them all.

Mark iii. 5-12.

He saith unto the man,
Stretch forth thy hand. And
he stretched it forth; and
his hand was restored.
And the Pharisees went
out and straightway with
the Herodians took counsel,
how they might destroy him.
And Jesus with his disciples
withdrew to the sea; and a
great multitude from Galilee
followed him, and from
Judaea, and from Jerusalem,
and from Idumaea, and from

beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing what great things he did, came unto him. And he spake to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd, lest they should throng him. For he had healed many; insomuch that as many as had plagues pressed upon him that they might touch him. And the unclean spirits whensoever they beheld him fell down before him and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God.

And charged them that they should not make him known, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying,

Behold my servant whom I have chosen;

My beloved in whom my soul is well pleased:

I will put my Spirit upon him.

And he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles.

He shall not strive, nor cry aloud.

Neither shall any one hear his voice in the streets.

A bruised reed shall he not break,

And He charged them much that they should not make him known.

And smoking flax shall he not quench,

Till he send forth judgment unto victory.

And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.

These narratives are evidently taken from a common written source. They differ in two respects. Matthew, instead of the detailed description of the healing of the great multitude, including strangers from Idumaea and beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon, has shortly, 'Many followed him and he healed them.' On the other hand, this gospel sets out the passage from Isaiah which is not found in Mark. It will be noticed that the words immediately preceding this quotation are nearly identical with the concluding words in the extract from Mark.

Matthew xii. 16.

Mark iii. 12.

καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα καὶ πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς
μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσω-
σιν. ἵνα πληρωθῇ, κ.τ.λ.

Now, is it possible to determine what was the original text of this passage? Did the writer of Matthew abridge the account of the healing of the multitude, or the writer of Mark amplify it? Did the writer of Matthew insert the quotation from Isaiah, or the writer of Mark leave it out? Both questions admit of a satisfactory answer, which is this: both writers abridged their original, the writer of Matthew by substituting a short summary for the detailed narrative of the healing of the multitude, and the writer of Mark by omitting the quotation, so that the

original might be restored by adding to the extract from Mark the latter part of the extract from Matthew containing the quotation from the words, 'That it might be fulfilled,' &c.

This may be shown from the following considerations. The material part of the prophecy is contained in the words, 'He shall declare judgment to the Gentiles,' and again, 'And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.'¹ But Matthew's narrative contains nothing of which this could be a fulfilment; on the other hand, in Mark we read of a great multitude from Idumaea and beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon, to which the prophecy is evidently intended to refer.

This conclusion is confirmed when we look at the parallel passage in Luke vi. 17. There we read of 'a great number of the people from all Judaea and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him and to be healed of their diseases.'

For a passage analogous to what I suppose the original narrative, altered differently in Matthew and Mark, to have been, I may refer to Matthew iv. 13-16.

Before leaving this topic, it may be as well to remark that the reason of the writer of Matthew omitting the words containing the description of the great multitude from Galilee, Judaea, Jerusalem, Idumaea, beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, is this. In his anxiety to assemble a large audience for the sermon on the Mount, he transplanted some of them into another place (see chapter iv. 23-25 and chapter v.), and so left the prophecy standing without its fulfilment.

¹ Compare the comment of Justin on the same passage: 'Is it then on the patriarch Jacob that the Gentiles and you yourselves hope?' *Dial.* c. 135.

The consideration, therefore, of this passage supports the conclusion that the Messianic prophecies, which are independent translations from the Hebrew, formed part of the material common to the three synoptic gospels, and that it was the writers of Mark and Luke who struck out, and *not the writer of Matthew who inserted these passages.*

CHAPTER IX

SOURCE OF MESSIANIC PROPHECIES COMMON TO MATTHEW
AND JUSTIN MARTYR

IF a collection of Old Testament prophecies relating to the Messiah existed in the early Church, we might expect to find traces of it in other books besides the canonical gospels, and the first place to which one naturally turns to test this expectation is Justin Martyr.

Upon his quotations, Dr. Abbott, in his article on the Gospels in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' after observing that in long passages he generally quotes the LXX accurately, makes the following remark: 'Messianic passages, even when long, are modified (sometimes with a closer return to the Hebrew original) by Christian use and adaptation to Christ.' It must be noted that Dr. Abbott is dealing with Justin's quotations from the LXX for the purpose of combating the inference that might be drawn from his evangelical quotations, that he did not use the canonical gospels, by showing that he quoted the LXX with equal inaccuracy. He has to make the admission that in his long quotations Justin quoted the LXX accurately, but out of this admission he makes the exception I have quoted. So far as my own reading of Justin goes, I should say that he always quotes the LXX accurately, except in Messianic prophecies—that is, with such

accuracy as to leave no doubt as to the source of the quotations. But I can make no claim to have compared the whole of his quotations. But the converse is not always true; there are Messianic passages in Justin which appear to have been quoted from the LXX.

But it must be borne in mind that Justin's quotations have certainly to some extent—possibly to a considerable extent—been assimilated by his transcribers. This can be proved to have taken place with regard to a quotation from Psalm lxxxii. in his dialogue with Trypho (cap. 124), which Justin gives expressly as according to the Hebrew text (*ὡς μὲν ὑμεῖς ἐξηγείσθε*), and then goes on to point out how the LXX differs (*Ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα ἐξηγήσει εἴρηται*). But when the passage is looked at, it is found to agree with the LXX verbatim. In fact, it has been assimilated by some copyist or editor in such a way as to destroy the sense of Justin altogether. It is unlikely that such a stupid piece of assimilation is the only specimen to be found in Justin. It is more likely to be the work of some editor who heedlessly carried out some general plan of assimilating the quotations. The inference to be drawn is that much greater weight is to be attached to Justin's differences from, than to his agreement with, canonical books.¹

There are eleven quotations contained in Matthew which, according to the theory of Bleek, as explained above, might be expected to depart from the LXX. Of these five are to be found in Justin.²

¹ See note at end of chapter.

² In arriving at this statement I have relied upon the tables of quotations from the Old Testament contained in Dr. Davidson's *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, and on the index to J. C. T. Otto's edition of Justin Martyr.

1. Isaiah vii. 14: 'Behold a virgin shall conceive,' &c.; quoted Matthew i. 23, Justin, 1 Ap. c. 33, and with its context before and after Dial. cc. 43 and 66, and partly quoted i. Ap. c. 33, Dial. cc. 67, 68, 71 and 84.

2. Micah v. 2: 'But thou, Bethlehem,' &c.; quoted Matthew ii. 6, Justin, 1 Ap. c. 34 and Dial. c. 78.

3. Jeremiah xxxi. 15: 'A voice was heard in Ramah,' &c.; quoted Matthew ii. 18, Justin, Dial. c. 78.

4. Isaiah xlii. 1-4: 'Behold my servant,' &c.; quoted Matthew xii. 17-21, Justin, Dial. c. 123 and c. 135.

5. Zechariah ix. 9: 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion,' &c.; quoted Matthew xxi. 5, Justin, 1 Ap. c. 35, Dial. c. 53.

