

is of the kindred of the house of Eli, but because he is privileged to be in the secret of Yahweh, who is God of the whole earth. Since he bears this word with such a commission, he need not and must not fear any man, for the word, being of God, fulfils itself in the destiny of men.

It is scarcely necessary to do more than point out how intimately this construction of the prophet's call and commission explains and agrees with the feature of his spiritual loneliness which is indeed his distinguishing mark in the select company of the prophets. He was singularly human, less bound to home and kindred and nation by the tie of prejudice, but only more bound by the tie of natural, kindly, human affection. He loved the human things in Israel, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstone grinding the children's food, the kindly twinkle of the cotter's light after night-fall. Man, as man, with his human attachments, was very dear to him. Yet he walks alone across the stage of the history of time with almost none to understand what he meant or to bid him godspeed on his way. He was able to do it without growing sour or bitter, because he learned from the beginning that to the faithful and humble heart there is given a high fellowship, even the fellowship of Him who promised to be with him. So interpreted, the passage suggests the secret strength of a Greater than Jeremiah. "Ye shall leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me."

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE APOLOGY OF QUADRATUS.

It is generally agreed that the line of Christian Apologists, who constitute so large an element of the literature of the second century, is headed by the names of Quadratus and Aristides. Of these the first is said to have been a bishop,

and the second a philosopher ; both of them hail from Athens ; each of them is suspected of having presented the Defence of the Faith for which he is famous to the Emperor Hadrian on one of his visits to Athens, i.e. either in the year 125-6, or 129-130 ; but whether all of these traditional data or dates are verifiable must be considered doubtful ; we can hardly accept them *en bloc* without close and careful scrutiny of the sources from which they are derived. Happily, we are much better placed than formerly as regards one of the Apologies in question. We have the Apology of Aristides in a Syriac dress, and in a Greek adaptation, and now comes the news of the recovery of an actual fragment of the Greek Aristides from the sands (fertile enough in this regard) of Oxyrhyncus. Quadratus still lurks, perhaps among the same rubbish heaps, and perhaps he also is robed in Syriac and waiting to be recognized, or lurking in the pages of Greek romance. It must often have stirred the inquisitive faculty of patristic students and ecclesiastical historians to hear that Aristides was found, and set them thinking and saying to themselves, "What about Quadratus ?" Being one of the inquisitive band myself I think it may be useful to set down some of the directions in which the scholar's curiosity may occupy itself, until the time when the missing book shall come to light.

In the first place, then, we are to remind ourselves that practically all we know about Quadratus, and the single fragment that we possess of his work, comes from the pen of Eusebius. Jerome and others may repeat what Eusebius says, and may embellish his account, but experience tells us we are usually safe in disregarding Jerome when he is transcribing or translating Eusebius with amplifications ; the added matter usually betrays itself as untrustworthy.

What, then, is the sum total of the Eusebian matter,

which must form one point of departure in any quest for the lost author? First of all, there is the statement in the *Chronicon* that Quadratus, a hearer of the Apostles, and Aristides presented apologetic appeals to Hadrian on behalf of the Christians, *or perhaps* on account of an edict (against the Christians).

So Eusebius couples the two Apologists together under the date 125 A.D. Next comes the passage in the *History*, with the famous quotation, as follows :

“To Hadrian Quadratus addressed and presents a discourse, having composed an Apology for our form of religion, because, you know, there were persons who were planning annoyance for our people. This Apology is still current among many of the brethren, and there is a copy in our own possession, from which one may see luminous evidence both of his intelligence and of his orthodoxy. And he himself discloses his personal antiquity, in the very terms of his own record, saying thus :

“ ‘ But the works of our Saviour were permanent (*ἀεὶ παρῆν*), for they were real ; to wit, persons healed, those that rose from the dead, who were not only visible at the time of their resurrection, but were continuously present ; not only during our Saviour’s tarriance on earth, but after his removal they were here for a long time, so that some even came down to our days.’ ”

In reading these two Eusebian extracts, we must interpret *our own times* of Quadratus and not of Hadrian, nor of Eusebius ; it will be natural for later writers to say that this means “ to the time of Hadrian.” We must also take the reference to the campaign of violence against *our people* in the same sense as *our times*, which means that the language of the *Chronicon* is also taken from Quadratus, so that we have really two quotations. Then we must observe further that when Eusebius speaks of Aristides’ *Apology*

in similar terms to those which he uses of Quadratus, and says that, like the latter (*παραπλησίως τῷ Κοδράτῳ*), he addressed an apology to Hadrian (*ἀπολογία ἐπιφωνήσας Ἀδριανῷ*), the language seems to suggest that both *Apolo-gies* were orally delivered in the first instance.

