

standard authorities are not in any way vitiated by a consideration of the treatment to which the MS. of Justin appears to have been subjected. Where mixed quotations occur, the likeness of the separate parts to canonical authorities may be the work of a transcriber, but scarcely the mixture or dislocation of the texts. So a transcriber might produce mixed renderings by a partial assimilation, but a transcriber who copied out of another book, as described by Dr. Hatch, would rather produce a complete agreement with some one generally accepted text. Besides, for a mixed rendering to have been produced in this way, the quotation as it stood in the original text of Justin must have differed from any canonical authority; otherwise there would have been no motive to tamper with it.

CHAPTER X

SOURCE OF SOME MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN
JUSTIN MARTYR, NOT FOUND IN MATTHEW

THE Messianic prophecies quoted in Justin which I have hitherto dealt with are those also found in Matthew. I will now notice some not found in the canonical gospels, and I will first deal with the curious quotation which I have already noticed for another purpose, and which is contained in the passage immediately preceding the passage which contains the quotation from Isaiah vii. 14, also found in Matthew i. 2-3, 'Behold the Virgin,' &c. It is as follows:—

'And Isaiah also, another prophet, prophesying the same things in other words, thus said: "A star shall arise out of Jacob and a flower shall go up from the root of Jesse, and in his arm shall the Gentiles hope" (Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἄνθος ἀναβήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαί, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιδύσιν).'¹

As I have said, this quotation is not a little curious. Justin quotes the whole as from Isaiah, but the first four words, 'A star shall arise out of Jacob' (Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ), really come out of the book of Numbers, where they are put into the mouth of Balaam, and are to be found word for word in the LXX. (See

¹ I Ap. c. 32.

Numbers xxiv. 17.) The remaining words come, some from the first verse and the others from the tenth verse of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, and are all to be found in the LXX, except that it has ἐπ' αὐτῷ, 'in him,' instead of ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ, 'in his arm.' Justin quotes the passage from Numbers xxiv. 17, in chapter 106 of his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' a little more fully. 'A star shall rise out of Jacob, and a leader out of Israel' (Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ), and here refers it to Moses. The additional words added in this place (καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ) differ from the LXX, which has 'A man shall stand up out of Israel' (ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ).¹

The same passage, Numbers xxiv. 17, is quoted by Irenaeus in his third book against heresies, chapter ix. 2, apparently, as near as we can judge by the Latin version, with one exception, in the words used by Justin in the 'Dialogue.' The quotation runs thus:— 'orietur stella ex Jacob et surget dux in Israel,' where the word 'dux' (leader) is evidently a translation of the ἡγούμενος found in Justin, and not the ἄνθρωπος of the LXX. In the ordinary text of Irenaeus the quotation is put into the mouth of Balaam, but according to the Vossian codex Irenaeus makes the same blunder as is done by Justin in the 'Apology,' and attributes the quotation to Isaiah.² Now from these facts we may draw the following inferences. In the

¹ The Alexandrine codex has καὶ before ἀναστήσεται.

² See Stieren's edit. vol. i. p. 453. Stieren brands this reading as 'perperam,' but he describes the Vossian codex which contains it as 'optimis MSS. adnumerandum esse,' and gives reasons which show that it was copied from a very ancient exemplar, in which Greek passages were written in uncial letters. See *Prolegomena*, xx. xxiii.

first place, there can be no doubt the reading of the Vossian codex exhibits the true text of Irenaeus. No reason can be supposed why any transcriber of Irenaeus who found Balaam, should erroneously substitute Isaiah, and at the same time stumble into an agreement with Justin in such an obvious blunder. On the other hand, it is not at all surprising that such a blunder as the reference to Isaiah should be corrected. Secondly, the agreement of Irenaeus with Justin in the erroneous reference to Isaiah, and also in the use of the word 'leader' (ἡγούμενος or dux) not found in the LXX, shows that Irenaeus either quotes from Justin or from some source, not the LXX, which Justin also followed. Thirdly, Irenaeus cannot have quoted from the 'Apology,' because he would not there get the word ἡγούμενος, and would probably have taken some of the words found in that quotation which in fact come from Isaiah. Fourthly, Irenaeus cannot have quoted from the 'Dialogue' as we have it, because there he would have found the quotation with a reasonable degree of correctness referred to Moses instead of to Isaiah.

We are therefore driven to the conclusion that Irenaeus quoted from some source other than the LXX, from which Justin also quoted.

This conclusion is fortified by the consideration of the difference between the quotation in Justin and the quotation in Irenaeus. Justin uses only one verb, 'A star shall arise (ἀνατελεῖ) out of Jacob, and a leader out of Israel.' Irenaeus uses another verb in the second clause, 'A star shall arise (orietur) out of Jacob and a leader shall stand up (surget) in Israel.' Now as a fresh verb is used in the second clause in the LXX, in the Vulgate, and in the English versions,

it may be safely considered that this is the more natural way of rendering the original. But the passage as it stands in Justin does not halt in any way for want of a second verb. Supposing therefore Irenaeus had taken his quotation from this source, he would have had no inducement to supply it. On the other hand, nothing is more probable than that Justin might omit the second verb as superfluous or by accident.

The only escape from this conclusion possible would be by supposing that Justin originally referred the quotation in the 'Dialogue' to Isaiah; that this was copied by Irenaeus; and that the reference in Justin was afterwards corrected by his transcribers. But this theory does not account for the use of the second verb by Irenaeus and not by Justin. Moreover, upon it Justin would on two distinct occasions make the same gross blunder in the reference, a thing in itself improbable, unless there was some cause for it; and such a cause could only be the existence of the misreference in some work he followed, for in the 'Dialogue' he cannot have copied from himself in the 'Apology,' as the 'Dialogue' contains words not found either in the LXX or in the 'Apology.' We should therefore equally on this hypothesis establish the existence of some work on Messianic prophecy used by Justin, in which the prophecies were given in a version other than the LXX.

There is, however, still the possibility that this work might have consisted of notes compiled by Justin himself. This however is improbable. Had Justin laboriously extracted the prophecies from the Hebrew text and translated them into Greek, he would probably have remembered where they came from.

Again there remains to consider the verbal agreement the quotations have in part with the LXX. This I explain, as I have done before, by the hypothesis that the work on Messianic prophecy used by Justin had been collated with the LXX and the renderings of the LXX written in the margin, and that these marginal readings, so far as they could be conveniently identified, were substituted by Justin for the original text.¹

I will now pass on to another quotation made by Justin. In his 'First Apology,' cap. 35, he says thus:—

'And that the Christ when born would be concealed from the rest of mankind until he became a man, which actually happened, hear the things foretold on this point. They are as follows: "A child was born to us, and a young man was restored to us, whose dominion is upon his shoulders" (*Παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, καὶ νεανίσκος ἡμῖν ἀπεδόθη, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων*),² disclosing the power of the cross to which he applied his shoulders when crucified, as will appear more clearly as my discourse proceeds.'

The prophecy cited by Justin is from Isaiah ix. 6, and according to the LXX runs thus, "*Ὅτι παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τοῦ ὤμου αὐτοῦ*." 'For a child was born to us, a son also was given to us whose dominion was upon his shoulder.'

It will be noticed that Justin differs from the LXX in using the words, 'And a young man was restored to us,' instead of the words, 'A son also was given

¹ The only one of the *Hexapla* texts of the passage in question which has been preserved is that of Symmachus, which, instead of the *ἄνθρωπος* of the LXX, and the *ἡγούμενος* of Justin and Irenaeus, reads *ἀκήπτρον*.

² 1 Ap. 35.

to us,' and also of the word 'shoulders' in the plural, instead of 'shoulder' in the singular. It will be further noticed that, as rendered by Justin, the passage may with some difficulty be construed as he would have it, into a prophecy that the Messiah should be unknown until he was a grown man, with an obscure reference to his crucifixion, but that this would be impossible if the rendering of the LXX be adopted. The passage may therefore be safely taken as an independent translation from the Hebrew, not as an inaccurate quotation from the LXX. Its partial agreement with the LXX is capable of explanation either by assuming that the translator made use of that version as far as it served his purpose, or by supposing that the passage was afterwards collated with the LXX, and assimilated to it so far as could be done without destroying the interpretation put upon it.¹

The passage we have just quoted follows in the 'Apology' immediately after the passage in which 'Thou, Bethlehem,' &c., is quoted from Micah.

The next quotation I will consider is of a prophecy which, though perhaps not strictly Messianic, is on a topic, the destruction of Jerusalem, which, when viewed as a consequence of the rejection by the Jews of the Messiah, is so closely related that it might be well included in any work on Messianic prophecies. Justin writes thus:—

'Also concerning its desolation and concerning the fact that none of them would be permitted to dwell there, it has been said thus by Isaiah the prophet, "Their land is desolate, in their presence their enemies devour it, and

¹ This passage is preserved according to the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, but none of them agree with Justin in any of the points in which he differs from the LXX.

there shall be none of them who dwells in it" (*Ἡ γῆ αὐτῶν ἔρημος, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν αὐτὴν φάγονται, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ*).¹

This prophecy, though referred by Justin to Isaiah, is really a combination of texts taken from Isaiah i. 7 and Jeremiah l. 3 (xxvii. according to the arrangement of the LXX); the language differs considerably from the LXX, according to which the portion quoted of Isaiah i. 7, that is, all the words in the quotation down to *φάγονται*, runs thus:—*Ἡ γῆ ὑμῶν ἔρημος, αἱ πόλεις ὑμῶν πυρίκαυστοι, τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀλλότριοι κατεσθίουσιν αὐτήν*.² 'Your land is desolate, your cities burned with fire, your country before your face strangers eat it up,' while the portion which comes from Jeremiah l. 3, that is, the remainder of the quotation, runs thus:—*καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἕως κτήνους*.² 'And there shall be none who dwells in it, from a man even to a beast.'

It will be noticed that in that part of the prophecy which comes from Isaiah, the sense is not materially different from that of the LXX, though there is a great difference in language. In the part which comes from Jeremiah, with the exception of the insertion of the words *ἐξ αὐτῶν*, the language of Justin, as far as it goes, is identical with the LXX. The insertion of these words, however, coupled with the omission to quote the words which follow, and also, perhaps I should say, of the preceding words, makes a great change in the meaning. Jeremiah intended to prophesy of Babylon that it should be uninhabited by

¹ 1 Ap. c. 47.

² The Alexandrine codex omits *καὶ* between *ἀνθρώπου* and *ἕως*.

man or beast. Supposing this prophecy to be applied to Jerusalem by the process of taking words out of their proper meaning, so customary with interpreters of prophecy, there still remains the difficulty that at the time Justin wrote the city of Aelia Capitolina was standing or in process of erection upon the site of Jerusalem. If, therefore, the words of Jeremiah had been quoted exactly, even after surmounting the difficulty that he was speaking of Babylon, not Jerusalem, their fulfilment in the sense in which they are applied by Justin would not be at all apparent.

Now it is very hard to suppose that Justin intentionally falsified this prophecy. The facts of the case appear to be best met by supposing that he made use of a catena of extracts originally made from the Hebrew, translated into Greek, and afterwards collated with the LXX more or less perfectly, and the words of the LXX written more or less perfectly in the margin. In such a case the mixture of the words of the LXX with an independent version, and the running together of quotations from different prophets would be easy of explanation. So would the alteration made by Justin in the sense of the passage. At the time the catena was formed Jerusalem probably had not been rebuilt after its destruction by Titus, and the framer of the catena might omit the words 'They are fled; they are gone both man and beast' as immaterial. The question of their materiality would not be considered by the collator, and Justin, having before him only the words *καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ*, would readily insert *ἐξ αὐτῶν* to bring out more clearly what he did not doubt was the sense. It must be noticed that no dogmatic reason can be given for the varia-

tion from the language of the LXX in the part of the prophecy that comes from Isaiah.

The confusion together of extracts from Isaiah and Jeremiah should also be compared with the similar confusion of extracts from different places in Isaiah and from Numbers and Isaiah we were just considering, and also the similar confusion between Malachi and Isaiah in Mark i. 2; also the reference by Justin of a prophecy to Zephaniah instead of Zechariah, also the similar reference in Matthew (xxvii. 9) of a prophecy to Jeremiah instead of Zechariah. All these mistakes are of a class incident to the use of a catena of extracts in which extracts from one author get readily mixed with extracts from another, and entire extracts get referred to the wrong author. They therefore point to the existence of such a catena which was used by Justin and Irenæus as well as by the authors of Matthew and Mark, or rather, I should say, of the work whence was derived the matter common to the three synoptic gospels.

Justin again quotes Isaiah i. 7 in his 'Dialogue with Trypho':—

'For the circumcision according to the flesh, which is from Abraham, was given for a sign, that you might be distinguished from other nations and us, and that the things which now in justice you suffer you might suffer alone, and that your countries might become desolate, and the cities burned with fire, and the crops strangers might eat up before your face, and none of you should go up into Jerusalem (*ἵνα γένωνται αἱ χώραι ὑμῶν ἔρημοι, καὶ αἱ πόλεις πυρίκαυστοι, καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν κατεσθίωσιν ἀλλότριοι, καὶ μηδὲς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐπεβαίῃ εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ*).'¹

¹ *Dial.* c. 16.

Notwithstanding the indirect nature of this quotation, it will be found to follow the LXX much more closely than the direct quotation in the 'Apology,' the only difference being the substitution of *τοὺς κυρποὺς* for *τὴν χώραν* and the transposition of the latter word into the first clause and its substitution there for *γῆ*, also the omission of *ὑμῶν* after *πόλεις*. These changes, coupled with the indirect form of the quotation, are sufficient to show that Justin was quoting from memory and not with the book before him; and therefore that the words which ran in his head were those of the LXX, not those which he used when quoting directly in the 'Apology.' It will be further noticed that the sense of the latter part of the prophecy quoted in the 'Apology,' that which comes from Jeremiah, ran in Justin's head also when writing the 'Dialogue,' but not the words. He expresses it in altogether different language: 'And none of you should go up into Jerusalem' (*καὶ μηδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐπιβαίνει εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ*). These considerations tend to support the conclusion that when Justin was quoting directly in the 'Apology' he was not quoting from memory, and that therefore he made use of some document which contained a version of the passage independent of the LXX.

Immediately after the passage we have just been considering Justin introduces another prophecy as follows:—

'Also that it was foretold that our Christ would heal all diseases and raise (*ἀνεγερεῖν*) the dead, hear what has been said. It is as follows: "At his coming will a lame man leap as a hart, and plain will be the tongue of the stammerers, the blind will receive their sight, the lepers will be cleansed, and the dead will rise up and walk" (*τῇ*

παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλείται χωλὸς ὡς ἔλαφος καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάων, τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται, καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ περιπατήσουσιν); and that he did these things you can learn from the "Acts in the time of Pontius Pilate" (*ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἁκτῶν*).'¹

In his 'Treatise on the Resurrection,' Justin again makes the same quotation in somewhat different language.²

'For did they not see on the earth the blind receiving theirsight and the lame walking (*τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέποντας, χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας*) at his word? All which things the Saviour did: firstly indeed that it might be fulfilled which was said by the prophets about him that "The blind receive their sight and the deaf hear &c.," (*τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσι καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα*), but also that we may have faith that in the resurrection the flesh will be raised whole.'

The passage supposed to be quoted in both places is Isaiah xxxv. 5, according to the LXX: *Τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν καὶ ὠτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται. Τότε ἀλείται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλὸς, τρανὴ δὲ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάων*. 'Then will the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf will hear. Then will the lame man leap as an hart, and plain will be the tongue of the stammerers.' If we compare this with Justin, we see that, instead of 'Then will the eyes of the blind be opened' (*Τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν*), he has 'The blind will receive their sight' (*Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι*), evidently an altogether different version. In the 'Apology' the words 'And the ears of the deaf will hear' are left out; but in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' he has 'The deaf hear' (*κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν*); again

¹ 1 Ap. c. 48.² C. 4.

a version different from the LXX, 'The ears of the deaf will hear' (*ὅτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται*).

The words 'Then will the lame man leap as an hart and plain will be the tongue of the stammerers' he has in the 'Apology' word for word with the LXX; but in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' another rendering of these words also is disclosed in the words *χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας*, which would be *χωλοὶ περιπατήσουσιν*, 'the lame will walk.' We must suppose, therefore, that an attempt was made in the 'Apology' to substitute the words of the LXX for these words; but that in so doing the word *περιπατήσουσιν* was left in by mistake, and so found a nominative in *νεκροὶ*, so making the dead to walk as well as rise.

There remains to consider the words 'And lepers will be cleansed and the dead will rise.' There is nothing in the passage in Isaiah of which these words can be a rendering or a paraphrase. They are therefore probably words from some other place which have been run together, as we have already had occasion to notice in previous cases. This is rendered the more probable as in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' the citation is made from the prophets. What places they are supposed to come from is more difficult to say. In Leviticus xiv. 2-9 we read: 'This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing . . . he shall be clean;' and in Psalm lxxxviii. 10: 'Shall the dead arise?' Free renderings of these passages might produce the words cited by Justin. If it be objected that this is simply to find the quotations *totidem verbis*, it may be answered that other prophecies, probably from the same collection, are no better. For instance, 'That it might be fulfilled which

was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene,' for which no better original can be found than the statement of the angel to the wife of Manoah, as to the future Samson: 'For the child shall be called a Nazarite unto God from the womb.'

The explanation of the foregoing phenomena is the same as that we have had suggested before. Justin used a catena of quotations, originally made in Hebrew, translated into Greek and afterwards collated with the LXX, and the LXX renderings written in the margin. Justin's quotations were produced by mixing the renderings of the LXX with those of the original document, and also by running consecutive quotations from different books together as if they were continuous. That the mixture was made by Justin himself is shown by the components being found to vary in different quotations of the same passage. In this case by comparing the quotation in the 'Apology' with that in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' we can restore the passage as it stood in the text of the catena used by Justin without much doubt. It must have been as follows: *Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσιν καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούσονται, καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται, καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται, καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατήσουσιν*. 'The blind will receive their sight and the deaf will hear, and the lepers will be cleansed, and the dead will rise up, and the lame will walk.' It will be noticed the quotation was so familiar that Justin winds it up in the 'Discourse of the Resurrection' with an &c. (*καὶ τὰ ἄλλα*).