Every one of these quotations as it occurs in Justin agrees with Matthew in something or other in which Matthew differs from the LXX.

In quoting Isaiah vii. 14 in the 'Apology,' Justin departs from the LXX considerably more than Matthew does, but his subsequent quotations of the entire passage agree with the LXX, according to the Vatican text, except in one word in which the two quotations differ both from each other and from the LXX, but in which the last quotation agrees with Matthew. The partial quotations, as far as they go, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, agree exactly with the LXX. These partial quotations usually have λήψεται, but one immediately following the quotation above cited from the 'Apology' like it, has ἔξει, and again in chap. 43 of the 'Dialogue' Justin declares

that the Jews said that Isaiah did not say, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, but Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεάνις ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν.

In quoting Micah v. 2 and Jeremiah xxxi. 15, Justin agrees with Matthew exactly, except that in both places he fails to quote the last two words of Micah v. 2, quoted in Matthew, and both Matthew and Justin depart largely from the LXX.

Justin quotes Isaiah xlii. 1-4 and Zechariah ix. 9 twice. In both instances Justin's quotation resembles the LXX more nearly than Matthew does; in both instances Justin agrees with Matthew in some points in which he differs from the LXX, and in both instances the latter of Justin's quotations agrees more nearly than the former with the LXX.

The quotations from Isaiah vii. 14, Micah v. 2, and Zechariah ix. 9 are given by Matthew from 'the prophet,' but by Justin the quotation from Isaiah and the quotation from Micah in the 'Apology' are referred correctly to Isaiah and Micah, and the quotation from Zechariah in the 'Apology' incorrectly to Zephaniah, and in the 'Dialogue' correctly to Zechariah. On the other hand the quotation from Jeremiah xxxi. 15, which Matthew refers correctly to Jeremiah, is given by Justin as from the prophet.

Both Matthew and Justin agree in correctly referring the remaining quotation to Isaiah, and in the 'Dialogue' Justin, like Matthew, refers the quotation from Micah to the prophet.

It will be noticed that in only one of the cases in which Justin agrees exactly with Matthew in the words, does he agree also in the reference; and in the other case in which he agrees in the reference he

differs in the words, and that passing by the last two words of the quotation from Micah, in all cases, except in the quotations of Isaiah vii. 14 in the 'Dialogue,' in the extent of the quotation Justin agrees with Matthew, by which I mean that the quotation begins and ends in the same place, Justin or his transcribers sometimes supplying intermediate phrases from the LXX, which are omitted in Matthew.

I will now consider more closely Justin's quotation of Isaiah vii. 14. He quotes it in his 'First Apology,' cap. 33, in the following words: 'Ἴδού ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.' (Behold the virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall say in reference to his name, God with us.)

It will be noticed that the passage as quoted by Justin agrees with the passage as quoted in Matthew in all the differences of the last-named passage from the LXX.

1. It has the third person plural of the verb ἐροῦσιν, 'they shall say,' instead of the second person singular of the verb καλέσεις, 'thou shalt call,' or taking the reading of the Sinaitic Codex, καλέσει, 'thou shalt call' or 'she shall call,' where, though Justin agrees with Matthew in the difference as regards the number and person, he diverges further from the LXX than Matthew, in using a different verb.

2. It has the words Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, 'God with us,' also found in Matthew, but not in the LXX, but here again the divergence of Justin from the LXX is much greater than the divergence of Matthew, for in Matthew these words are added as an explanation of

the word Emmanuel, used in the LXX, while in Justin they take the place of that word itself.

When we were comparing the passage as quoted in Matthew with the LXX, we remarked that the *primâ facie* impression produced would be that it was originally taken from the LXX.

We do not think that would be the impression produced by the passage from Justin. There the latter part of the quotation appears an entirely independent version, though the former part would seem to have been either originally influenced by a recollection of the LXX, or to have been subsequently assimilated to it.

It will now be necessary to consider how far this *primâ facie* impression is affected by the other quotations of the passage by Justin. Justin quotes the whole passage with its context before and after—that is to say, from the tenth to the sixteenth verse inclusive—twice in his dialogue with Trypho. Having made the quotation the first time, he diverges from the topic to answer some objections of Trypho, and then, after a considerable interval, expressly returns to it again, and in so doing repeats the quotation he had made before the digression. Both passages, with a few exceptions, are intended to be, and in fact are, verbatim quotations from the LXX, and therefore must have been intended to be exactly like one another. But, notwithstanding this, there are a few differences between them. These differences must, under the circumstances, be mere errors, either on the part of Justin himself or his transcribers. On the other hand, where the two quotations agree in

differences from the LXX, we may be confident that we have to deal with what Justin intentionally wrote.

The differences from the LXX, not noticing recognised various readings in which both passages agree, are as follows:—

(1) In verse 16 both passages have *πονηρά* after *ἀπειθεῖ* instead of *πονηρίᾳ*.

(2) Both passages interpolate in verse 16 words accurately quoted from the LXX version of the fourth verse of the following chapter, making it run, 'For before the child shall know good or evil, he refuses evil by choosing good. For before the child shall know to call father or mother, he shall receive the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria before the King of the Assyrians.'

(3) In the same verse 16 both passages read *καταληφθήσεται*, instead of *καταλειφθήσεται*, meaning 'the land shall be taken' instead of 'the land shall be forsaken.'

(4) Also in the same verse 16 both passages read *σκληρῶς οἴσεις* for *φοβῇ*, making the meaning 'the land shall be taken, which thou shalt bear hardly,' instead of 'the land shall be forsaken, which thou fearest.'

(5) In verse 17 both passages have *ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς* instead of *ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας*.

Besides these differences, in which both quotations agree, the former quotation has the following differences from the LXX not found in the latter.

(6) In verse 13, *Ἀκούετε* for *Ἀκούσατε*.

(7) In the same verse 13, *ὁ* before *οἶκος*.

(8) In verse 15, *καὶ* before *ἐκλέξασθαι*.

The latter quotation has the following differences from the LXX, which are not found in the former:—

(9) In verse 16, *κακὸν ἢ ἀγαθόν* for *ἀγαθόν ἢ κακόν*.

(10) In verse 17, *τῶν* omitted before *Ἀσσυρίων*.

(11) Besides this, in verse 14 the former quotation has *καλέσεται*, the third person singular of the future middle, and the latter quotation has *καλέσουσι*, the third person plural of the future active, where the LXX has the second person singular of the future active of the same verb.

(12) Besides these differences from the LXX, in verse 15 the former quotation has *ἐκλέξασθαι*, the reading of the Vatican, and the latter *ἐκλέξεται*, the reading of the Alexandrine codex.