Where shall we turn next in our quest for further traces of Quadratus? Two suggestions have been made, one many years since, the other in quite recent times.

We are told by that omnivorous reader Photius,¹ that a certain Eusebius of Thessalonica, in the sixth century, had a controversy with a monk named Andreas, who employed against him words of Quadratus. Diligent search has not disclosed the existence, either of the arguments of Andreas, or of the ten books of Eusebius. The other direction in which it seems possible that the scent might be picked up by the hunter was the publication by De Boor of some fragments from the ecclesiastical history of Philip of Side.² These fragments have already become famous on account of a quotation from Papias to the effect that James and John were both of them martyred by the Jews, a statement which has been the cause of not a little controversy. Philip of Side also records from Papias that the mother of one Menahem was raised from the dead. He then goes on to say that "concerning those who were raised from the dead by Christ, *they lived till the time of Hadrian* (*ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων*)."³ From the concurrence of this language with that of Quadratus, it has been inferred that Papias and Quadratus were dealing with a common tradition. We have already shown that the language of Quadratus "till our own days," was likely to be repeated in the form "until Hadrian," and so we infer that the sentence attributed to Papias is not from that writer, but the words "Quadratus says" have dropped from the text

¹ Cod. 162.

² *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. V.

of Philip of Side. So it does not seem that anything further is likely to be discovered in this direction. We must now cast our nets a little wider.

The conjunction which Eusebius makes between Quadratus and Aristides suggests to us that perhaps the former may be found in the lurking-place of the latter. We know that Aristides was the *pièce de résistance* in the long drawn out banquet of the story of Barlaam and Joasaph. We have also shown that for whole tracts of the famous treatise of Celsus against the Christians, we find him answering the statements and confuting the arguments of Aristides. Is it then possible that John of Damascus may also have looted Quadratus' *Apology*, or is there any connexion between Celsus and Quadratus?

As far as relates to the great novel of John of Damascus, there is no *a priori* objection to the hypothesis that Quadratus might have been employed. We have called the *Apology* of Aristides his *pièce de résistance*, but it should be noted that he nibbles at it from his first pages, and he either knows it by heart or has it at his elbow when writing. Was Quadratus also on the *menu*? Nothing more likely from one point of view; there is plenty of apologetic matter scattered up and down in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. For example, there is the reply of the hermit to King Abenner (ii. 11); and there is the speech with which Joasaph converts Theudas from paganism to Christianity (xxxi. 285), to take the most striking cases. Each of these orations is an *Apology* as truly as the embedded Aristides. Take the former, which I quote from the recent excellent translation of Woodward and Mattingley. It begins this way:

“O King, if thou askest the cause how I came to despise things temporal, and to devote my whole self to the hope of things eternal, hearken unto me. In former days, when I was still but a stripling, I heard a certain good and whole-

some saying, which, by its force, took my soul by storm : and the remembrance of it, like some divine seed, being planted in my heart unmoved, was preserved ever until it took root, blossomed and bare that fruit that thou seest in me. Now the meaning of that sentence was this : It seemed good to the foolish to despise the things that are (τῶν ὄντων) as though they were not (ὡς μὴ ὄντων), and to cleave and cling to the things that are not as though they were. So he that hath never tasted the sweetness of the things that are, will not be able to understand the nature of the things that are not.”

Evidently we have a philosophical inquiry before us, with τὸ ὄν and τὸ μὴ ὄν. And that we are dealing with genuine Apologetic matter, may be seen by comparing a passage from the *Oration* of Melito the Philosopher, addressed to Marcus Antoninus : ¹

“ Truth, using the word as a stimulus and smiting such as are asleep, also awaketh them ; and when they are awake, seeing the truth, they also understand, and hearing, they also *distinguish that which exists from that which doth not exist*. . . . But the folly of which I speak is this, if a man should leave that *which really exists* and serve that *which really does not exist* : but there is that *which really exists*, and is called God.”