Before leaving this passage we must not fail to compare it with the answer said to have been given by Jesus to John's disciples, which is found in almost the same words in Matthew and Luke:—

'Go your way, tell John the things which ye do hear and see, the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them (Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπονσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται).'¹

It must be noticed that this must be taken to be an answer in the affirmative to John's question whether Jesus was the Messiah. It can only be such an answer on the supposition of a well-known prophecy, of which these words stated the fulfilment; and this prophecy we see to be the same as that which was in the hands of Justin. The only difference, apart from a slight difference in order²—which may perhaps be owing to an error in my restoration of the prophecy that was before Justin—being the substitution of *ἐγείρονται* for *ἀναστήσονται*, or rather, as it would be the present and not the future, *ἀνίστανται*; and the addition of the words 'the poor have the good tidings preached to them.'

Possibly these differences ought to be reduced, as the passage in Matthew is quoted by Clement of Alexandria and Origen with the reading *ἀνίστανται* instead of *ἐγείρονται*.

But apart from this latter possibility the agreement between the prophecy implied in the words of Matthew and Luke (and which, therefore, we may suppose was in the hands of the writers of those books—or perhaps, rather, of some book, portions of which are embodied in both their narratives) and the

¹ Matthew xi. 5, Luke vii. 22.

² The words which are differently placed (*χωλοὶ περιπατήσουσιν*) are omitted altogether in Codex D.

prophecy in the hands of Justin, is so close and remarkable as to leave no doubt of their derivation from a common written source—and that source must have contained a rendering independent altogether of the LXX. Moreover, the agreement is not merely in the rendering, but in the running together of quotations from different places, so as apparently to form one prophecy, some of which are only to be found in the Old Testament at all by great straining of the words as well as the meaning. We see, therefore, the common source must have been a catena of extracts, and this is confirmed by the fact that Matthew and Luke follow the catena one step further by the addition of the words 'And the poor have good tidings preached to them' (*καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*), which appear to refer to Isaiah lxi. 1, 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the poor.' According to the LXX: *Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίζεσθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέ με*. Having regard to the nature of the reference, the words of Matthew perhaps in this last case follow the LXX as closely as might be expected if we supposed that to be the source from which the part of the prophecy relating the evangelisation of the poor came. But there is nothing in this to shake the inferences drawn from the former part of the passage. The same two words used in the LXX, *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*, may have been used by the original translator, or they may have become assimilated to the LXX at some subsequent stage.

The only possible escape from the foregoing conclusion would be to argue that Justin constructed his

prophecy after the model of the prophecy implied in Matthew and Luke. To this there are insuperable objections. Such a process must have been intentional on the part of Justin. Now in no one place in his writings is to be found the prophecy implied in Matthew and Luke. We only arrive at the conclusion that he had such a prophecy before him by piecing together what he says on two different occasions. The supposition, therefore, of his having intended to construct the prophecy to supply the place of that implied in Matthew or Luke, falls to the ground. Had he done so he would have stated it explicitly.

Moreover (according to the more probable reading in the 'Apology') Justin expressly refers to the 'Acts in the time of Pilate' as the source of his information as to the fulfilment of the prophecy.

Before leaving this passage we must not omit to notice its bearing upon another question noticed above: that is, whether the passages from the Old Testament, cited as having been fulfilled in Jesus, were in the material common to the three synoptics and left out by Mark and Luke, or whether they were absent from the common material and were inserted by Matthew.

We have already found an argument from comparison with Matthew and Mark in favour of the former contention. The passage now before us affords an argument bearing in a similar direction—that is, it shows that a writer of material common to Matthew and Luke had before him a work containing prophecies originally extracted from the Hebrew.

To pass on to another quotation, in the 'First Apology,' cap. 51, we read:—

'But that he was to ascend into heaven as it was foretold, hear. For it was spoken thus: "Lift the gates of the heavens. Be ye opened, that the King of Glory may come in! Who is this King of Glory? the strong Lord and the mighty Lord" (*Ἀρατε πύλας οὐρανῶν, ἀνοίχθητε ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; Κύριος κραταῖος καὶ κύριος δυνατός*).'

The passage here cited comes from Psalm xxiv. 7, 8. According to the LXX it runs thus:—

Ἀρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπύρθητε πύλαι αἰώνιοι, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; Κύριος κραταῖος καὶ δυνατός, Κύριος δυνατός ἐν πολέμῳ.

'Lift your gates, ye princes and be ye lift up ye everlasting gates, and the King of Glory will come in! Who is this King of Glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle.'

It will be noticed that this quotation differs from the LXX down to the words *ὁ βασιλεὺς* where they first occur. After this it agrees with the LXX verbatim, with the exception of the omission of the word *δυνατός* where it first occurs and of the words *ἐν πολέμῳ*.

The passage would appear to be the result of the mixture of an independent version with the LXX, as in previous cases. It cannot be a case of careless citation, as the LXX would not bear the meaning Justin puts upon it.¹

Immediately following the passage quoted above Justin proceeds: 'But that also he is about to come

¹ A portion of this passage has been preserved in two of the *Hexapla* texts. Aquila reads: *Ἀρατε πύλαι κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπύρθητε ἀνοίγματα αἰώνια*; and Symmachus reads: *Μετάβατε πύλαι οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν ὑψωθήτωσαν δὲ αἱ πύλαι αἰώνιοι*. It is obvious that the differences of Justin from the LXX are not in any way due to the influence of either of these versions.

with glory out of the heavens, hear also what has been said upon this point by Jeremiah the prophet. It is as follows: "Behold, as a son of man one comes above the clouds of heaven and his angels with him: Ἰδοὺ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ." ¹

The LXX version of this passage, which does not come from Jeremiah, but from Daniel vii. 13, is as follows: Ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ. 'Behold in the clouds of heaven one was coming as a son of man and one was present as ancient of days, and the attendants were present with him.'

Here again we see an independent version, influenced, probably, by the recollection of the language of the LXX rather than afterwards affected by mixture. It may be noticed that this direct quotation departs further from the language of the LXX than the allusion to the same passage in Matthew xxvi. 64 we have noticed above. Ἐπάνω is used instead of ἐπὶ, and the use of the present ἔρχεται for the imperfect, there being no change of construction to require it, constitutes a real difference, which the use of the participle in the allusion does not. I do not here notice the concluding words, as they do not occur at all in Matthew xxvi. 64. In the false reference to Jeremiah we again see the mark of the use of a catena of citations.

¹ 1 Ap. cap. 51. According to Theodotion, Ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφθασε καὶ προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ. 'Behold with the clouds of heaven one coming as a son of man, and he came first to the ancient of days and approached him.' Justin both resembles and differs from this version about as much as he does from the LXX.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSIONS

I do not think it necessary to continue the examination of Justin's quotations from the Old Testament any further.

I have now examined eleven passages containing citations of sixteen passages from the Old Testament, fifteen of which differ more or less from the language of the LXX. Of these, five are also cited in Matthew, one in Irenaeus and one in Tertullian, and two are the subjects of an allusion in Matthew.

As regards the passages in which Justin agrees with Matthew and Irenaeus in words not found in the LXX, the fact that he is quoting from some written source, independent of the LXX, may be taken as established beyond doubt, and the same inference follows with but little doubt as regards the passage in which he agrees with Tertullian. The question then arises whether that source with regard to the quotations which partly agree with Matthew, can be Matthew. I think the examination I have made, both of the language of the quotations and of the context in which they occur, proves that this was not the case. But there still remains the question whether he was not quoting from some old evangelical work which

was made use of by the framers of our present texts of Matthew and 'Protevangelium.' I incline to the opinion that in some places this was the case, and of course it is possible that some of the quotations not found in Matthew come from such a source. But as regards the bulk of the quotations, there is nothing to indicate any such source. On the other hand there is much to show that they came from a catena of extracts originally made in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and afterwards collated with the LXX, and the renderings of that version written in the margin; and that the citations in the gospels, as well as Justin, came originally from such a document. This is shown by the mixture of the renderings of the LXX with different renderings; by differences in the mixture in different quotations of the same passage; by the double renderings in the same quotation, once in the words of the LXX, and again in other words, *e.g.* *πρᾶος*, which can scarcely be said to differ from *πραῦς* and *πρωχός* in Zechariah ix. 9, by the way in which words which appear superfluous in Justin, added to words in Matthew, restore an otherwise lost sense; *e.g.* in the same quotation the apparently superfluous *ἀλάλαξον* added to the *εἴπατε* of Matthew gives the meaning 'Say hurrah!' which is equivalent to 'rejoice greatly,' the meaning of the original; also by the running together of quotations from different books and their reference to the wrong author. The extraordinary distortion of some of the quotations, so that it becomes impossible to do more than guess where they come from, again very much favours the theory that they were made in Hebrew by some one imperfectly acquainted with it, which I suppose would

be the case with many, even among the Palestine Jews.

On the whole, the examination of the quotations in Justin tends to show that such a book, as I have contended Papias attributed to Matthew, was in existence in the Primitive Church.

CHAPTER XII

MESSIANIC PROPHECIES NOT FOUND IN CANONICAL BOOKS

I WILL now pass on to consider some passages of another kind, that is to say, passages cited by Justin and some other fathers as quotations from canonical or apocryphal books of the Old Testament, but which are not now, and apparently never were, to be found in the books from which they are said to have been taken in any MS. or version. That these passages were not in the copies current in his day, Justin was aware, and he is prepared with an explanation. In the 'Dialogue with Trypho' (chap. lxxi.) he charges the Jews with having altogether taken away many passages from the translations made by the seventy elders with Ptolemy, and at the request of Trypho he gives some instances as follows (I quote from the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library') :—

'From the statements, then, which Esdras made in reference to the law of the passover, they have taken away the following : " And Esdras said to the people, This passover is our Saviour and our refuge. And if you have understood, and your heart has taken it in, that we shall humble Him on a standard, and thereafter hope in Him, then this place shall not be forsaken for ever, says the God of hosts. But if you will not believe Him, and will not

listen to his declaration, you shall be a laughing-stock to the nations " (Καὶ εἶπεν Ἐσδρας τῷ λαῷ· Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐὰν διανοηθῇτε καὶ ἀναβῇ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, ὅτι μέλλομεν αὐτὸν ταπεινοῦν ἐν σημείῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλπίζομεν ἐπ' αὐτόν· οὐ μὴ ἐρημωθῇ ὁ τόπος οὗτος εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσητε αὐτῷ μηδὲ εἰσακούσητε τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἔσθε ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). And from the sayings of Jeremiah they have cut out the following : " I (was) like a lamb that is brought to the slaughter : they devised a device against me, saying, Come, let us lay on wood on His bread, and let us blot Him out from the land of the living ; and His name shall be no more remembered." And since this passage is still written in some copies (of the scriptures) in the synagogues of the Jews (for it is only a short time since they were cut out), and since from these words it is demonstrated that the Jews deliberated about the Christ Himself, to crucify and put Him to death, He Himself is both declared to be led as a sheep to the slaughter, as was predicted by Isaiah, and is here represented as a harmless lamb ; but being in difficulty about them, they give themselves over to blasphemy. And again, from the sayings of the same Jeremiah these have been cut out : " The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves ; and He descended to preach to them his own salvation " (Ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀναγγελίσσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ) ; and from the ninety-fifth Psalm they have taken away this short saying of the words of David, " from the wood." For where the passage said, " Tell ye among the nations the Lord hath reigned from the wood " (Εἶπατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· Ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), they have left, " Tell ye among the nations the Lord hath reigned " (Εἶπατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· Ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν).

The first passage, said to have been removed from Jeremiah, is Jeremiah xi. 19, and is found in all the

manuscripts. It is quoted sufficiently accurately from the LXX, with the exception of the omission of the word *ἄκακον*, harmless, qualifying the word lamb. With the other passages the case is different; the passages supposed to have been excised from Esdras and Jeremiah are not contained in any MSS. whatever, and the words supposed to have been excised from the psalm out of the great multitude of MSS. of the LXX are to be found in two only, where their presence is of little weight, the Verona Psalter and Cod. 156,¹ and as the Jews could not have brought it to pass that these passages should be excised from the copies in use among the Christians, we cannot suppose that such passages ever in fact formed part of the texts of Esdras, Jeremiah, or the Psalms. Justin, however, was not alone in citing these passages as from Esdras, Jeremiah, and the Psalms. The same passage is cited from Esdras by Lactantius, 'Instit. Div.' c. 18, in the following words:—'Apud Esdram ita scriptum est: Et dixit Esdras ad populum: Hoc pascha salvator noster est et refugium nostrum. Cogitate et ascendat in cor vestrum quoniam habemus humiliare eum in signo (or ligno); et post haec sperabimus in eum, ne deseratur hic locus in aeternum tempus, dicit dominus Deus virtutum. Si non credideritis ei neque exnuderitis adnuntiationem ejus, eritis derisio in gentibus.' As Otto remarks, this passage is cited by Lactantius 'non sine aliqua discrepantia.' The imperative 'cogitate' is substituted for 'Εάν διανοηθῆτε, and the assertion 'sperabimus' for the hypothesis 'Εάν . . . ἐλπίσωμεν, the clause 'ne deseratur, etc.' is made to depend on 'sperabimus,' and 'dominus' is inserted

¹ Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 189.

before 'Deus,' which has nothing to correspond to it in the Greek of Justin. The first difference is somewhat emphasised by the fact that 'Εάν διανοηθῆτε introduces one branch of an alternative, and the following words, 'Εάν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσητε, introduce another; and in the second case 'Εάν is naturally translated by 'si,' and the subjunctive is not turned into an imperative, which leads us to suppose that had Lactantius been translating from Justin, and had 'Εάν before him in the first place, he would have translated it in the same way.

Of themselves no great weight can be attached to these discrepancies, but the fact that Lactantius cites the passage as an existing passage from Esdras without calling attention to its having been excised from the book, is a strong argument that he got it from some source where its excision was not mentioned, and therefore not from Justin, and these discrepancies add weight to that argument. Besides this, Lactantius cites the passage in Latin. Immediately before, he cites three passages from the Sibyl in Greek. It would, therefore, appear probable that if he took this passage from Justin, he would cite it in Greek also.

It should be noticed, however, that Lactantius cites passages from the Old Testament in Latin, and it may be, therefore, that he dealt with the supposed passage from Esdras as with other passages from the Old Testament; but the probable reason of his citing the Old Testament in Latin is that he cites it from a Latin version, so that if the same reason applied to the supposed passage from Esdras, we must suppose that his version contained it, and therefore that he did not cite it from Justin; but a little further on he

cites another passage as from the Old Testament, which is not there. In the words addressed by the Lord to Solomon in 2 Chronicles vii., the answer to the question 'Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land and to this house?' is made to run: 'Because they left the Lord their God, and persecuted their king most beloved by God and crucified him in great humility, on account of these things God hath brought upon them these evils (et persecuti sunt regem suum dilectissimum Deo et cruciaverunt illum in humilitate magnâ, propter hæc importavit illis Deus mala hæc). It is altogether unknown where these words come from. It follows, therefore, that Lactantius had before him some book then extant in Latin, containing Messianic prophecies, some of which were fictitious, or at all events in which disconnected passages had got run together. We may therefore well suppose that the reputed passage from Esdras came from this source. We therefore trace up this passage as probably coming from some book containing other prophecies of the like nature.

The second passage, stated by Justin to have been excised from Jeremiah, is worthy of more note. It is cited or alluded to by Irenæus in no less than five different places. In the first place (lib. iii. c. xx. 4) he cites it as from Isaiah. In the second place (lib. iv. c. xxi. 1) he cites it as from Jeremiah. In the third place (lib. iv. c. xxxiii. 1) he sets it out among other prophecies fulfilled in the first advent of Christ. In the fourth place (lib. iv. c. xxxiii. 12) he sets it out among things spoken by other prophets; and in the fifth place (lib. v. cap. xxxi. 1) he sets it out as spoken

by the prophet. In none of these passages is the text of Irenæus extant in the Greek.

The first place is as follows:—

'Esaias ait: Et commemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, qui dormierant in terra sepulchris; et descendit ad eos evangelizare salutem quæ est ab eo, ut salvaret eos.'

The second place is as follows:—

'Sicut Hieremias ait: Re commemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, qui prædormierunt in terra defossionis, et descendit ad eos, uti evangelizaret eis salutare suum, ad salvandum eos.'

In the third place Irenæus says that the Jews are not willing to understand that all the prophets announced the two advents of Christ:—

'The one, indeed, in which he became a man, subject to stripes, and knowing what it is to bear infirmity, and sat upon the foal of an ass, and was a stone rejected by the builders, and was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and by stretching forth his hands destroyed Amalek; while he gathered from the ends of the earth into his Father's fold the children who were scattered abroad, and remembered his own dead ones who had formerly fallen asleep, and came down to them that he might deliver them (*et re commemoratus mortuorum suorum qui ante dormierant, et descendens ad eos, uti erueret eos et salvaret eos*), but the second in which he will come on the clouds,' &c.

The fourth place is as follows:—

'Alii (i.e. prophetae) dicentes: Rememoratus est Dominus sanctus mortuorum suorum, qui prædormierunt in terra limi et descendit ad eos, uti erigeret, ad salvandum illos; causam reddiderunt, propter quam passus est hæc omnia.'

In the fifth place Irenaeus is arguing against some heretics who denied the resurrection of the body, and maintained that immediately on their death they should pass above the heavens. He proceeds as follows:—

‘How can they be wondered at if again they know nothing as to the place of the resurrection? For they do not choose to understand that if these things are as they say, the Lord himself, in whom they profess to believe, did not rise again upon the third day; but, immediately upon his expiring on the cross, undoubtedly departed on high, leaving his body to the earth. But the case was that for three days he dwelt in the place where the dead were, as the prophet says concerning him:

‘*Propheta ait de eo: Commemoratus est Dominus sanctorum mortuorum suorum, eorum qui ante dormierunt in terra sepelitionis, et descendit ad eos, extrahere eos et salvare eos.*’

Many of the differences to be found in these five citations probably arise from the Latin translator of Irenaeus having given different translations in different places of the same Greek words. Thus, ‘commemoratus est,’ ‘recommemoratus est,’ and ‘rememoratus est,’ are no doubt all different renderings of *ἐμνήσθη*. So ‘sepultionis,’ ‘defossionis,’ ‘limi,’ and ‘sepelitionis’ are probably all different renderings of *χώματος*. So ‘evangelizare salutem quae est ab eo’ and ‘uti evangelizaret eis salutare suum’ are two different renderings of *ἀναγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ*, but ‘uti erueret eos,’ ‘uti erigeret,’ and ‘extrahere eos’ appear to point to a different reading. Whether the differences between ‘dormierant’ and ‘praedormierunt’ or ‘ante dormierunt’ point to any difference in reading may be doubted.