(6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) are in all probability mere errors of transcription, (12) being probably due to some copyist correcting one of the passages according to a text of the LXX which he had before him, which happened to differ from the text used by Justin.

Of the others, (1) and (5) may be different readings of the LXX, and (3) looks very like a blunder of Justin's. But we shall have to notice another view of it: (2) is an instance of the running together of distinct passages, which is a marked characteristic of Justin's quotations of Messianic prophecies, and is rendered the more peculiar in this case by the general exactness of the quotation.

Before considering the remaining differences, we must here remark that Justin quoted from a written document. The discrepancies which we have noticed

are not of a kind to raise any presumption that the quotations were made from memory.

To pass on now to (12), the reading *καλέσεται* would make the meaning like that of the English version, 'a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name,' &c.

Mr. Cheyne renders 'the young woman is with child and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name,' &c., which, as regards the word in question, is the same. *Καλέσεται* is probably, therefore, a more correct rendering of the Hebrew than either the *καλέσεις* or *καλέσετε* of the LXX, or the *καλέσουσι* which is to be found in Matthew¹ and in the later of the quotations we are considering. In ancient times there appear to have been a good many different renderings of this word—that is to say, renderings which differ in voice, number, and person. Thus the LXX, according to the Vatican and Alexandrine codices, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, have the second person singular of the future active *καλέσεις*, the Sinaitic codex has the second person singular of the future middle or the third person singular of the future active *καλέσει*.² Justin in this place has the third person singular of the future middle. The Vulgate has the third person singular of the future passive, 'vocabitur;' Irenaeus (lib. iii. cap. xxi. 4) has the second person plural of the future active, 'vocabitis,' and Matthew and Justin in other places have the third person plural of the future active.

¹ It is found also in a few cursives of the LXX, but may be there set down to assimilation.

² Possibly this may be a mere copyist's blunder. The scribe was not too particular about his sigmas; a few words back he has *γατρι* for *γαστρι*.

As regards the passages now under consideration, I think we may be certain that Justin wrote the same word in both places, and that of the two readings one or other is due to the error of a transcriber; and supposing either *καλέσεται* or *καλέσουσι* to have been the original reading, there seems no difficulty in supposing the other to have arisen from it by mere error of transcription. On the whole, it would seem more probable that Justin used the same voice, number, and person that he made use of in the 'Apology'—that is to say, that he wrote *καλέσουσι*. Of course it is possible that Justin originally wrote *καλέσεις* or *καλέσετε* with the LXX in both passages, and that the copyists have made different blunders in each; but I do not think this so probable. There would be two errors instead of one, and if he had *καλέσεις*, the common reading, in neither case would the transcriptional probability be so great.

There remains to consider (4). In this case Justin, for some reason or other, has clearly departed from the LXX. It is not easy to divine any object for the variation. Having regard to the evidence afforded by the passage in the 'Apology' that he had some other version of this passage, as probable a cause as any would appear to be a mixture of versions. That is to say, that these words belonged to some independent version which Justin in some manner mixed with the LXX.

It should be noticed that the principal differences from the LXX follow one another consecutively—i.e. after the interpolation of the words from chapter viii. The text reads on, *καὶ καταληφθήσεται ἡ γῆ ἣν σὺ σκληρῶς οἴσεις*. This is very favourable to the theory

of a mixture. Justin, or the authority he followed, must have turned to another text to make the interpolation, and may have followed it for several words further than was necessary. On the other hand the meaning, 'The land shall be taken, which thou shalt bear hardly,' might suit the desired interpretation better than 'The land shall be forsaken, which thou fearest,' interpreting the words as referring to the overthrow of the Jewish nation by the Romans. Still, even if this was the reason for the intentional retention of the words, they must have come from somewhere, and they are more likely to have formed part of an independent version of the passage with which Justin was acquainted than to have been an original version of his own. On the whole, the examination of these quotations in the 'Dialogue' rather strengthens than otherwise the inference to be drawn from the quotation in the 'Apology,' that Justin had access to some version of that passage, independent of the LXX.

The argument that Justin followed some authority different from the LXX is not a little strengthened by the form in which the passage is quoted by Tertullian: ¹—

'Sic Esaias dicit. Andite Domus David, non pusillum vobis certamen cum hominibus, quoniam Dens praestat certamen, propter hoc ipse Dens dabit vobis signum: Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod interpretatur nobiscum Deus. Butyrum et mel manducabit: quoniam prius quam cognoscat infans vocare patrem aut matrem accipiet virtutem Damasci et spolia Samariae adversus regem Assyriorum.'

It will be seen that Tertullian here runs together the words out of the eighth chapter of Isaiah with the

¹ C. Jud. 9.

words out of the seventh, in the same way as Justin; and yet it does not appear that Justin is the source of the quotation. It contains the conflate rendering, 'Immanuel which is, being interpreted, God with us,' to be found in Matthew. If, therefore, Tertullian followed Justin, he must have assimilated the passage to Matthew; but it is against this that he has the word 'vocabitis,' agreeing with the ordinary reading of the LXX instead of the 'vocabunt' of Matthew. It would seem probable, therefore, that Tertullian followed the same authority that was followed by both Justin and Matthew; but in a later stage than that in which it was before either of them in which it had been further assimilated to the LXX.

A question it may be desirable to clear up with regard to the differences between the quotation in the 'Apology' and the LXX is whether those differences can in any way be traced to any other version of the Old Testament current in the second century.

The extant fragments of Origen's 'Hexapla' enable us to give the passage now under consideration, as it appeared in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

According to Aquila and Theodotion it was as follows: 'Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεάνις ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαμβάνει καὶ τίκει υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ.

According to Symmachus: 'Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεάνις συλλαμβάνει καὶ τίκει υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ.

All of which may be rendered sufficiently exactly for our present purpose:—

¹ Migne, P. G. tom. xvi. This is the source from which all my statements as to the *Hexapla* are taken.

'Behold the young woman is pregnant and brings forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel.'

A glance at these versions is enough to show that the differences between Justin or Matthew and the LXX cannot have arisen from any of them.