If we compare this oration, which is referred to the year 169 A.D., with our previous extract, we shall see that the line of argument is closely in agreement with what we find in the passage from the speech of the hermit : so we are justified in saying that the hermit is quoting a philosophic Apology of the second century. Is it possible that we have stumbled upon the wreckage of Quadratus ? The opening of the hermit's speech suggests a parallelism with that of Aristides, each of them being introduced by an ὁ βασιλεῦ.

¹ Cureton : *Spic. Syr.*

We shall leave the suggestion on the table and see whether it acquires verisimilitude.

In the 17th chapter of *Barlaam and Joasaph*, we have the monk instructing the young prince in the elements of theology; he begins exactly as Aristides does, to argue from Creation to the Creator, and from the visible things to the eternal power. You would at once see, by reading the speech of Barlaam by the side of the *Apology* of Aristides, that we are dealing with matters philosophic and apologetic; you can almost hear the echo of "I, O king, by the grace of God came into this world, and when I had considered the heavens and the earth and the seas, and beheld the sun and the rest of the orderly creation, I was amazed at the orderly arrangement of the world: and I understood, etc."

Barlaam puts it in this way:

"Even as a man, beholding a house splendidly and skillfully builded, or a vessel fairly framed, taketh note of the builder or workman, and marvelleth thereat, even so, I that was fashioned out of nothing and brought into being, though I cannot see the maker and provider, yet from his harmonious and marvellous fashioning of me . . . have seen that I was not brought forth by chance, nor made of myself. . . . I thought upon the well-ordered structure and preservation of the whole creation. . . ."

Here, then, is another fragment of an Apology, or a fragment of another Apology. Is it part of Quadratus' work, or some other?

In the 31st chapter of the romance, Joasaph makes an oration to Theudas on the absurdity of idol worship, and the argument is easily seen to be on lines similar to those of the *Apology* of Aristides. Here, then, is a third Apology, or, counting Aristides, a fourth Apology embedded in the story of Barlaam and Joasaph. It cannot be regarded

as improbable that one of them should represent the lost Quadratus.

Now let us see if we can approach the subject from another angle of vision. I do not think it has ever been noticed that the author of *Barlaam and Joasaph* has made use, in the course of his story, of another Christian Romance, probably the first Christian novel ever written : I mean the *Clementine Recognitions*. If we compare the following passages in *Barlaam and Joasaph* with the opening of the Clementines, there will be no doubt of the dependence of one on the other.

The young prince uses the language of Clement : " He restlessly turned over all these things in his mind, pondering without end, and ever calling up remembrances of death. Wherefore trouble and despondence were his companions, and his grief knew no ease ; for he said to himself, Is it true that death shall one day overtake me ? And who is he that shall make mention of me after death, when time delivereth all things to forgetfulness ? When dead, shall I dissolve into nothingness ? Or is there life beyond, and another world ?

" Ever fretting over these and the like considerations he waxed pale and wasted away " (*B. & J.*, v. 34).

Later in the story, Joasaph asks Barlaam the monk concerning a future life ; he tells him that " much anxiety has fallen on my heart, and consumeth my flesh in pain and grief and fasteneth on my very bones. Shall we men, appointed to die, return to nothing, or is there some other life after our departure hence ? These and kindred questions I have been longing to resolve."

The language shows that the romance is borrowing from the same source as before.

It might be said, What of that ? unless you are trying to prove that there was a copy of the Clementine Homilies

in the library of the Monastery of St. Saba ? It is clear that the language of these two passages is taken from the following noble opening of the *Clementine Romance* : “ I, Clement, being a Roman citizen, even from my earliest youth was able to live chastely (*σωφρόνως*), my mind from my boyhood drawing away from the lust that was in me to dejection and distress.