I will now pass on to two points in which a differ-

ence of reading can clearly be seen through the Latin version; where Justin has *κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ*, Irenaeus has in two places ‘Dominus sanctus Israel,’ in a third ‘Dominus sanctus,’ and in a fourth ‘Dominus sanctorum’ (mortuorum, &c.). In the remaining place the form of the allusion, for it is not a direct quotation, required the suppression of the nominative. We see, therefore, that the word *ἅγιος* was certainly part of the text as known to Irenaeus, though there is room for dispute as to whether, as most probable, he had it in the nominative qualifying *κύριος*, or whether he had it in the genitive agreeing with *νεκρῶν*, or whether he had it both ways. It is equally clear that the words *ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ* were not part of the text as known to Irenaeus.

Another distinction between the text of Irenaeus and that of Justin is that Irenaeus continues the quotation further, and in this all the places in Irenaeus agree. Thus the words ‘ut salvaret eos,’ ‘ad salvandum eos,’ ‘et salvaret eos,’ ‘ad salvandum illos,’ ‘et salvare eos’ have nothing to answer to them in Justin. These two points of distinction show that Irenaeus did not obtain the quotation from Justin, but this conclusion is very much strengthened by the fact that Irenaeus does not once suggest that the passage has been suppressed, or indicate any doubt that it was extant in the Old Testament, which he would hardly have failed to do had Justin been the source of his information. This apocryphal quotation appears to have had no small influence among the primitive Christians. On it appears to have been founded the dogma of the Descent of Christ into Hell, anciently called the Harrowing of Hell, which we still read in the Apostles’ Creed, and which formed the basis of the apocryphal ‘Gospel of

Nicodemus.' The note of Feuardentius to the last quotation shows that this dogma in its expanded form was adopted by the Catholic Church.¹

'He teaches plainly that which the Catholic Church has firmly believed and universally handed down about the descent of Christ to hell, namely that his soul separated from his body, not by a certain operation only, but by its proper presence (as we say in the schools), penetrated the lower parts of the earth and arrived at the place where the spirits of the saints were held, and remained with them up to the moment of the resurrection, whence it led forth together with itself as many as were fitted and suitable for the kingdom of God. That this dogma has always been reckoned among those articles of faith about which it is wicked to doubt can easily be collected from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and the books of all the Fathers.'

There is an allusion to a similar incident in one only of the canonical books—the first epistle of Peter. There we read (iii. 18), 'Because Christ also suffered for sins once . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing;' and again (iv. 6), 'For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.'

It will be noticed that there are points of difference as well as points of agreement between these

¹ Stieren's *Irenaeus*, ii. 1063. F. Franciscus Feuardentius, ordinis F. Minorum in s. facultate Parisiensi Doctor theologus, published his second edition of *Irenaeus* A.D. 1596, *ibid.* i. 29.

passages and the passage quoted by Justin and Irenaeus. In particular, the former passage in 1 Peter brings out the point that Christ visited the dead in the spirit at the time when his body was dead. This point, which is emphasised by Irenaeus, is hardly to be found in the passage which he cites in support of it. Yet Irenaeus does not strengthen his position by citing 1 Peter, though he was acquainted with that book. The reason probably is that the authority Irenaeus was following, from which he got the supposed quotation by Jeremiah or Isaiah, did not cite 1 Peter, and would therefore date from a time anterior to 1 Peter, or at which 1 Peter was not old enough to have had much influence in the Church.

Another point of difference consists in the specific reference in 1 Peter of Christ's visit to the persons who were disobedient in the days of Noah; a third point of difference consists in the absence in 1 Peter of any express reference to the dead saints. In fact in this point there is a marked contrast between the passage quoted by Justin and Irenaeus and 1 Peter. In the supposed quotation the object of the visit is the instruction of the dead saints, which is said to have been attained. In 1 Peter the object of the visit is rather that the dead may be judged upon the same basis as the living, having had the same opportunities.

These differences lead to the conclusion that 1 Peter does not allude to the supposed passage from Jeremiah or Isaiah, and that that passage is not founded on 1 Peter. But though this is so, there can be no doubt that the writer of 1 Peter alludes to some account with which he supposes his readers will be familiar.

This dogma of the harrowing of Hell was one which obtained in the Middle Ages extensive acceptance among the people.

Thus in the 'Miller's Tale,' when Nicholas asks the carpenter to swear secrecy, he answers—

Say what thou wilt I schal it never telle
To child ne wyf by him that harwed helle.

And it must be noticed, as appears from the name 'the harrowing of Hell,' the dogma which obtained circulation was founded upon the apocryphal passage cited from Isaiah or Jeremiah, and not from the first epistle of Peter.

It must be noticed that a comparison of the citations in Irenaeus and Lactantius with those in Justin Martyr justifies the inference, not merely that they were not derived directly from Justin Martyr, but that they were not so derived indirectly—that is to say that they were not transmitted to Irenaeus and Lactantius through any writer who took them from Justin Martyr. This appears from two reasons, one of which is common to Irenaeus and Lactantius, and the other applicable to Irenaeus only.

The reason common to both is this, that both Irenaeus and Lactantius cite the passages as if there was no doubt that they were to be found in the books from which they purport to be taken. Now it is scarcely possible that any one deriving his knowledge of the passages from Justin could venture to cite them in such a way. He would know, if he did so, that he might appear to his reader to be himself inventing the prophecies. If, therefore, he cited them

at all, he would repeat Justin's charge against the Jews of mutilating the Scriptures.

The reason applicable to Irenaeus only is that he continues the quotation further than Justin; his authority, therefore, cannot have taken from Justin what was not there. We see, therefore, that the common source of these apocryphal prophecies must have been a work existing before the time of Justin.

The Psalm from which Justin says the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου have been excised by the Jews, is found in the Old Testament in two places—once in the Psalter and once in 1 Chronicles xvi.; and the two recensions of it differ considerably. Justin cites the Psalm at length twice—once in '1 Apology' 41, where the quotation agrees very nearly with the Chronicles, and once in 'Trypho' 73, where the quotation, as we have it, agrees with the Psalter. In Justin's citation in the 'Apology,' the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, which he complains have been excised, are to be found, but in 'Trypho' the MS. of Justin does not contain them. The omission of these words in 'Trypho' is the more remarkable as the citation follows immediately the passage we have cited above in which Justin accuses the Jews of having excised them.

The quotation in the 'Apology,' though following generally the language of the Chronicles, has some curious differences. For instance, instead of 'The gods of the nations are idols' (εἰδωλα), according to the Chronicles, or 'The gods of the nations are demons' (δαιμόνια), according to the Psalter, he has 'The gods of the nations are images (or idols) of demons' (εἰδωλα δαιμονίων), and instead of 'strength and rejoicing are in his place' (ἐν τόπῳ αὐτοῦ), he has

'strength and rejoicing are in the place of his sanctuary' (ἐν τόπῳ ἁγιάσματος αὐτοῦ), which would seem to be conflated with the reading of the Psalter, 'Holiness and majesty are in his sanctuary' (ἐν τῷ ἁγιάσματι αὐτοῦ). Instead of 'Give to the Lord ye families of the nations (αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν), give to the Lord glory and strength,' it has 'Give to the Lord the father of the æons (or ages) (τῷ πατρὶ τῶν αἰώνων) glory.' Instead of 'Take gifts and offer them before his face' (λάβετε δῶρα καὶ ἐνέγκατε κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ), it has 'Take a thankoffering and enter before his face' (λάβετε χάριν καὶ εἰσέλθετε κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ). The quotation concludes with the words, 'Let them rejoice among the nations, the Lord reigned from the wood' (εὐφρανθήτωσαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), instead of, as in the Chronicles, 'Let the heaven rejoice, and let the earth be glad, and let them say among the nations The Lord is reigning' (εὐφρανθήτω ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθω ἡ γῆ καὶ εἰπάτωσαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν Κύριος βασιλεύων).

Besides the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, which it is clear Justin considered part of the text, he repeats the reading εἶδωλα δαιμονίων in 'Trypho,' c. 55, but in three short citations which come after the citation of the whole Psalm in 'Trypho' the words are as in the Psalter. So in 'Trypho,' c. 73, he quotes the words εἶπατε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, which are left out in the 'Apology,' but in that place he refers to the Psalm by its number in the Psalter, which he evidently follows. The reading εἶδωλα δαιμονίων is found in two other places—in Irenæus iii. 6, and Clement of Alexandria, 'Protrept.' c. 4. The reading τῷ πατρὶ τῶν αἰώνων

is partially confirmed by codices B and S, which, instead of αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, read πατρὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν.¹

Reference to the passage supposed to have been excised from the Psalm is again to be found in other authorities. Thus Tertullian ('Adv. Jud.') says, 'Come now if you have read in the power of the prophet in the Psalms, the Lord reigned from the wood (*Dominus regnavit a ligno*), I look to see what you understand, lest by chance you think some woodcutter king to be meant, and not Christ who reigned from there, death being overcome by his suffering on the cross.' Tertullian here can scarcely be copying Justin, else he would not talk in this way about persons reading in the Psalms what he would have learnt from Justin they would not find there, but other Latin fathers besides Tertullian cited these words as from the Psalms, and they even found their way into the old Latin version; indeed, it has been suggested that it is from this use of the words among Latin authors that they found their way into the two solitary Greek MSS. in which they occur, those MSS. being accompanied by a Latin version. In the case of the Basle MS., cod. 156, great probability is given to this inference by the ignorance of the government of ἀπό, shown in the form in which the words occur—viz., ἀπο τῷ ξύλῳ, which can be best accounted for by the supposition that the words are a literal translation of *a ligno*.² It would appear, then, that this extensive use of the words among Latin authors, backed up by these two Græco-Latin MSS.,

¹ Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 194.

² *Ibid.* p. 189.

ought not to lead to the inference that they ever formed part of the LXX text. Besides the enormous preponderance of authority against them, there is the fact that, except to a person on the look out for Messianic prophecies which could by any means be twisted into applicability to Jesus of Nazareth, they do not appear to make any sense in the context.

To come to the conclusions we ought to draw. It seems, in the first place, we ought to conclude that Justin's differences from the LXX are not due to vagaries of his own, but that he followed some authority. The only other inference would be that all the other places in which the same differences are found are derived ultimately from Justin. Now Justin must have had some ground for his accusation against the Jews, and in whatever place he got the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, he might have got all the other differences. It is not credible that these words were ever part of the LXX. We may therefore suppose that Justin's authority was some sort of citation. If we suppose it to have been a catena of extracts, the insertion of these words can be most easily explained, for they are the last words in Justin's citation, and therefore might not improbably have really formed part of the next following citation in the catena. The catena which we have had reason to suppose Justin employed, was one originally made in Hebrew, translated into Greek, and afterwards collated with the LXX. It may not be possible to show evidence of this process in the citation we are dealing with, but such a process might, readily enough, produce its peculiarities. It would appear that the

Psalter as well as the Chronicles must have been collated in producing the text cited by Justin.

No inference can be drawn from the form of the quotation in 'Trypho.' The omission of the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου appears to show that it has been assimilated to the LXX by the hand of some copyist.

I will now pass on to consider what inference ought to be drawn from the foregoing facts with reference to our present inquiry.

The first is certainly this, that there was some secondary authority upon Messianic prophecy which was largely and blindly followed in the primitive Church, and that without referring the alleged prophecies to their context.

The second point which we may infer is that this authority was of such a nature that blunders of all sorts were made by using it, such as referring passages to the wrong authorities and causing them to be corrupted. We see further that Justin, in using this authority directly or indirectly, endeavoured to refer the passages to their context in the LXX, and when he could not find them accounted for his inability to identify them by supposing the copies of that version to have been mutilated by the Jews. But, notwithstanding, later writers appear to have continued to cite the passages as if there were no doubt of their authenticity.

These facts would be well accounted for by the extensive circulation of a catena of Messianic prophecies extracted from the Old Testament as well as from some apocryphal book or books which were accepted by the writer.

If we suppose this catena was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and extracts were made in it from some book or books which were never translated into Greek, we can well understand how the source of some of these extracts should be unascertainable.

We have therefore here further evidence of the existence of such a work in the primitive Church, and even if this latter evidence is not so definite as to the exact character of the work as that we have had occasion previously to consider, of the existence of some work upon Messianic prophecy having wide circulation and authority in the primitive Church, it appears to be absolutely conclusive. On no other theory can we account for different writers, one after the other, citing and building their faith upon the same non-existent prophecies.

NOTE.—In the foregoing remarks I have not considered a theory which has been very prevalent in Germany though not in England. Critics who interpret *λόγια κυριακά* to mean 'the discourses of the Lord' often by an analysis of the synoptic gospels separate a part which they suppose to be derived from such a work. It is not to the purpose I have in hand to examine into the correctness of this analysis. It may well be that portions of the synoptic gospels are so separable, and can be shown to have come from such a work, but the work can hardly be that attributed to Matthew by Papias, for that work was written in Hebrew, while, as has been shown, the Old Testament citations in the discourses of Jesus invariably come from the LXX, and the discourses themselves dovetail into the citations in such a way as to show

that the original writer of them must have used the LXX. Admitting, therefore, that the criticism which discovers this book of discourses is correct, the book cannot have been that attributed by Papias to Matthew.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

REMARKS UPON THE TRANSLATION OF THE FRAGMENT OF PAPIAS RELATING TO MARK

THERE are three points in which my rendering of this passage is likely to be called in question.

- (1) 'Without arrangement' for *οὐ τάξει*.
- (2) 'Did not act wrongly' for *οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε*.
- (3) 'Related' for *ἐμνημόνευσεν* and *ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*.
- (1) Many critics translate *οὐ τάξει* 'not in chronological order.'

Thus Bleek says (*Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. § 48), '*οὐ τάξει*, when used in reference to an historical treatise, can only mean "not in the chronological order wherein the individual had done them."'

It is begging the question to assume that Papias was speaking of an historical treatise. But, passing this by, even of an historical treatise the remark is inaccurate; otherwise Gibbon for instance, when he pursues the method explained in his forty-eighth chapter, would be described as writing *οὐ τάξει*.

The things said and done by Christ might be arranged upon many different plans, e.g. according to the prophecies of which they were supposed to be the fulfilment, or the moral duties they enforced.

But this is, after all, rather beside the question. The word *τάξει*, when applied to a discourse or treatise, means arrangement generally, as when Aristotle, in the third book of his '*Rhetoric*,' says, *λοιπὸν δὲ περὶ τάξεως εἰπεῖν* ('it remains to speak about arrangement'). The denial of *τάξις*, therefore, to a treatise denies not merely chronological, but any sort of orderly arrangement.

How great a stumbling-block, however, this phrase (ὃ μὲν τοὺς πάντας) is in the way of any one who would apply the words of Papias to our second canonical gospel, may be seen by the efforts made to avoid it by a forced rendering. Thus in Clark's 'Ante-Nicene Library' it is rendered 'not, however, in exact order.'

(2) The rendering I have here adopted is substantially that made use of in the first instance by the author of 'Supernatural Religion' following certain German authorities, and afterwards somewhat modified in consequence of the acrimonious attacks of Dr. Lightfoot. The verb ἀμαρτάνειν may mean either to make a mistake, or to sin, or do what is morally blameworthy. The question is, what meaning has it in this passage? I think the latter, i.e. I think Papias means that Mark was not morally blameworthy for writing without arrangement. Papias has already said that what Mark related he wrote accurately (ἀκριβῶς). The rendering of Dr. Lightfoot would make a mere useless repetition of this statement.

Again ὥστε οὐδὲν ἤμαρτε Μάρκος is a consequence of what went before, viz. of the explanation why Mark wrote without arrangement. It is a natural consequence from that explanation that Mark ought not to be blamed for doing the best he could under the circumstances, but it would not be a natural consequence to say that he made no mistake. In other words, the antecedent stating the imperfection of his means of information, gives a reason why Mark might be excused for making mistakes, not for his not making any.

(3) Mark could not properly be said to have remembered the things said or done by Christ. What he might remember were the words of Peter. Moreover Papias goes on to say that Mark did not pass by any of the things which he heard. Papias therefore means that Mark committed to writing everything that Peter told him. To say that he wrote merely as many things as he remembered would imply that he had forgotten some. I therefore adopt the rendering 'related.'

APPENDIX II

PLACES IN WHICH ΛΟΓΙΟΝ OCCURS IN THE LXX

Numbers xxiv. 4, 15.

Sept. (Eng. Ver.)

Psalms xl. (xii.), 6.

„ xvii. (xviii.), 3.

„ xviii. (xix.), 14.

„ civ. (cv.), 19.

„ evi. (evii.), 11.

„ exvii. (exix.), 38, 50, 58, 67, 76, 82, 103, 133, 140, 148, 158, 162, 169, 170.

„ exlvii. 15.

Isaiah xxviii. 13.

„ xxx. 27 twice.

Kircher gives several references which I was unable to verify, probably owing to using the common or Vatican text instead of the Aldine used by Kircher. He also refers to several places under the head ΛΟΓΙΟΝ where the common text reads λογιόν, meaning a part of the high priest's vestments.

APPENDIX III

PHILO THE AUTHOR OF THE 'DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA'

It is, perhaps, due to the learned authorities who have disputed the genuineness of the 'De Vita Contemplativa' that I should state my reasons for differing from them.

Though always reputed a work of Philo's, from the time of Eusebius who makes the earliest extant mention of it downwards, it does not contain any direct statement as to who was its author, but it begins with a reference to the author having made mention in a previous treatise of the Essenes. We find such a treatise among the works ascribed to Philo in the 'Quod Omnis Probus Liber.'

This treatise again does not contain any statement as to its author, but it is addressed to one Theodotus, and makes reference

to a former treatise apparently addressed to the same person on the converse topic: 'Our former treatise, O Theodotus, was on every slave being bad' (*περὶ τοῦ πάντα δοῦλον εἶναι φαῦλον*). No such treatise is now extant, but we learn from Eusebius that he had in his hands a book ascribed to Philo under the title *περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον*, which was no doubt the book referred to.

Putting aside for the present the possibility of the forgery of the 'De Vita Contemplativa,' the question is whether these three books were rightly ascribed to Philo, and the first book addressed to Theodotus, which would be the most likely of the three to contain any evidence of authorship, being lost, it is evident that we are in a very unfavourable position to review the judgment of Eusebius and others, who had that book in their hands, that Philo was the author of all three.