We have noticed that in verse 10 some of the MSS. of the LXX read *ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται*, and others *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει*. It is a question whether Matthew and Justin derive the latter reading from the LXX, or whether the various reading in the LXX is attributable to assimilation with Matthew. Upon this it may be remarked that on the occasions where Justin is undoubtedly quoting the LXX, he uses *λήψεται*, and he also, for the most part, uses *λήψεται* in his partial quotations of or allusions to the passage. It would appear, therefore, that in Justin's time *λήψεται* must have been a well-established reading of the LXX, probably the only reading known to Justin. It may also be noticed that the passage is cited by Origen in his book against Celsus, lib. i. cap. 34, with the reading *λήψεται*. This, I believe, is the only citation by Origen which has any weight on the present question; for short citations, without the context before or after, might as well come from Matthew. It may also be remarked that no ground of transcriptional probability can be alleged why *λήψεται* should be substituted for *ἔξει* or *vice versa*.¹ The most probable ground of the various reading would appear to be assimilation to some other text, which, in this case, must be Matthew. It would seem there-

¹ Dr. Hatch cites in favour of *λήψεται*, Codd. A.S, xii. 26, 41, 90, 106, 144, 239, 300, but I suspect has made some slip. See *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 197.

fore more probable that the reading *ἔξει* in the LXX is due to assimilation to Matthew, than that Justin and the writer of Matthew derived the word from copies of the LXX which contained it in their day. We may therefore reckon this word as a third difference from the LXX in which Justin and Matthew agree.

To return to the other question, whether the agreement between the quotations in Matthew and Justin, in their differences from the LXX, does not show that these quotations had a common origin which was not the LXX.

Upon this question some light may be thrown by the passages cited from the 'Hexapla.'

All the versions agree in substituting *συλλαμβάνει*, which I have rendered 'is pregnant,' for the *λήψεται* or *ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται* of the LXX, in the place where Matthew and Justin have *ἔξει*.

This agreement is double-edged: on the one hand it would tend to point out *συλλαμβάνει* as the word which would appear more obviously appropriate to a writer of the second century, and so give greater weight to the inference of a common origin, other than the LXX, for the quotations in Matthew and Justin to be derived from their agreement in the use of the less appropriate word *ἔξει*.

On the other hand, it points out an agreement in the use of the future tense which might not otherwise have been noticed between Justin and Matthew and the LXX, which might be supposed due to the influence of that version.

To determine how this double edge really falls, it will be necessary to consider the true meaning of the original of the passage in Isaiah, and the proclivities

of the different translators. To determine the true meaning of the original I will consider the different ways in which it has been rendered.

In the Vulgate it is rendered, 'Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen ejus Emmanuel.'

'Behold a (or the) virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel.'

In the authorised English version it is rendered, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Immanuel.'

In the revised version it is rendered in the text: 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel;' or, according to the marginal readings, 'Behold the maiden is with child and beareth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.'

As rendered by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne it is, 'Behold the young woman is with child and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.'

Mr. Cheyne gives his reasons for the rendering 'is with child' as follows: 'So we should render, and not "shall be with child," in view of the parallel passage, Gen. xvi. 2 (Judg. xiii. 5, 7, is doubtful) and of verses 15, 16.' The parallel passage in Genesis appears to consist of identical words addressed to Hagar, in a context which shows that a present, and not a future, must be intended, and verses 15 and 16 appear to mislead the same inference in the passage under consideration.

However, Mr. Cheyne's reasons do not appear to show that there is any obvious grammatical impropriety in the use of the future; and though, therefore, one may suspect that the rendering in which he concurs with the margin of the revised version and the three 'Hexapla' translators is correct, the adoption

of the future does not appear to be so forced that the agreement of Justin and Matthew in the tense should be taken as evidence of the influence of the LXX to counterbalance their difference in the word.

But it may be further urged that the agreement of the three translators, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, in departing from the LXX ought to show that their rendering was the obvious one to adopt, according to the state of knowledge in the second century.

To deal with this argument we must consider the proclivities of these translators: Aquila was a Jew, Symmachus and Theodotion were Ebionites. The object of all three, therefore, was to give a rendering of the passage in Isaiah that was inconsistent with its application to Jesus of Nazareth, or, at all events, with his parthenogenesis.

This takes very much from any weight that might be attached to their agreement in the use of the present tense instead of the future, as showing that it would appear in the second century the preferable rendering, and therefore tracing up the future of Matthew and Justin to the influence of the LXX; but it does not at all detract from the similar argument to be derived from their choice of the word. On the other hand, when it is remembered that the object of Aquila was to give the exact meaning of the Hebrew, of Symmachus to write in good Greek, and that the practice of Theodotion was not to depart unnecessarily from the LXX, it will be seen that their agreement in the use of one word is evidence that it was the obvious word for any one at that time to adopt for the purpose.

Again, it will be noticed that all these versions

agree with the LXX in the use of *καλέσεις* in the second person singular, instead of *καλέσουσιν* or *ἐροῦσιν* in the third person plural, which not a little emphasises the weight to be attached to the agreement between Matthew and Justin in their divergence from the LXX.

But it will be further noticed that Matthew and Justin agree not merely in having the third person, but in having the third person plural; in that they differ from all the other authorities I have cited; which again affords strong evidence of a common origin for the difference.¹

We may therefore conclude with confidence that the quotations in Matthew and Justin have a common origin, which is not the LXX.

The next point to consider is which form of the quotation is the older—that in Matthew or that in Justin.

There are three reasons which concur in proving that the form of the quotation in Justin is the older.

(1) If the original were originally in the form contained in Justin, the alteration to the form in Matthew is readily explicable—as a partial assimilation to the LXX; but no reason can be given for altering the form in Matthew into the form in Justin.

(2) If the form in Matthew was altered into the form in Justin, the person who made the alteration must have preserved unaltered every point in which Matthew differed from the LXX, a thing unlikely to

¹ *καλέσουσι* also appears in some MSS. of the citation in Origen *Contra Celsum* noticed above, but it is probably due to assimilation to Matthew. The passage after the word *Ἐμμανουήλ* runs on, *ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός*.

be effected, either by accident or design—for which latter there was no motive. On the other hand, if the change was made in the contrary direction, the preservation of these differences is easily explicable: they merely show that to that extent the intention to assimilate to the LXX was imperfectly executed.

(3) The LXX transliterates and Justin translates the Hebrew word for Emmanuel, while Matthew both transliterates and translates it. The rendering therefore of Matthew stands to the rendering of Justin and the LXX in the position of a composite reading, and by the ordinary rule of criticism must therefore be assumed to be later than either of the simple readings it combines.

We may therefore conclude that the writer of the first gospel, or some person he copied, had the quotation before him in the form given by Justin, and this leads to the inference that at all events the latter part of the quotation comes from some version of the passage independent of the LXX.

It has, however, been contended that the former part of the quotation certainly came direct from the LXX, on the following grounds, which I must consider.

This portion of the quotation, as is well known, formed the foundation-stone of the faith of those among the primitive Christians who succeeded in transmitting their belief to the Catholic Church. When the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Palestine and other Ebionites asserted that as a matter of fact Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation, they replied that this was impossible, as it was prophesied that the Messiah should be the son

of a virgin. When the Ebionites went further and denied the prophecy, pointing in confirmation to the more accurate versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, a myth was invented that Ptolemy had shut up each of the seventy translators in a separate cell and that so, without any communication with the others, each had produced a version of the entire Old Testament, and when they had done it was found that all the seventy versions agreed verbatim. After such a manifest miracle it was contended that the LXX version must be absolutely accurate.¹

As the LXX version of this passage came ultimately to be so strongly relied on, it has been supposed that that version must have been the source from which the Messianic prophecy in question was originally taken; but that does not follow.