“ For I had a habit of reasoning, how originating I know not—making frequent cogitations concerning death : when I die, shall I neither exist, nor shall any one ever have any remembrance of me, while boundless time bears all things of all men into forgetfulness ? and shall I then be without being or acquaintance with those who are ; neither knowing nor being known, neither having been nor being ? And has the world ever been made ? And was there anything before it was made ? For if it has been always, it shall also continue to be ; but if it has been made, it shall also be dissolved. And after its dissolution shall there ever be anything again, unless, perhaps, silence and forgetfulness ? Or perhaps something which it is not now possible to conceive ? As I pondered without ceasing these and such like questions, I know not whence arising, I had such bitter grief that, becoming pale, I wasted away.”

Evidently Joasaph is Clement. One does not need to write the passages down in Greek to see that they are the same.

Very good ; but the question lies deeper than the possible proof of the existence of a copy of *Clementine Recognitions* at St. Saba. For when we reflect upon the matter, the Clementines are a more marvellous product than the story of Joasaph and Barlaam. Up to quite recent times, scholars have failed to notice that the body of the book was an old folk-tale, with which had been incorporated fragments from all quarters. In particular, a large part of the lost book of Bardaisan on the *Laws of Countries* is here pre-

served. No one has ever been able completely to unravel the threads of this story, perhaps no one ever will ; but it is just as composite as *Barlaam and Joasaph*. We are going to suggest that the noble opening of the book is a piece of Christian Apologetic, in which the writer is speaking autobiographically. Its literary value is far beyond the rest of the book. The author began with a noble theft, the same method by which he transferred the splendid arguments of Bardaisan. But this is not Bardaisan : it is from some lost Christian writer, probably from one of the second century Apologists.

There is a curious coincidence between the story of Clement and that of the hermit in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. Clement begins with τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν, " my first years," and the hermit with ἐν ἡμέραις ἀρχαίαις, ἔτι κομιδῇ νέος ὑπάρχων, " in old time when still quite a lad." Is it possible that we are dealing with fragments of the same story ? Does either of them, or both, come from the *Apology* of Quadratus ?

When we read the *Homilies* carefully we see a great many passages that have the appearance of having been transplanted from the world of apologetic literature into the fairy-land of romance. Here also there are, as in Aristides, sketches of the *amours* of the Olympians, mixed with philosophic reflections upon the nature of the world and the Great First Cause. In the sixth Homily we pick up again an argument exactly like that of Aristides, that the four elements cannot themselves be God. Here are some passages :

" First, then, the four original elements cannot be God because they have a cause. Nor can that mixing be God, nor that compounding and generating . . . for the four elements, if they lay outside one another, could not have been so mixed together as to generate life without some great artificer. . . .

“Thus we are shut up to the supposition that there is an unbegotten artificer, who brought the elements together, if they were separate ; or if they were together, artistically blended them so as to generate life, and who, out of all produced one work. For it cannot be that a work which is completely wise can be made without a mind that is greater than itself. Nor will it do to say that Love is the Artificer of all things, or desire, or power, or any such thing. All these are liable to change and transient in their very nature. Nor can that be God which is moved by another, much less what is altered by time and nature and can be annihilated.”

It is clear that the Clementines are just as much a piece of patchwork as the story of Barlaam and Joasaph ; in either case the novelist had a library at hand with which he was familiar, and from which he borrowed freely. It was not necessarily a Christian library in the exclusive sense, but it contained many Christian books. In either case, the collections were rich in Apologetic literature ; and if the passage which we quoted above does not come from an *Apology*, we cannot think of a source to which it can be referred.

Now let us return to the fragment of Quadratus preserved by Eusebius, and see if we can get any more light upon the book from which it is taken. It is clear from the terms of the extract that Quadratus is replying to some charge or objection ; the words, “ But our Saviour’s miracles were permanent, his healings permanent, the resurrected dead continued in life,” require an antecedent. Some one has been suggesting that the miracles were phantasmal, transitory, a mere illusion of the moment. It is the charge of wizardry that Quadratus is refuting.