Proceeding however as best we may by the criticism of the two books which remain, the first point to consider is what internal evidence they contain of their date. Now in the book 'Quod Omnis Probus Liber,' cap. 12, we find the following passage: *Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία καλοκαίριος οὐκ ἄγνος ἢν πολυανθρωποῦτον ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγη μῦρα νέμεται. Λέγονται τινες παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Ἑσσαιοὶ πλήθος ὑπὲρ τετρακισχίλιους καὶ ἑμὴν δάξαν. . . . οὐ ζῶα καταθέοντες.* This statement as to the large part of the very numerous nation of the Jews living in Palestine, could hardly have been made after the dispersion of the Jews by Titus, nor could the Essenes have been specially singled out as not sacrificing animals, after the destruction of the Temple had brought it to pass that all the Jews had ceased to sacrifice at all.

Again, a great part of the 'De Vita Contemplativa' is taken up by a description and denunciation of the extraordinary and scandalous luxury of the Italian banquets. Now we learn from Tacitus that this luxury came to an end when Vespasian invited the provincial families to Rome ('Ann.' lib. iii. cap. 55). Juvenal, who wrote under or after the Flavian dynasty, makes the niggardliness of entertainments a frequent theme for his satire, though he sometimes contrasts by way of emphasis the expense a rich glutton would be at for his own eating.

These indications of time support one another, and as we cannot suppose that had the war in Judaea been actually going

on, or only recently ceased, it would have escaped the notice of the writer, indicate some time before the commencement of that war as the latest date to which either book can be assigned.

Further, the writer of the books is a man well read in Greek literature, who is a Jew and not a Christian, and the books contain no allusion to the Messiah, or to any distinctly Christian doctrine. In particular, there is no allusion to any of the questions which originated in the teaching of Paul, e.g. to the lawfulness of Jews eating with Gentiles, or the necessity for circumcision.

Now when it is remembered that the writer is a Hellenizer who would evidently persuade his countrymen to follow his example in the zealous study of Greek literature, and to reconcile its teaching with that of their own sacred books by allegorical interpretations, it is certain that if the movement which originated in the teaching of Paul had taken place at the time he wrote, he would have felt much interested in it.

What view he might have taken of that movement we may not be able to say: whether he would have supported it, or have felt called on to defend himself from the charge, which would certainly have been made against him as a Hellenizer, of supporting it; but we may be certain that he would not have been able to pass by that movement in silence. The absence, therefore, in such a book as the 'De Vita Contemplativa' which deals especially with manners, of any reference to the Pauline movement, is strong evidence that the book was written before that movement originated, which will bring it to the age of Philo.

The notice of Egypt and Alexandria would lead further to the inference that that was the country of the author. But if it be conceded that the books are of the age of Philo, I do not suppose any one will care to dispute that their ascription to him is correct.

The writer gives a particular description of the mode of life of persons whom he calls Therapeutae, and Eusebius declares that there can be no doubt that the practices so described are the same as those which prevailed among Christians in his day. I do not dispute the accuracy of this identification, but it must be remembered that the doctrines held by the Therapeutae are not described with any exactness, though enough is said to show that they were not Christians, but Jews. There appears, therefore, no difficulty in supposing that the societies of Therapeutae, as

described in the 'De Vita Contemplativa,' existed in the time of Philo, being then composed of Jews; that they afterwards adopted the teaching of Paul and so became Christians, but that they continued their peculiar organisation and way of life, which thus found its way into the Christian Church.

I will now return to the question of the probability of the 'De Vita Contemplativa' being a forgery. Supposing the book to be genuine, it shows that a great mass of Christian customs which were currently supposed to have been instituted by the apostles were really much older, and must have come from some other source.

If the book be a forgery, it must have been the object of the forger to establish this conclusion. This is an object which I cannot attribute to any one in the first three centuries.

APPENDIX IV

VARIOUS QUOTATIONS AND RENDERINGS OF ISAIAH xlii. 1-4

ISAIAH xlii. 1-4, as quoted Matthew xii. 18-21:—

Ἰδοὺ, ὁ παῖς μου, ὃν ἡρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. Θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ. Οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κρινυῖται, οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. Κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεύξει, καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ὥς ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκας τὴν κρίσιν. Καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.¹

The same passage, as quoted Justin, 'Dial.' c. cxliii.:—

Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ἐκλεκτός μου, θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. Οὐκ ἐρίσει οὔτε κράξει, οὔτε ἀκούσεται τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ· κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεύξει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον· οὐ μὴ σβέσει, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει, κρίσιν ἀναλήψει, καὶ οὐ μὴ θραυσθήσεται ὥς ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἐλπιοῦσιν ἔθνη.

¹ The passage from Matthew is quoted according to Griesbach. Westcott and Hort omit the εἰς in the phrase εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν, and Tregelles has, instead of this phrase, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησεν.

The same passage, as quoted Justin, 'Dial.' c. cxlvi.:—

Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσδέξεται αὐτόν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. Δέδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. Οὐ κεκράζεται, οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ· κάλαμον τεθραυσμένον οὐ συντρίψει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ὥς ἂν νίκας ἐξοίσει, κρίσιν ἀναλήψει, καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσεται, ὥς ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἐλπιοῦσιν ἔθνη.

The same passage, according to the LXX:—

Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσδέξεται αὐτόν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, κρίσιν ταῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. Οὐ κεκράζεται, οὐδὲ ἀνήσει, οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ. Κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει, καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν. Ἀναλήψει, καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσεται ὥς ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

The Alexandrine codex reads κράζεται for κεκράζεται, and συντεθλασμένον for τεθλασμένον, and the fragments of Origen's 'Hexapla' disclose two other various readings, ὃν ἡρέτισεν for προσηδέξατο αὐτόν, and ἐν τῷ νόμῳ for ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι.

The same passage according to the revised English version: 'Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break and the smoking flax shall he not quench, he shall bring forth judgment in truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law.'

The same passage according to the version of Mr. Chayne: 'Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul is well pleased. I have put my spirit upon him, he shall cause the law to go forth to the nations. He shall not cry nor clamour, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A crushed (*lit.* crucked) reed he shall not break and a dimly burning wick he shall not quench, truthfully (*more lit.* 'according to the standard of truth') shall he cause the law to go forth. He shall not burn dimly, neither shall his spirit be crushed (*lit.* 'he shall not be dim nor be crucked') till he shall have set the law in the earth, and for his teaching the countries wait.'

According to Theodotion, as appears from the extant fragments of Origen's 'Hexapla,' the passage began, 'Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήφεται αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκλεκτός μου ὃν ἠδύκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, and it appears by the same authority that both Theodotion and Synmachus had *λίον ἀμαυρόν* instead of *λίον καπνιζόμενον*. Theodotion's rendering shows traces of the influence of the rendering of Matthew, or more probably of the source from which it was derived, but he cannot have followed that source at all closely as is shown in the rendering *λίον ἀμαυρόν* instead of *λίον τυφόμενον* in which Matthew and Justin agree. After writing the above, I came upon a careful study of the same passages in Dr. Hatch's 'Essays in Biblical Greek' (p. 199), to which I would refer those who wish to pursue the matter further.

APPENDIX V

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS,

BOOK III. CHAPTER XXXIX

Of the writings of Papias.

WRITINGS of Papias, five in number, are in circulation, which have been entitled 'of an exposition of Dominical Oracles' (*Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως*). Of these Irenaeus also makes mention as alone written by him, saying somewhat as follows:—

'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.'

So far Irenaeus; but Papias himself in the introduction to his discourses shows himself to have been by no means a pupil and eyewitness of the holy apostles, but tells us by the words which he says that he received the things pertaining to the faith from those who were well known to them:—

'But I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you with the interpretations, whatever things at any time I well learned from the elders and well remembered, having thoroughly established the truth concerning them. For I did not, as most men, take

pleasure in those who say most, but in those who teach what is true, nor in those who relate the commandments of another man, but in those who relate the commandments given by the Lord to the faith and coming from the truth itself. But if anywhere any one came who had been a follower of the elders, I used to search after the words of the elders. What Andrew? or what Peter said? (*εἶπεν*), or what Philip or what Thomas? or James? or what John? or Matthew? or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and the things which Aristion and John the elder, the disciples of the Lord, say (*λέγουσιν*). For I did not apprehend that things out of books profited me so much as what was said by the living and abiding voice.' Where also it is worthy to be noticed that he twice mentions the name of John, and the man of that name first mentioned he associates with Peter, James, and Matthew, and the rest of the apostles, clearly meaning the evangelist, but the other John he puts in a separate clause, and classes with others outside the number of the apostles, placing Aristion before him, and he clearly names him 'the elder.' So that through these things also is shown to be true the account of those who have said that there were two in Asia who bore the same name, and that there were two sepulchres in Ephesus and that each is still to this day called John's. To which things it is necessary to pay attention. For it is likely that the second, if one would not admit the first, beheld the revelation which is in circulation under the name of John. Papias also, of whom we are now speaking, acknowledges that he took the words of the apostles from those who had followed them, but says that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and John the elder. At least he frequently mentions them by name and places their traditions in his writings. And let not these things be said by us to no purpose.

It seems worth while, in addition to the before-quoted words of Papias, to touch upon other sayings of his in which he relates one extraordinary thing (*παράδοξον*) after another as having come to him from tradition.

That Philip the apostle stayed at Hierapolis with his daughters has been shown above, but that Papias, being contemporary with them, relates that he had received a wonderful statement from the daughters of Philip, must be now shown. He narrates the resurrection of a corpse having taken place in his time,

and again another extraordinary thing which happened about Justus who was surnamed Barsabas, as to his drinking a noxious drug and through the grace of God enduring no harm. And that this Justus after the ascension of the Saviour, the holy apostles both appointed with Matthias, and prayed over for the lot of filling up their number instead of the traitor Judas, the book of the Acts somewhat thus narrates:—

‘And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas who was surnamed Justus and Matthias, and they prayed and said—’

The same man has reported other things also as having come to him from unwritten tradition, both certain strange parables of the Saviour and teachings of his and some other things rather fabulous. Among which also he says that there will be, after the resurrection from the dead, a certain thousand years when the kingdom of Christ is corporally set up upon this earth. Which I believe he has imagined, having misconceived the apostolic narratives, not having understood the things said by them mystically in signs.

For he appears a man of exceedingly small understanding, to judge from his books, and yet he has become the cause of the like opinion with himself in very many who came after him of the ecclesiastical writers who have put forward the antiquity of the man, as, for instance, Irenaeus, and whoever else has declared that he thinks the same. And 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 be content to set forth a tradition in addition to those words of his before set out, which was set out about Mark who wrote the gospel, in these words.

‘And the elder said this. Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, as many things as he related either said or done by Christ, wrote correctly but not in order, for he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterwards, as I said, followed Peter who used to make his teaching according to the occasion, but not as making an orderly compilation of dominical oracles [or discourses] so that Mark erred in no respect in thus writing some things as he related them. For of one thing he took care, not to pass by any of those things which he heard or to falsify anything in them.’

These things then have been narrated by Papias about Mark, but about Matthew these things have been told.

Matthew compiled the oracles in the Hebrew language, but each interpreted them as he was able.

The same man has used testimonies from the first epistle of John and of Peter. And he has set forth also another narrative about a woman falsely accused to the Lord of many sins, which the gospel according to the Hebrews contains. And let these things be observed by us cursorily in addition to the things explained.

There can, I think, be no doubt that ‘falsely accused’ is in the absence of cause to the contrary the proper rendering of the Greek *δυσλειτουργος*, but certain writers have a strong desire to see in this passage an allusion to the story of the woman taken in adultery to be found in the common text of the fourth evangelist, and influenced by this desire they translate the word ‘accused’ simply without the ‘falsely.’ Had the story mentioned by Papias been the well-known story contained in the fourth gospel, it is not likely that Eusebius would have referred it to the gospel according to the Hebrews. The use of the word *δυσλειτουργος* shows that the story mentioned by Papias must have been of a different cast, perhaps modelled on that of Susanna.

Even if *δυσλειτουργος* without any controlling context could be properly translated by the word ‘accused’ simply, it would be a very hazardous conjecture that it was the well-known story of the woman taken in adultery which was alluded to, but Mr. Harmer has, on the faith of this conjecture, printed the story in the list of fragments of Papias, and, what is more, by printing it in larger type has indicated that the MSS. of the gospel which contain this story ought to be supposed to tell it in the words of Papias. This is very far-fetched. Even if it is the story mentioned by Papias, the language of the fourth gospel would more probably be founded on that of the gospel according to the Hebrews.

Drs. Westcott and Hort give the rendering ‘maliciously accused,’ hoping that this, without doing violence to the Greek, might be made applicable to the story in the fourth gospel, but the word ‘maliciously’ is no more applicable than the word ‘falsely.’

The object of the accusers was not to injure the woman but to lay a trap for Jesus.

To the other learned writers who have contended that this passage contains an allusion to the woman taken in adultery must be added the late Dr. Hatch. He does so very obliquely by taking it for granted that the passage is an allusion to the woman taken in adultery, and citing it as an instance of a post-classical use of the word *διαβάλλειν* as applicable to a true accusation. As he devotes an article to the ecclesiastical use of the words *διάβολος* and *διαβάλλω*, we may presume that he produces all the evidence that his great learning enabled him to lay hands on. We see then that he has only one case to bring forward of a post-classical use of *διαβάλλω* in Luke xvi. 1. 'There was a certain rich man which had a steward, and the same was accused (*διεβλήθη*) unto him that he was wasting his goods.' Dr. Hatch says that this accusation was presumably true, and hence that the meaning of slander would be inappropriate, but this is not so. There is nothing in the context to require that the original accusation was true; the steward was afterwards called unjust on account of what he did after he knew he was to be dismissed, not on account of what he had done before.

It must be further noticed that if the difficulty as to the meaning of *διαβάλλειν* is surmounted, there remains the further difficulty that the woman in the fourth gospel is accused of one, not of many sins.

APPENDIX VI

DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS

I HAVE assumed in the text the common date of the crucifixion of Jesus, that is A.D. 33. This date is not by any means established beyond controversy, but a very simple consideration determines a posterior limit for it which will prevent any question with regard to it materially prejudicing my argument. The crucifixion cannot have been later than the last passover which occurred while Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judaea, and the facts stated by Josephus enable us to fix this date in such a way that it cannot be put later than A.D. 36.

Upon this I think everybody is agreed, though Keim contends that the last passover of Pontius Pilate should be put one year earlier, that is in A.D. 35.

The common date of the crucifixion is that adopted by Eusebius, who based his determination upon the statement in the third chapter of Luke, 'Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea . . . in the time of high priest (*ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως*) Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias' (Eusebius, 'H. E.' lib. i. c. x.). There are several remarks to make upon this passage before considering how it is treated by Eusebius. The first is that it relates to the teaching of John, and only bears upon the period of the teaching of Jesus in that it is stated in all the gospels that Jesus began to teach during the teaching of John. The second remark is that, as applied to the teaching of John, the passage appears to present an inconsistency. The first part appears to fix a point of time for the commencement of that teaching, while the last part appears to indicate an extended period during which that teaching took place, and this difficulty does not vanish when the matter is looked into more closely, for we find from Josephus ('Antiquities,' xviii. cap. ii. 1) that Annas was appointed high priest by Quirinius at the conclusion of the census which was made in the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium, i.e. A.D. 6, and removed by Valerius Gratus some time in the first nine years of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 14 to A.D. 23, and that after an interval of between two and three years, during which three different persons (Ismael, Eleazer, and Simon) were successively appointed and removed from being high priests, the same procurator appointed Caiaphas high priest who continued to hold the office all the rest of the time Gratus was procurator, and all the time his successor Pontius Pilate was procurator, after which he was removed by Vitellius, according to most authorities in A.D. 37, but according to Keim in A.D. 36. We thus see that Annas and Caiaphas were successively high priests for a period of thirty years or upwards, including the interval of from two to three years during which Ismael, Eleazer, and Simon held the office. It further appears from Josephus that Gratus was appointed procurator not long after the accession of Tiberius, and held the office for eleven years. The appointment of Caiaphas therefore cannot be put later than the

eleventh or by bare possibility the beginning of the twelfth year of Tiberius. These considerations show that the statement of Luke is inconsistent with itself. If John began to teach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, he did not begin until at least six years after Annas had ceased to be high priest; and if John taught while Annas was high priest, he must have been teaching for at least six years before the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

The passage in Luke being thus difficult, the interpretation put upon it by Eusebius is still more difficult to follow. He appears to have taken it as applying directly to the teaching of Jesus, and to mean that his teaching comprised the interval between the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas. This interval, from the passage in Josephus I have referred to which Eusebius quotes, he makes out to have been something less than four years. How this can be does not appear. Josephus says that Ismael was deprived not long after (*μετ' οὐ πολὺ*) his appointment, and that Eleazer and Simon each held office a year, from which it would seem to follow that the three together must have been in office from two to three years. Of course by taking in part of the terms of office of Annas and Caiaphas it is easy to make four years or any time you please up to thirty years. But it is impossible in this way to get any determinate term. The only way I can at all follow the reasoning of Eusebius is by supposing that he means that he forms the conclusion upon the construction of the gospels that Jesus taught for something less than four years, and intends to show that this is consistent with his having taught under Annas and Caiaphas and for the interval between them, but this is not what Eusebius appears to say. However this may be, if four years for the duration of the ministry of Jesus are added to the fifteenth year of Tiberius we get the nineteenth year of Tiberius or A.D. 33 as the year of his death. The grounds of this determination are altogether untrustworthy, but though this is so the date itself is probably not very far wrong.

As a posterior limit to the date can be determined from our knowledge concerning the date of the removal of Pilate, so an anterior limit is fixed by the date of his appointment which Josephus tells us was ten years earlier. This would make the earliest possible date the passover of A.D. 26. The considerations available for determining the date within these limits are these.