The LXX is long anterior to the Christian era. The version it contains therefore of the passage in question, although erroneous, expresses the meaning which perhaps many Jews put upon it at that time, and which therefore may have been put upon it by some persons after the Christian era, altogether irrespective of its application to Jesus of Nazareth. Besides, even if correctly understood in this particular, the passage may still have been capable of being applied in some way as a Messianic prophecy, and might therefore be included in a collection of Messianic prophecies compiled in the Hebrew, even by a man who had never questioned the natural generation of Jesus.

No doubt the aptness of the words of the LXX to

¹ Justin? *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, cap. xiii.; Irenaeus, *Contra Haer.* lib. iii. cap. xxi. ss. 1, 2, 3.

express the Catholic doctrine, accounts for the complete assimilation of the commencement of the prophecy to that version.

This history of the quotation does not, therefore, afford any reason why it should not have formed one of a collection of Messianic prophecies made and circulated in Hebrew.

The remaining subject to refer to is the context of the quotations in Justin, and, as regards the first, it is found in the same context with an evangelical quotation; which would probably indicate that the source was a gospel of some sort.

The quotation is stated by Justin to be spoken by an angel of God to the Virgin and to be, 'As those who have related all things about our Saviour Jesus Christ taught, whom we believe' (*ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν*).¹

It is as follows:—

'Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb of the Holy Ghost and bring forth a son, and he shall be called the son of the Most High, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins' (*Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*).'

The words down to 'Jesus' might be a summary of the words stated in the first chapter of Luke to be addressed to Mary on the occasion of the annunciation by the angel Gabriel, and the words from 'And thou shalt call his name,' &c., down to the end agree

¹ 1 Ap. c. 33.

exactly with the words stated in the first chapter of Matthew to have been spoken by an angel of the Lord in a dream to Joseph. On the other hand, these latter words agree exactly with words stated in the 'Protevangelium' of James to have been spoken by the angel of God to Mary on the occasion of the annunciation, and the former words might just as well be taken from the 'Protevangelium' according to the text of Fabricius as from Luke, for they have exactly the same degree of agreement with it, and further it must be noticed that Justin agrees with the same text of the 'Protevangelium' in describing the angel as an angel of God, while in Luke the angel is described by name as Gabriel, and in Matthew as the angel of the Lord. With some texts of 'Protevangelium' the agreement of the former part of the words spoken would be closer than with Luke. On the whole, therefore, if we had to confine ourselves to extant books, it would seem more reasonable to infer that Justin cited 'Protevangelium' accurately, than that he made an inaccurate jumble of Matthew and Luke, and at the same time stumbled into a consecutive narrative and an agreement with 'Protevangelium,' following it up with an emphatic appeal to the authorities he, in common with his fellow Christians, believed (*οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν*) as the source of his statement. As a further proof that the putting the latter part of the quotation into the mouth of the angel is not an oversight, it should be noticed that Justin repeats the statement a little further on. 'But the name Jesus in the Hebrew language means the same as saviour in the Greek dialect. Whence also the angel said to the virgin "And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people

from their sins." ' It is, however, not necessary to assume that Justin cited from 'Protevangelium,' or even that that book was in existence in his day. What is proved is that Justin's account and that in 'Protevangelium' had a common origin. In other words, that there was a gospel extant in Justin's day, which contained the particulars in which Justin and 'Protevangelium' agree, of which Justin made use and which was certainly not our Matthew. These considerations fortify the conclusion we have already come to from considering the language of the quotations in Matthew and Justin, that though these quotations had a common origin different from the LXX, that origin was not Matthew, and would appear to point to the probability that the immediate source from which Justin took the quotation was some gospel which formed a basis for the present canonical Matthew, as well as for 'Protevangelium.' The quotation from Isaiah itself is not found in 'Protevangelium,' but the words put into the mouth of the angel are evidently modelled upon the LXX version of that quotation, which some MSS. of 'Protevangelium' follow closely.

The next quotation from Micah v. 2 follows in the 'Apology' almost immediately. The probability therefore is strong that it comes from the same source as the quotation from Isaiah we have been considering, notwithstanding that it agrees verbatim with Matthew, with the exception of the omission of the last two words τὸν Ἰσραήλ, a difference not without weight when we remember that it is repeated in the 'Dialogue.' Justin again differs from Matthew in referring it to

¹ 1 Ap. c. 33.

the prophet by name. After making the quotation Justin goes on speaking of Bethlehem :—

‘ It is a village in the country of the Jews distant thirty-five stadia from Jerusalem, in which Jesus Christ was born ; as also you can learn from the census made under Quirinius, who was your first procurator in Judaea (*ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηναίου τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρῶτον γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου*).’¹

Now had Justin had Luke before him when he was making these quotations, or even been acquainted with the work, he would have learned that Quirinius was governor (*ἡγεμών*) of Syria, not procurator of Judaea, when this census was made, and it must be remembered that Justin, having lived in Palestine, was not likely to have confounded the offices. It must be noticed too that Justin appeals to the census in a way Luke never ventures to do. He tells the Emperors that if they looked into it, they would find the birth of Jesus recorded. There is no doubt in such matters that Justin was a man of great faith. But for the present purpose, as the evangelical quotation which I just now considered could not possibly have been concocted out of Matthew without the aid of Luke, anything which shows that Justin had not Luke in his mind just then, tends also to show that there must have been some other source for that quotation than Matthew, and that therefore Matthew is not the source of the two quotations from Isaiah and Micah we have been considering.

The circumstances under which Justin quotes the passage ‘Thou, Bethlehem,’ &c., the second time and the passage from Jeremiah are these. He is explaining

¹ 1 Ap. c. 34.