Now if we turn to Origen’s reply to Celsus, we shall find him engaged in the very same task of refuting the charge

of magic, with the actual words of Celsus before him ; his method of reply is different from that of Quadratus. In the third century it was impossible to say that "the subjects of miraculous power lasted till my own days" ; and the force of the argument from persistence has been so weakened by the lapse of time that it is not available in the manner in which Quadratus presented it. Origen will take his own line, and ask whether the beneficent results of a Christianised world can possibly be the result of magicians and magic arts. But let us see how Celsus puts the emphasis on the magical explanation of miracles which he does not venture directly to deny. He begins by saying that Perseus and Amphion, and Aeacus and Minos, are credited by the Greeks with divine ancestry, and with works great and marvellous, beyond the power of man. He asks, why do not Christ and His followers show similar wonders ? Why did He not respond when His divinity was challenged in the temple and tell us plainly if He was the Christ ? To which Origen asks whether any of these Greek wonder-workers has left any luminous or beneficial result, that continues to after days (*παρατεῖναν εἰς τὰς ὕστερον γενεάς*).

This is a modification of Quadratus' manner of reply.

The whole world, says Origen, has the work of Jesus before it. But, says Celsus, suppose I grant you the truth of the healings or the resurrections or miraculous feeding of the multitude ; it was, in any case, nothing more than magicians do for a few pence in the market-place. They also drive out demons, expel diseases, call up the souls of heroes, set things in motion as if alive, which really are not alive, and so on.

I wonder, says Origen, sily, if this is the same Epicurean Celsus who once wrote a book against magic ! If, however, Celsus is prepared to concede the reality of magic, as an

explanation of our Lord's miracles, let him tell us of any magician who has reformed the world. Those who saw the wonders of Jesus underwent ethical transformation. Can Celsus produce the like? Is there any explanation possible except that God appeared in human form out of goodwill to our race?

It is clear, then, that wizardry (*γοητεία*) is one of the main arguments of Celsus, and, as we have seen, this is precisely what Quadratus is replying to in the famous quotation from his *Apology*. Then it is Celsus that Quadratus is replying to, just as it is Aristides whom Celsus is refuting. The result is very suggestive and interesting. We have the sequence

Aristides

Celsus

Quadratus.

We have also a good tradition for the belief that Aristides and Quadratus both presented their *Apologies* to Hadrian at Athens. In that case, we may take it, that the *True Word* of Celsus is the court reply to Aristides, and the Quadratus *Apology* is the summing up of the case for the Christians.

Here we are face to face with the chronological difficulty. It is not easy to make a definite statement as to the date of Aristides and his *Apology*; and as to Celsus, we are in a similar perplexity. Origen did not know accurately; what he did know was that Celsus was an Epicurean, but there were two such philosophers of the same name, one in the time of Nero, the other under Hadrian, and subsequently. Evidently it is the second Celsus that we are in search of.

From the fact that he is said to have lived under Hadrian, we are tempted to believe that this is the date of the *True Word*; but then there is the suspicious allusion to subsequent life and activity. It is generally held that Celsus

must be referring (in Orig. *c. Celsus*, ii. 9) to the expulsion of the Jews from their own land and city after the revolt under Bar Cochab, say after 135 A.D. It is not, however, clear that Celsus really refers to the great expulsion; it is perhaps only Origen's comment on their sufferings, and his proof that they got no more than their deserts. With Aristides the difficulty occurs in another form; as is well known, the Syriac version appears to refer the *Apology* to the time of Marcus Antoninus; but this raises the question whether his contemporary Quadratus would, as late as the time of Marcus Antoninus, have spoken of miraculous works as continuing their evidence to his own day. The problems of the chronology of the three writings requires, therefore, to be reconsidered. Our suggestion is that all these writings should be considered to be contemporary, and that a further investigation should be made as to the choice of emperors to whom the arguments are to be presented, and, if Hadrian is selected, a further decision is required as to the earlier or later date of the Hadrianic visits to Athens.

Here, for the present, we leave the matter; we have shown that there are a number of *Apologies* of the second century, which have been borrowed by Christian romances; amongst them may, perhaps, be found the relics of Quadratus. We had already proved, in the *editio princeps* of Aristides, that Celsus replied to Aristides, and we now venture the suggestion that Quadratus replies to Celsus, and that all three works belong to the same Athenian visit of either Hadrian or of Marcus Antoninus. That is as far as we have at present been able to pursue the search for the lost *Apology* of Quadratus.

RENDEL HARRIS.