All the gospels are agreed that Jesus was not crucified until after the execution of John the Baptist, an event which is mentioned by Josephus and of which the date can be approximately determined. Josephus tells us that John was executed by the orders of Herod, who feared he might raise a rebellion, and that the Jews thought a defeat suffered by an army of Herod's in a war against Aretas, King of Arabia Petrea, was a judgment of God in consequence. It is a probable inference that the defeat was not long after the execution of John, and moreover, Josephus tells us that John was executed at Macherus which just before the outbreak of the war he says was tributary to Aretas. We must therefore suppose that Herod had acquired the fortress during the hostilities, and that therefore John was not put to death until after the outbreak of the war. We thus get the execution of John fixed as having taken place after the outbreak of the war and before the defeat of Herod's army. Josephus begins his account of the war by stating that about this time or in this interval (*ἐν τούτῳ*) Aretas, the King of Arabia Petrea, and Herod had a quarrel. In the preceding section he had mentioned that Philip, Herod's brother, died in the twentieth year of Tiberius (August 19, A.D. 33 to August 19, A.D. 34). The war therefore must have begun about this date. Josephus also tells us that after the defeat Herod wrote and complained to Tiberius who ordered Vitellius, the President of Syria, to make war on Aretas, and that Vitellius in consequence collected an army which he was leading against Aretas when he was interrupted by the news of the death of Tiberius. As Tiberius died on March 16, A.D. 37, it follows that the defeat of Herod's army could not have been later than some time in A.D. 36. We thus fix the execution of John as taking place some time between the years A.D. 33 and A.D. 36. As we have already shown that the passover of A.D. 36 is the latest possible date for the crucifixion of Jesus, we are thus enabled to fix the passover of A.D. 33 as the earliest possible date. It appears improbable that the crucifixion of Jesus took place so late as A.D. 36, for in that event it would have been but a few months before the removal of Pilate, and it seems probable that his removal would have formed part of the traditions recorded in the gospels and would most likely have been looked upon by the primitive Christians as a judgment upon him. As this is not so, it would appear improbable that

the crucifixion was later than the passover of A.D. 35. Josephus mentions that the cause of the war between Herod and Aretas was the slight put by Herod upon his wife, the daughter of Aretas, in putting her away in order to marry Herodias, and he also says that Herod engaged to marry Herodias when he was setting out on a visit to Rome on some business, the nature of which he does not disclose. This intrigue was not discovered by Herod's wife until he returned from Rome, when she fled to her father and the war broke out. Now Keim with considerable probability conjectures that the business which took Herod to Rome, was to try and obtain from Tiberius the tetrarchy rendered vacant by the death of his brother Philip. If that is so, the duration of the journey of Herod to Rome, of his stay there and of his return, must be interposed between the death of Philip which cannot have been earlier than the latter part of A.D. 33 and the outbreak of the war. This would probably throw that event after the passover of A.D. 34, and so bring us to the passover of A.D. 35 as the date of the crucifixion of Jesus. This is a probable, but by no means a certain, conclusion, which is maintained by Keim.

Attempts have been made to determine the date of the crucifixion by astronomical computations. It is assumed that the tradition of the Church may be relied on that it took place on a Friday, and on a Friday which was the day after the day on which the passover was eaten. Now the passover was eaten on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, and the problem therefore is to determine on which of the possible years of the crucifixion the fifteenth day of the month Nisan fell on a Friday. The Jewish months are said to have commenced on the evening on which the new moon was first visible, and the month Nisan to be the month the moon of which came to the full first after the vernal equinox. Astronomers are able to calculate the day of the week upon which the moon which came to the full first after the vernal equinox in any year would, upon the supposition that the sky was clear, be first visible in Jerusalem, and several astronomers have made such calculations, and a table of the results may be found in Dr. Salmon's 'Introduction to the New Testament' (p. 274, 4th edition). Though no doubt as a matter of computation this table may be absolutely relied on, there are several sources of doubt in applying it to the determination of

the matter at issue. One is whether we have any warrant for supposing that the Jewish priests, who were not remarkable for being good astronomers, determined the vernal equinox correctly. Another doubt is as to whether the theory of fixing the commencement of the month by actual observation of the moon was adhered to. Keim ('Jesus of Nazara,' vi. 212) says it was but various authorities cited in the article 'Chronology' in the ninth edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (p. 714) appear to state that the Jews at the time of the Christian era made use of a cycle. Now as a lunation does not consist of an exact number of days, any cycle must proceed upon some system by which the deficiency of one month would be compensated by the excess of another, and this could scarcely be so adjusted that every month should begin on the precise day the new moon was first visible. If on the other hand the beginning of the month was determined in each case by observation, it must have been often delayed by the state of the weather.

There are other differences as to what the Jewish customs actually were. For instance, whether they reckoned the first day of the month as beginning with the evening on which the new moon appeared or at the preceding midnight, and as to whether they ate the passover on the evening which formed the end, or the evening which formed the beginning, of the fourteenth day of the month.

The better opinion would seem to be that the day began in the evening, and that the passover was eaten on the evening which formed the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth day of the month. Taking this to be so, if Jesus was crucified on a Friday, the passover must have been eaten as we should say the Thursday previous, which would be the fourteenth day of the month. The moon therefore must have been first visible, weather permitting, as we should say on a Thursday evening. Applying this to Dr. Salmon's table we see that in the year A.D. 34 there were two moons, either of which might have been the paschal moon; one the new moon of March 9, the other the new moon of April 7. The first might have been visible on Wednesday, March 10, and the second on Thursday, April 8, or perhaps not till Friday, April 9. This latter moon is the only moon in the table which would, weather permitting, have become first visible on a Thursday, and if it were necessary

that this condition should be fulfilled, April 23, A.D. 34, would be fixed as the date of the crucifixion, but the state of the weather might easily lead to the moon not being seen for a night or two. The moon which is marked on the table as first becoming visible on Wednesday, March 10, would therefore do as well, and so I think would the moon which is marked as becoming visible on Tuesday, March 20, A.D. 35.

When the moon is marked as not becoming visible till after Thursday, the case is different; the state of the weather could not lead to its being observed earlier. A.D. 33, when the moon would not be seen till Friday or Saturday, and A.D. 36, when the moon could not be seen till Sunday, would therefore be excluded.

The conclusions to be drawn from these astronomical considerations, whatever they may be worth, would therefore point to A.D. 34 or A.D. 35 as the year of the crucifixion.

So far as astronomical considerations go, the years A.D. 28 and A.D. 31 stand in nearly the same position as the year A.D. 35, though on other grounds they are excluded.

APPENDIX VII

EXTRACT FROM GEORGE HAMARTOLUS AND NOTE FROM THE
CODÆX BAROCCIANUS AS TO THE MARTYRDOM OF JOHN

THE entire passage from George Hamartolus is quoted in the following words by Mr. Harmer in the abridged edition of Lightfoot's 'Apostolic Fathers':—

Μετά δὲ Δομιτιανῶν Ἐπιστάτου Νερῆος ἔτος ἐπὶ ὃς ἀποκαταστάμενος Ἰωάννης ἐκ τῆς κήσου ἀπέλκεται αἰεὶς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. μῆτις τότε περιῶν τῷ βίῳ ἐκ τῶν δωδεκῶ μαθητῶν καὶ συγχρημάμενος τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον μαρτυρίου καταξίωται. Πάπας γὰρ ὁ Ἱεροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, αὐτίστης τοῦτον, γενόμενος, ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων φησὶ, ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀγχοῦθη· πληρώσας δευδμή μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ περί αὐτῶν πρὸς ῥῆσιν καὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ὁμολογίαν περὶ ταύτων καὶ συλασάμενος· εἰπὼν γὰρ ὁ Κέρνιος πρὸς αὐτοὺς· Δύνασθε πιστεῖν τὸ πατήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πιστῶ· καὶ κατανεύσαντων προδόμενος καὶ συνδεμένῳ· Τὸ πατήριον μου, φησὶν, πισθε,

καὶ τὰ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίσουμαι βαπτισθήσασθε. καὶ εὐκόςως, ἀδυνατοῦ γὰρ Θεοῦ ψεύσασθαι. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ πολυμαθὴς Ὁριγένης ἐν τῇ κατὰ Μιχαῖλον ἐρμηνείᾳ διαβεβαιῶνται, ὡς ὅτι μεμνητὴρ Ἰωάννης, ἐκ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπασημανόμενος ταῦτο μεμαθήκεναι. καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ὁ πολυτίτωρ Ἐνσέβιος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἱστορίᾳ φησὶ· Οὐρανὸν μὲν τὴν Παρθίαν εἶληκεν, Ἰωάννης δὲ τὴν Ἀσίαν, πρὸς οὗς καὶ διατρίψας ἐτελεύτησεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

It will be noticed that a full stop is placed after *καταξίωται*, thus making the quotation of Papias continue indefinitely down to *βαπτισθήσασθε* or further. Whether this is Mr. Harmer's own punctuation or that of Nolte, from whom he takes the extract, and again if the punctuation be that of Nolte, whether it is found in the MS. or supplied by him, I do not know; but, however this may be, I think it is clearly erroneous. The statement of Papias is a parenthesis and ends with *ἀντηρόθυμῳ*. Removing this full stop I render the passage as follows:—

After Domitian Nerva reigned one year and he recalled John from the island and set him free to dwell in Ephesus. Being then the only one surviving out of the twelve apostles, and having written the gospel ascribed to him, he was thought worthy of martyrdom for Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis, who was an eye-witness of him, says, in the second book of the Dominical Oracles, that he was killed by the Jews, having fulfilled certainly with his brother the prophecy of Christ about them, and their own compact and agreement about it. For the Lord having said to them, "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink?" and they having eagerly assented and agreed, "My cup," he says, "ye shall drink, and with the baptism that I am baptised with shall ye be baptised." And it was as was to be expected, for it is impossible that God should lie. But so also the very learned Origen, in his commentary upon Matthew, maintains strongly, having subscribed that he had learned this from the successors of the Apostles that John was a martyr; and indeed Eusebius also, the great scholar, says in his ecclesiastical history that Thomas was allotted Parthia but John Asia, where, having spent his days, he came to an end at Ephesus.

The note from the codex Baroccianus is given by Mr. Harmer in the same work in the following words:—

Πάπας Ἱεροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἀκουστής τοῦ ἐσολόγου Ἰωάννου γενόμενος, Πεδυκάριον δὲ ἐταῖρος, πέντε λόγους κυριακῶν λόγων

ἔγραψεν, ἐν οἷς ἀπὸ ἀριθμῶν ἀποστόλων ποιούμενος μετὰ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, Φιλίππου καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Μαθθαίου εἰς μαθητῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνέγραψεν Ἀριστιῶνι καὶ Ἰωάννῃ ἑτερον ὃν καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἐκάλει. ὥς τις οἶσθαι, ὅτι [ins. τούτου] τοῦ Ἰωάννου εἰσὶν αἱ δύο ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ μικραὶ καὶ καθολικαί, αἱ ἐξ ὀνόματος Ἰωάννου φερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀρχαίους τὴν πρώτην μόνην ἐγκρίνειν· τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τούτου πλανηθέντες ἐνόμισαν. καὶ Πάπιας δὲ περὶ τὴν χιλιονταετηρίδα σφύλλεται, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος. Πάπιας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῆρέθησαν. Πάπιας ὁ εἰρημνέας ἰστορήσεν ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου, ὅτι Βαρσαβᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰούστος δοκιμαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων ἰὼν ἐχίδνης πῶν ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθὴς διεφυλάχθη. ἰσταρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μήτερα Μανυῖμον τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν· περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων, ὅτι ἔως Ἀδριανῷ ἔξω.

I think Mr. Harmer or his authority is in error in putting a full stop after ἐκάλει, and in supposing the words that follow to be in the oblique narration and consequently the words of Papias. The construction is ὡς with the infinitive introducing a consequence. The punctuation and construction adopted by Mr. Harmer leads to the absurdity that Papias is made to have speculated as to the authority of the two short epistles ascribed to John, and to have considered that they were the work of the John he was acquainted with, and not of the apostle, because the primitive fathers only accepted the first epistle. Who can these primitive fathers have been from whose conduct Papias drew this inference? They cannot have been the elders from whom he collected his traditions, or he would have asked them the question point blank and been able to narrate their answer. The opinion is evidently that of a much later writer than Papias; probably Jerome was the originator of it (see passage referred to in the text).¹ The silence of Eusebius in this case is of weight. He expressly mentions that Papias used the first epistle of John. If Papias had noticed the two other epistles he would also have mentioned it.

I add a translation of the entire passage:—‘Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who had been a hearer of John the Divine and a

¹ Ante, p. 37.

companion of Polycarp, wrote five books of Dominical oracles, in which, making an enumeration of the apostles, after Peter and John, Philip and Thomas and Matthew, he recorded as disciples of the Lord Aristion and another John whom he also called elder, so that some think that the two short catholic epistles which are in circulation under the name of John are the works of this John, because the ancients accept the first only. But some erroneously considered the Apocalypse also the work of this John. And Papias also is mistaken about the millennium, and, following him, Irenaeus. Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews. The aforesaid Papias has narrated as having received it from the daughters of Philip that Barsabas, who is also called Justus, being tested by the unbelievers, drinking the poison of a viper in the name of the Christ, was preserved harmless. But he narrates also other wonders, and especially that concerning the mother of Manahem, who was raised from the dead. About those raised from the dead by the Christ that they lived until Hadrian. . . .

APPENDIX VIII

EXTRACTS FROM ANASTASIVS OF SINAI

Anastasius Sinaita, Contempl. Anagog. in Hexaem. i.

SED quoniam earum quas subiecinus dubitationum exitum non invenimus, et in eis plane perplexi sumus, et omnino haesitantes, freti ore sancti spiritus: Pauli, inquam, lingua, quae dicit quod quaecumque sunt in lege, prius scripta sunt in figuram Christi et ipsius ecclesiae: accepta, si vere dicere oportet, occasione ex Papia viro clarissimo Hierapolitano, qui dixit in Epistothio Clemente, et Pantuano Alexandrino sacerdote, et Ammonio sapientissimo, interpretibus veterum et primorum conventionem, qui totum Hexaemeron intellexerunt de Christo et Ecclesia, post vere sensilem secundum litteram creationem, extra ullam dubitationem sensum speculantes Ecclesiae, pro qua universus est nostri certaminis scopus, ad hoc opus descendimus. (Migne, ‘P. G.’ lxxxix. p. 860).

Anastasius Sinaita in ‘Hexaemeron’ vii.:—

Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀρχαιότεροι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐξηγητῶν, λέγων δὲ Φίλων ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀμύχρονος καὶ Πάπιας ὁ πολὺς ὁ

Ἰωάννου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ φοιτητῆς ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης Κλήμησις τε ὁ Λουγδουνηὺς καὶ Ἰουστίνος ὁ μάρτυς καὶ φιλόσοφος Πανταίετος (lego Πάνταινός) τε ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄμφ' αὐτοὺς, πνευματικῶς τὰ περὶ παραδείσου ἐθεωρήθησαν (forte ἐθεώρησαν) εἰς τὴν Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ἀναφερόμενοι. Ἐξ ὧν εἰσιν καὶ οἱ περὶ πάντα πάνσοφοι δύο Καππαδόκαι Γρηγόριοι. Ἄπαντες οὗτοι ἐξ αἰτίων τοιῶνδε φάσκοντες εἶναι καὶ πνευματικῶν τινα παρῖδεισιν.

Primum, quod si Adam non erat interitui obnoxius quando factus est, perspicuum quod non fuit particeps alimenti terrestris et in quod cadit interitus. Quod si poterat esse particeps ciborum sensilium, est etiam perspicuum quod in eum cadit interitus (quidquid enim intrat per os rursus excernitur). Si autem in eum cadebat interitus, omnino erat etiam mortalis; si autem creatus est mortalis, non utique facta est mors per inobedientiam: atque haec quidem est prima causa interpretum (Migne, 'P. G.' lxxxix. p. 961). Lightfoot, 'A. F.', abridged ed. p. 521.

APPENDIX IX

NOTICE OF PAPIAS BY JOHN MALALAS

Ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκθέσεως Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχείως τῆς περὶ χρόνων καὶ κτίσεως κόσμου ποιηθείσης, ὡς φησιν, ἀπὸ βιβλίων Μωσέως, Ἀφρικανού, Εὐσεβίου, Παππίου καὶ Διδύμου, καὶ ἐτέρων.

Πρώτος ἐκ γῆς ἄνθρωπος πλαυθεὶς ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ εἶχε μέτρον ἡλικίας ποδῶν 5' μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς, κ.τ.λ.—Cramer, 'Anecdota Graecae codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis,' vol. ii. p. 379.

APPENDIX X

EXTRACTS FROM DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE AND MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

Ἄλλοι δὲ, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐπὶ προσύλους ἐννοίας ἀποκλιθέντες, εἰρήκασιν ὁμοειδῆ τοῦ τῆδε βίου τὴν τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἐπηγγελμένην ἀγωνίαν καὶ μακαριωτάτην λῆξιν, καὶ τροφὴς οἰκείας ἀλλοιωτῶς βίβ' τοῖς ἱσαγγέλτοις ἀθεμίτως ἀπέρμψαν. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἀποπεσεῖται τίς ποτε

τῶν ἱερωτάτων ἀνδρῶν εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας πλάνησις.—Dionysius Areopagus, 'De Eccl. Hierarch.' cap. vii. (Migne, 'P. G.' iii. 553).

Ταῦτά φησὶν αἰνιττόμενος, οἶμαι, Παππὶν τὸν Ἱεραπόλεως τῆς κατ' Ἀσίαν τότε γενομένου ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ συνακράσαντα τῷ Θεῷ εὐαγγελιστῇ Ἰωάννῃ. Οὗτος γάρ ὁ Παπίας ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ αὐτοῦ βιβλίῳ τῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεων τὰς διὰ βιωμάτων εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἀνιστάσει ἀπολαύσεις· εἰς ὅπερ δόγμα μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπίστευσεν Ἀπολλινάριος, [καθὼς ἐμφαίνεται ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι αὐτοῦ] ὁ καλοῦσι τινες χιλωνταετηρίδα. Πῶς οὖν Ἀπολλινάριον τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου συγγράμματα κατὰ τοὺς τιτῶν λήρους τὰ ἀναφύοντα Ἀπολλινάριον· καὶ Εἰρηναῖος δὲ ὁ Λουγδύνην ἐν τῷ Κατὰ αἰρέσεων πέμπτῳ λόγῳ τὸ αὐτὸ φησι καὶ παρῖγει μάρτυρα τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰρημέσων τὸν λεχθέντα Παππῖν.—Maximus Confessor, Scholium on the above passage (Migne, 'P. G.' iv. 176).

Maximi Scholia in Lib. de Caelesti Hierarchia:—

Σὺ δὲ, ὦ παῖ· Πῶς παῖδα καλεῖ τὸν θεῖον Τιμόθεον ὁ Μέγας Διονύσιος ζητητέον· ἡ γὰρ ὡς οἶμαι ἅτε πρωτεβηκῶς αὐτὸν ταῖς ἔτεσι, ταῦτό φησι καὶ τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ προέχων ὡς καὶ πρωεπτάσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ, καθὰ δηλοῖ τὰ μετὰ χείρας συγγράμματα· καὶ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ θεῖου Διονυσίου ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἁγίος Τιμόθεος, ὡς αἱ ἱεράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων δηλοῦσιν, ἀλλ' αὖν τὴν ἐξω παιδείαν ἰκανώτερος ἢ ὁ μέγας Διονύσιος· ἡ παῖδα καλεῖ αὐτὸν, ὡς μιμούμενος τὸν Κύριον λέγοντα· Παιδί μὴ τι προσφάγων ἔχετε· ἡ ἐπειδὴ τοὺς κατὰ Θεὸν ἀκακίαν ἀσκούοντας παῖδας ἐκάλουν, ὡς καὶ Παπίας δηλοῖ βιβλίῳ πρώτῳ τῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεων καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐν τῷ Παιδαγωγῷ (Migne, 'P. G.' iv. 48).