Isaiah viii. 4, which he quotes accurately from the LXX, as a Messianic prophecy. He construes it thus : ‘ For before the child shall know how to call his father or mother he shall receive the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria before the king of the Assyrians.’¹ For the purpose of explaining the fulfilment of this prophecy, Justin sets out the story of the visit of the wise men, whom he always calls the wise men (or perhaps rather I should say wizards) from Arabia and of the slaughter of the Innocents, and in so doing gives the quotations from Micah and Jeremiah exactly as they occur in Matthew, with the exception that he does not quote the concluding words of the former passage *τὸν Ἰσραήλ*. From the position therefore in which these quotations occur, I do not think there can be much doubt that they came from some gospel. The question is whether that is Matthew, and in the main the narrative is consistent with that supposition ; but there is one objection which seems insuperable, and that is the description of the wise men. No one who had been accustomed to the account in Matthew, would ever turn the wise men from the East into the wise men from Arabia, but if any one could have done so, certainly not Justin on this occasion, for he was labouring to show that this visit of the wise men was a fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah viii. 4, and he did it in this way. The king of Assyria meant Herod, who was so called on account of his godless and lawless mind. The wise men or wizards were the servants of the evil demon, and when they turned from their evil deeds and worshipped Christ, they were as spoils received by him. But now comes the difficulty. How

¹ Dial. 77.

are they the spoils of Damascus? Justin meets the matter by saying: 'But that Damascus was and is in the land of Arabia, even if it is now assigned to the country called Syrophoenicia, none of you can deny.'¹ But though Justin here says that nobody can deny Damascus was and is in the land of Arabia, it is notwithstanding sufficiently certain that Damascus was and had always been reckoned in Syria, not in Arabia. We may therefore be quite certain, that if Justin had had a gospel to quote from, using such a phrase as 'wise men from the East' instead of 'from Arabia,' he would have been only too glad to adopt it. From his not doing so, we may conclude that our Matthew was not in his hands, at all events in its present state.

This conclusion is supported by some other circumstances. Thus Justin agrees with 'Protevangelium' in saying that the wise men found Jesus in a cave (σπηλαίῳ), instead of a house (οἰκίᾳ) as stated by Matthew; he also differs from Matthew in saying that they found the child in a manger (φάτνη).

Again, Justin makes the wise men say, 'That from a star appearing in the heaven they knew that a king was born in your (i.e. Trypho's) country, and we are come to worship him' (ἐξ ἀστέρος τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ φανέντος ἐγνώκεναι ὅτι βασιλεὺς γεγέννηται ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν),² instead of 'Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we saw his star in the East and are come to worship him' (ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ).³ This difference of language

¹ Dial. c. 78.² Ibid.³ Matthew ii. 2

might be taken merely to be the result of a paraphrase, did it not happen again to bring Justin into agreement with the words put into the mouths of the wise men in 'Protevangelium.'

'We saw a very great star, shining among the stars of heaven, and blotting out the other stars, so that they did not appear, and we knew that the [great] king was born in Israel, and through this we are come to worship him (Εἶδομεν ἀστέρα παμμεγέθη λάμπαντα ἐν τοῖς ἀστροῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀμβλύνοντα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστέρας ὥστε μὴ φαίνεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐγνώμεν [or καὶ ἡμεῖς οὕτως ἐγνόκαμεν] ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς [μέγας] ἐγεννήθη ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν).'⁴

The words in square brackets indicate various readings.

It will be noticed that not reckoning as a difference the double *ν* in ἐγεννήθη which distinguishes the aorist of γεννάω from the easily confounded and nearly synonymous aorist of γίγνομαι, all the words used by Justin occur in 'Protevangelium,' except that Justin, by reason of his work taking the form of a dialogue with a Jew, substitutes ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὑμῶν for ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ. Whether the words not found in Justin were omitted by him as unnecessary for his purpose, or whether the writer of 'Protevangelium' amplified a common original, it is not necessary to consider. That Justin either followed 'Protevangelium' or some other original which 'Protevangelium' also followed, and which was not Matthew, is, I think, certain. It should further be noticed that Matthew makes the star to be seen in the east, where, according to Matthew, the wise men came from; Justin and 'Protevangelium' make it to appear

⁴ Cap. xxi.

in the heaven. This shows that Justin's materials were consistent with themselves in not bringing the wise men from the East, and therefore were not 'Protevangelium,' where the wise men come from the East though the star appears in the heaven, but that Justin and 'Protevangelium' must have had a common original which was not Matthew.

In his account of the slaughter of the innocents which follows, Justin again has an important difference from Matthew, which again agrees with the account of the visit of the wisemen contained in 'Protevangelium,' at all events according to four MSS. in a point in which that differs from Matthew. Justin says that Herod ordered that absolutely all the children (*πάντας ἀπλῶς τοὺς παῖδας*) in Bethlehem should be slain,¹ instead of the children from two years old and under, and there can be no doubt that these four MSS. contain the true text of 'Protevangelium,' for none of the MSS. of that work contain the passage in which Matthew, in order to prepare for the latter statement, makes Herod diligently inquire what time the star appeared.

It must be noticed that the quotations we are considering—Micah v. 2, 'And thou, Bethlehem,' &c., and Jeremiah xxxi. 15, 'A voice was heard in Ramah,' &c.—are not found in most manuscripts of 'Protevangelium,' but there are MSS. of that work which contain both of them. Thus, the former, which is found in the text of Fabricius in the same words as in Matthew, is also found very slightly assimilated to the LXX in the MSS. cited by Thilo as Paris B, and the latter,

¹ *Dial.* c. 78.

which is not found in the text of Fabricius, is found in the MSS. cited by Thilo as Paris F.¹

The passage from Zechariah ix. 9 is quoted twice in different language, once in the 'Apology,' where it is wrongly referred to Zephaniah, and once in the 'Dialogue,' where it is rightly referred to Zechariah. The words of these quotations differ considerably from one another and from Matthew; the former approaching more nearly in some places to the LXX than does Matthew, the latter in some points approaching more nearly and in other points departing further from the LXX than either Matthew or the former quotation.

I will consider the latter quotation first. It differs in language both from Matthew and the LXX, sometimes agreeing with one, sometimes with the other, and sometimes differing from both. It begins thus: 'Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion (*χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών*), which agrees with the LXX, differing from Matthew which has, 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion' (*Εἰπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών*). It proceeds, 'Raise the war cry' (*ἀλάλαξον*), not found either in Matthew or the LXX. It proceeds, 'Shout, daughter of Jerusalem' (*κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ*), which agrees with the LXX, but is not found in Matthew. It proceeds, 'Behold, thy king' (lit. *the king*) (*Ἴδού ὁ βασιλεὺς*), which agrees with both Matthew and the LXX. It proceeds, 'Of thee' (*σου*), found in Matthew, but not in

¹ In editing *Protevangelium*, Thilo did not attempt to discover which was the true text, but it must be noticed that, having regard to the antiquity of Justin, as likely a method as any to arrive at the original text would be to adopt throughout those readings which agree best with Justin. I may here state that the only editions of *Protevangelium* I have studied are those of Fabricius and Thilo, and my statements regarding it must be taken as limited to what appears in those editions.

the LXX. 'Will draw nigh' (ἤξει), which differs from both Matthew and the LXX, which have 'cometh' (ἔρχεται). It proceeds, 'to thee' (σοί), which agrees with both Matthew and the LXX. It proceeds, 'Just and a Saviour, he is meek' (δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς καὶ πραὺς). This agrees with the LXX, but differs from Matthew, which has merely the word *πραὺς*, meek. It proceeds, 'and poor' (καὶ πτωχός), which is not found either in Matthew or the LXX. It proceeds, 'riding upon' (ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ), differing from most texts of Matthew, and from the LXX only in the omission of the word *καὶ*, 'and,' before *ἐπιβεβηκὼς*. *καὶ*, however, is also omitted in Matthew according to Codex D and some other authorities. It proceeds, 'a beast of burden and a foal of an ass' (ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον ὄνου), differing from the LXX, which says, 'a beast of burden and a young foal' (ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον); and from Matthew which says, 'an ass and a foal, the son of a beast of burden' (ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου; according to codex D, however, the last word should be *ὑποζύγιον*).