APPENDIX XI

DATE OF THE MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP

Irenaeus describes Papias as the hearer of John, but the companion of Polycarp. Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπῳ δὲ ἐταῖρος. This would seem to imply that in the opinion of Irenaeus Polycarp and Papias were, if not men of about the same age, at all events men of the same generation, and it makes the age of Polycarp, if ascertainable, some index to that of Papias. Irenaeus gives several particulars about Polycarp, but no precise dates: that he was taught by apostles; that he had lived among many who had seen the Christ; that he was appointed by

apostles, bishop in the church in Smyrna; that he lived to a very great age; that he paid a visit to Rome when Anicetus was bishop, and was there at Easter; that he suffered a glorious martyrdom. The three first of these statements would probably be derived from the statements of Polycarp himself, and must be taken with caution as the statements of a man magnifying his own position, and more especially as the statements of an old man magnifying the transactions of his youth. Care must also be given to the sense in which he may have used the words apostle and bishop. The former word has come to be the designation of thirteen, or say fourteen men, and as applied to these men it is not used univocally. Twelve men, though there is some doubt about the precise individuals, are said to have been appointed by Jesus to the office in his lifetime; one is said to have been formally elected by the remaining eleven apostles in the place of Judas Iscariot, and Paul laid claim to the office on subjective grounds, which the church has finally admitted. Besides Paul, Barnabas is sometimes styled an apostle, and it is probable that others among the original preachers of Christianity were so styled in their own time. Probably the apostles who taught Polycarp and appointed him bishop, were John the elder and Aristion. We must also remember that the word bishop, in early times, did not mean an officer who exercised the sole authority, but one of a body of men. The appointment to the office of bishop in the days of Polycarp would, therefore, amount to no more than ordination does among us. We see, therefore, that these statements merely involve that Polycarp attained the age of three- or four-and-twenty before the end of the first century. For him to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, as stated by Eusebius, he must have lived to be eighty-four or eighty-five years old. Dr. Lightfoot, after an exhaustive examination of the authorities, places the accession of Anicetus to the see of Rome at from A.D. 153 to A.D. 155.¹ Polycarp would, therefore, have been at least seventy-six or seventy-seven, or more probably a year or two older, at the time of his visit. These dates are all possible, though they make rather extreme suppositions. Thus we have to suppose that Aristion, as well as John the elder, lived to extreme old age,

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. 343.

that when very old he and John the elder took part in the ordination of Polycarp at an age which must be considered young, and that Polycarp, when seventy-six or upwards, took a journey from Smyrna to Rome. It is not improbable that the age at which Polycarp took this journey ought to be increased a year or two. Dr. Lightfoot, whose computation of the date of Anicetus has been taken, held that the martyrdom of Polycarp took place in the February of A.D. 155. He was, therefore, under strong inducements to place the accession of Anicetus at a time which would render this date possible; he has accordingly taken the duration of the episcopate of Eleutherus¹ at fifteen years, in accordance with the chronicle of Eusebius, which we have only in versions, rather than at thirteen years, in accordance with the 'Ecclesiastical History.' If the shorter period be adopted, Anicetus would not succeed before A.D. 155 at the earliest, and as the visit of Polycarp to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, is the best attested fact we have about him, his martyrdom at Smyrna in February 155 would become impossible.

Polycarp is stated by Eusebius ('H. E.' iv. 14, 15) to have suffered martyrdom during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (7 March 161 to 17 March 180). M. Waddington has propounded an earlier date, A.D. 155. The grounds upon which this date is founded are as follows: there is extant a letter purporting to be written by the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philomelium giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp. It is stated at the end of this letter that Polycarp was martyred in the consulship of Statius Quadratus. There are also extant certain orations of one Aelius Aristides, a rhetorician, written in praise of Aesculapius. By piecing together notices contained in these orations M. Waddington² was able to determine that Statius Quadratus was proconsul of Asia in the year A.D. 155, or a year or two before or after. This determination has been accepted by many critics, and I do not propose to take any exception to it, but its application to the determination of the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp depends upon the statement in the letter purporting to come from the Church of Smyrna, that Polycarp

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. 326.

² While correcting the proofs I read with regret of the death of this distinguished statesman and scholar.

was martyred in the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus. This letter purports to be written by eye-witnesses; if, therefore, it is genuine, there can be no ground to question any statement of that character contained in it. But the genuineness of the letter has been questioned by many critics on different grounds.

Some MSS. which contain this letter, contain also a life of Polycarp; this life is acknowledged to be altogether unauthentic. It is full of foolish miracles, of which the following is a specimen. Polycarp being the slave of a lady, notwithstanding his youth she gives him the charge of her property while she goes on a journey; while she is away he steals all the contents of her stores and gives them to the poor. When his mistress returns, the other servants, who are jealous of Polycarp, hasten to tell her. Polycarp, thereupon, beseeches the Lord who immediately refills the stores.

This life is anonymous, but the letter has annexed to it a sort of postscript, which purports to be written by one, Pionius, and it has been inferred, with considerable probability, that the same person was the author of the life. Dr. Lightfoot considered that the life, as we now have it, is incomplete, and that in its completed state it embodied the letter. The question at once presents itself whether the letter itself may not be the work of the author of the life. If so, it may be presumed that, like the life, it is altogether a fiction. In this aspect the date of the life becomes material. It was certainly known and treated as authentic by Macarius Magnes,¹ about the end of the fourth century, who cites incidents from it including the miracle we have noticed. Eusebius was acquainted with the letter, and borrowed largely from it in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' but he does not make any notice of the life. An argument might perhaps be based upon this, that the life was not then in existence, but it appears that Eusebius quoted the letter from a book containing accounts of martyrdoms, for he proceeds immediately afterwards to quote accounts of other martyrdoms from the same source. (Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ γραφῇ καὶ ἄλλα μαρτύρια συνήπτο κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν Σμύρναν πεπραγμένα ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν περίοδον τοῦ χρόνου τῆς τοῦ Πολυκάρπου μαρτύριος μεθ' ὧν καὶ Μητροδωρὸς τῆς κατὰ Μαρκίωνα πλάνης πρεσβύτερος, κ. τ. λ.)

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii., 1885, p. 1012; *ibid.* vol. i. p. 545.

The martyrdom of this Metrodorus and of the others which follow are not related in the letter of the Smyrneans, but are now extant in a separate document. The authority followed by Eusebius would therefore appear to have been some treatise on martyrdoms compiled from various sources, and the writer of such a treatise, finding the letter of the Smyrneans in the life of Polycarp, might not improbably extract it nearly verbatim without noticing the rest of the life.

It would appear therefore that no inference can be drawn as to the non-existence of the life from Eusebius not mentioning it. Apart from the silence of Eusebius there is nothing but internal evidence as to the date of the life, which consists of nothing else but the state of doctrinal controversy disclosed by it. The writer intended to make use of the name of Polycarp to support the doctrines to which he was attached, and for this purpose put into his mouth a tolerably complete creed; when this creed is looked at, it is seen to be very precise in condemning the Montanists, but to be altogether silent upon the Arian controversy. This leads to the assumption that the life was written at some time when the church was much troubled by the Montanist heresy, but before the Arian controversy had arisen, that is to say, certainly some time before the year A.D. 319, but probably we may say some time in the third century. Dr. Lightfoot has attempted to fix a later date for this life. His argument is as follows:—

'But when did this false Pionius live? He interests himself in the Quartodeciman controversy, and he represents St. Paul (§ 2) as teaching two things respecting the celebration of Easter: (1) That it must be kept during the feast of unleavened bread and not outside this season as is done by the heretics, especially the Phrygians; and (2) That it need not of necessity be held on the fourteenth day. The second point is a protest against the Quartodecimans. As Polycarp himself was well known to have been a Quartodeciman, this statement could hardly have been made till the earlier history of the Quartodeciman controversy had passed out of memory. The first injunction has reference to certain Montanists and others in the fourth and fifth centuries who like the former disregarded the day of the week, but unlike them put aside the Jewish lunar reckoning and adopted the Roman Calendar instead, celebrating the passion on a fixed day in March or April which they supposed to have been

the actual day of the crucifixion, though differing among themselves in their calculations (Epiphanius, *Haer.* i. i., Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. 18, Anon. *Serm.* in Pasch. 7 in Chrysost. *Op.* viii. 2, p. 276; see Duchesne, p. 10). This points to a time not earlier than the middle of the fourth century, and no notice in the work suggests a prior date.

'It may seem strange perhaps that an author writing after the great Christological disputes of the fourth and succeeding centuries had begun should not indicate his views on the points of dispute, but they had no reference to the subject before him, and apparently he took no special interest in them.'

No weight can be given to the argument drawn from the opposition shown by the writer of the *Life* to the Quartodeciman heresy. He shows a consciousness of the real opinions of Polycarp, and that they were well known, by putting the arguments against it into the mouth of Paul, not of Polycarp. In fact Paul seems to be mentioned for no other purpose. It is in fact an ingenious device to make a panegyric upon Polycarp the vehicle for an attack upon a doctrine of which he was known to have been a principal supporter.

The argument drawn from the Montanist variation of the doctrine is only valid upon the assumption that this doctrine can be shown not to have existed before the fourth century. Now the references given by Dr. Lightfoot do not at all bear this out. It may be that this particular heresy is not mentioned by any writer earlier than Epiphanius who wrote in the latter half of the fourth century. But this does not by any means show that the doctrine itself is not a century older. There is nothing in Epiphanius to suggest that the heresy he is describing was then new; on the contrary he describes it as a variation of the Quartodeciman heresy among the heresies of the second century, the next heresy he mentions being that of the Alogi which he expressly states to have sprung up after it.² But apart from this there is no reasonable ground upon which it can be urged that the doctrine did not arise until just before Epiphanius described it. The Montanists had then existed as a sect for two centuries,

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 1885, p. 1011.

² Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.* lib. ii. tom. i.; *Haer.* li. Migne, *P. G.* xli. 888.

and we know that their doctrines had become crystallised long before his time. Epiphanius twits them with it. 'How,' he says, 'is it that after Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla you no longer have prophets?' and again, repeating the words of Maximilla, 'After me there will be no longer a prophetess.'¹ It would seem probable therefore that the practice of observing Easter according to a fixed day of the calendar month was a part of the original Montanist doctrine. In the *'Philosophumena'* (book viii. chap. xii.), a work of the early part of the third century, the Montanists are said to introduce novelties of fasts and feasts which would seem to be an allusion to this practice. I do not know any other such novelty attributed to them. It must be noticed that as the *Life* was written before the end of the fourth century, if not written before the Arian controversy began, it must have been written in the height of that controversy. It is improbable that the writer would be so unmoved by this controversy, which convulsed the world around him, that no trace of it can be seen in his book, while he troubles himself to forgo arguments against the then obscure sect of the Montanists. It is far more probable that he wrote during the third century when the Montanist movement still troubled the Church.

It must be noticed that the date of the *Life* is only material upon the supposition that Dr. Lightfoot and others are right in concluding that the author of the *Life* is the same as the author of the postscript to the letter which I will now proceed to quote in the translation of Dr. Lightfoot.

'This account Gaius copied from the papers of Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp. The same also lived with Irenaeus.

'And I Socrates wrote it down in Corinth from the copy of Gaius. Grace be with all men.

'And I Pionius again wrote it down from the afore-mentioned copy, having searched it out (for the blessed Polycarp showed me in a revelation as I will declare in the sequel), gathering it together where it was well-nigh worn by age, that the Lord Jesus Christ may gather me also with His elect into His heavenly kingdom: to whom be the glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit for ever and ever, Amen.'²

¹ *Adv. Haer.* lib. ii. tom. i.; *Haer.* xlvii. Migne, *P. G.* xli. 857.

² *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 1066.

It is not, I think, possible to contend that this statement is true. Dr. Lightfoot does not do so.¹ What he contends is that it is as it purports to be—the work of a writer different from the writer or writers of the letter to which it is appended. But the question arises, Why should anyone append such a memorandum to a genuine letter? If we suppose the letter to have been forged by the same person who wrote the postscript, the object is obvious—he wished to remove an objection which he felt would be raised to the reception of his forgery. People would say, he thought, How was it we knew nothing about this letter before? How does it now appear for the first time? And if, as Dr. Lightfoot supposes, the letter was inserted bodily in a life of Polycarp, the further question would be asked, How did the author get hold of it? The statements in the postscript are culminated to remove these difficulties; it is difficult to see for what other purpose they can have been intended. It would be ridiculous to append such statements to a letter already in circulation. Why, it would be asked, should the ghost of Polycarp appear to Pionius to show him a worn and tattered copy of a document which he could have got in good condition from any bookseller, and (on Dr. Lightfoot's hypothesis as to dates) have read nearly verbatim in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius? It would appear, therefore, to follow from the mere consideration of the postscript that the letter is a forgery.

The letter itself contains much to strengthen this conclusion. It contains many miracles. Thus, three days before his apprehension, Polycarp while praying fell into a trance and saw his pillow burning with fire, and he turned and said unto those that were with him, 'It must needs be that I shall be burned alive.'² Again, as he entered the stadium, a voice came to him from heaven, 'Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man.'³ The actual martyrdom is told in the following words: 'When he (Polycarp) had offered up the Amen and finished his prayer, the firemen lighted the fire. And a mighty flame flushing forth we to whom it was given to see saw a marvel, yea and we were preserved that we might relate what happened to the rest. The fire, making the appearance of a vault like the sail of a vessel filled by the

wind, made a wall round about the body of the martyr, and it was there in the midst not like flesh burning but like a loaf in an oven or like gold or silver refined in a furnace. For we perceived such a fragrant smell as if it were the wafted odour of frankincense or some other precious spice. So at length the lawless men, seeing that his body could not be consumed by the fire, ordered an executioner to go up to him and stab him with a dagger, and when he had done this there came forth a dove and a quantity of blood so that it extinguished the fire, and all the multitude marvelled that there should be so great a difference between the unbelievers and the elect.'⁴

The mention of the dove in this passage has been a great stumbling-block in all ages. Eusebius, or the authority he followed, altogether omitted it. More or less ingenious emendations of the Greek text have been suggested by different writers to avoid the difficulty. Thus, instead of *περιστερὰ καὶ*, 'a dove, and,' Ruchat conjectures *περὶ στέρνα*, 'about his breasts,' and Le Moyne *ἐπ' ἀριστερῇ*, 'on the left,' and Wordsworth *περὶ στύρακα*, 'about the butt spike.'⁵ If Polycarp had been dispatched with the butt of a spear instead of with a dagger, *ἐκπίδαι*, this conjecture would have been very plausible, as it simply changes one Greek letter and omits another, but daggers have not butt spikes. It is against all such emendations which are not inadmissible as making nonsense, that they do not account for the omission of the phrase by Eusebius. Dr. Lightfoot supposes the words *περιστερὰ καὶ* to be an interpolation of the author of the postscript. He remarks as follows: 'If then the spurious Pionius be the author of this postscript, he is responsible for the edition of the Smyrnanian epistle. Our Greek and Latin copies have the Pionian postscript and therefore represent the Pionian edition. Eusebius alone of all extant authorities is prior to the false Pionius and gives an independent text. Now our spurious Pionius was before all things a miracle-monger. Among other miracles he relates that on the eve of Polycarp's appointment to the episcopate a white dove was seen hovering about his head and around it a circle of light. As a dove thus visited Polycarp

¹ Letter, s. 15, 16; *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 1063.

² *Ibid.* part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 976 n.

³ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 593.

⁴ Letter, s. 5.

⁵ *Ibid.* s. 9.

preparatory to his consecration, so also a dove is found leaving him, or at least leaving his body, when his spirit is wafted to heaven. But this miracle appears only in the Pionian copies, not in Eusebius; moreover, by the abruptness of its appearance an interpolation is suggested. Is it not the same dove which appears on the two occasions, and was it not uncaged and let fly by the same hand? We cannot resist the suspicion that our spurious Pionius was responsible for both these appearances.¹

We have shown that there is no reason for the assumption that Eusebius is prior to the false Pionius, and it appears a rash conclusion that the mention of the dove is an interpolation. Though the appearance of the dove is the incident in the letter least capable of a subjective explanation, the whole narrative is so highly miraculous that there can be no reason to suggest the intervention of a different hand, and besides the context requires some notable miracle: 'we to whom it was given to see saw a marvel, yea and we were preserved that we might relate what happened to the rest.' The arguments of Dr. Lightfoot, therefore, go to show that the letter proceeds from the author of the life. Of this there is another indication. The life, as has been noticed, shows an especial animosity to the Montanists, called, from the place where the heresy originated, the Phrygians. In the letter a story is told of a Phrygian who, having come forward of his own free will, when he saw the wild beasts lost courage and offered incense. Grammatically a native of Phrygia is all that is meant. But the story, none the less, suggests an intention to attack the Montanists. This is another indication of the same hand that wrote the life.

There is yet another considerable objection to the genuineness of the letter. It states twice, once in the body of the letter and once at the end, that Polycarp suffered on Great Sabbath, (*ὁντος σαββάτου μεγάλου, σαββᾶτου μεγάλου*). By Great Sabbath the early Christians who were orthodox meant the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter Sunday. But this letter, if genuine, must have been written by the Church of Smyrna, and the Church of Smyrna at and long after the martyrdom of Polycarp was Quartodeciman, that is to say, they fixed Easter by

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 628.

the day of the month without regard to the day of the week. With them, therefore, such a day as Great Sabbath, as understood by the orthodox, could not occur. We have therefore a very strong argument that the letter is a forgery, the writer being either ignorant that the Smyrneans were Quartodecimans, or, what is more probable, intentionally misimputing to them orthodox phraseology in order to make evidence against the Quartodeciman heresy. This we see the writer of the life would be likely to do, as he there puts fictitious teaching into the mouth of Paul for the same purpose. It would take very long to set out all the attempts that have been made to explain away this difficulty. They appear to fall under three heads: First, that the Quartodecimans used the phrase 'Great Sabbath' in some sense of their own, we can only guess at. As regards explanations of this class, it must be conceded that we have not sufficiently accurate knowledge of the Quartodeciman usages absolutely to exclude such a conjecture, but we know nothing to give it the least probability. In the only sense, as far as we know, in which the name was applied by Christians, it was inapplicable to the Quartodeciman usages.

The second explanation, that of Dr. Lightfoot, is that a Jewish festival was intended. To this it must be answered, that this does not appear admissible on the language of the letter. The fact is twice stated nakedly without any reference to the Jews. The third explanation, a modern supporter of which is Lipsius, is that the mention of Great Sabbath both in the postscript and in the body of the letter is spurious. This would be indeed an effectual answer if it could be sustained, but the reading is supported by all the authorities, including Eusebius. It is however interesting to note of two such learned critics that Lipsius is constrained to deal with Great Sabbath as Lightfoot with the dove. Closely connected with the statement that the martyrdom took place on Great Sabbath, is the statement of the day of the month on which it took place, which in the different Greek MSS. and Latin version of the letter, and the Paschal Chronicle founded on it, assumes no less than five different forms which may be restored as follows, by aid of the critical apparatus of Dr. Lightfoot.¹

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 983, 981.

According to the MS. known as Baroccianus described as 'b,' it runs thus:—

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος μηνὸς ἑξαμήνου δευτέρα ἱστομένου πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαΐων σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ ὥρα ὀγδοή· συνελήφθη ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος Στρατίου Κορίνθου.

According to the Paris MS. described as 'p,' it runs thus:—

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα ἱσταμένου πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαΐων σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ ὥρα ὀγδοή· συνελήφθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος.

According to the Moscow MS. described as 'm,' it is as follows:—

Ἐμαρτύρησεν δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος κατὰ μὲν Ἀσιανούς μῆνός Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα, κατὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίους πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ ὥρα ἐνάτη ἢ καὶ συνελήφθη ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἀρχιεραρχούντος μὲν Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀσβεστοῦ Τραϊανῶ ἀνθυπατεύοντος δὲ Κοδράτου.

The Paschal Chronicle has the following notice, which is set out so far as it appears to be based upon the letter:—

Πολλοὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν ἐν οἷς Πολύκαρπος . . . συλληφθεὶς ἐπὶ ἀνθυπαίου Τατίου Κοδριάνου ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου εἰρηνάρχου οὐκ ὄντος Νικήτου . . . τῇ πρὸ ζ' καλανδῶν Ἀπριλίων, τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ ὥρα η'.

The old Latin version is as follows:—

Martyrium S. Polycarpi mense Aprilio vii Kal. Maias majore sabbato hora octavā; captus est ab Herode, Pontifice Philippo Trajano, Proconsule Statio Quadrato.

There is one other passage bearing upon the question—the heading of the letter in the codex Baroccianus:—

Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπισκόπου Σμύρνης τῆς Ἀσίας πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Φεβρουαρίων.

The passage as restored by Dr. Lightfoot is as follows:—

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα ἱσταμένου πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων, σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ, ὥρα ὀγδοή· συνελήφθη ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος Στατίου Κοδριάνου.

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 552, 553.

² Bolland, *Acta Sanctorum*, January 26, ii. 692 seq.; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 660; vol. ii. sec. ii. p. 984.

³ *Ibid.* p. 940.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 983, 984.

The important point in restoring the passage for our present purpose is the name of the Roman month, and of secondary importance is the question whether the day of the Greek or rather Macedonian month was named. The name of the Roman month is important because, all the authorities being agreed as to the number of days before its Kalends on which the martyrdom took place, upon fixing the name of the Roman month, the day of the year is fixed precisely. And the naming of the Greek or Macedonian month cannot raise any difficulty, because in different cities different months went by the name of Zanthicus.¹ The Greek or Macedonian month would therefore have to be interpreted according to some calendar which would agree with the date as given by the Roman month. Though the Greek month therefore could occasion no difficulty, the day of the Greek month might occasion difficulty, hence the importance of determining whether it is or is not part of the text. We are only directly concerned with the text down to σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ; the remaining words are important only as they may bear upon the foregoing. It must be noticed that if either April or May is taken as the Roman month, a possible date is given for Great Sabbath in the ordinary acceptance of the term, and the argument that that is the meaning of the term, and consequently that the letter is a forgery, is strengthened. If, however, March, or still more February, is taken as the name of the Roman month, then an impossible date, according at all events to orthodox usage, is given for Great Sabbath, and accordingly there is occasion for the argument that Great Sabbath could not have been intended in its ordinary sense. And the particular argument against the genuineness of the letter founded upon attributing such phraseology to the Quartodeciman Smyrnaeans is so far weakened. We must not therefore be surprised to find that Dr. Lightfoot, who is a strenuous supporter of the genuineness of the letter, is also a strenuous supporter of the reading Μαρτίων. As Dr. Lightfoot was a critic of no mean learning and ability, it is fortunate that we have the opportunity of testing his restoration of this passage by certain rules which he has laid down himself. In his preface to his edition of the Smyrman letter he says as follows: 'The principles which must

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 678 n.

guide an editor in the construction of the text are simple and obvious; a reading found in Eusebius and any one other authority must as a rule be accepted; when Eusebius fails us, the coincidence of the Latin version with any one Greek MS. should commonly be regarded as decisive. Of the Greek MSS. themselves the general order in point of authority is m. b. p. v., but in individual cases the peculiarities of the several MSS. may require to be considered in estimating their relative values.¹ Elsewhere Dr. Lightfoot gives his reason for preferring m. over the other MSS. It is that its readings more generally agree with Eusebius.² This shows that it is based upon an ancient text, but being so based it may nevertheless have been subject to licentious alteration, and this is in fact the case with the Moscow MS. Speaking of the form the postscript takes in that MS. Dr. Lightfoot says: 'The scribe of the Moscow MS. has struck out the words καθὼς δηλώσω ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς, so as to make the document complete in itself; at the same time he adds a few sentences of his own relating to Polycarp.'³ It is obvious therefore that the Moscow MS., notwithstanding its ancient original, when it is unsupported by other documents, is an authority to be accepted with some caution.

To apply these principles to the determination of the text, we find that we have in favour of the reading Μαίων the two Greek MSS. b. and p. and the Latin version. Against it there is in favour of the reading Μαρτίων the Moscow MS., and of the reading Ἀπριλίων the 'Paschal Chronicle,' while the heading of b. would suggest the reading Φεβρουαρίων. There seems now no doubt at all that the weight of authority is in favour of Μαίων. It has that agreement of the Latin version with a Greek authority, in this case two Greek authorities, which on a point upon which Eusebius is silent, in accordance with Dr. Lightfoot's rule, should commonly be decisive. In favour of Μαρτίων there is only the Moscow MS. Now we have noticed the tendency to licentious alteration exhibited elsewhere in this MS. It is exhibited in a noticeable degree in this passage. In the few words we have quoted, quite apart from the change of Μαίων into Μαρτίων, there are no less than

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. p. 946.

² *Ibid.* p. 940.

³ *Ibid.* p. 1008.

four alterations which are certainly of this character, by which I mean alterations made intentionally and not proceeding from any misinterpretation of the exemplar before him by the scribe or editor or from carelessness on his part. Thus there are the insertion of the three phrases κατὰ μὲν Ἀσιανούς, κατὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίους, and τοῦ ἀσβεβούς, and the change of ὀγδόῃ into ἐνίτῃ. There is also, though not so obviously of this character, the change of Μαρτυρεῖ into Ἐμαρτύρησεν. Dr. Lightfoot has shown his opinion of these readings by rejecting all of them. It appears therefore that in the Moscow MS. the passage under consideration has been entirely rewritten. This alone would render any reading it contained very suspicious. The readings Ἀπριλίων and Φεβρουαρίων, not being supported by any MS. or version of the passage, scarcely enter into competition. We see therefore that the weight of authority is strongly in favour of the reading Μαίων. If we look to the context we see that this reading gives a possible day for Great Sabbath, which Μαρτίων does not. As we know from Eusebius as well as all the other authorities that the letter placed the martyrdom on Great Sabbath, we have here a strong confirmation of Μαίων as the proper reading.

We will now come to the reason of the reading Μαρτίων. This reading gives for the date of the martyrdom the twenty-third of February, which was one of the traditional days on which it was celebrated.¹ The Vienna MS. has interpolated this date into the body of the letter, and Dr. Lightfoot quotes this interpolation as a confirmation of the reading Μαρτίων in the passage we are considering which the Vienna MS. omits. But this does not seem the proper inference to draw. The editor of the Vienna MS., in omitting one section of the document and making an interpolation in another place, was clearly making an intentional change. Why, it may be asked, did he do this? The answer must be that it was his way of changing the date of the martyrdom. The reading Φεβρουαρίων in the heading of b. admits of a similar explanation. It gives the date of the martyrdom the twenty-sixth of January. Now the twenty-sixth of January was another traditional date for the martyrdom.² Dr. Lightfoot

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 660, 661.

² *Ibid.* 661.

argues that *Μαρτίων* was the original reading because it would explain the readings *Μαίων* and *Ἀπριλίων*, *Μαίων* as resulting from the accidental omission of two letters, and *Ἀπριλίων* in order to give a possible date for Great Sabbath. This argument as far as it goes is good, but it is nearly as easy to make *Μαρτίων* out of *Μαίων* as vice versa, and if you once got both readings *Μαίων* and *Μαρτίων*, *Ἀπριλίων* might be taken by the writer of the 'Paschal Chronicle' as a mean between them. But it must be noticed that vii. Kal. Maias or the 25th of April, though a possible, is a very late date for Great Sabbath. The 25th of April was a possible date for Easter as late as a.n. 387, when we learn from St. Ambrose that Easter was kept on that day by the Churches of Egypt.¹ It would, therefore, have been a possible date for Great Sabbath a century or more earlier, but the 'Paschal Chronicle' was about two centuries and a half later, in which time by the Julian calendar the equinox would have come nearly two days earlier. At that date, the 25th of April would probably have been too late a date for Great Sabbath, and this consideration might have induced the compiler of the chronicle to substitute April for May. We must notice also that Dr. Lightfoot has to argue that *Φεβρουαρίων* is a mistake for *Μαρτίων*. If this can be so, *Ἀπριλίων* may be a mistake for *Μαίων*.

So far as we have gone the balance of probability seems altogether in favour of the reading *Μαίων*, and if we adopt the reading of the Latin version *Mense Aprilio*, or *Μηνί Ξανθικοῦ*, there is nothing more to say against it. According to the form of the Macedonian calendar prevalent in Syria the months agreed with the Julian months, Zanthicus being equivalent to April,² and this seems to have been the meaning put upon the passage by the Latin translator; but according to the Greek MSS. the reading is not merely *μηνί Ξανθικοῦ* but *μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα*, and upon this an argument can be raised which affects the Roman date. There were calendars in force in proconsular Asia based on the Julian calendar, but differing from it in the names and commencements of the months, each month commencing eight days before the month to which it most nearly corresponded in the Julian calendar. According to these calendars the *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν*, or, as we should say, the sixth day before the Kalends, when it

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th edit. vol. vii. 'Easter.'

² *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 678 n¹.

had thirty days, would correspond with the third day of the Greek month, but in certain of these calendars when the month had thirty-one days it was reckoned as having two first days, so that which was really the third was called the second, thus making the month always end on the thirtieth day. In such cases only *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν* corresponded with *δευτέρα*. If, therefore, *δευτέρα* is part of the text, the Greek month must be referred to one of these calendars. Now, the only one of these calendars which is known to contain the month Zanthicus, is a calendar known as the Ephesian, and according to this calendar Zanthicus commences eight days before the first of March.¹ *Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα* will therefore correspond with *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων*, and thus, assuming *δευτέρα* to be a part of the text, we get an argument in favour of the reading *Μαρτίων*. On the other hand, assuming *Μαίων* to be the true reading, we get an argument for rejecting *δευτέρα* in favour of the reading of the Latin version. There is no improbability that the Latin version alone should preserve the original reading. The copyists of Latin versions generally copied them mechanically, while the Greek mind, being much more active, tended to introduce changes.

With a view of further sifting the matter it may be asked according to what calendar the date ought to be interpreted. If the letter is genuine, it must be answered, the calendar of Smyrna; if the letter is not genuine, it is difficult to say according to what calendar. It might be the calendar of Smyrna or any other that would be commonly understood. Now, according to the calendar of Smyrna the month which began eight days before the Kalends of March was called not Zanthicus but Anthesterion. We see, therefore, that, supposing the letter to be genuine, we do not here get any confirmation of the reading *Μαρτίων*. We do not know the name of the month which, according to the calendar of Smyrna, began eight days before the Kalends of May.²

Our knowledge of the calendar described as the Ephesian is derived from a MS. containing a number of calendars, which also contains the commentary of Theon upon Ptolemy, and which, therefore, must be after the days of Theodosius the Great.³

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 667.

² *Ibid.* 661 *et seq.*

³ This is the only indication of the date of the MS. I have seen, but I suppose it is not nearly so ancient.

The names of the months are Macedonian. When this calendar came into use in Ephesus is unknown. We have evidence that it was not in use A.D. 104; an inscription of Ephesus of that year making *πρὸ ἧ' καλανδῶν Μαρτίων* equivalent to *μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος β'.*¹ This inscription shows that the calendar in force at Ephesus differed from the calendar in question in two points. The month had the Ionian name Anthesterion instead of the Macedonian name Zanthicus, and the days were counted regularly from the beginning instead of counting the second day of the month as the first. There is also an inscription of Smyrna referred to the age of the Antonines which would make *πρὸ πέντε καλανδῶν Εἰουλίων*, or, as Dr. Lightfoot conjectures, *Εἰουλίαν*, equivalent to *Ἑκατομβαιῶνος τετάρτη.*² Now again, Hecatombeon is not one of the names of the Macedonian months. There is, therefore, nothing to suggest that the calendar in question had come into use at Ephesus or Smyrna till long after the martyrdom of Polycarp or the writing of the letter we are considering. If, therefore, the reference to this calendar were part of the original text, it would suggest a very late origin for the letter, but we have seen it is probably not part of the original text but a subsequent alteration.

The probable history of the text is this. The original reading was that of the Latin version, *Μηνὶ Ζανθικοῦ πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαΐων*; that this reading was rejected in favour of that of the Moscow MS. by some editor who wished to insert the traditional date of the martyrdom, and that the reading thus produced was mixed with the original reading, as we get it in MSS. b. and p. The great argument in favour of this conclusion is that undoubtedly the letter in its original form placed the martyrdom on Great Sabbath. No reasonable meaning can be given to Great Sabbath except the obvious one—the Saturday before Easter Sunday; and the letter in its original form must have contained a date consistent with this.

The writer of the letter was probably the person whom Dr Lightfoot calls the false Pionius. He probably had before him, at the time he wrote it, the traditional date of the martyrdom, which he departed from to give way to his fancy of making the

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 665.

² *Ibid.* 666.

martyrdom take place on Great Sabbath, but the words *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν* were probably suggested by it. In a letter intended for general circulation he did not give the day of a Greek or Macedonian month, which would be intelligible in a limited locality only, but stated that the martyrdom took place in the month Zanthicus, which, in accordance with the most generally known form of the Macedonian calendar, was equivalent to April, in which sense we see it was taken by the Latin translator. It must be noticed also that Josephus, in his 'Antiquities,' takes Zanthicus as the equivalent of the Jewish month Nisan.

The letter shows a tendency to draw or make parallels between the martyrdom of Polycarp and the crucifixion of Jesus. In a genuine document it is not improbable that primitive Christians would more or less strain the facts to bring out such parallels. The existence of these parallels does not, therefore, appear very much to aid the argument against the genuineness of the letter. On the other hand, the letter has a verisimilitude about many parts of it which has been used as an affirmative argument of its genuineness. Most of the forgeries of the primitive Christians are so contemptible from a literary point of view, that it is not surprising that it should be rather taken as an axiom that no literary skill ought to be expected from the writer of a Christian document, but this inference is unfounded. It would be strange if such skill were not found now and then. Supposing the possibility of such skill, the presence of this apparent verisimilitude is no argument of the genuineness of the document that exhibits it; it shows merely the skill of the writer.

The writer of the Smyrnan letter had probably witnessed martyrdoms in the Decian persecution, and so was able to give a graphic picture of one. It may be asked why he did not describe the actual martyrdoms he had witnessed? This would not have answered his purpose; he wished to establish doctrines by putting them into the mouth of a famous man like Polycarp.

There are several ways in which the art of the writer of the letter is disclosed. Thus he takes his formal introduction and ending from the epistle of Clement of Rome, thus securing the ancient style.¹ Probably he guided himself in a similar way in

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 610, 611.

other matters. Thus he may have taken the names of the proconsul and Asiarch from some inscription, and so secured the names of actual men who held office together. It must be noticed also that there are passages in the life which exhibit the same verisimilitude as the letter, particularly the account of the election and instalment of Polycarp, and this is produced, there can be little doubt, in the same way by the writer basing his narrative on similar scenes he had witnessed.

The proper conclusion, therefore, appears to be that the letter of the Smyrnæans is a forgery, and, that being so, the arguments of M. Waddington as to the date of the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus do not affect the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp; the only evidence we have of the latter date being the statement of Eusebius that it took place under Marcus Aurelius, a statement by no means certainly accurate, but of considerable probability.

All the evidence bearing upon the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp was collected by Dr. Lightfoot, the late bishop of Durham, in his 'Apostolic Fathers,' and the facts in the foregoing notice are all but entirely taken from that work (see especially the articles on the Letter of the Smyrnæans and the Date of the Martyrdom, 'Apostolic Fathers,' part II. vol. i. pages 588 to end). The article on the Early Roman Succession ('Apostolic Fathers,' part I. vol. i. page 201 *et seq.*) has also a considerable bearing upon the same topic. I must pay this tribute to the thoroughness with which the facts are set out in these articles, that they have enabled me to come to an entirely opposite conclusion to that which they were intended to support.