The differences from Matthew, which consist in adopting or approaching to the words of the LXX, might be accounted for by the process of assimilation, but not so the differences which are divergencies from the LXX, that is to say the insertion of *ἀλάλαξον*, 'Raise the war cry;' the substitution of *ἤξει* for *ἔρχεται*; and the insertion of the word *πτωχός*, poor. The language of this quotation therefore leads to the inference that it is not made from Matthew.

When the context is looked at, that would be consistent with the inference that the quotation comes from a gospel, and the substance of the narrative does

not differ materially from that of the synoptic gospels, or from what might have been derived from combining them.

Thus Justin agrees with Matthew as against Mark and Luke in the curious statement that Jesus entered Jerusalem riding upon both beasts, the colt and the ass; and gives a reason for it that the colt, unused to harness, was a symbol of the Gentile converts, and the ass, used to harness, of the Jews. When, however, the language of Justin is looked at closely, there are differences which suggest that he followed rather a common original of our synoptics, or some parallel narrative founded on such a common original, than those books themselves. Thus, instead of saying with Mark and Luke that the colt was one whereon no man ever yet sat (ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὐπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν),¹ he twice describes it by the unusual, not to say barbarous word *ἄσαγῆς*, unused to harness, which he explains to mean not having a yoke on his neck. Then he says that Jesus bid his disciples bring him 'an ass tied with her colt at an entrance of a village called Bethphage' (ὄνον τινα σὺν πῶλῳ αὐτῆς προσδεδεμένην ἐν τινὶ εἰσόδῳ κώμης Βεθφαγῆς λεγομένης).² Now Matthew, which is the only one of the synoptic gospels which mentions the ass as distinguished from the colt, simply makes Jesus tell his disciples that they will find 'an ass tied and a colt with her' (ὄνον δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς).³ Mark however, which only recognises the colt, says the disciples found a colt tied at the door without in the open street (πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θυρὰν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου).⁴ Luke gives no

¹ Mark xi. 2, Luke xix. 30.

² *Dial.* c. 53.

³ Matthew xxi. 2-4.

⁴ Mark xi. 4.

particulars. Now we see that Justin, while he agrees with Matthew in stating that there was an ass as well as a colt, states particulars which Matthew does not give, and even if we suppose he has applied to the ass what Mark says of the colt, the two statements are seen to be different. Justin says that the animal was tied at the entrance of the village, and Mark in the open street before the door.

Now when we consider that Justin must have studied the statements of his gospels minutely, with a view of showing the fulfilment of prophecies, it is very unlikely that he would get so far astray. The examination of the context, therefore, supports the conclusion, pointed at by the examination of the language of the quotation, that though the quotation is made from a gospel, that gospel is not Matthew.

To consider now the same passage as quoted in the 'Apology.'¹ As has been noticed, the language of that quotation differs from the LXX, from Matthew and from the 'Dialogue.' Where, however, it differs from Matthew it agrees with the LXX, and where it differs from the LXX it agrees with Matthew. It does not contain any of the words not found either in Matthew or the LXX, to be found in the 'Dialogue.' It agrees with the LXX in some points in which the quotation in the 'Dialogue' agrees with the LXX, and in which both differ from Matthew; on the other hand, it agrees with Matthew in some points in which Matthew differs from, and the 'Dialogue' agrees with the LXX.

¹ Χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ· Ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι πρῶτος, ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄπισθεν. Justin, 1 Ap. cap. 35.

As to the source of the quotation, it may be at once concluded, notwithstanding the agreement of the latter part, that it does not come from Matthew. For it begins in the words of the LXX, 'Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion, shout, daughter of Jerusalem,' instead of 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion,' as in Matthew (χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ, κ.τ.λ.), instead of Εἰπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών, ἰδοὺ, κ.τ.λ.). Now any one accustomed to read Matthew would be much more familiar with the quotation as given there than as standing in Zechariah, and, even if through quoting from memory he were to make some errors, would be certain to begin in the same way. On the other hand, that Justin did not on this occasion refer to Zechariah is shown by his wrongly referring the prophecy to Zephaniah. For the same reason the assumption would not be admissible that Justin originally gave the quotation as in Matthew, and that it has been since assimilated to the LXX. Transcribers of Justin from a few years after his own time have been all too familiar with the form the quotation takes in Matthew, to seek to change it, and any transcriber who corrected the language of the quotation would have also corrected the reference. On the other hand, the agreement of the latter part of the quotation with Matthew, which is exact with the exception of a single letter, which does not affect the sense (πρῶτος for πρῶς), and of the omission of καὶ before ἐπιβεβηκὼς, which agrees with Codex D and some other authorities, would seem to show that the quotation as given by Justin must have a common original with the quotation in Matthew.

The context does not give much aid in determin-

ing the source of this quotation. Some way back Justin had cited from Genesis xlix. 11, the text, 'Binding his foal to the vine,' &c., which he interpreted as a prophecy fulfilled by the disciples finding, as Jesus had told them, an ass's colt in the entrance of a certain village tied to a vine (*ἐν τινὶ εἰσόδῳ κώμης πρὸς ἄμπελον δεδεμένος*), riding on which Jesus entered Jerusalem.¹ It will be noticed that Justin here has the same difference from Mark in the description of the position of the colt, that he has in the 'Dialogue,' with the additional point of difference that it was tied to a vine. After this Justin quotes five, or more properly six, other Messianic prophecies including the words 'Behold the Virgin,' &c. And the words 'And thou, Bethlehem,' &c., we have already considered. Of these, the three or four that have not been already considered are quoted, with differences in words more or less considerable, from the LXX; some of the quotations also are abridged, in some the order of the words is altered, and in one place already cited some words out of Numbers together with others from Isaiah are run together and quoted as from Isaiah. None of these quotations, except the two already mentioned, are to be found in the canonical gospels. After this he quotes from Psalm xxii. in the words of the LXX, 'They pierced my feet and my hands and cast lots for my vesture.' He then proceeds as follows to explain the fulfilment of this and the preceding prophecies:—

'For, as said the prophet, mocking him they set him on a judgment seat and said, "Judge for us" (*διασύροντες*

¹ 1 Ap. c. 35.