NOTE.—In the foregoing remarks I have thought it a sufficient answer to Dr. Lightfoot's theory that Great Sabbath should be taken to refer to a Jewish festival, that that view is not admissible on the language of the letter; in other words, if members of a religious sect write to members of the same sect, and refer to a religious festival absolutely without any qualification, such festival not being a public institution of the country, they must be taken as referring to a festival of their own sect, and not of another, and, as appears by the letter, bitterly hostile sect; for if they did otherwise, they would appear to adopt the festival as their own. But if this obvious objection be passed by, Dr. Lightfoot's theory does not, by any means, free the case from difficulties. The only Jewish festival he can suggest is the feast of Purim

which was celebrated at the full moon. Now it seems that Saturday, the 23rd of February, A.D. 155, was four or five days distant from the day of full moon. Mr. Turner has accordingly suggested that the year of the martyrdom should be taken as A.D. 156, and the letter to read the 8th before the Kalends of March, by which device he obtains as the date of the martyrdom the high Sabbath before Purim (see 'Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica,' vol. ii., Oxford, 1890, page 120). We see therefore that Dr. Lightfoot's theory requires the Jews to have been very careless as to the phases of the moon, and Mr. Turner's a conjectural amendment of the text in one of the few points in which all the authorities agree.

INDEX

- ABBOTT, Rev. E. A., D.D., as to Justin Martyr's quotations, 146 *et seq.*
 Acts in the time of Pontius Pilate, 179, 195, 200
 Adam, 99, 100
 Africanus, 99
 Ammonius, 98
 Anastasius of Sinai, notice of Papias by, 97, 98, 99, 245, 246
 Andrew or Andreas, Bishop of Caesarea, notices of Papias by, 31, 96, 100
 Anicetus, 119, 248, 249
 Apocalypse, cited by Papias, 31, 96, 127, 128
 Apollinarius, notice of Papias by, 93
 Apostle, meaning of name, 248
 Apostolic constitutions, 36
 Aquila, translator of O. T., 157, 161
 Aquinas, 74 *n.*
 Aramaic, gospels how far from, 133 *et seq.*
 Arethas, Bishop of Caesarea, 31
 Aristion, 9-13, 233, 234, 248

 BAHNARD, 248
 Baroccianus codex, notice of Papias in, 22, 243-245
 Barsabas, called Justus, 22, 244, 245
 Bleek's analysis of O. T. quotations in gospels, 129 *et seq.*; similar phenomenon in Justin Martyr, vii
 CATENA of extracts used by Justin, 193, 197, 199, 204; used by Matthew and Luke, 199; used by fathers, 221
 Cerinthus, 119
 Clement of Alexandria as to gospels written first, 2; says that Mark wrote at Peter's request, 3*n.*; as to first epistle of John, 37; not typical of his age, 70; contends that Christians are described as children, 102 *et seq.* See also 98
 Clement of Alexandria Paedagogus, bk. I. c. x., 101 *et seq.*
 Clement of Rome, death of, 6; MSS., 61; way of citing O. and N. T., 63; use of λόγιον by, 58 *et seq.*; epistle of, 265
 Clement of Rome, first epistle, c. 13, 58, 60; c. 19, 58; c. 53, 59; c. 62, 59
 Clement of Rome, second epistle, use of λόγιον in, 68 *et seq.*
 Clement of Rome, second epistle, date of, 70 *et seq.*; MSS., 72, 73; c. 13, 68; c. 17, 72
 Credner, viii
 Cyril, 96

 DAVIDSON S., D.D., as to O. T. quotations in the gospels, 130 *et seq.*

De Boor, 22
Dionysius the Areopagite, 100,
101, 104, 246
Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria,
36

ELEUTHERUS, 119, 249
Epiphanius, 252, 253
Eusebius, as to date of Papias, 1,
6-8; does not say Papias re-
ferred to canonical gospels, 3;
as to influence of Papias, 8;
remarks as to Papias, 232 *et*
seq.; as to Clement, 70. See
also 23, 99

FRUARDENTIUS, 214

GOSPEL quotations, sources of, vi
Gospels, canonical, originally an-
onymous, 2
— sources of, partly Aramaic,
partly Greek, 133 *et seq.*
Great Sabbath, martyrdom of
Polycarp on, 256, 266
Greek—gospels how far from?
133 *et seq.*
Gregory, 96, 98

HADRIAN, 22-26, 244, 245
Hamartolus, George, notice of
Papias by, 22, 242 *et seq.*
Hatch, E., D.D., 183, 232, 236
Herodes Atticus, 7
Hilgenfeld supposes spurious
works of Papias, 16
Hippolytus, 96

IONATIAN epistles, 77
Irenaeus, notices of Papias by, 8,
105 *et seq.*; confounds John the
elder with the apostle, 13, 33
et seq.; in advance of his age,
70, 80; considered O. T. the
words of Christ, 85, 86; as to
millennium, 105 *et seq.*; elders
mentioned by, 115 *et seq.*; cites

non-existent prophecy as from
Jeremiah, 210 *et seq.* See also
96, 99

Irenaeus, against heresies:
bk. iii. c. 3, s. 4, 118; bk. iv.
c. 2, s. 3, 85; bk. iv. c. 27, 120
et seq.; bk. iv. c. 28, 123; bk. iv.
c. 30, 123; bk. iv. c. 32, 124; bk.
v. c. 5, s. 1, 120, 124; bk. v. c.
32, 109 *et seq.*; bk. v. c. 33,
105 *et seq.*; bk. v. c. 36, 116;
bk. v. How far from Papias?
108 *et seq.*

Isaac means a child, 103, 104

JEROME, notices of Papias by,
126, 127

Jesus lived to beyond forty or
fifty, 14; notices of by Papias,
90, 106 *et seq.*, 234; life inter-
esting to primitive Christians
only as fulfilment of prophecy,
83 *et seq.*; date of crucifixion
of, 236 *et seq.*

John, Apostle, martyrdom of un-
known to Irenaeus, 19; Euse-
bius, Lightfoot, Salmon as to,
23, 24; said to be plunged in
boiling oil, 26, 27; died when?
28, 29

— the disciple of the lord men-
tioned by Irenaeus, 33; in
Muratorian fragment, 35

— the elder, mention of by Papias,
9-12; alive when Papias wrote,
12; confounded by Irenaeus
with the apostle, 13; discussion
as to, 33 *et seq.*; conclusions
to, 43. See also 233, 248

— first epistle of, cited by
Papias, 31, 235; second and
third epistles, authorship dis-
cussed, 36 *et seq.*

Josephus, use of *λόγιον* by, 55
— Jewish war, bk. vi. c. v., 4,
56. See also 126

Judas, death of, 93-96

Justin Martyr, Gospel quotations
of, vi; O. T. quotations of, vii;
use of *λόγιον* by, 64, 65; Hexae-

meron attributed, 99; quota-
tions assimilated to LXX, 147,
183; agreement with Protevan-
gelium, 166, 167, 170 *et seq.*;
quoted O. T. from written
sources not LXX, 203; used
entire of extracts, 193, 197,
199, 202; charges Jews with
mutilating LXX, 206 *et seq.*

Justin Martyr, I Ap. c. 32, 61,
185; c. 33, 148, 150-167; c. 34,
148, 168; c. 35, 148, 176, 178,
189; c. 41, 217; c. 47, 190; c.
48, 194; Dial. c. 16, 193; c. 18,
65; c. 43, 148, 151 *et seq.*; c. 53,
148, 175; c. 55, 218; c. 66, 148,
151 *et seq.*; c. 67, 148; c. 68,
118; c. 71, 148, 206; c. 73, 218;
c. 77, 169; c. 78, 148, 170 *et seq.*;
c. 81, 35; c. 84, 148; c. 123,
148, 181; c. 135, 148, 181; De
Res., c. 4, 195; Cohortatio, c.
13, 164

Justus, Bishop of Jerusalem, 7

KEIM, 237, 241

Kircher's concordance, 49

LACTANTIUS cites prophecy as from
Esdras, 208 *et seq.*

Lightfoot, J. B., D.D., exploded
martyrdom of Papias, 6; as to
date of Papias, 12; contends
Papias was acquainted with the
fourth gospel, 17; rejects mar-
tyrdom of John, 23; as to epis-
tle of Polycarp, 68; as to date
of 2 Clement 70; as to style of
quoting N. T. in the second
century, 77 *et seq.*; reading in
2 Clement xvii. 73; Luke
prologue, 84 n.; date of Ani-
cetus, 249; date of Polycarp's
martyrdom, 248; authorship
of Life of Polycarp, 250 *et seq.*;
reading in Smyranean letter,
258 *et seq.*

λόγια, meaning of, 5; discussed,
48; used by Papias in one
sense, 4

λόγια κυριακά, meaning Messianic
prophecies, applicable to Pa-
pias, 89, 91 *et seq.*

λόγιον, meaning of in LXX, 49

— places in which found in
LXX, 227

— meaning of in Philo Judaeus,
50 *et seq.*; in N. T., 54, 55; in
Josephus, 55 *et seq.*; in Clement
of Rome, 58 *et seq.*; in Justin
Martyr, 64, 65; in Epistle of
Polycarp, 66 *et seq.*; in 2 Cle-
ment, 68 *et seq.*

— development in meanings of,
75

— summary of authorities as to,
76

— Latin renderings of, 80, 81

— sense in which used by Papias,
82 *et seq.*; differences as to,
not of meaning but intendment,
86; meaning inspired sayings
of the Lord, how applicable to
Papias, 86 *et seq.*; meaning
inspired narrative about the
Lord, how applicable to Papias,
86 *et seq.*; meaning history, 89

λόγιον or *λόγιον*, readings of Euse-
bius discussed, 45

Lyons and Vienna, letter of
churches of, 20

MACARIUS MAGNES, 250

Malalas, John, use of Papias by,
99, 100, 246

Manaimus, mother of, 22, 25

Marcion, 16, 119

Marcus Aurelius, 248, 266

Mark, book by noticed by Papias,
83; said by Papias not to have
acted wrongly, 225; said by
Papias to have written without
order, 225; remarks of Papias
as to discussed, 225; — and
Luke omitted O. T. quotations
from Hebrew, 140

Martyr contrasted with confessor,
20

Matthew, work attributed to by

- Papias, a work on Messianic prophecies, 1, 83
 Matthew, book by, noticed by Papias, 1, 83
 Maximilla, 253
 Maximus Confessor, Notice of Papias by, 100, 105, 246, 247
 Melito, 85
 Millennium, 105 *et seq.*
 Messianic prophecies common to Matthew and Justin Martyr, 138 *et seq.*
 Messianic prophecies in Justin Martyr not found in Matthew, 185 *et seq.*
 — not found in canonical books, 206 *et seq.*
 — secondary authority on, used by fathers, 221
 Methodius, 96
 Montanists, 251 *et seq.*
 Muratorian fragment as to epistles of John, 38 *et seq.*
 — date of, 41
 NEW TESTAMENT, style of quoting in 2nd century, 77
 — passages from discussed:
 — Matthew i. 23, quotation in; whether from LXX, 131, 150 *et seq.*; ii. 6, 132, 167; ii. 18, 149; iv. 10, 138; xi. 5, 198; xii. 13-21, 141, 148, 181; xv. 1-9, 138; xxii. 24, 132; xxvi. 64, 136
 — Mark i. 2, 132; iii. 6-12, 141
 — Luke prologue, 84 n.
 — — vii. 22, 198
 — Acts vii. 38, 54; viii. 85, 84; xvii. 11, 84; xviii. 28, 84; xxvi. 22, 23, 84
 — Romans iii. 2, 55
 — Hebrews v. 12, 55
 — 1 Peter i. 9 *et seq.*, 84; iii. 18, 214; iv. 6, 214; iv. 11, 55
 — Apocalypse xii. 9, cited by Papias, 96
 OLD TESTAMENT, quotations from, in Gospels, 129 *et seq.*; omitted by Mark, 141; by Luke, 200

- Old Testament, passages from, discussed:
 — Exodus, xvi. 19, 53
 — Numbers, xvi. 28, 38, 54; xxiv. 17, quoted by Justin as from Isaiah, 64, 185 *et seq.*; quoted by Irenaeus, 186
 — Deuteronomy, vi. 13, 138
 — 1 Chronicles, xvi. 23-31, 217
 — Psalm xix. 14, 49; xxiv. 7, 8, quoted by Justin, 201 *et seq.*; lxix. 23, 96; cix. 18, 96; cxix. 49
 — Isaiah, i. 7, quoted by Justin, 191; ix. 6, quoted by Justin, 189; vii. 10-16, quoted by Justin, 152 *et seq.*; quoted by Tertullian, 156; vii. 14, according to Aquila Symmachus and Theodotion, 157; readings of LXX, 158; quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148 *et seq.*, 159 *et seq.*; context of Justin's quotation, 165 *et seq.*; xxviii. 13, 14, 49; xxxv. quoted by Justin, 195; xlii. 1-4, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 181; quotations and renderings of, 230 *et seq.*; lxvi. 2, 60
 — Jeremiah, xxxi. 15, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148, 149; context of Justin's quotation, 168; i. 3, quoted by Justin as from Isaiah, 191
 — Ezekiel, xlii. 15 to xliii. 3, 56
 — Daniel, vii. 13, quoted by Justin as from Jeremiah, 202
 — Micah, v. 2, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148, 149; context of Justin's quotation, 167

- Old Testament, Zechariah, ix. 9, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148, 149; quoted by Justin, 1 Ap., 173 *et seq.*; context of quotation, 174 *et seq.*; quoted by Justin, Dial., 179 *et seq.*; according to Hexapla, 181
 — Malachi, iii. 3, 140
 Origen, as to Epistles of John, 37. See also 243
 Overbeck, 16

PALEY thought Papias referred to the first and second canonical gospels, 2

Pantaenus, 98

Papias, wrote on Messianic prophecies, v; title of his book, 1, 82; reference to Matthew, 1, 83; reference to Mark, 2, 83; date of, 1, 6 *et seq.*, 31; statements inapplicable to first and second canonical gospels, 3, 4; martyrdom of, exploded, 6; bishop of Hierapolis, 7; notice of, by Irenaeus, 8, 105 *et seq.*; influence of, 8; citation from, by Eusebius, 9; not a hearer of the Apostles, 12; wrote after the deaths of the Apostles, 12; wrote in lifetime of John the Elder and Aristion, 11 *et seq.*; notice of, in Vatican MS., 16; 'in exotericis,' meaning of, 16-18; said to have written fourth gospel at dictation of John, 16-19; supposed spurious books of, 16; notice of, in catena, by B. Corder, 18; notice of, in 'Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae,' 22; said John was killed by the Jews, 22, 23; did not say that those raised by Christ lived till Hadrian, 25; anterior limit to date of his work, 27 *et seq.*; cites first epistle of Peter, 31;

cites Apocalypse, 31, 93; use of *λόγιον* by, 82 *et seq.*; disparaged by Eusebius, 90; did not use canonical gospels, 90; why his books were lost, 90; summary of conclusions, 91; why distrusted books, 92; did not name Paul, 93; notice of, by Apollinarius, 93; notice of by Oecumenius, 94; notice of, by Andreas, 96; use of, by Malalas, 100; notices of, by Anastasius of Sinai, 98, 99; notices of, by Maximus Confessor, 100, 105; probability of his mentioning matter to be found in the canonical gospels, 114, 115; notice of, by Jerome, 126; notice of, interpolated in Eusebius, 127

Papyrus mistaken for Papias, 6

Peshito-Syriac version, 41-43

Peter, first epistle of, cited by Papias, 31, 235

Philip, daughters of, 11, 22, 233

Philip of Side, 22
 Philo Judaeus, meaning of *λόγιον* in, 50 *et seq.*; author of *De Vita Contemplativa*, 227 *et seq.* See also 104

Philo Judaeus, Meeting for seeking knowledge, c. 24, 51; Fugitives, c. 11, 51; Life of Moses, I. c. 15, 53; III. c. 21, 50; c. 23, 51; c. 35, 53; c. 36, 53; c. 38, 54; De Decalogo title, 52; De specialibus legibus sextum, etc title, c. 1, 2, 52; Rewards and punishments, c. 1, 51; Nobility, c. 5, 50; Contemplative life, c. 3, 52

Philosophumena, 253

Pionius, reputed author of Life of Polycarp, 250

Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, 7; notice of, by Irenaeus, 118 *et seq.*; visit to Rome, 118 *et seq.*; taught by apostles, etc., 247; date of martyrdom, 247;

- miracles attributed to, 250;
death of, 254
- Polycarp, epistle of, 78; date of, 68; use of *λόγιον* in, 66
- Polycarp, epistle of, c. 7, 66
- Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, says John was a martyr, 19; weight of his statement, 20 *et seq.*
- Pothinus, 125
- Primus, Bishop of Alexandria, 7
- Protevangelium, 173 n.; agreement of Justin with, 166, 170 *et seq.*
- QUADRATUS, apology of, 25, 26
- Quadratus Statius, 249, 258, 266
- Quartodeciman controversy, 251
- Quotations from O. T. from the Hebrew, omitted by Mark and Luke, 140 *et seq.*; from O. T. in gospels follow LXX where it differs from the Hebrew, 138; of Justin Martyr assimilated to LXX, 147, 183
- READING of Eusebius, *λόγιον* and *λόγος*, 4, 45 *et seq.*; of Clement of Rome, 60 *et seq.*; of II. Clement, 72, 73; of Smyranean letter, 258 *et seq.*
- Rebecca means patience, 103, 104
- Redeemed will witness with pleasure the sufferings of the lost, 74
- Richter, 50
- Rufinus, 81
- SABARIS, a martyr, 19
- Salmon, rejects martyrdom of John, 23; as to date of Muratorian fragment, 41; as to O. T. quotations in gospels, 133 n.; as to John the Elder, 15 n
- Sanday, as to mixed quotations, vi n.
- Scillitan martyrs, acts of, 78
- Septuagint, meaning of *λόγιον* in, 49; origin of, as told by early Christians, 164
- Smyrneans, letter of, 249; postscript to, 253; a forgery, 254; miracles in, 254; readings in, 255 *et seq.*, 257 *et seq.*
- Soter, 119
- Strauss, as to death of Judas, 96
- Supernatural religion (book called), v
- Symeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, 7; authorities as to his martyrdom, 7
- Symmachus (translator of O. T. into Greek), 157, 161
- TERTULLIAN, as to attempted martyrdom of John, 26, 27; mixed citation from Isaiah, 156; cites words 'a ligno' as from Psalm, 219
- Theodotion (translator of O. T. into Greek), 157, 161
- Thraseas, a martyr, 19
- Turner, C. H., date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 267
- VALENTINIANISM, 71
- Valentinus, 71, 118
- Vossian codex of Irenaeus, 186
- Vulgate, Ezekiel xliii. 3, 57
- WADDINGTON, as to date of Symeon's martyrdom, 7; as to date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 249
- Westcott (Bishop), as to date of Papias, 12; contends that Papias knew the fourth gospel, 17; as to O. T. quotations in gospels, 128
- Woman taken in adultery, story not from Papias, 235
- ZANTHICUS, Macedonian month, 259 *et seq.*