αὐτὸν ἐκαθίσαν ἐπὶ βήματος καὶ εἶπον Κρῶνον ἡμῶν).¹ But the prophecy "They pierced my hands and my feet" was a statement of the driving in of the nails into his hands and feet on the cross. And after crucifying him, those who crucified him cast lots for his vesture and divided it among them. And that these things happened you can learn from the "Acts in the time of Pontius Pilate." And to show that it was definitely prophesied that sitting on an ass's colt he should enter Jerusalem, we will repeat the words of the prophecy of another prophet Zephaniah. They are as follows: "Rejoice greatly," &c.'

After this Justin passes on to another topic. It will be seen that the context gives little aid in determining where the quotation comes from. Justin, having previously considered the entry into Jerusalem, abruptly returns to it when he has finished the topic on hand. The last book cited, the 'Acts in the time of Pilate,' cannot be identified with the extant work under that name, otherwise called the 'Gospel of Nicodemus.' It must be noticed that in the short passage out of Justin under consideration, two noteworthy statements have been encountered not in the canonical gospels, that the colt was tied to a vine, and the mocking words 'Judge for us.'

I will now again return to the quotation as it occurs in the 'Dialogue,' and see if any explanation can be given of its peculiar form. The peculiarity of this passage is that it contains words not found in the LXX, which appear to be alternative versions, or in other words part of the quotation is rendered into Greek twice over, once according to the LXX and once

¹ 1 Ap. c. 35. The newly discovered fragment of the gospel of Peter contains a similar statement. We may suppose therefore that that also is founded on the *Acts in the time of Pilate*.

otherwise. The only way that I can suggest to account for this is that the passage was originally an independent version from the Hebrew considerably abridged; that it was collated with the LXX by some one who wrote the renderings of the LXX in the margin, both where passages had been left out and where they had been translated differently; and that some transcriber carelessly incorporating these passages in the text, produced the effect I have noticed.

Restoring from the different quotations of the passage the points of difference from the LXX, we get the following as the original form of it: Εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών, ἀλάλαξον, ἰδὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἤξει σοὶ πτωχὸς ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου.

If this be compared with the LXX, which is as follows: χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἰδὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔρχεται σοὶ δίκαιος καὶ σῶζων αὐτὸς πραῖς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον, it will be seen that not more than nine words agree, including Σιών, ἰδὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς, σοὶ and καί. It is therefore altogether an independent version. It will also be seen that the word ἀλάλαξον, which when added to εἶπατε may be rendered 'Say hurrah!' restores the meaning 'rejoice' which is altogether lost in Matthew.

The quotation standing as we have restored it, some one must have collated it with the LXX, and written the points of difference in the margin of the codex something in this way,

Χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ
κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ
ἔρχεται

δίκαιος καὶ σῶζων αὐτὸς πραῖς καὶ
ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον.

With the aid of the margin, at some subsequent date, the text of the quotation must have been reconstructed. But the reconstructor must not have quite known when he ought to insert the phrases in the margin and when to substitute them for the text: in this way he left standing ἀλάλαξον and πτωχὸς.

As express mention of the ass seemed to be required, he preserved it by substituting ὄνον for νέον; perhaps the original collator had omitted to insert ἔρχεται in the margin; perhaps the reconstructor of the text did not know where to place it. Whether this process was performed by Justin himself or by some writer from whom he copied the quotation cannot be in this case determined, though the way in which he differs from himself in making the quotation would be explicable by supposing that he made the reconstruction himself and made it differently on each occasion.¹

I will now pass on to consider the last quotation, that from Isaiah xlii. 1-4, quoted in Matthew xii. 17-21 and by Justin twice, 'Dialogue,' c. 123 and 135. Both quotations are made by Justin in order to show that God, speaking of Christ in the Old Testament, calls him Jacob and Israel. They differ somewhat in language; sometimes agreeing with the LXX, some-

¹ The latter part of the quotation is extant in all the *Hexapla* texts. Aquila gives it: αὐτὸς πραῖς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱοῦ ἀνάδων. Symmachus: αὐτὸς πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ἀνάδων. Theodotion: αὐτὸς ἐπακαύων καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνου. And the fifth version: αὐτὸς πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνου.

times with Matthew; and neither differing from the LXX in any material point in which Matthew does not also differ. Both quotations begin in the words of the LXX, 'Jacob is my servant, I will help him; Israel is my chosen,' instead of, as with Matthew, 'Behold my servant whom I have chosen.'¹ The purpose of the quotations required the mention of the names Jacob and Israel, which are not contained in Matthew, or, as I judge by the Authorised Version, in Isaiah. From these facts it may be inferred (1) that Justin did not quote from Matthew; (2) that he did not make an independent translation from the Hebrew.

His quotations must therefore be supposed to have arisen from his in some way mixing the text of the quotation adopted in Matthew with the LXX version. Now this is done by him in two places in the 'Dialogue' in different ways, and the only supposition I can make to account for it is this: That he used some MS. containing Messianic prophecies translated independently from the Hebrew, which he or some one else had collated with the LXX, writing the differences in the margin, and that then as he made his quotations he constructed his text from these two sources as he went on, sometimes taking more from one source and sometimes from the other, thus bringing it about that the one quotation agrees more closely with Matthew, and the other with the LXX. This theory would, I think, explain most of the difficulties with regard to Justin's Messianic quotations. It is, however, probable that in some cases they came from evangelical works, but that even in

¹ For the different quotations of this passage in Justin and Matthew, and also the LXX version of it, see Appendix iv.

such cases he may have more or less assimilated them to the LXX in the way I have stated.

NOTE.—Some interesting remarks upon the text of Justin Martyr by the late Dr. Hatch are to be found in his 'Essays in Biblical Greek,' p. 186 *et seq.* It appears that Justin's text rests practically upon one MS. only, known as Cod. Paris 450, dated 1364, that the texts of other works contained in that MS. which can be tested by comparing them with better authorities are not good, and internal evidence is adduced to show 'that the scribe of the MS. or its original neglected Justin's own quotations and copied them for himself from some other MS.' After citing some cases of assimilation, not including that I have given above, Dr. Hatch draws the following conclusions:—

'It is clear from these instances that the longer quotations in the Paris MS. of Justin cannot be trusted as representations of Justin's own text, and that arguments based upon them alone fall to the ground. But it is also clear that the untrustworthiness of the longer quotations does not affect the shorter quotations which form an integral part of Justin's own text, and which are in many cases confirmed by his comments.'

These conclusions of Dr. Hatch I should be disposed to accept with a certain qualification. The changes which have been made in the MS. of Justin, so far as ascertainable, have been with the view of bringing him into conformity with standard authorities. Anything, therefore, in Justin which tends to confirm opinions current in the church ought to be accepted with caution, especially if it turns upon a word or two which might have been changed or interpolated. But arguments which turn upon differences from